Leeds
April 30, 1774

My Dear Brother

The Preaching School in a preaching house does it so much hurt, & keeps it so dirty, in spite of all the care which can be taken, that we have made it a rule for several years, Let no School be taught in any preaching house. But I cannot commend your Design, if you had a proper place and a Master might easily be procured.

If we live till Duty, I shall willingly accept of your kind invitation. I am with Love to S. Terry.

Your Affectionate Brother

Wesley
The discovery of a new Wesley letter is always an interesting event. The particular one which we are about to describe has several points of especial interest. By the kind co-operation of Mr. H. Duffield of Leeds, the present owner, we are able to describe it in detail, and to reproduce a facsimile of the letter itself.

It is written on the right half of one side of a sheet of laid paper measuring 12½" x 8¼", folded several times to make an envelope measuring 4½" x 3¼". It is addressed

"To
M' Rich'd Terry
in
Hull"

and over the address, in the top right-hand corner, is scrawled a large "3". The back of the envelope bears a stamped postmark "LEEDS", and Wesley's well-known monogram seal, with the motto "Believe, Love, Obey." The paper bears a circular water-mark showing the letters "G R." surrounded by leaves, underneath which is the papermaker's name "I Nind." This will certainly be the same "Mr. Nind" to whom Wesley was anxious to remit £50 in May, 1774. (Standard Letters, vi, 80, 87.) The paper with which Mr. Nind supplied Wesley, both for printing and correspondence, was usually like this, of very good quality, costing about 14/- or 15/- a ream.

The letter itself reads thus:

Leeds
April 30, 1774

My Dear Brother

The teaching School in a preaching house does it so much hurt, & keep's it so dirty, in spite of all the care which
can be taken, that we have made it a rule for several years, "Let no School be taught in any Preaching house." But I commend your Design, if you had a proper place. And a Master might easily be procured.

If we live till July, I shall willingly accept of your kind invitation. I am, with love to S. Terry,

Your Affectionate Brother
J. Wesley.

To the present writer this letter opens up new fields of thought, both fascinating and tantalising because it is difficult, maybe impossible, to be certain about several points. Where, for instance, is there any other mention of this apparently well-established "rule"—"Let no School be taught in any Preaching house." It does not appear to be an official ruling which had gone through the Conference, since it does not appear in the Large Minutes of 1772, although in those same Minutes Wesley does give the following general advice to his assistants:—"Every where insist on decency and cleanliness. Tell them cleanliness is next to godliness." Had there been many previous examples of day schools being held in Methodist premises which were also used for Sunday Services? Examination of scores of standard books on early Methodism has brought little information. Rev. J. Wesley Bready, in his England Before and after Wesley, page 268, says "The first preaching-house in Halifax was also used as a day school," which was taught by a local preacher," but J. U. Walker's History of Wesleyan Methodism in Halifax represents the facts as indicating that Titus Knight, the converted collier who later became a minister, actually "commenced a preparatory school for education" in "the room adjoining the chapel," which was opened in 1752 (see pages 72, 87). A writer in Proceedings iii, 102 says that through the labours of Nathaniel Dracup "a school-chap-

1. Works, 1771-4, xv, 310. Incidentally, the compilers of books of quotations seem to have gone astray in tracing this saying to Wesley's sermon On Dress, where he says, using quotation marks, "cleanliness is, indeed, next to godliness." Stevenson's Book of Quotations says that Wesley quotes the phrase, giving "no indication as to its source," not realising that Wesley is quoting himself!
(pages 182, 211-3) that what he calls “a little school-house, with
burial ground attached,” was built in 1766 and used “as a day
and Sunday school and preaching-room” until 1814, though
whether it was so used from the beginning is very doubtful. This
information, meagre though it is, shows that Yorkshire was a
fruitful ground for experiments in education. Mr. Bready also
reminds us that both West Street Chapel and the Foundery ran
schools, and the same appears to have been true of the Orphan
House at Newcastle. The rise of free schools on Methodist
premises is shrouded in obscurity.

Mr. A. H. Body, in his *John Wesley and Education*, says:

As early as 1784 a free school for forty boys was established in Whitefriars
Street, Dublin, and from this humble beginning sprang the chain of
Methodist day schools, opened in the most needy districts, which during
the early part of the last century rendered such sterling work
educationally.

This letter of John Wesley’s surely proves, however, that he
had had unfortunate experiences with similar schools long before
this date. Certainly Richard Terry’s suggestion, apparently for a
free school financed by himself, and to be held in the Manor
Alley Chapel, Hull, antedates the one mentioned by Mr. Body
by ten years. It seems possible that the natural interest attaching
to the phenomenal rise of Sunday Schools, largely under
Methodist influence, has caused the gradual development of free
schools out of the “Charity Schools” to be overshadowed. It
would be interesting to know if anything came of Richard Terry’s
scheme, of which Wesley approved in principle. The Hull
Central Reference Library, however, can throw no light on the
question.

What about the promoter of this scheme, the recipient of
Wesley’s letter? Here we are on surer ground, and the information
obtained necessitates the compiling of a new chapter in the
history of Hull Methodism. For much of this information the
writer is indebted to the Chief Librarian of the Hull Reference
Library, Mr. James G. Sleight, and grateful acknowledgment of
his generous help is here made.

In his interesting *Early Chapters of Hull Methodism*, Mr. W.
H. Thompson has a few references to Richard Terry, and the
book also contains a photograph of Terry’s house. His full
importance to the early Methodist cause in Hull has, however,
been obscured by the hand of time. The general impression
which he has left in the pages of Methodist history is well summed
up by the *Methodist Conference Handbook*, Hull, 1938, which
describes him on page 101 as
“a public-spirited citizen of Hull, of Methodist habits and sympathies, if not a full adherent. His house, which was at the corner of Beverley Road and Clough Road, is now in ruins, but part of the grounds are still vacant, and there is a tree there, known until recent years by the older folks as ‘Wesley’s tree.’”

It is also stated that Wesley preached at Newland in 1786, and in the grounds of Terry’s house there in 1789. We cannot but agree with Mr. W. H. Thompson, however, in believing that General Perronet Thompson’s reminiscence of “Mr. Wesley preaching on the grass plot of Mr. Terry’s house at Newland,” “very likely” in 1789, should be amended to 1786 in view of Wesley’s express statement that on June 17th, 1786, he “preached about four at Newland.” His text was Ephesians ii. 8, “For by grace ye are saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God.” (Standard Journal vii. 70.)

It will be seen, however, that Terry’s associations with Hull Methodism were much closer and lasting than has hitherto been suspected. This new Wesley letter proves that they started long before that 1786 visit. A brief sketch of his career and relations with the Methodist cause in Hull will be of interest.

In 1774 he was forty years of age, already a man of substance, making his mark as a Baltic merchant, and well-known in Hull trade circles. Wesley’s letter, addressed simply “To Mr. Richd Terry in Hull” would be delivered at his offices in High Street. One addressed “Newland, near Hull” would have been unhesitatingly delivered at “Newland Hall,” “Newland Park,” or “Terry’s House,” as his mansion was varyingly called.

In 1771 Hull had been made the head of a Methodist Circuit, and in the same year a new chapel was erected in Manor Alley. To make room for it the old “Tower of Henry VIII” in which the Methodists had previously worshipped was pulled down. It seems very likely that Richard Terry’s support was enlisted in raising funds for this new chapel. When erected, it bore the inscription, “This preaching-house was built by the people called Methodists, 1771, pro bono publico.” John Wesley, visiting Hull on June 24th, 1772, described it as “extremely well-finished, and upon the whole one of the prettiest preaching houses in England.” Probably on this visit Wesley and Terry met—perhaps the Methodists proudly introduced Terry to Wesley as one of their latest acquisitions. At any rate it seems certain from the tone of Wesley’s letter that they had met at some time
previous to their correspondence. Wesley's next visit to Hull after June, 1772, was July, 1774, for which visit Terry had offered hospitality.

Wesley was supposed to look upon the house of Mr. Snowden in High Street as his Hull "home," 2 but he was also quite ready to avail himself of Terry's offer. He reaffirms this in a letter addressed "To Mrs. Terry, at Newland, Near Hull," and dated April 11th, 1780—"If I should come near the eastern coast, I should be glad to spend a little time with you." This letter closes, "I am, with love to Brother Terry, dear sister, Yours affectionately." 3 It seems reasonable to assume, therefore, as Wesley did "live till July" that at least, some part of his visit to Hull on July 7-8, 1774 was spent with Mr. and Mrs. Terry. The summer of 1781 would also see him in their company. More than that we cannot affirm with absolute certainty.

The next certain date is June 17th, 1786, when Wesley preached at Newland, at that time "a pleasant village 1¼ miles from Hull, where several imposing mansions had been built by Hull Merchants." 4 A few weeks after this well-known visit, on July 30th, Wesley wrote to Terry from the Bristol Conference, expressing grave disapproval of a scheme for sectionalising the Hull Circuit, so that the preachers could concentrate more on particular churches and neighbourhoods. 5 It seems obvious from this that Terry was more than a mere outsider, offering occasional financial help to the Methodist cause.

Richard Terry did not take a great part in public life, and one wonders whether the little he did was not prompted by his associations with Methodism, as was the case with so many philanthropists in the late eighteenth century. He showed real interest in the poor. According to an account of 1794,

The poor of the town of Hull are carefully and comfortably maintained in a spacious building appropriated for that

---

2. See the account of Hull Methodism given in Wesleyan Methodist Magazine for 1837, pages 885-889; also Early Chapters in Hull Methodism, P. 23.
charitable purpose. The management of all business relative to the poor is vested in a Corporation, entitled, "The Corporation of Governor, Deputy Governor, Assistants, and Guardians, of the poor in Hull."  

The first Hull Directory, of 1791, shows that at that date Terry was one of the "Assistants," but in the appendix, dated 1792, he has been promoted to "Governor for the Poor, Richard Terry, Esq; High Street." By 1794, however, he was once again one of the nineteen assistants, and described as plain "Mr. Richard Terry, Newland." It seems probable that he was really not cut out for public life. Between 1792 and 1794 he took a partner into his business, for the Universal British Directory describes the firm at that date as "Terry and Wright, Merchants, High-st."  

In 1798, when the question of national defence was calling for public-spirited men, Joseph Benson compiled a list of subscribers to the George-Yard Methodist Chapel defence fund. These twenty-eight Hull Methodists between them contributed £740-15-0. The first name on the list is that of Richard Terry, who gave £100, whilst another entry shows that Avison Terry gave £50. (For Avison Terry see below.)  

The old man was nearing the end of his days, however, and in 1804 he died, and was buried in St. John's Church.

Mr. Sleight has sent a long extract from High-Street, Hull, some years ago, by John Symons, 1862, pages 80ff. This merits quotation in its entirety. With regard to Terry's business address, now No. 41, High Street, Mr. Symons says:—

Richard Terry and Sons. This house formerly belonged to the Hildyards, and was next door to the King's Coffee-house ... It was originally a most magnificent mansion, with a hall open to the roof in several places. 

describing the Terry family he continues:

Mr. Richard Terry was one of the earliest and most successful Baltic Merchants in Hull. The founder of this wealthy house was originally a school-master at Gilberdyke, near Howden. The only surviving representative of the once great mercantile family is the venerable Avison Terry, Esq of Newland, near Hull, the last of a long line, which is likely to end with him. The whole family were High Churchmen.

9. According to Sheahan's History of Hull, 1869, Avison Terry was at that date a grand old man of 93. Although the family apparently died out, their name is still commemorated by a "Terry Street," presumably named after them.
Piety and benevolence were synonymous of the names of Richard Terry and Sons. Mr. Terry did not take an active part in public life. The only office he ever held was that of Governor of the Poor in 1792; but he devoted himself to religion and charity, contributing most munificently to the churches of St. Mary, St. James, and St. John. In the interior of the last named elegant temple dedicated to God's worship, may be found the "narrow mansion" where sleeps the good Richard Terry, who died the 12th of May, 1804, aged 70 years.

Midst kindred dust thy sacred ashes rest;
Thy soul has fled, and mingles with the blest.
The bust may perish, and the dome may fall,
O'er halls of grandeur death extends his pall:
But, more refulgent, virtue claims the skies,
And spurns the dust where meaner glory dies.

It will be noticed that Mr. Symons stresses Richard Terry's High Church associations. This must not blind us to the fact that he was undoubtedly prominent in Methodist circles as well. In all probability he strove, like John Wesley, to be both a good Churchman and a good Methodist at the same time. His name certainly merits being inscribed boldly in the annals of Hull Methodism.

FRANK BAKER.

THE "RICHMOND" LETTERS OF CHARLES WESLEY.
(Continued)

In this concluding section are found two letters to Mark Davis and one to John Wesley about him. To judge solely by the references in the Standard Journal and Letters they furnish some new information. They show that Charles, with certain "leading laymen" in London, tried to secure the appointment of Davis to City Road, because he was now in Holy Orders. Charles Wesley stayed in London till Davis had arrived, and then went off to Bristol. Trouble soon arose, however, in London, and John Wesley asked his brother for full information about Charles' own share in the matter, and Charles sent it. Perhaps John used this at the meeting described in his letter to Charles, 22nd February, 1774.

10. As Mr. Sleight points out, the phrase "the dome may fall" was indeed prophetic, for St. John's Church has since been pulled down, to be replaced by the Ferens Art Gallery, a generous gift by one of Hull's most loved citizens—and, until his death a few years ago, a loyal Methodist.
To Rev. Mark Davis.

Bristol Dec. 10. 1772.

My dear Bro'.

"You understand it is a matter concluded on, that the People are to be directed by 12 Lay-preachers" You misunderstand their misinformation. All which we would or can do for keeping them together after our departure is, To commend them to the most solid and stablished of our preachers (be they 12 or more or less) whom we advise to keep close together, and regulate the society as near as may be according to their old rules. Now this is impossible without a Clergyman or two at their head. Wherefore my Brother has so often & so warmly invited you to come & help them, before we leave them. But *Nihil est tam bonum quam quis male narrando posset depraevivisse*. I suppose your Informer made you believe you must be under the government of Lay-preachers, whereas in the very nature of things both they & the Society must be under yr. (?) government. It is not in my Brother's or my power to order it otherwise after our death: it is not in our Will. Do what we can the people will choose for themselves; & the major part of them prefer a Clergyman to a Lay-preacher.—Indeed I defy any man alive to foretell or divine how the Lord will carry on his Work when we are at rest. We plan and continue the best we can, but leave the event to God—-Known unto Him are all his Works, & all his Workmen. Whether he had chosen you to benefit or be benefitted by our children He only can tell. I am ignorant and therefore without a choice. I have no interest in your coming or staying away. The will of the Lord be done—If a mans eye is not single he may start endless objections; which is still only conferring with flesh & blood. But I think you run no hazard by helping us. *Tu in portu navigas, & are absolute master of your own motions*. Come with me to London in the end of Feby. *Sic sum (say I & the Flock) si places utere.* If you should not like us; if you should stumble at the threshold by falling into bad hands, or otherwise; you may retreat in a week, & bury yourself again, & your Gospel-talent at Coychurch.

If you should find it good to be still with us, the people will look upon you as their future Father & Guardian, & when my Brother goes, naturally cleave to you. Then he that watereth shall be watered by the Lord. Then the Lord will give a J.F. or two; then you shall save your own soul, & theirs that hear you.
Wishing you & your dear partner all happiness in Xt. Jesus
I remain dear Sir

Yr. faithful Bror* & Sen*
C.W.

[J.F. = John Fletcher]

There are several references to Mark Davis in John Wesley’s Letters and Journal. He began to travel in 1756, but ceased to do so in 1769 (Standard Letters, v.p. 329). In the same place it is stated that he ‘probably entered the Church of England.’ The above letter enables us to delete ‘probably.’ Davis seems to have been living at a place called ‘Coychurch,’ near Bridgend, Glam. This letter shows that Charles and some of the ‘leading spirits’ in London had suggested to Davis that he should return to the ranks of the Methodist preachers and work at the Foundery and West Street. Is this the earliest instance of the giving of an ‘invitation’ to a Preacher? But Charles Wesley had a purpose of a wider sort. Evidently Davis had written to ask what the government of Methodism would be when both the Wesleys were gone. He had heard a rumour about this that disquieted him. Charles’ letter shows that his own hopes were that there would be a group of Evangelical clergy within Methodism when he and his brother died, that they would control the Connexion, and that John Fletcher and Mark Davis would be among them. It is interesting to note that John Wesley had asked Davis to return to the Methodist ranks. He knew of this particular proposal, as the letter of May 22, 1773, shows.

To Mr. D. London May 22. 1773
My Dear Brother & friend

He that believeth shall not make haste. I always believed if God had chosen you to water what we had planted & to build up where we had laid the foundation he would in his own due time & manner incline your heart, inspire you with resolution, & direct & shine upon all your paths. Accordingly you know I left you to yourself, or rather to God & his gracious Providence. I never persuaded or urged you to come among us; but stood still to see the design of God. He has made his design plain at last both to you and to me. It is the Lords doing not ours; & my will & your will lies at his feet.—I wanted one more sign of the divine counsel, that is, the opposition of Satan. This also is added for our confirmation. I wrote to my Brother desiring him to say nothing of the Salary to any man, before he mentioned it to our Committee here. My reason was obvious. I knew such premature notice would give some enemies to the Cause & Clergy an handle to mischief. My Bro’. unwarily wrote word of it to Mr. A.M. He had made good use of the intelligence and thrown all the hindrances he could in your way. He and his trusty associate T.O. have wrote to my Bro’. dissuading him, have tried
to prejudice Mr. R. the Stewards & Society: with very little success indeed, but their envy is restless & indefatigable. Mr. Horton Kemp & Folgham assure me Mr. R is quite satisfied. I shall write immediately to secure my Bro'. The Comme to a Man & the Society in general longs for your coming—Mr. Kemp bids you come away and not stay for the stuff, for the whole land is before you. If there should be the least demur after all about the Salary—Mr. K.H.F. & a very few more will make that matter easy—In fact the Salary is a mere pretence—The true and only objection is your Orders. T O. A.M. &c. will not be so much wanted, so much respected: so well paid, & so important (they foresee) if any Clergyman succeed to the care of this Flock. Hinc ille lacrymae! hence all their plots, their open & secret opposition? But the bridle is in their jaws. The Founder & head of the Church of England is against them & I firmly believe the bulk of the poor Methodists will never turn Dissenters, but continue in the Ship, till we are brought safe to the haven.

You see the necessity of your hastening to us. I will defer my journey till June 14 that I may be here to receive you & leave you settled. Let nothing retard your setting out beyond Whit Monday. If your partner is too weak to accompany you, leave her to follow at her leisure. The Lord be your guide & Councillor in this & all things.

P.S. You can keep a secret. If God give me strength I may possibly surprize somebody by my unexpected appearance at the Conference in Aug. (a few words indecipherable here because of a worn margin) to the C. of England to my Bror. & to you. C.W.

[‘T.O.’ and ‘A.M.’—Thos. Olivers & Alex. Mather.]

In this letter Charles Wesley refers to some opposition to the return of Mr. Davis to Methodism because of the size of his proposed Salary. As he promises in the letter, he wrote to his brother about this, for John's reply will be found in a letter from Londonderry, 30th May, 1773. He does not seem to have shared his brother's suspicions about the motives of Mather and Olivers. These two preachers were appointed to London at the Conference of 1772, (but not that of 1773), This may explain why John Wesley wrote to Mather about the proposal for Davis to go there.

The Conference of 1773 was held in London. As Tyerman says, Wesley had now failed to obtain the consent of Mr. Fletcher to be his successor. Was Charles Wesley at this Conference? The name of Mark Davis does not appear in the list of appointments in Min. Conf. 1773, which may show that his appointment was peculiar.
Proceedings

XV

[The following letters of the Rev. Chas. Wesley relate to a negotiation with Mr. Davis a Welch Clergyman to supply the Foundry & West St. Chapels.]

Copy of

Letter to my Bro'.

Jan. 20 1774.

In June 26th 1772, I met Mr. D in Bristol, on his way to Wales. He informed me, y' my B. & he had been treating some time, about his coming to assist us at our Chappels. We rode & discoursed together most days till July 16th—I saw how much depended on his being; first, a man of grace, and of a single eye; and next, a true lover of the Church of England. I therefore endeavoured in our first conferences, to stir up and provoke him to love and to good works. From the beginning I laid aside all reserve. All the difference betwixt my B. and me, (I told him) was that my B's First Object was the Mts, and then the church; mine was, first the Church, and then the Mts. That our different judgement of persons, was owing to our different temper; his, all hope and mine all fear. That I could not blame him for asking Mr. D to join us, although I dared not do it myself, fearing my own ignorance and shortsightedness, and believing he ought to be persuaded in his own mind, so that if he came, it might be his own deed, and choice—The farthest I durst go, was to answer his objections. Some he mentioned, but kept others back & seemed to leave Bristol unresolv'd. In his letters from Wales, he again seemed willing to come; but started fresh objections, which I fairly satisfied. I acted with the utmost simplicity; telling him the faults, as well as virtues of our children; setting before him, all our difficulties, and discouragements, as well as the advantages which might accrue, both to him, and to them. In the beginning of December 1772, he mentioned a new objection. "I understand it is a matter concluded, and that the people are to be directed by 12 Lay-preachers." I set him right in my answer of Decem, 10th, & added "Known unto God are all his works, and all his workmen. Whether he has chosen you to benefit, or be benefitted by, our children, He only can tell. I am ignorant, and therefore without a choice. I have no interest in your coming, or staying away. The will of the Lord be done." "But I think you run no hazard by helping us. "Tu in portu navigas," and are an absolute master of your own motions. Come with me to London in the end of February; If you should not like us; if you should stumble at the threshold, you may retreat in a Quarter, a Month
or a Week, and bury yourself again, and your talent at Coychurch.”

In his next, he mentioned an impossible condition. “If he was sure Mr. F would secure (? succeed) my Bror.” I replied, in few words. “There is all reason to hope, J F. will succeed J. W. — The Lord will give him suitable associates. — I have no more to say upon this subject; you must be fully persuaded in your own mind.”

From this time, I gave up all thoughts of his coming, and expected to hear no more from him about it. But not long after, he surprized me with another letter, “That he would no longer confer with flesh and blood, or fear to disoblige Lady H., but was resolved to follow his conscience, and come among us.” I replied that his fear of her Ladyship was a new objection which he ought maturely to consider, and not rashly disoblige his Benefactress.

I told the time I should set out for London, not expecting his company, nor desiring it. — On Feb'y 25, 1773, I came to London. On Thursday, March 10th, I met Mr. D., at the Foundry, to which he came, quite unexpected, the evening before. — He immediately declared to Mr. Ley and me, that he would have nothing to do with the Committee; and desired they might not be consulted in respect of his salary. For which reason, when it was touched on among them, Mr. Horton stopt their proceeding on that subject, and declared that my Bror. would reserve it to himself.

Mr. D. demanded £80 a year, in Mr. Ley's presence. I agreed to it, and promised to write to my Bror who, I doubted not, would agree to it, too. On Sunday March 15th, he assisted me at the Chapel, and so, every Sunday till Easter. On the 13th, or 14th of April, he set out for Wales. But first agreed with me in presence of Mr. Ley either that his travelling expenses should be paid, or his salary commence from the time of his first coming to Town. To this last we mutually agreed. In his first letter from Wales, May 1st, he writes thus. “There was one thing which I postpon'd laying before you, and am very culpable for my neglect; our real situation, and circumstances. (Here followed a long account of them). “We find it impracticable to sell our goods. They are become a mere drug and are sold here, for half value; so that we must take them all to London. And as this will be attended with great expense, I shoud esteem it a great Christian Kindnese, if the Stewards would lend us 40 or 50£, to defray expenses of our journey, and to commence housekeeping. I must beg, my dear Sir, your being so kind as to lay this before the Stewards, immediately, because I can do nothing before I
have an answer.” I immediately summoned the Committee, and laid it before them. They all agreed to advance him 40£ of his salary. Some enquired, what that would be. Knowing Mr. D’s desire that it should not be submitted to them, and that my Bror. when he came, would better reconcile them to so large a salary, I only said, that my Bror. had formerly told me He would allow him 70£, a year. Mr. Horton then put an end to the enquiry, by telling them that my Bror. would reserve that matter to himself.” I proposed, at coming to London, to return immediately after Easter, but yielded to stay a little longer, for Mr. D’s sake. He promised to be back before Whit Sunday at the farthest, and in a letter of May 28, writes, “I take it inexpressibly kind your staying for my arrival, for I know the timidity of my spirits.” I had informed him of my having mentioned to the Committee, my B’s former offer of 70£; of their allowing 40£ for advance; and of my B’s consenting to pay him 80£ pr annum. In my letter, were these words, “You know I left you to yourself, ; I never persuaded, or urged you to come among us; but I stood still, to see the Design of God. Mr. Kemp has sent you the enclosed (Bill) bidding you come away and not stay for the stuff, for the whole land is before you.—You see the necessity of your hastening to us. I will defer my journey till June 14th, that I may be here to receive you, and have you settled. Let nothing retard you setting out before Whitsun Monday. If your partner be too weak to accompany you, leave her to follow you at her leisure. It may be best for you to have an house ready for her.—June 8th, Mr. D. came up with his wife and Family to Mr. Horton’s and soon after I set out for Bristol.

Dear Bro’.

According to your desire, I send you this plain Narrative; from which you may answer all which concerns me in Mr. D’s letter. “My urgent letter. and absolute call to come,” was no more than my pressing him to keep his word. I thought I had a right to hasten him back, after the bargain was made. And I did urge him to return at the time fixd by himself, chiefly for his sake; then for my own and the people’s, who might be apt to grudge the large stipend, if he stayed longer from them. As to that expression of Mr. Kemp’s “Stay not for the stuff, for the whole land is before you,” I am persuaded any clergyman acceptable to the people would find it strictly true: and while they had a piece of bread, he would be sure of part of it. . . .

C.W.
Mark Davis came to London, but difficulties soon arose. On January 13, 1774 John Wesley wrote to Charles from London, saying "Your advice with regard to Mr. D. is good. He is very quiet, but not very useful." By the next month, at latest, parties for and against him were disputing in the London Societies, for on February 22, 1774, John wrote to Charles as follows; "To-day Henry Hammond and Jo. Bates pleading on the one side, Mr. Horton and Ley on the other, Mr. D. had a full hearing. In the end he desired (not demanded) that some compensation might be made him for his losses. This is to be referred to the Committee which meets to-morrow night. I shall not be there, but at Lewisham." It seems plain that Davis was to leave. The short letter at the end of the following "copy" shows that Davis had said that Charles Wesley had urged him to come to London, and evidently John Wesley had asked his brother to give him his account of the whole matter. Possibly John used this information at the Meeting described above. On Jan. 5, 1760 and on Jan. 13, 1791, John Wesley visited his "old friend Mark Davis" (see Standard Journal). At that time, therefore, Davis seems to have been living in or near London. At the head of the "copy" there is the following note, but not in the same writing as the other notes, — See Jackson, vol. ii, 299, a chasm of three years." This seems to refer to Jackson’s Life of Charles Wesley, where Jackson passes straight from 1772 to 1775, the suggestion, no doubt, being that he omitted the Mark Davis episode.

(See Proceedings xxii : 187)

The letter of Charles Wesley addressed to William Perronet was directed to him not at "Mexads Court, Dean Street, Soho," but at "Meard’s Court." See London in Miniature: being a Concise and Comprehensive Description of the Cities of London and Westminster . . . With the addition of A Correct alphabetical List of all the Streets, Lanes, Squares, Courts, Alleys, &c. within the Bills of Mortality . . . London: Printed for C. Corbett, in Fleet-Street, M.DCC.LV.; on page 372 of which is the entry "Meard’s court, Dean str."
This book is very little known, and I am indebted to Mr. Edmund Austen for calling my attention to it. The name Thicknesse is not mentioned, so far as I am able to tell, in any Methodist publication.

The eccentric title prepares one for a book full of strange things and such this autobiography contains in abundance, described in rambling, but sometimes very vivid fashion by one who was evidently an eccentric person. Only the first volume contains any material relevant to our purpose.

Philip Thicknesse was the son of the Rector of Farthingoe, Northants, whom he describes as a conscientious Clergyman. We need not dwell upon the pedigree of the family, which in the course of events enabled his son to take his seat in the House of Lords. The author commenced his education at Aynhoe School, but removing to London with his mother, who was left a widow with eight children in 1725 he entered Westminster School.

From this seat of learning he was expelled, and was placed with a very respectable apothecary. "(upon what is called liking," F.F.B.)

This did not last long. The truth was, that I had been so poisoned by the glaring colours in which Ogelthorpe [sic] had in his printed books displayed the prospects of his new colony of Georgia, that I was determined to go thither; and at length prevailed upon my mother to consent to it. While this project had filled me with infinite delight, for I then considered myself as one setting out to begin the forming of a new world. My Mother told me that if I chose a verse in the 39th Chapter of Genesis in which there are 83 letters, it would unfold to me the future events of my life. [Evidently the 49th Chapter is meant but it contains more than 83 letters]

Now it happened to pass in those days, that the Scriptures were not only believed, but seriously attended to; so I fixed upon the 26th verse, and when I found that the blessings of my father would extend to the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills, and be upon the head of him who was separated from his brethren, (I was then the first of the family that separated from his brethren) I felt a delight, and a faith too, not to be removed; and my mother, though a sensible woman, was weak enough to become a partaker with me, in that heart-felt satisfaction she perceived to be spread over my countenance; nor could at that time any offer however
advantageous in appearance, have diverted me, from adding one to the number of foolish Georgia emigrants.

Upon our arrival in Georgia, I was much surprised to find the town of Savanna, or rather the spot where the town now stands, situated upon a high bluff of barren sand, and directly opposite to a low swampy island; on the muddy shore of which within a small compass, I could count at least twenty Alligators [sic] basking thereon. Mr. Causton, the chief Magistrate to whom I had letters received me civilly and Mr. John Westley, to whom I also had a letter, seemed disposed to admit me among the number of his elect. Mr. Causton's Niece, a very pretty young lady, was one of Mr. Westley's early prayer attendants at the Chapel, after which, she, with several other young people, usually attended Mr. Westley to domestic lectures for further edification, at his own apartments, but Mr. Williamson, a gentleman who came over in the same vessel with me, paid his addresses to that young lady, and soon after married her, by which means he was in possession, of many pious letters written Mr. W. to Mrs. Williamson, but he not approving of that kind of correspondence, she no longer frequented his domestic lectures, and I believe, like myself, became rather slack in attending his early morning prayers. Mr. Hutton, a worthy clergyman, of whom I shall speak more fully hereafter, who had recommended me to Mr. Westley, I found had been informed soon after my arrival, by Mr. Westley, that I did not give him too much of my company, and to say the truth, I did not covet much of his; and I will give my reasons. Dr. Hutton was a clergyman of worth and character, who could not reconcile himself to take the necessary oaths, whereby he could hold his church preferment, he therefore resigned it, and took a house in College Street, Westminster, and had several boys of that school boarded with him; his own family consisted of a wife, a son, and a daughter; the son is still living, and is, or was, well known among that sect called Moravians.

* He was bred a Bookseller, and opened a shop near Temple Bar, from whence he went to Moravia, to fetch himself a wife of that Nation and Religion; but this is not the age for Booksellers to make Fortunes by the Sale of Bibles, Prayer Books etc., and as Mr. Hutton would sell little else, that business would not do, and he betook himself to one which it seems did, that of a Moravian Leader.
My family were intimate with Dr. Hutton's and my sister, who was about the same age as Miss Hutton, became so far her confident that she shewed her a great number of letters written by Mr. Charles Westley to her, in which the care of her soul and body too, seemed to claim much of his regard; for I must observe, that Messrs. Westley and Whitefield, who were the first movers of the Methodist sect, were continually at Dr. Hutton's, praying, eating etc., my sister, who perhaps had more knowledge of the world and mankind, than Miss Hutton, (for, tho' of good understanding she was very deal) did not approve of that spiritual correspondence between Mr. Charles Westley, and her female friend. She perceived it made the young woman unhappy, and therefore prevailed upon her, to drop that sort of correspondence with him, observing to her, at the same time, that mankind have various ways of pursuing happiness through this life to a better; and as I did not find Mr. John Westley seemed to have any disposition of corresponding with me, and thinking too, that my soul was of as much importance to him, as the soul of any young lady whatever. I had very little intercourse with him afterwards. I must not however omit to mention a singular misfortune which befell him, in consequence of his zealous endeavour to reform a fair, but frail lady, then at Georgia, whose immoral conduct had been much centured by Mr. Westley, and who sent to desire him to call upon her; it was natural for him to conclude, his visit was to pave the way to repentance and future good conduct, he accordingly attended her, but the instant he entered her apartment, she laid violent hands upon him, threw him upon the bed, and threatened him with the immediate loss of life, or what some might deem as dear as life, nor did she dismiss him, till she had deprived him of all the Adonis flowing locks, which at that time, adorned one side of his meek and goodly countenance; yet such was his humility, that he appeared the Sunday following at Church, in his partial and ear-crop'd head of hair; the lady perhaps intended to have made Mr. Westley a Monk, as the Duchess of Montpensier did Henry the third. Let it be remembered however, that a desire of such spiritual correspondence with the sex, which appeared in both these brothers, might arise from the utmost purity, and virtuous intentions; however their letters might be construed to convey suspicion of sinister designs; those gentlemen were not ignorant, that there never was, nor ever can be, a new sect formed, (and that, was their great object) if women were not engaged to promote it, they knew that Arius did more by engaging Constantia, the Emperor's sister, into his way of
thinking, relative to the consubstantiality of the word, than he could have done by gaining over a thousand male followers. The Westleys, and Whitefield, first stated the methodistical plan, but Lady Huntingdon, in reality, is the sole person who has established its permanency; and there is no doubt but her motives were good, because her life and manners are exemplary, and truly virtuous: she may appear in the eyes of some of us, righteous over much, but then remember a text of scripture, containing only two words; and from which my father made an excellent discourse, i.e. "judge not."

After this, Mr. Westley and I seldom met, but the day I had embarked with a view to returning to England, I was agreeably surprised to find him with me, in a small sloop bound to Charles Town in South Carolina, in which I had engaged my passage; he was going to get prayer books printed, and I to find a conveyance to England. Our sloop commander, proved to be a perfect reprobate mariner, and we fresh water sailors, thought he carried too much sail, I urged him, for it blew hard, to shew less canvas, and Mr. Westley implored him to swear not at all; but our prayers prevailed not, more sail and more oaths, seemed to be the consequence of our requests; by this time we were out of sight of land, the gale increased and we run gunwale under water, if there was no real danger we apprehended much, and Mr. Westley, (to my great surprise) said, well Mr. Thicknesse, I have a small book in my little trunk here, which I should be unwilling to lose, and with the utmost sang froid, opened his trunk, and put the book into his pocket! Now what was I to conceive by this singular transaction? For though, the ship, Whitefield sailed in, to Georgia, stood still in the Atlantic ocean, when all her sails were sleeping, in a fresh gale of wind, I saw no possible chance of saving our lives, had the sloop overset; nothing but a float of Allegators, with lock saddles alongside, ready to take us on shore could have preserved us. I did not take the liberty to ask Mr. Westley, his plan of preservation, or if his book was the charm, which contained it; he had but one, so I must let that remain in enigmatical obscurity, along with Mr. Whitefield's motionless frigate. We got however safe on shore at Charlestown the next morning, where Mr. Westley and I parted in good fellowship, and therefore, though I have not done with Georgia, I hope the candid reader will excuse me taking him over to England for a little while, to relate my next meeting with this very singular gentleman though at the distance of near half a century! It is only just to cross the passage of the Severn with my old fellow traveller, then I shall
have done with him till we meet, and I trust and hope we shall where neither storms can disturb us, waters divide us, and where; —O blessed reflection! If we do meet we must all be of the same way of thinking.

It so happened, that from the time we parted at Charles Town, and from our profligate salt water Captain, we did not meet again, till within a very few years since, and then under the same kind of disaster, with a fresh water brute; for crossing the Severn with a female friend, one of the boatmen (I should say one of the Captains, for they are all Captains) pushed the Thyller so suddenly a weather, that he had nearly thrown my friend overboard. I immediately unshipped it, and with an appearance of being in earnest, accompanied by words, not proper to repeat, threaten'd to knock the fellow down with it, this threat brought before me, a goodly looking old man, who with a persuasive tongue, and the gentlest manners, besought me to say no more; the lady, he observed, was safe, and that in a few minutes, we should be no longer within his reach, that though my provocation was great, oaths, or resentment, could not mend the matter, and he fully succeeded in his attempt, for his manner was captivating, his arguments convincing. At this time I thought I recognised my old acquaintance Mr. Westley, and it promised me pleasure, in making myself known to him, for I had no longer any doubt as to his person, having that instant heard one of his attendants (for I think he had several) mention his name: I availed myself therefore of so fair an occasion to observe that it was not the first time he and me had been in difficulties together upon salt water: he seemed surprised! and asked me when, and where we had been so circumstanced? I then reminded him of our Charles Town Pilot; why said he, what is your name? And being told, instead of kindling those sentiments, which were warming in my own bosom into a flame, he treated me, and the event, with cool indifference; and scarce spoke afterwards! Now Uncle Toby would not have done so; would he courteous reader? This was not Shandean indeed Mr. John Westley; I will not say it, looked like a want of Christian charity, but I will say, had not such a want of sentiment been evident, this transaction had never come on shore. Why I protest Mr. Westley, that were I to meet Jemmy MacKittrick, alias Adair, fifty years hence upon the Severn, I should only jobe him, for printing and publishing a parcel of notorious lies.

. . . . . I thought to have done with this methodistical subject, but I cannot lay down my pen, without observing, that however
seriously, and in earnest, many of the leaders of those people no doubt are; yet they are all, men of *warm constitutions* and that if they had been natives of a mahometan country, where women are excluded, even from religious societies, they never would have separated from the established mode of worship. 

(From the *D.N.B.* we learn that Philip Thicknesse was nearly exactly coeval with Wesley. He was born in 1719 and died in 1792. After his Georgia experiences he served as a Lieutenant in Jamaica against runaway negroes; became Captain of Marines in 1741; purchased Lieutenant Governorship of Landguard Fort in 1766; was imprisoned and fined for libelling Colonel Francis Vernon in 1762. He was a patron of Gainsboroughs

The *Ency. Brit.* informs us that he wrote a sketch of the life and paintings of Gainsborough and a *Treatise Writing in Cypher.*

Students of Wesley must often been struck by the impression created upon his contemporaries by his activities as an old man. He would not have been so remarkable in our time as in that age when seventy was regarded as very venerable. Thicknesse tells us at the end of his first volume that “the author is in his seventieth year, and never pretended to be an accurate writer.” He goes on to refer gratefully to the fact that he had reached his three score and ten, without feeling any of the infirmities which generally belong to such who attain a length of days, to which not one man in fifty thousand arrive; nor one in a hundred thousand. without finding such an age, render life, rather a burden, than a blessing . . . .  F.F.B.)

**JOHN BAKER’S DIARY.**

**SIDE LIGHTS ON EARLY METHODISM IN HORSHAM, SUSSEX.**

John Baker [1712-1779] was of Sussex origin and could claim relationship with the families of Manning, Blunt, Scawen, Swinburne and others. His daughter married Henry Swinburne whose mother was a friend of Miss Sarah Wesley. The Diary, which covers the years 1750 to 1779, was discovered among the papers of the late Cardinal Manning. Baker was a Solicitor of the Inner Temple and wealthy. In 1771 he came with his wife and the Swinburnes to reside at Horsham; he was also accompanied by his servant Charles Lewis whose name frequently occurs in the Diary. The only references to Methodism, and incidentally to Miss Wesley, are found during the years 1776-7:—
Feb. 7, 1776. Charles last night went to hear one Woodgate a Methodist from London preach at a sort of barn near Mr. Dawson. It seems when Tasker, the tallow chandler, died by the market house three or four years ago, one Mann, from Petworth came and took the house and trade and introduced Methodism, and made some converts preaching at his own house. But now they have got a licence from the Sessions to preach at this house and began last night. They have hymns too sung. Young Sowton asked to act as clerk. Sowton was among one of the top hands among our singers; he and his wife and her mother, John Pavey and wife and others are made Methodists.

Feb. 8, 1776. It seems Woodgate [or Woodcott] preached again last night but Charles, who admired him the night before, said “it was all sad stuff about the New Birth;” the maids went too, but I don’t find he made any converts from our house.

April 21, 1776. Sunday. Mr. Blunt came after 6, and Mr. Scawen, Miss Louisa Scawen, Miss Stevens and Master Billy went to hear the Methodist preacher on the Common. Sept 6, 1776 Mrs. Martin told me of fracas between Mr. Fleet and Mann the Methodist preacher, and others last Sunday night at Methodist Meeting and their going to Sir Charles Eversfield and others for a warrant. Mr. Fleet went away to London at about 11 last Monday, having lodged here the night before. Our Charles Lewis was with him at the Methodist Meeting on Sunday evening when the thing happened.

Nov. 3 1776. Charles told me that he and Ann went to Methodist Meeting vis-a-vis. Mr. Brown catechising children and all his sermon about Zaccheus (whom he called Yaccheus) climbing the tree—excellent singing and many women’s voices, he said.

[Feb. 1777.] Mrs. Swinburne retired to Arundel. She found herself in her native county where her old friend of early days 11th Duke of Norfolk was a kind neighbour. She corresponded with Miss Sarah Wesley, niece of John Wesley, to whose influence it was probably due that many of her children left the Romish faith for the Church of England. She died here on the 30 January [1777] aged 62.

EDMUND AUSTEN.
EAYRS' ESSAY PRIZES FOR YOUNG MINISTERS.

The Rev. Dr. George Eayrs, of the United Methodist Church, who died in 1926, was a valued member of the W.H.S. An enthusiastic student of the literature relating to the Methodist Revival and the history of Methodism generally, he issued a number of publications well calculated to inform and inspire. Of these the most praiseworthy and acceptable was his volume on the Letters of John Wesley—though superseded by the Standard Edition published later this book has still a value and interest of its own.

Dr. Eayrs was anxious that his brethren in the ministry should be encouraged to pursue the line of study which he had found so helpful, and provided in his Will for two prizes to be competed for each year by younger ministers.

Changes incident to Methodist Union and other circumstances caused some delay, but the scheme ultimately took shape by September, 1935, when the Rev. Thomas Naylor, Secretary of the Ministerial Training Committee, announced that the prizes, £15 and £5, would be available for at least four years, the competition to be open to Methodist ministers of not more than fifteen years standing.

Our members will welcome, we think, at this stage, an account of what has been accomplished.

The subjects of the Essays, which were to be about 5000 words, were as follows:—

1. 1935-6 John Wesley's Christian Library.
2. 1936-7 The influence of Moravianism on the Organization of Methodism.
3. 1937-8 Methodism and the Chartists.
4. 1938-9 John Wesley as a Textual Critic of the N.T.
5. 1939-40 The Theology of the Hymns of John and Charles Wesley.
6. 1940-1 The Unrest in Methodism, 1790-1800.
7. 1941-2 A Study of John Wesley's Reading.

For the first year the prize was awarded to Rev. Frank Baker, B.A., B.D., for what the judges called an extremely able and original work, and the second prize went to the Rev. Reginald J. Doidge, B.Sc. Mr. Doidge's work was published as number
of the "Little Books of the Kindly Light" by the Epworth Press.

In the second year the first prize was won by the Rev. Frederic Hunter, M.A., and the second by the Rev. W. A. Goss, M.A. Mr. Hunter's Essay was incorporated in the thesis which gained for him the degree of Master of Arts at the Manchester University.

The subject of "Methodism in its relationship to the Chartists," proved attractive to a much larger number of competitors; the first prize was awarded to the Rev. Maldwyn L. Edwards, M.A., Ph.D. and the second to the Rev. Ernest Jones, B.A. The essay of the Rev. Richard Mort was highly commended and a special award of £2 was allotted to him. The prize essay was incorporated by Dr. Edwards in his volume entitled: This Methodism.

A set of excellent Essays was sent in on the Subject of "John Wesley and Textual Criticism." The two prizes were assigned to Rev. T. F. Glasson, BA., B.D., and Rev. Harold K. Moulton, M.A. and the special award to Rev. Harold A. Guy, B.A., B.D. It is interesting to note the name of Moulton reappearing in the sphere of Methodist scholarship. Mr. Moulton wrote in India, under difficult conditions.


All necessary particulars concerning these essays may be found year by year in the Minutes of Conference.

F. F. BREThERTON.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

803. DANIEL DEFOE AND THE ANNESLEY FAMILY.—

In a note attached to Mr. Baker's review of Dr. Shepherd's recent book I referred to the statement of Prof. Henry Morley that there was reason to believe that Daniel Defoe's second wife (I ought to have said first) was a daughter of Dr. Annesley. Dr. Shepherd writes to say, however, that it appears to be quite certain that Defoe had only one wife, Joan Tuffley, and that there is consequently no foundation for Prof. Henry Morley's opinion. The best book on Defoe, says Dr. Shepherd, is that by Professor J. R. Sutherland simply entitled "Defoe," 1937.—F. F. B.
804. SCURRILOUS ATTACK ON METHODISM IN RYE AND PEASMARSH, SUSSEX.—The following are extracts from the London Magazine for 1761:—

"I am well assured that a certain gentleman was threatened with the sentence of rustication for some juvenile flights at Christ Church in Oxford; the very same gentleman, who in the noviciate of his Methodist Ministry went to depossess a young woman of an unclean spirit at Lillingston-Lovel in Oxfordshire, when a scene ensued that modesty forbids me to mention.

"I am not certain whether there be similar circumstances between this person and Miss L—R of Peasmarsh, in Sussex—a common prostitute, who is now a most celebrated preacher among the Methodists: & being possessed with seven devils, they glory that they have ejected one."

"I am well assured that a missionary of Mr. J. Wesleys' who instructed the good people of England at or near Rye in Sussex was known to be a popish priest by a gentleman who was no stranger to his person and function in foreign parts."

Is anything known respecting the individuals mentioned?

Mr. Edmund Austin.

805. In the facsimile of Wesley's Hymns 1782 there is a curious error in Hymn 318, "O thou whom camest from above. Verse 2 line 4 reads—

In humble love and fervent praise.

But in the original book of C. Wesley, Hymns on the Scriptures vol 1, p 57 the line reads—

In humble prayer and fervent praise.

And this is the rendering in subsequent editions. Why "love" in the 1782 book?

Rev. F. Senior.

A Correction.

In our December 1940 issue, page 170 line 39, "donor" should be changed to "donors," for the statue of Charles Wesley was the gift of Sir Arthur Munro Sutherland, Bart., unveiled 3rd June, 1939.