CHARLES WESLEY’S ENGAGEMENT
Light from Unpublished Letters

Among the precious treasures at the Methodist Archives in London there is a large collection of unpublished letters from Charles Wesley to his beloved Sally. None are more interesting than those which record the quick blossoming of their love, the hindrances in their path, and the eventual triumph which brought them into such a long and happy union.

On 17th September 1747 he was ready to disclose his affection when in a letter to her he marvels at the divine wisdom bringing them together, and confesses: “My heart is deeply engaged for you.” His solicitation for her spiritual growth never varies, and on 12th August 1748 he writes:

I expect to hear you have met constantly every morning and evening to sing and pray together for yourselves and absent friends

and then adds the gallant comment

I can hardly reckon myself in the number so continually do I bear you upon my heart.

The next day in a letter she has become “my dearest friend”, instead of “dear”, and he says he has slept immoderately well “because of a guardian angel who hovers over me”. He concludes: “May Jesus be your portion for ever.”

On 1st October 1748, writing from Bristol, he passes judgement on some verses Sally has written:

They want perspicuity but they are worth correcting. You use your memory aright when you store it with things worth remembering and enlarge it by using it. You should be ever getting something by heart.

Begin with the first book of Prior’s Solomon.

Poor Sally! A little later he remarked that he was nourishing himself up for a journey “with my philosophical brother”. In a poem on the death of Westley Hall (aged 14 years), son of Westley and Martha Hall, he refers grimly to the father:
His fearful doom thou canst not feel,
Or fall like him from heaven to hell;
Thou canst not now his fall deplore,
Nor pray for one that prays no more.

In the following November (Manchester, 2nd November) he begins "My best beloved friend", and, speaking of his open-air preaching, says "... it would have done you good to see and hear such a multitude of hungry souls crying after Jesus." In a reference to George Whitefield's Calvinistic preaching, he says:

What woes and miseries and curses await me if this prophet of God speaks true. But the threatenings do not reach me—I hear all, suffer all, blessed be God and keep my temper and my love.

Of his brother, John Wesley, he declares that he will write to him and receive "his last decisive order". He ends by expressing his longing to hear of her affairs.—"My heart is with you—the Lord Jesus be your rest."

On 10th November he writes from Newington:

How did every place on the road bring my dearest friend to my remembrance. You are ever with me. Be zealous of good works. Watch unto prayer.

Replying on 27th December to a letter from Sally, he says:

Your letter filled my heart with joy and my eyes with tears. May I not receive it as a token he has chosen us for each other to transmit his grace and happiness and help each other on to his glory.

Referring to John Wesley, he says:

Why be at a loss to write to my brother? He knows every thought of my heart concerning you for they are his own—and none on earth loves you better allowing me but one exception.

It is on 3rd January 1749 that he makes first mention of a marriage settlement of £100 per annum. In a letter to Mrs. Gwynne, who was the one to be placated, he followed his offer of £100 a year:

Till now I neither knew nor cared what my writings and my brother's were worth. Let Sally's fortune if she die return to her family. If you judge it right to give me an absolute denial, that puts an end to it.

On the last day of that month he tells Sally that Ebenezer Blackwell and his wife will help in purchasing a house. On 9th February 1749 Marmaduke Gwynne, Sally's father, agreed to the £100 proposal, and on 1st March Charles was accepted by the family, but letters on 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 5th March showed that Mrs. Gwynne was not satisfied, and the settlement was still in doubt. Even more dampening was a letter on 10th March written by Mrs. Gwynne to Charles, asking for a delay in the marriage plans, and wanting to know how John Wesley intended to secure the money. Charles, so easily depressed, confided to Sally that he was far from confident, and, in another despairing letter, concluded: "I break off my letter not my love—that stands when heaven and earth pass away."
Happily John gave the required assurance and signed a legal bond, guaranteeing the £100 a year, and for Charles the clouds rolled away. On 26th March he told Sally in a letter that the settlement was agreed, and he was just setting off from London for the marriage. On Saturday, 8th April 1749, John Wesley joined their hands in holy matrimony, for in Stevenson’s words (Memorials of the Wesley Family), “their hearts had been united long before”. On 12th May 1749, Mehetabel Wright (Hetty Wesley) wrote to Sally, her sister-in-law, an affectionate letter, and said of Charles “... he has no equal in some accomplishments which I forbear to mention because of our kindred.”

Marmaduke Gwynne, the friendly squire of Garth, had no doubts about the marriage. Writing to Charles and Sally from Ludlow on 22nd June 1749, he declared: “I am better pleased you are married to Mr. Wesley than the greatest monarch on earth.” To Charles he said he had been speaking to the vicar and “lamenting the unkind treatment you and your brother have met with from too many of the clergy”. By way of postscript it can be recorded that Mrs. Gwynne was by now completely satisfied, and in a letter from Garth, 18th May 1749, she wrote:

... all this family send their love and kind respects to you. I hope your good brother is well and our hearty respects attend him.

But perhaps the last word can be given to Charles in one of the many letters he wrote to Sally in their first separation after marriage.

May 4th. This is the third worthless letter I send you in pain of body and mind. O my friend how much am I indebted to you and unable to make you the least amends.

Sally did not share this over-modest view of his own worth to her, and they continued in the same bonds of love until their lives’ end.

MALDWYN L. EDWARDS.
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ORDINATIONS IN METHODISM,
1791-1836

In Proceedings, xxxiii, pp. 118 ff. the Rev. H. Edward Lacy brought up to date our knowledge of the ordinations that took place in Methodism during Wesley’s lifetime. In the table printed on pages 37-40 I have endeavoured to do the same for the period from the death of Wesley to the introduction of the laying-on of hands. It is an obscure period, for it is really difficult to know just what happened and where. In using the table, one must bear in mind that in 1792 ordinations were forbidden without the consent of Conference, and in 1793 “the distinction between ordained and unordained Preachers” was dropped. At the same time, missionaries continued to be ordained before going abroad, but an exception to this is to be found in the case of John Ogilvie in 1808.

This list makes no claim to completeness, as it consists only of those particulars I have collected in the course of my reading, together with some supplied by the Rev. A. Raymond George of Leeds and the Rev. Bernard L. Semmens of Australia—to both of whom I tender my thanks. There are sure to have been other ordinations during this period. For example, Robert Newton may have been ordained before he went to Scotland, as he says he wore gown and bands there. Again, I have confined the list to Great Britain. We know that in 1826 Samuel Leigh and two others ordained a certain John Hutchinson in Sydney. It would be good if one of our Australian readers could work on similar cases in that country.

I should be glad to receive further additions to this list, provided the information is well authenticated.

Referring again to Mr. Lacy’s article, perhaps it would not be out of place to append certain emendations and additions which are the result of further light on the subject since that article was written. These are as follows:

T. COKE—The facsimile of his ordination certificate was printed in the 1916 Standard edition of the Journal, but not included in the 1938 and following reprints.

R. JOHNsoN—Certificate as Deacon is at Methodist Archives, London.

“MR. HA . . .”—This person is now known to be William Hunter.2

W. WARRENER—Certificate as Elder is at the Mission House, London.

C. ATmore—Certificate as Elder is at Methodist Archives, London.

D. McALLuM—for xxiv, read xxv.

John C. Bowmer.

Illustrated opposite is the ordination certificate of William Griffith (24th May 1808)—one of those housed at the Archives Centre in London.

1 Benjamin Gregory: Sidelights on the Conflicts of Methodism, p. 333.
These are to certify to all whom they may concern, that I Thomas Coke, Doctor of Civil Law, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, have, on this twenty-fourth day of May, One thousand eight hundred and eighty, in the fear of God and with a single eye to his glory, by the imposition of my hands and prayer (being assisted by other ordained Ministers) set apart William Griffith for the office of an Elder in the Church of God. And I do recommend him as a proper Person to feed the Church of God, and to administer the holy Sacraments. Given under my hand and seal, the day and year above written.

Thomas Coke
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Place</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1791: 24th Sept. Courseule, near Coutances</td>
<td>William Mahy</td>
<td>Dr. Coke</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>As for de Queteville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and Place</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793: Oct.</td>
<td>Francis Thursby or Thoresby</td>
<td>Dr. Coke</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Pawson: letter to Atmore, 9th Oct. 1793</td>
<td>Pawson says this was the first public ordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794: early</td>
<td>Adam Clarke</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Pawson: letter to Atmore, 21st Jan. 1794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794: early</td>
<td>John Pawson (as Bishop)</td>
<td>Dr. Coke</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Pawson: letter to Atmore, 21st Jan. 1794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798: 9th July</td>
<td>John Braithwaite</td>
<td>D. McAllum, T. Warwick, Thos. Olivers, Warwick, M.D.</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Proceedings, xv, p. 79 (copy of Certificate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801:</td>
<td>William Atherton</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Gregory: Sidelights, p. 333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802:</td>
<td>Edward Thompson</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>West Indies</td>
<td>Proceedings, xxxiii, p. 178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808: 24th May</td>
<td>William Griffith</td>
<td>Dr. Coke and others (prob. A. Clarke and T. Rankin)</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Certificate in Archives</td>
<td>Coke acted as &quot;Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, U.S.A.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808: 10th Aug.</td>
<td>John Ogilvie</td>
<td>Dr. Coke and others</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Certificate at Headingley College, Leeds</td>
<td>Coke as Bishop, M.E.C., U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol—prob. at Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and Place</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819: 25th Nov.</td>
<td>Titus Close</td>
<td>Charles Atmore and others</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Methodist Magazine, 1867, p. 619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London: St. George's in the East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819: 25th Nov.</td>
<td>William Shaw</td>
<td>Charles Atmore and others</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Methodist Magazine, 1867, p. 619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London: St. George's in the East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820: 2nd Nov.</td>
<td>John Felvus</td>
<td>John Riles, George Morley, Joseph Taylor</td>
<td>St. Christopher's</td>
<td>Certificate in the Methodist Archives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London: St. George's in the East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London: St. George's in the East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and Place</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821: 5th Nov.</td>
<td>John Crofts</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td><em>Methodist Magazine, 1821, p. 952</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London: Hinde Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821: 5th Nov.</td>
<td>William Parkinson</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td><em>Methodist Magazine, 1821, p. 952</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London: Hinde Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821: 5th Nov.</td>
<td>William Bell</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td><em>Methodist Magazine, 1821, p. 952</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London: Hinde Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826: 1st Nov.</td>
<td>Alfred Bourne</td>
<td>John James</td>
<td>India</td>
<td><em>Methodist Magazine, 1838, p. 325</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Townley Morley, Mason France, Newstead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830: 12th July</td>
<td>George Scott</td>
<td>William Naylor</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Certificate in the Methodist Archives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>George Morley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elijah Hoole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835: 7th Oct.</td>
<td>Daniel J. Draper</td>
<td>Richard Reece</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Certificate at Wesley Church, Melbourne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Beecham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John P. Haswell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Alder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Beecham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John P. Haswell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Alder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A VENTURE IN CHARITY, 1791-1803

You have done well to set up the Strangers' Friend Society. It is an excellent institution.

JOHN WESLEY.

The remarkable work of the Strangers' Friend Society in Manchester in the first twelve years of its life deserves to be recorded in its own right; but the story merits the telling also because of its interesting links with John Wesley, Adam Clarke, and the Didsbury Wesleyan Theological College in Manchester, now a College of Education for the training of teachers. Moreover, the Society appears to have been the first really successful one established by Dr. Clarke, and the inspiration for subsequent efforts of a similar nature. This study has arisen from research work undertaken into "The Care of the Poor in Manchester from 1790 to 1841", and affords an outstanding example of the relief of destitution by a small group of dedicated and unostentatious workers, voluntarily, and in marked contrast to the provision of statutory parish relief.

The work of the Society met with universal approval from the very beginning—approval which echoed the sentiments of Wesley himself, only a month before he died, when, in a letter to Dr. Clarke, he wrote: "You have done well to set up the Strangers' Friend Society. It is an excellent institution." Wesley was referring to Adam Clarke's second venture in Dublin, in 1790—a more ambitious project than the one which he and Clarke had initiated together in Bristol the previous year. It was in Manchester, however, that the institution was really to take root and flourish, only eight months after the death of Wesley.

Manchester was the largest centre of Methodism outside London, and Wesley himself visited the town on fifteen occasions at least between 1733 and 1790. Considerable interest attaches to each of these visits, but reference can be made only to three of them, the first on 30th March 1781, when he opened the chapel in Oldham Street, the second in July 1787, on the occasion of the annual Conference. This latter event called forth interesting comment in the Manchester Mercury:

It was truly pleasing to see a clergyman, at the great age of 85, delivering a Discourse, without notes, clear and rational in itself, with the strength and voice of a man thirty years younger... and he does not even use glasses to assist his sight in reading.

Wesley's age was wrongly stated (he had in fact just celebrated his 84th birthday), but here was a tribute from one of Manchester's two

2 Quoted by James Everett in Adam Clarke Portrayed (1843), vol. i, p. 281.
3 ibid., p. 310. See also Etheridge, op. cit., p. 130.
5 Details of these visits can be found briefly set out in W. E. A. Axon: Annals of Manchester (1886).
6 Manchester Mercury, 31st July and 7th August 1787.
staunchly Anglican and Tory papers. In 1790 Wesley paid his last visit to the town, preaching twice on Easter Day, when 1,600 communicants were present at the Lord's Supper. He died in 1791, and when, later that year, the 48th Methodist Conference met in Manchester, it met for the first time without his presence.

A leading member of that Conference, however, was Dr. Adam Clarke, who in 1791 was appointed to the Manchester circuit. He was both a scholar and a popular preacher, as well as a close associate of Wesley, under whose influence he had come at the very outset of his career as a student at Kingswood. He had in fact come to Kingswood from Coleraine in Ireland, at the invitation of Wesley, in 1782, and we are told that it was while working in the garden for exercise that he dug up a half-guinea, and appropriated it, with the principal's sanction, to the purchase of a Hebrew grammar—the first step on the path of a Hebrew scholar who rose high in the Methodist movement and was President of the Conference in 1806, 1814 and 1822. Clarke was a man of Whig principles, sympathetic to parliamentary reform, but declining to preach politics from the pulpit. He did not enjoy very good health at any time, but during his two years at Manchester was able to avail himself of the waters at Buxton, of which he had a high opinion, especially as regards their value to those afflicted with rheumatism. He died of cholera in London in 1832.

Ten years later came the opening of the Wesleyan Theological College at Didsbury, the end-product of a movement which Adam Clarke had initiated as President of the Leeds Conference in 1806, when he put forward a plan for improving young preachers. The plan was published in pamphlet form in 1807, and led in time to the first Wesleyan Theological Institution at Hoxton in 1835, and finally, as a result of the £75,000 Centenary Fund, in 1838, to the opening of Didsbury College in September 1842. Until the outbreak of war in 1939 Clarke's portrait is said to have hung in the college. The portrait is no longer there, but one last link remains. The sundial on the lawn outside bears the following inscription:

ADAM CLARKE, LL.D.
MILLBROOK,
LANCASHIRE.
1818

and underneath, from Virgil's *Georgics*:

Sol tibi signa dabit, solem quis dicere falsum audeat?
[i.e. The sun will give you a sign: who will dare to say the sun is false?]

Such a pagan sentiment could not be allowed to pass unchallenged, and it is countered, on the opposite side of the dial, by a verse from Psalm cxliv.:

Man is like unto vanity: his days are as a shadow that passeth away.

7 Axon, op. cit.
9 ibid., p. 323.
10 Etheridge, op. cit., p. 134.
A Venture in Charity, 1791-1803

Have we here a glimpse of Adam Clarke the Hebrew scholar gently reproving the Latin poet?11

The college was opened in 1842, but the building in which it was housed dated from 1790, and had its origin in the large red-brick mansion built by Richard Broome in that year, with a magnificent cantilever staircase which still graces the “black-and-white” entrance hall. It is interesting to reflect that just about the time when the house was built, a society was founded in Manchester—the Strangers’ Friend Society—by a group of men inspired by the teaching of Wesley and led by Dr. Adam Clarke (a close associate of Wesley, initially, in such a venture), and that the house was later to become a theological training college under Wesleyan auspices also.

In 1791 Didsbury was in the country; even today it is pleasantly set on the south side of the city. But the Methodists who launched the new enterprise were not concerned with the rural delights of that area, as students must have been over half-a-century later, but only with the very worst parts of Manchester—with the filth, the squalor and the human misery thrown up by the rapid and unprecedented industrialization of the period—the unknown, neglected quarters of the town, which the members of the Strangers’ Friend Society now took upon themselves to visit. No minute books of the Society appear to have survived, but we obtain glimpses of its work from other sources, not the least valuable being the Manchester Mercury, whose columns provide striking contemporary evidence.

The Society was founded on 7th November 1791,12 on the recommendation and with the actual help of Adam Clarke. This, as we have seen, was his third venture, to which he came fortified by his experience at Bristol in 1789 and in Dublin in 1790. Only a small group of people were involved—about thirty, we are told—all of them Methodists; for it was, says Aston,13 a sectarian society “in the good sense of the term”, since its patrons and supporters were chiefly Methodists, but only Methodists were excluded from its benefits. Apart from this, persons of every denomination, or of none at all, were relieved by no other standard than the measure of their distress and the amount of funds available. Associated with Clarke in the venture was Samuel Bradburn, President of the Conference in 1792, who wrote in a letter:

Mr. Clarke and I have initiated a new charity called the Strangers’ Friend Society. It succeeds beyond our most sanguine expectations. We have many pounds in hand. It is certainly very affecting to hear of the good work done every week by it.14

These were sentiments expressed in a private letter, but they are repeated again and again in the columns of the Mercury. The motto

11 For information on the sundial I am indebted to Mr. A. H. Body, the Principal of the Didsbury College of Education.
12 Manchester Mercury, 10th January 1792.
13 J. Aston: Manchester Guide (1804); also A Picture of Manchester (1816), pp. 137-8.
14 Etheridge, op. cit., p. 140.
of the Society was: "As ye are, so shall the stranger be before the Lord", and the original Rules were printed on a folio sheet, double column, signed by Clarke and Bradburn, and headed The Nature, Design and General Rules of the Strangers' Friend Society instituted at Manchester, November 7th, 1791. Howbeit Adam Clarke appears to have expressed regret at not having kept a copy of the very first two or three rules drawn up by Wesley and himself at Bristol in 1789 and printed on a piece of paper about the size of his hand, for he wrote: "I would give a guinea for them now."

Weekly contributions were to be made, and no questions to be asked of those who needed help. Only the extent of their distress mattered. Visitors were appointed, chosen for their piety and discretion, to take upon themselves daily to seek out objects of real woe and to visit their miserable retreats; and, after inquiring minutely into the nature of their complaints, to afford them that relief their circumstances call for.

These objects of charity were in utter destitution, but had no claim upon parish funds.

In the pages of the Mercury we have vivid accounts of the nature of the work undertaken by each visitor and of the conditions under which the people lived, of the risks the helpers ran, and of the universal approval expressed concerning their efforts. In January 1792, only two months after the Society's foundation, relief had been given to over 450 persons or families. A "Book of persons visited and relieved" was kept, and extracts from these cases are reproduced from time to time. They make harrowing reading. Two examples will suffice to illustrate this, but many more could be cited.

John Pritchard—stone mason—lame many weeks. His wife miscarried—had no food—three children—only shavings to lie on—no coverings.

M. Gorton—her husband dead in the room—had spent her last penny on coal then burning—he lay ill many weeks and never had any medical help.

On 17th January 1792 the Mercury wrote:

The great number of persons relieved by the Strangers' Friend Society is extraordinary when it is considered that none can partake of its advantages except those who are absolutely destitute and in want of the necessities of life. Yet such it seems there are in this populous town, obscured from the view of all but those who take upon themselves, on behalf of the Society, to search out these objects and administer comfort to their necessities. This is a truly noble employment and we hope will never want advocates and the aid of the public for support.

Relief was usually given in food and clothing, in blankets, coal, or even implements with which to earn a living—"and proper care is taken that nothing is pawned or sold". So the work went on, and made an immediate impact upon the community at large. Help was

16 Everett, op. cit., i, p. 307.
17 Manchester Mercury, 10th January 1792.
given to the very limit of the Society’s funds, and when financial resources were almost exhausted an appeal usually brought the required result. A marked feature of these appeals is the extravagant, emotional language in which they are written. Other means were employed also. One response took the form of “A Grand Selection of Sacred Music” in Oldham Street chapel on Thursday, 3rd January 1793, with soloists and full orchestra. Handel’s oratorio Judas Maccabeus was performed in the morning at eleven o’clock, and there was a concert of other music in the evening at seven.18

The year 1793 was one of commercial crisis, and on 15th April, in support of the main bank in the town (Jones, Barker & Co.) a public meeting of “Gentlemen, Merchants and Tradesmen” raised £160,000 and sent a deputation to London to wait upon the Governor of the Bank of England and, if unsuccessful, upon the Prime Minister, William Pitt. A “Committee of Commercial Affairs” was also set up.19

It was natural that a crisis of this magnitude should have its effect upon the poor of Manchester, and the men who had rallied to help the bank now turned to the plight of the poor. On 6th May, at the Bull’s Head, there was a meeting of the newly-formed Commercial Committee, the churchwardens and overseers, and the Managers of the Strangers’ Friend Society “to devise some plan for the immediate relief of such poor persons as ought to be relieved”. It was a tribute to the work of the Strangers’ Friend Society that they were invited to take part in the meeting, and it was a recognition of the real value of that work when they were asked to form part of the Manchester Poor Committee, the first of its kind in the town.20

On 7th May another appeal went out on behalf of the Society. The sum of £350 had been expended in the preceding six months, and the appeal stated:

The visitors are daily employed in all the Districts of the Town, in seeking out, in visiting in person, and relieving all proper objects; and when the Poor are found destitute of medical assistance, immediate relief is procured by the Society (gratis) from the Physicians and Surgeons of the Infirmary.

The committee and visitors—with as many gentleman also as chose to come—met every Monday evening in Spear Street, Oldham Street, to report their proceedings and to give details of the money expended. Assurances were given that any danger of bringing into town any improper persons, in hopes of relief from the Society, were avoided.

... all kinds of Street Beggars, Vagrants, and many of those who are found in the different Lodging Houses are excluded.

The appeal concludes with the deep concern of the Society for the amazing number of distressed families “starving for bread” in all the suburbs of the town, through want of employment. The Society

18 ibid., 18th December 1792.  
19 ibid., 16th April 1793.  
20 ibid., 7th May 1793.
In July, Adam Clarke left Manchester for Liverpool, where another Strangers' Friend Society was to flourish. He was to return to Manchester in 1803. Meanwhile the Society in Manchester went from strength to strength.

Throughout 1794, in the pages of the *Mercury*, we catch glimpses of it at work and of the appreciation of that work both by the community generally and by parish officials concerned with the statutory administration of poor relief. Thus on 28th January we read:

We are very glad to hear that the Strangers' Friend Society are daily exerting themselves on behalf of the Poor in this cold and inclement season.

And on 25th February the following advertisement:

March 5th (Ash Wednesday)—A Performance of the *Messiah* for the benefit of that most Humane Institution—the Strangers' Friend Society—in Oldham Street Chapel, with Selections from Handel the following day.

The 27th June 1794 saw the winding-up of the Manchester Poor Committee, when it was resolved that any balance left should be paid over to the Society—a further mark of appreciation of their work.

On 21st October, with the approach of winter, another appeal went out for the sick poor:

This institution rests upon its own merits... The indefatigable labours of the visitors have not been in the least abated, though exercised at the Hazard of their Lives.

It was no lie; for Manchester, at the end of 1794, was subject to a severe outbreak of epidemic fever—"a terrible scourge...at this time very prevalent among the Poor", and the fact that the Strangers' Friend Society was playing an active part in fighting the scourge is evident from other sources. On 12th December there was a meeting of the town's Committee for the Relief of the Sick Poor, when a long report, prepared by the physicians of the Infirmary, was read. It was a comprehensive survey of the situation in Manchester, dealing fully with causes and necessary precautions, calling attention to the main localities of the disease and painting a grim picture of the cellar dwellings in those areas where cotton operatives were struck down.

Having heard the report, the Committee hastened to assure the public that all that could be done was being done, and added:

In these Endeavours the Committee are happy to acknowledge the great assistance they have received and the Benefits which have remitted to the Poor from the humane and benevolent exertions of the Strangers' Friend Society who have anxiously sought out the sufferers from Want and Disease, in the most obscure and dangerous recesses, and who have omitted no means in their power to alleviate their affictions.23

---

21 ibid., 7th May 1793.  
22 ibid., 1st July 1794.  
23 ibid., 16th, 23rd and 30th December 1794.
In Manchester 1795 was again a bad year, and on 28th January a Committee for the General Relief of the Poor was set up which continued to work until July, when, on 3rd July, it was resolved that, of the balance of £384, the Strangers' Friend Society should receive £144. The Society acknowledged the gift as more than adequate, and called off an appeal for funds just issued. It was but a recognition of what had appeared in the *Mercury* on 7th April:

In the most unlimited sense, this Institution is the Stranger's Friend. It knows no distinction, no discrimination. It is open to the poor of any country ...

A food crisis persisted throughout the rest of 1795, with a scarcity of provisions, high prices, and riots in the Market at the end of July resulting in the Riot Act being read. All this called for special measures which cannot be dealt with here; but the work of relief continued well into 1796, when once again the problem of infectious fever raised its head, and once again the committee of the Strangers' Friend Society was singled out for special service as part of the larger Committee for the Health of the Poor.

In February a further appeal was made on behalf of the Society, which had "stood the critical enquiry of experience for four years. Its merits stand unimpeached." As a result of the outbreak of fever, 1796 is full of news concerning the setting up of the Manchester Board of Health and special fever wards in the House of Recovery. Considerable opposition was encountered, based mainly on fear, but the project was eventually launched. In May, rules were published both for the House internally and for controlling the fever outside, and amongst them was one providing for the inspection of the dwellings of the poor, together with the resolution

That an Inspector shall be appointed in each District of the Infirmary to aid the Execution and to enforce the observation of the regulations. And that the Gentlemen of the Strangers' Friend Society shall be requested to undertake this office.

In the same month the Society lost by death its treasurer, Mr. Edward Smith, and tribute was paid to him, at a time when one finds very little in the way of obituaries, as one who continually "went about doing good" and "delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him".

Even more remarkable was the appreciation expressed in a more practical way on 5th June 1796, when Alexander Mather, who was at this time superintendent of the Manchester circuit (to which he had been appointed by the Conference of 1794) and a member of the Society's committee, preached a charity sermon on its behalf in Oldham Street chapel. His text was from Hebrews xiii. 2: "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." The *Mercury* reported:

---

*ibid.*, 3rd February 1795.  
*ibid.*, 7th and 14th July 1795.  
See *Manchester Mercury* issues for July and August 1795.  
*ibid.*, 16th February 1796.  
*ibid.*, 10th May 1796.
We are told the congregation was very numerous and that many respectable families, who do not usually attend, showed their approbation of the institution by their generosity.

Large congregation or powerful sermon? We do not know; but the collection, including donations sent in by those who did not attend, amounted to £170 17s. 10d.—the largest single total the writer has met among many examples of financial response to charity sermons in Manchester during the period.\(^{31}\)

Appeals for the Society appear to have been met from various sources in 1797. No mention of it occurs in 1798; a legacy of £500 provides the sole reference for 1799, and there are fleeting glimpses in 1800 and 1801; but in Aston’s *Manchester Guide* (1804) we read, in reference to the Report of the Strangers’ Friend Society for 1803:

...in the course of 12 years the sum of £6,403. 18. 7d has been divided by the Society among upwards of 60,000 persons.\(^{32}\)

It was an impressive record. A description of the Society appears in Aston’s *Picture of Manchester* (1816), in Edwin Butterworth’s *Sketch of Lancashire* (1841), and in Harland’s and Croston’s editions of Baines’s *History of Lancashire* in 1868 and 1889 respectively; but it is not clear when the Society ceased to exist, for it may have been wound up officially years before.

Our main concern here, however, has been with the first twelve years of its life. Moreover, just when we begin to lose regular sight of it there was instituted in Manchester, in 1799, another outstanding example of charity, this time a public charity on a grand scale—the Soup Charity. Yet here too we have a link; for the visitors of the Strangers’ Friend Society played an active part in the setting up of the first “soup shops” in Manchester—being chosen to serve on the committee which established them.\(^{33}\)

When Adam Clarke took up residence in the Chapel House in 1791, he cut a memorial inscription in the glass of his study window, commemorating Wesley,\(^{34}\) and when he founded the Strangers’ Friend Society in November, he must surely have had in mind his close association with Wesley in a similar enterprise in Bristol in 1789 and also the approval expressed by Wesley concerning the second venture in Dublin in 1790. Only eight months intervened between the death of the founder of Methodism and the setting up of the charity which was to merit and win such general approbation in Manchester, so that one feels justified in linking the name of John Wesley directly with this venture; for, as far as Manchester was concerned, his comment was equally true. It was indeed “an excellent institution”.

G. B. HINDLE.

[Mr. G. B. Hindle, B.A. is Senior Lecturer in History at the Didsbury College of Education, Manchester.]

\(^{31}\) ibid., 7th June 1796.  
\(^{33}\) *Manchester Mercury*, 15th January 1799.  
\(^{34}\) Everett, op. cit., vol. i. See also *Manchester City News*: Notes and Queries, 28th March and 18th April 1903.
By 1850 the influence of the Original Methodists in the Erewash Valley and neighbouring districts could not be disregarded by the advocates of a paid ministry. The Record soon succeeded in spreading Free Gospel principles throughout the locality, so that in this year alone over one hundred members were added to the Connexion. And yet the heyday of the movement had still to come, for many more societies were to be included on the plan during the next few years. Altogether forty-seven societies became involved in the Connexion, though never more than twenty-six were on the plan at the same time. As will be explained later, a few Original Methodist societies were of short duration, and lasted barely a year. These were usually splinter groups, the defection of which rarely impeded the progress of the denomination (usually PM) from which they had broken away. A greater number had a life-span of perhaps ten or fifteen years, and were sufficiently influential to cause considerable concern to other denominations in their locality. A third group formed the backbone of the Connexion, and their staying-power enabled the Original Methodists to extend their influence into the late 1860s.

Kendall was therefore far from accurate when he stated that the “Selstonites” “dwindled until the feeble remnant was absorbed in the greater split from Methodism in 1849”. Moreover, it should be said now that the Original Methodists were never known as “Selstonites” — not even by those who had remained loyal to the PM cause. They were frequently nicknamed “Greenites” (not surprisingly, since there were often as many as seven people named Green active in the movement), and their preachers were occasionally referred to as “Cheap Johns”, but not even their bitterest opponent used the term “Selstonites”.

Several pamphlets were published during the 1850s by Primitive Methodist, Baptist and Congregationalist ministers in which Free Gospel principles in general and Original Methodist in particular were violently denounced. The Original Methodists replied in the most scathing terms, and in a later article the writer will endeavour to show the degree of bitterness which existed on all sides as the more important of these pamphlets receive our consideration.

In the summer of 1850, the PM Conference met in Nottingham. Its leaders heard from William Carthy a very one-sided account of the reasons for the division in the Belper circuit. With the authority of Conference, Carthy published a 10-page pamphlet, entitled Falsehood detected, and Truth defended, in which he denounced

1 H. B. Kendall: History of the Primitive Methodist Church, i, p. 249.
the Original Methodists and their doctrines. This pamphlet has been lost to Methodism for nearly a hundred years. Kendall, writing shortly after the turn of the century, knew only that such a document had existed. It is therefore the writer's intention to deal with the contents of this pamphlet in detail, and with the reply which it evoked from the Original Methodists, who published a supplement to their Record of 1st October 1850, in order to give Carthy's pamphlet the treatment which, in their opinion, it deserved.

In the second paragraph of this pamphlet, Carthy takes exception to a remark made in the Record, and vehemently denies the truth of the following statement:

The Original Methodists' Connexion owes its commencement to the tyranny and covetousness of what are called the Primitive Methodist Travelling Preachers.

—but Carthy and his fellow-pamphleteers leave out the word "Travelling". The Original Methodists therefore ask in their supplement:

Do they wish to hide the diminished heads of the five hundred travellers (who have forsaken their proper occupation and calling to take upon themselves the less laborious and more lucrative business of praying and preaching by weight and measure), amongst the thousands of those noble-minded men whom they call local Preachers [?] We are not attributing our commencement to the misdoings of these our fellow-labourers; no, we are personally acquainted with a good number of them, and it cost us many a severe pang to be separated from them; we esteem them highly for their works' sake; these men are attending to our Lord's injunction—"freely have ye received, freely give;" and we say, all honour to these truly-devoted, laborious, and disinterested preachers of the Gospel.

In the third paragraph the pamphlet tells us that "the ministers have often been represented as groaning under the despotic power of layism." The Original Methodists reply:

We know they have by the T.P.'s themselves; we have heard them make similar remarks, attributing the cause to those worthy men who founded the connexion, and they have significantly added, "but the Bourne's will not live for ever". It will be well for the hundred thousand P. Meths to look well after their T.P.'s who modestly style them a despotic power.

In the same paragraph the pamphlet states that "no minister in the Connexion has the power, were he disposed to use it, of tyrannizing over the weakest member in the connexion." And again, "nor can they in any way exercise any undue control over their brethren, being placed on a perfect level with them." The Original Methodists reply:

Let our readers ask the numerous divisions that have distracted Primitive Methodism since its commencement, they will all declare that these fine assertions stand opposed to facts; we are not acquainted with one of them but what was an effect produced by the same cause as ours; namely, the tyranny or covetousness of one or both of the T.P.s. Or, let them ask the many thousands of backsliders that are to be met with
in our towns and villages; generally speaking, they attribute their fall to the same cause. As for being on a perfect level with their lay brethren, this cannot possibly be true, for we have just been told that they are "groaning under the despotic power of layism"; poor things, there is no equality here. How does this correspond with what we read in the fifth page? Why use such language as the following in reference to themselves, "to whom the God of heaven commands them [the laity] to submit themselves"?

The fourth paragraph commences with another quotation:

that proud men had crept in among them [the PM] previous to 1839; and that their zeal was not so much to promote God's glory as the interests of their sect, particularly its financial interests.

Strange though it may seem, the pamphleteers do not attempt to impugn the truth contained in this quotation, but after saying a good deal about it leave it not only unrefuted but uncontradicted. Later in the same paragraph we find the following words:

Who possessing a spirit of candour and fairness even now can say, that the salaries of Primitive Methodist Ministers are more than necessary, or even sufficient?

The reply is brief and pointed:

So they have not sufficient even yet? Primitive Methodists! keep your eyes upon your leech-like T.P.'s, who are still saying, "give, give, not so grudgingly, give us what is necessary, what is sufficient" that is "advance our salaries again."

The fifth paragraph is headed with a quotation from the Record, and says

that they [the travelling preachers] shouted loud in their public assemblies, and made great professions of disinterestedness, but in their private meetings for church management, their principal care was how they might best augment their own incomes.

The writers of the pamphlet remind us of the fact that the salaries of ministers are fixed by the lay brethren of the Conference alone. But the Original Methodists are not impressed with their argument. They in their turn ask

Who constitute the lay-brethren of the Conference? Why generally speaking, they are composed of T.P.'s fathers, sons, brothers, uncles, nephews, cousins, particular friends, and nominees.

To justify their statement, they refer to circumstances which came under their observation at a district meeting at which many of them were officially present.

One of the lay brethren brought in a written proposition for a certain part of the T.P.'s to have their salaries increased, and he moved that this written document should be forwarded to Conference, with the sanction of that district meeting, but it fell to the ground for want of due form. When the thing came to be inquired into, this lay-brother was the father of a T.P., and that son had written the proposition, although he was not a member of the meeting.

In the Original Methodists' opinion, this incident spoke volumes
on the subject. They said that they could, if required, give date, place, and names.

The sixth paragraph begins with a quotation which says "If any of the leading men opposed them [the travelling preachers], they bore with the individual for a time, and endeavoured by caresses to bring him over to their side." They then ask:

How does this agree with the previous statement about the tyranny of the preachers? Do tyrants usually make use of such measures as caresses to accomplish their purposes?

The reply was as follows:

If these pamphlet writers had been readers as well as writers, they would have learnt from the history of the world in which they live, and from the history of Rome's iniquities in particular, that there are three prominent features which are common to tyrants generally whether political or religious; these are cunning, cruelty and cowardice: the first leads them very frequently to try what effect deceitful caresses will have upon an opponent, and if these fail, they then manifest their cruelty by inflicting all the pain and injury they can on him; and not unfrequently they are so cowardly that, like these pamphleteers, they dare not attach their names to their own work.

It is true that Carthy did not attach his name to the document, but the Original Methodists had little difficulty in determining its authorship: and from the significant "we" so often met with in its ten pages, they judged correctly that it was published by the authority of Conference.

The next pretended quotation in the pamphlet was in all probability an intended misquotation from the Record—

... but if he was what they termed an obstinate man, that is, if he was a man of unflinching integrity who would not be turned from the course which his judgment and conscience told him was the right one, but upon every proper occasion opposed their despotic and money-grasping proceedings; then, he became what the T.P.'s termed a marked man.

The pamphleteers' comment "Who marked them we know not" evoked the Original Methodists' answer

It was the T.P.'s who marked them; and if these men dare append their real names to their base pamphlet, we are persuaded that they would be marked by the discerning part of their readers as designing, crafty, and interested parties.

The latter part of the sixth paragraph denounces in the most vehement terms the leading ex-Primitive Methodists of Selston, who were, of course, by the time this pamphlet appeared, active members of the Original Methodists' Connexion. The paragraph is so fraught with bad feeling that the Original Methodists are puzzled to know why the travelling preachers made repeated attempts to get them back again. The seventh paragraph also pours out invective against the Selstonians. The eighth paragraph says that

a few facts will show the candid reader how designing men may manage, by partial statements and suppression of some important facts to misguide them, and cause them to come to a wrong conclusion.
Then in the ninth paragraph reference is made to William Carthy's appointment to the Belper circuit in 1838 and to the stormy Quarter-day of December that year. John Tomlinson's name is introduced, and he is contemptuously referred to as "the nail-maker". The bitter resentment of the Original Methodists is most clearly seen in their reply, reminding us of their own struggles to make ends meet at a time when wages were barely adequate and the price of provisions often too high for their thin purses:

John Tomlinson is still a nail-maker as his father and grandfather were before him. And pray, gentlemen-pamphleteers, tell us what your T.P.'s were a few months or years since? We know them well, too well—they have eaten at our tables, slept in our beds, and received a liberal share of our monies. We knew some of them before they were T.P.'s and have heard them preach at that time with their shirt sleeves peeping through their coat elbows, and their bones all but peeping through their skin. What were they then? why nail-makers, shoe-makers, stocking-makers, basket-makers, colliers, tailors, day-labourers, chair-bottomers, and such like—but now they have got their bones covered with an abundance of flesh, their backs covered with broad cloth, and frequently REV. placed in front of their names. One would naturally suppose, that feeling their own greatness, they would never so far disgrace themselves as to attack a poor nail-maker.

At this point in the Original Methodists' supplement, five pages are devoted to a re-telling of the events leading up to the withdrawal of John Tomlinson from the PM connexion—all of which was recounted in the first instalment of this history.²

In the ninth paragraph the pamphlet tells its readers that William Carthy could not claim the advanced salary unless the funds of the circuit were in such a state as to allow it; this, according to their own showing, was the law of the Connexion. But their opponents are quick to point out that the Belper circuit owed £50, besides chapel debts amounting to £2,000.

Was that Circuit, under those circumstances, in a proper state to advance the T.P.'s salary? Where was W.C.'s just and sacred rights, as trumped up in the eleventh paragraph? Was not £70 per annum a sufficient sum for a number of poor men to pay for a T.P., when they were more than £2,000 in debt? Facts like these are hard arguments. These writers tell us that the December Quarterly-meeting, 1838, resolved to pay the salary according to rule. We ask them did he receive it either that quarter, or in any succeeding quarter, while he remained in that Circuit? Certain official men in that Circuit say, he did not.

In the tenth paragraph we are told:

During the twenty-six years of his [William Carthy's] ministry, we believe he can confidently defy his basest calumniators to prove the smallest thing derogatory to his ministerial character.

The care with which the Original Methodists scrutinized this pamphlet may be appreciated from the following remark:

It seems these men are not quite sure that it is all true, for they qualify their bold assertion with "we believe". If they will go and ask the scores and hundreds, in the Circuits where he has travelled, and who have been driven from the Connexion by his tyranny and covetousness, they will be able to be more positive in their next pamphlet. They further tell us that he left the Belper Circuit without a scar, carrying the "laurels of victory with him". We don't envy him his laurels, and, as to his victory, we are persuaded such another would send him to his basket-making again.

The eleventh paragraph gives the PM version of the reason for the establishment of the Original Methodist connexion. It was because the authorities in the Connexion would not allow some vile and improper persons (who had crept into the societies in the Belper Circuit) to remain members, especially a certain nail-maker who at that time resided at Belper, and who had been guilty of conduct so utterly at variance with all that is holy and good, as to prove himself unfit for membership in any religious community; and yet had contrived, by removing from place to place, to elude the penalty which his conduct merited. This certain nail-maker resides in the Belper Circuit still; he is a native of that Circuit, and has resided in it half a century.

In reply we read:

It is rather coarse usage for an old man who has been a member of the Methodist family forty-two years, to be exhibited to the public as a wandering vagabond, who had crept into the P.M. Connexion in some deceitful way. If so, he paid dearly for it, for they [the travelling preachers] crept into his pocket to the depth of £70 in seven years. And for this they allowed him, notwithstanding his vile and unholy conduct, to creep pretty high in the Connexion, even to the high office of District representative to the annual Conference; and the T.P.'s would gladly have continued him in office, if he would have continued to dance to their fiddle. Degraded, and vile, and unholy as he was, he yet retained as much respectability as rendered him a proper person to be the father of a T.P., and of a T.P.'s wife too. This quotation seems to intimate that he left Retford Circuit in a clandestine manner; but the facts of the case were widely different. On account of long-continued affliction in his family, he was advised to remove to his and their native air. On the last Sabbath before his removal, he preached a farewell sermon in that Circuit, and left it on the Friday following, with his large family of ten persons; not at midnight, but at midday, with two teams (one his own, the other his brother's) laden with furniture, etc., accompanied by a T.P., who saw him take leave of many of his friends, neighbours, and customers. This was not much like a clandestine removal. He frequently went over to that Circuit afterwards on business, and, at such times, was invited to preach both at Retford, and in the Circuit. Instead of creeping into the society at Belper, he did not join the society there, until he had been strongly and repeatedly invited by both T.P.'s and lay-officials. There was no inducement for him to wish to creep in, for he knew that if he joined them, the T.P.'s would want his labour, his food, and his money. He had suffered so much in these points previously, that he felt reluctant, and did not consent until much pressed.

John Tomlinson was aged 58 when this was written.

The writer has been unable to trace the activities of this minister, and would welcome any information.
In the same paragraph it is asserted that after John Tomlinson had left the meeting at Sutton-in-Ashfield he remained on the outside, roaring like a lion, and only withdrew upon being told by the superintendent of the Circuit that unless he ceased, and went away, he would be placed in custody.

States the supplement:

The first assertion says so much, that it is unnecessary to contradict it; the second is equally untrue as the first. Instead of being threatened with being placed in custody after he had left the meeting, this shameful unheard-of line of conduct was adopted in the meeting, when these five-minutes ministers thought the defendant was speaking too long and loud. Like an ancient council, when a martyr was making his defence, his words cut them to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth. But, thank God, this PM council was in England, and so they were powerless; otherwise we have no doubt they would not only have deprived him of his liberty, but of his life; for priestcraft is the same in principle in all ages, countries and communities; all the difference lays [sic] in circumstance, for he had been guilty of that sin which, in the eyes and hearts too of many T.P.s, is unpardonable, namely—opposing an advance of salary. It is true that the superintendent did follow him out of the meeting, and the General Committee delegate too, and endeavoured to induce him to return, assuring him that if he would do so, the meeting would certainly clear him; but having come to a determination, he was not to be moved. He remaining thus firm, the meeting passed the motion of dismemberment for what these pamphleteers please (in order to injure his character in the eyes of their readers) to call wilful lying.

The pamphlet goes on to say that

this man went over to Selston, and made the people believe that he was an innocent and ill-used man, and that the preachers were tyrants; and, by these means, he produced sympathy, and ultimately prevailed upon them to separate from the Connexion.

In reply to this accusation, the secessionists say that Tomlinson had no need to tell the people at Selston this, for there was a deputation from the Selston society in the District Meeting; neither did he, but returned home, and without ever attempting to entice one single individual away from the society, he began peaceably and quietly to worship with another branch of the Methodist family, by whom he was gladly received, after W.C. had done all he could to injure him in the estimation of the religious public. He never entered Selston from the day of the District Meeting until the 7th of July following, when he preached at the Camp-meeting. The division had then taken place and he joined it heart and hand; and, after the lapse of eleven years, he is thankful that he did so. O how these pamphleteers love truth and justice.

In the next paragraph they give a widely different reason for the division. They say that

because W.C. wanted to examine the chapel accounts, the managers at Selston took offence—made a schism, and set up for themselves.

The Original Methodists ask:

How are these two contradictory statements to be reconciled? Verily,
these writers are the queerest lovers of truth and justice we ever knew in our lives; for if one of these statements be true, the other must be false. But it so happens that they are both false. It was no one circumstance, but a series of words and deeds continued for years, that caused the separation. **It was the tyranny and covetousness of the T.P.’s evinced in tempers, words, and acts, that were anything rather than Christian.** [Their italics.]

In the fourteenth paragraph the pamphleteers accuse the divisionists of seizing the Connexion’s chapel at Selston. The writer has already given some description of this place of worship.5 The Original Methodists do not attempt to deny this, but seek to justify their action in the following way:

These simple good men, not understanding the craft of priests, thought the chapel was theirs,—their money bought the land, built it, repaired it, and paid all that had come against it for thirteen years;—they had uniformly been told by the T.P.’s that it was not a Connexional chapel, because it was not built on freehold ground; they had yet to learn, that when they had purchased the possession from the former occupier—when the agents of the lords of the manor had accepted them as tenants—when they had paid the rent from year to year—when they had paid the interest regularly for the money borrowed on behalf of the property—and when even the principal too, belonged to the inhabitants of Selston; and, moreover, when they had paid the T.P.’s for preaching in it, having done all this themselves, they had yet to learn how the chapel could possibly belong to any body but themselves.

In the next paragraph it is asserted that the Selston people knew that the Primitive Methodists were going to hold a camp meeting on Selston Common, and that therefore when the secessionists held theirs at the same place and at the same time, their intentions were to create a rival camp. The Original Methodists reply:

This annual Camp-meeting had always been known as **SELSTON CAMP MEETING**—the Selston people composed, supported, and managed it, and they had welcomed their friends who came to it; and, as there were no Primitives in Selston, but one old woman, (who continued with them because she had three brothers who were T.P.’s) they naturally supposed it to be their camp-meeting still, and, as such, held it in the usual way.

Farther on in the same paragraph we learn that the seceders had enlisted “the aid of all the disaffected persons they could muster, irrespective of character or moral worth”. In the opinion of the Free-Gospellers this slander was as “dreadfully foul” as it was “dreadfully false”; and their criticism of this paragraph ends with the following words:

How men, professing to be Christian ministers, could write such things, we do not know: we see it is so, and are astonished. They were only two men in the waggon used as a preaching-stand, except such as were inhabitants of Selston, and Preachers on the P.M. plan.

In the sixteenth paragraph a fourth reason for the division is

*See Proceedings, xxxv, illustration facing p. 172.*
adduced. We read that a certain W. Leaker was planned to make a quarterly collection in Selston chapel, but the leading men refused, declaring that no such collection should ever be made in that chapel. Yet, according to the Original Methodists,

So far from this being true, W. Leaker never entered that chapel at all, either to preach, or make any collection whatever, previous to the division.

The four paragraphs which follow are concerned with the status of the PM chapel at Selston, the writers of the pamphlet asserting that it was the property of the PM Connexion, and that it was intended primarily to provide a preaching-place for the PM travelling preachers. In reply, the divisionists point out that even at the opening, the afternoon service was taken by a Wesleyan local preacher, and the evening service by "Mr. Hodgkin of Ruddington, a P.M. local preacher". Further, they say that the Belper circuit committee had refused the request that an appeal for funds to build a chapel at Selston should be made in the circuit, on the ground that the property would not be freehold, and that therefore the Connexion would not recognize it.

In the twenty-first paragraph it is said by way of taunt that only a small proportion of those seceding had joined the Original Methodist society. This, say the latter, is because of the scattered nature of the population; though some, it is admitted, have fallen away.

The penultimate paragraph accuses the Original Methodists of a lack of charity: the reader will undoubtedly feel that both sides were sadly deficient in this essential quality.

In the final paragraph of the pamphlet we are told that the Connexion against which some of them are incessantly inveighing, has, notwithstanding their puny efforts to injure it, gone on, gaining strength and obtaining accession to its ranks by thousands.

We conclude this chapter by quoting the final point made by the Original Methodists in their supplement:

We never have endeavoured to injure the P.M. Connexion; we defy these tale-tellers to prove their accusation correct; we have never made one attempt to injure it; we wish it great success. It is not the Connexion, it is the tyranny and covetousness of the T.P.'s that we are opposed to; but it is made evident in each of the ten pages of this wonderful travelling-preacher tale, that they are labouring hard to undermine the P.M. constitution, and pave the way for turning the T.P.'s into the Connexion, in the same way as the hundred T.P.'s among the Wesleyans were made the Conference, and in the same way as the Roman Catholic priesthood have made themselves into the church. We rejoice that the P.M. Connexion is increasing by thousands; we know that they have a noble army of Sabbath-school teachers, prayer-leaders, class-leaders, and local preachers, who, generally, are ornaments to their profession, indefatigable in their endeavours, and often very successful in their efforts. Is it a thing to be wondered at—that such a body should have its nine thousand increase? Perhaps forty thousand persons of both
sexes—the flower of the Connexion, youth full of expectation—manhood full of vigour, and age full of experience—all their varied excellencies, brought to bear systematically and unceasingly upon one object, and that object the best, and all this done gratuitously—is it to be wondered at, that such mighty, combined and continuous causes, should produce corresponding effects? No, we rather wonder that such a vast array of moral machinery does not produce more extensive results: and are persuaded that if it was not for the thousands that are annually deterred from joining it, or, when joined, are driven from the Connexion by the tyranny and covetousness of the T.P.'s, the increase would be nineteen instead of nine thousand. But this unseemly incubus, with which the Connexion is burthened, hangs like a dead weight from it, and prevents it from rising in its own native vigour, and blessing the world to the same extent it otherwise would do. We say cordially to every free labourer in the P. Meth. field, Go on, we wish you success in the name of the Lord.

DONALD M. GRUNDY.

(To be continued)

THE ANNUAL LECTURE
in connexion with the Middlesbrough Conference, 1967,
WILL BE DELIVERED IN
Yarm Methodist Church,
On Wednesday, 12th July, at 7-30 p.m.,
BY
Rev. FREDERICK HUNTER, M.A., B.D.
Subject: "THE WESLEYS AND CATHOLICITY."
The chair will be taken by MR. JOHN I. MILLER.

The Annual Meeting of the Society will be held at the same Church at 5-30 p.m.

Mrs. Herbert Ibberson kindly invites members of the Society to Tea in the schoolroom at 4-30 p.m. It is essential that all those who desire to be present at the Tea should send their names to the Rev. Peter W. Sutcliffe, B.A., 625, Yarm Road, Eaglescliffe, Stockton-on-Tees, Co. Durham, not later than Monday, July 10th.

The historic Yarm Octagon is in the High Street, near the clock tower. Motorists should proceed from Middlesbrough to Stockton; then turn left at the first traffic lights, and left again at the next lights; then proceed 4 miles along the A19 road into Yarm. There is a half-hourly train service from Middlesbrough (to Darlington). Alight at Eaglescliffe, and take bus 10 or 10A from Yarm Road bus stop to Yarm—or walk the 1½ miles. It would seem desirable to check on the return train times.

The Society's Exhibition of Methodist History will be opened at the Dorman Museum, Linthorpe Road, Middlesbrough, on Saturday, 1st July, by the Rev. R. Walters Dunstan. The Exhibition will be on view during the period of the Conference.
I HAVE recently examined a Society Book for the Epworth circuit started on 31st March 1788, in which year the preachers were Thomas Tattershall, Robert Hayward and George Mowatt. The first half-dozen pages are worn to the extent of making it difficult to decipher everything, though even from these there is much to be culled. The size of the book is such that it would be a long and tedious task to transcribe it, but for the benefit of those working on societies within this wide circuit, a few notes may be helpful.

The first readable entry is for June 1788, when the following societies are given, with names of leaders and members: Walkeringham (10), Beckingham (10), Grindley (26), Clayworth (24), Wheatley (10), Leverton (36), Retford (45), Houghton Park (9), Worksop (15), Mattersey (11), Misterton (48), Westwoodside (18), Epworth (80), Owston Ferry (58), Butterwick (13), Kidby (8), Amcotts (23), Crowle (23), Swinfleet (18), Rawcliff (4), Camblesford (8), Snaith (13), Whitley (11), Baln (4), Sykehouse (7), Fishlake (13), Thorne (85), Hatfield Woodhouse (14), Stainforth (2), Cantley (6), Burnham (12) and Yealand (2)—a total of 666.

Thomas Tattershall adds a note that several more meet in class in divers parts on trial, as also some of those do who are mentioned here and I have but little expectation of some of these holding out to the end. Therefore I leave out 16 of the whole and call them 650. Which number, be it noted, is printed in the annual returns for that year.

It will be seen that the Epworth circuit extended beyond the Isle of Axholme, and included societies in Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire. Anyone working on the history of these societies would undoubtedly need to see this book, and it is located at the Epworth Methodist manse.

Sturton(-le-Steeple) is added in 1790, Norton in 1792, and also Whitgift. In 1793 are added Addlingfleet, Drax, Wroot and Misson. Thomas Carlill certifies "A few names not included in the book were overlooked, otherwise a true account to the best of my judgement." Bole and Cowick begin in 1796 and 1797 respectively, and Tuxford also in 1797. From 1798 the writing is much improved, and some order attaches to the lists. In 1798 Stockwith appears, and Warsop also, but Worksop is missing. (One wonders whether there may be a confusion of names here: Nottinghamshire students may care to look into this.) Laneham is added in 1799, and Beltoft in 1800.

One would like, before parting with the eighteenth century, to make detailed reference to the Kilhamite agitation of 1797. Suffice it to say that in that year the Epworth circuit returned a membership of 957, with all the names duly recorded; but in the following year
the number is down to 600. By comparing the lists it is possible to
gather the names of those who seceded. The name of Kilham (re-
presented by Simon, father and son, and Thomas the clockmaker,
also Ann), with which the book began, disappears entirely from the
lists following 1798.

In 1801 appears the name of Belton, and in 1802 both North and
South Leverton, Gunhouse, Luddington, Lound, Hayton and Levels.
Worksop is there as well as Warsop, making it appear that the
former may have ceased for a time. The writing of Abraham Moseley
for 1803 is less legible, though the ink was good. Haxey is on for
the first time, also Newlands, Temple, Carlton and Derrythorpe, but
the Retford circuit had by this time been formed, and by a process
of deduction one may observe the limits of that circuit.

Numbers only are given for 1805 by John Barritt, and when P.G.
(Philip Garritt) came that year he appended a note, saying: "This
amount of the number is incorrect. Mr. B. has sett down too many
for several places."

Names appear again in 1808 in the delightful
handwriting of Martin Vaughan, and collections for the year are ap-

dended. The same is the case for 1809, and under the yearly

collection is "The preacher's merciful fund—£13". In addition, £77

was contributed towards "Garthorp, Burringham and Belton

chapels".

Thomas Tattershall concludes the book with a tidy list of names
for 1811, and rounds it off with the words "May God bless and
crown the labours of our successors more abundantly. Amen.
Amen." In this year are added societies at Pollington and Goole
(the latter having 8 members). A collection, also in 1811, for West
Butterwick chapel realized £49 17s. 9d., and for the Conference
Debt £14 12s. 6d., whilst British Prisoners in France received a
contribution amounting to £19 4s. 2d. On the cover of the book is
a list of "Private subscriptions included in the total of the Preach-
er's merciful Fund".

I provide this bare outline of the Epworth book, for such volumes
are rare, in the hope that it may serve those who seek information
respecting the societies mentioned. Except for a page or two, it is
in excellent preservation.

WILLIAM LEARY.

Readers who intend to spend a holiday in Cornwall ought to equip them-
selves with A Guide to places of interest in Methodist Cornwall
by our secretary, the Rev. Thomas Shaw. This is more than a "local history";
it is a real guide book, containing over 120 references and numerous sketch
maps to help the tourist to find the more inaccessible places. Copies may
be obtained, price 2s. 6d. plus 5d. postage, from the author at 94, Albany
Road, Redruth, Cornwall.

We continue to receive local histories of Methodism, on which we con-
gratulate the compilers. A list of those most recently to hand will appear
in our next number.
Two pew tickets from Wesley's Chapel, London

(see p. 64)
A Pew Ticket from Bethel Chapel, Rochester
(see p. 64; also Proceedings, xxxv, p. 196)

A Pew Ticket from St. Peter's Street Chapel, Canterbury
(see p. 64)
BOOK NOTICES

Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-19th Century America, by Timothy L. Smith. (Abingdon Press (1957), $4.00.)

The work of Dr. Timothy Smith has largely passed without notice in Britain. In America his stature has been increasingly recognized, and his recent contribution to the new standard three-volume history of American Methodism, together with his last work, the official history of the Church of the Nazarene, has claimed for him a rightful place among the leading Church historians.

This present study pre-dates his other work, but is a contribution of outstanding importance. The two-fold thesis contained therein and offered for his Harvard Ph.D. is (1) that the generally-held view that by the 1850s revivalistic religion and the quest for Christian perfection which under Methodist and the new-school Calvinist influences had permeated American Protestantism had largely run its course was totally untenable on examination of the facts, and (2) that it was from the revival measures and perfectionist aspirations of the developing city missions in the period 1840-65 that the real attack upon much social injustice emanated and thus the seeds of the social gospel of the succeeding decades were firmly planted.

It was therefore evangelism—and more precisely that type which was strongly orientated in the Wesleyan holiness tradition—which gave birth to strong social reform pressures long before Protestant liberalism was given, or claimed, a certain credit for new approaches to social well-being. Perfectionist optimism operated far outside the area of purely individualistic personal piety. "Going on to the highest" was a message for men in community. Dr. Smith musters source after source in his well-documented study, revealing the weakness, if not the total defeat, of the theory expounded by such men as Frederick Jackson Turner and William Warren Sweet that the frontier was the birthplace of nineteenth-century American idealism.

Historians who have declared that the revivalism in these decades rarely pointed men to anything but heavenly ideals at the cost of earthly concerns have increasingly in recent years in America shown a marked willingness to review this position. That this is due in large measure to the present study is in itself sufficient evidence of its weight. Because of its localized field it seems to have been almost entirely overlooked here. This is to be regretted, as on reading this vivid account our own appetites are whetted for similar definitive studies in the same field.

As British Wesleyans such as William Arthur influenced American Wesleyan revivalism in the direction of stressing the total social good, so without question American Methodists such as Dr. William and Mrs. Phoebe Palmer, William Taylor (later Bishop and father of the self-supporting missionary Church movement) and James Caughey, together with the leader of Oberlin perfectionism, Charles G. Finney, moved great crowds and affected movements here. But apart from concentrating on the results of the 1859 Revival, little has been done to assess their influence on the renewal of the nineteenth-century interest in Britain in practical as well as personal holiness. Kathleen Heasman's Evangelicals in Action (Bles, 1962) is a beginning, but the range here is too wide and shallow to be really satisfying.

Dr. Smith's work, although taking in a wide sweep of Protestant evangelical and social thought, undoubtedly concentrates on the area where
very little has been done, viz. the total picture of the full effects of Wesley's teaching on sanctification on a vast part of a great nation. Results on matters as diverse as Sunday schools and slavery are set forth here. Rather than describing the last throes of a declining doctrine and experience, this study supports the view held by a few, against the stream for some time, that the nineteenth century, rather than the eighteenth, was the matrix of the doctrine of holiness.

As a Nazarene, Dr. Smith honestly declares his sympathy with the faith of the Wesleyan revivalists. At the same time, accuracy and impartiality—those cherished aims of the historian—are as strongly present as in any work which openly opposes well-established conceptions.

A small point, perhaps!—but it is hardly correct to say that "Methodist preachers who professed sanctification meant to claim sinless perfection" (p. 10): familiarity with the mass of sermonic and doctrinal material produced by these men shows clearly that they knew their Wesley better than that.

John Wesley: his Puritan Heritage. by Robert C. Monk. (Epworth Press, pp. 286, 425.)

John Wesley was bred from Puritan stock, and Puritan influence on his thought and practice was clearly significant. Yet the amount of research devoted to this strand in Methodism is meagre compared with that expended on Anglican, Catholic, Reformed and Pietistic influences. Dr. Monk, an American Methodist scholar, has made an effort to redress the balance.

The sub-title of his book is "A Study of the Christian Life", and he examines in detail the theology and practice of Wesley and the Puritans in this key area of their common concern. He finds his main evidence in the fifty volumes of The Christian Library, which Wesley edited from 1749 to 1755, with its predominance of Puritan writings. The author prints all extracts from the Library so that the original text and Wesley's abridgements and emendations can be clearly seen.

Dr. Monk's detailed and careful study finds considerable common ground in theology between Wesley and the Puritans, including their concern for experimental religion, their doctrines of original sin, justification, assurance and sanctification, and their covenant theology. Only in this last area, however, does he confidently claim direct dependence on the part of Wesley. In the realm of applied theology, this dependence increases sharply. Wesley uses Alleine's and Baxter's tracts to awaken the unconverted; draws on his grandfather Annesley for his theology of conscience; recommends Puritan models of self-examination and meditation; adopts Philip Henry's pattern of family worship; and makes Baxter's Reformed Pastor the official pastoral handbook for Methodist preachers. Whether the affinity between Wesley and the Puritans in church order is as great as Dr. Monk suggests is more arguable. He would see behind Methodist polity the influence not only of the Anglican religious societies and the Moravian bands, but also of the Congregational "gathered church". Must not due weight be given here to the much more open nature of membership in the Methodist societies, and their continued relationship, despite all tensions, with the parish church?

In any attempt to assess Wesley's Puritan heritage, close scrutiny must surely be given to the Epworth home, and the training given to her children by Susanna Wesley. Dr. Monk's few scattered references to Susanna
only hint at her importance as a transmitter of the Puritan tradition, and cry out for amplification and research. Again, in concentrating on the experiential and practical element in Puritanism and Methodism, the author rather overlooks their intellectual content. For both Wesley and Baxter (the Puritan divine to whom Wesley seems most strongly drawn), the place of reason in religion, though subordinate, is a vital one; and it is no accident that the standard Puritan sermon was divided into (1) Doctrine, (2) Reason, (3) Use (i.e. practical application). Dr. Monk treats thoroughly of (1) and (3), whilst virtually passing over the mediate term. There is an egregious misprint on page 103, where Wesley is made to describe Methodism's purpose as "to spread spiritual holiness over the land".

Nevertheless, when all qualifications are made, this work breaks new ground in its detailed examination of the Puritan contents of the Christian Library, and provides chapter and verse for the influence—often unthinkingly assumed or denied—of the Puritans on Wesley. It also underlines their shared passion for religion in earnest, for practical Christianity, and for real holiness in heart and life.  

JOHN A. NEWTON.

The Handbook of the Methodist Conference, Middlesbrough, 1967, edited by G. C. Stangroom, follows the pattern of its predecessors in its arrangement of things both new and old and its allocation of space thereto. The main historical article, from the pen of our Editor, needs no commendation. Mr. Bowmer projects the two-hundred-year-old history of Methodism in the North-East on to a small screen of four-and-a-half pages. It is the story of a Methodism established for a century in a rural community, and then successfully battened on to the newly-industrialized society of newcomers from about 1830 onwards. The illustrations of the local preacher Timothy Hackworth and his "Sanspareil" locomotive are fitting symbols of North-East Methodism in its historical aspect. The growth of Middlesbrough from the village which it was in 1828 to the modern city of 157,740 inhabitants is outlined by William Lillie. The articles on Durham, by Tom Greener, the Moors and Dales, by Doris A. Cleverly, and the coastal villages, by Sam Davies, are a blend of ancient and modern. There are short accounts also of the Newbiggin chapel (1759) and —of particular interest to those able to attend our Society's annual Lecture—of the Yarm Octagon (1764).

T.S.

NOTES AND QUERIES

1163. THE WESTLEYS OF LYME REGIS.

Miss E. M. Pearson of Weymouth sends us a copy of items in the burial register of Lyme Regis (Dorset) parish church, kindly supplied by the vicar, the Rev. J. H. G. Charles:

1656 23rd September—Margaret Westley
       9th October—Margaret, daughter of John Westly
1670 15th February—Mr. Bartholomew Wesly
1671 13th July—Mary Wesly, widow
1679 13th September—John Wesly
1685 22nd December—Margaret Wesly, widow

This information will supplement previous articles on the Wesley ancestry (see Proceedings, iv, pp. 89 ff.; vi, pp. 1 ff.).

EDITOR.
1164. Cards with Engravings of Chapels.

The cards to which Dr. Beckerlegge refers in his note under the above heading (Proceedings, xxxv, p. 196) are almost certainly pew tickets. I know of at least two similar examples, and there is evidence to suggest that they are in some way connected. The most important example, which passed through my hands recently, is a ticket used at City Road chapel. It bears an engraving of the chapel, and is dated 1807. This ticket reached me through the kindness of Mrs. E. M. Barnes of Leamington. A similar ticket was in use in the early days of the St. Peter’s Street Wesleyan chapel, Canterbury, opened on New Year’s Day 1812. This shows not only the front of the chapel, but two figures strolling arm-in-arm up the avenue of poplars which led to the entrance.

The fact that all these tickets come from London and North Kent is scarcely a coincidence. There is a more direct link between some of them at least. Bethel chapel, Rochester, was designed by the Rev. William Jenkins, sen., who was responsible for a number of London chapels at that period. His design was based on that of Wesley’s Chapel. The chapel at Canterbury was, in turn, designed by Jenkins as a modification of the Rochester one. Possibly Sheerness was a further example of his work, but I have no records to substantiate this. Where the Hartlip chapel fits into the picture perhaps we can only guess. It was built in 1820 by a local Anglican layman, and was the first Bible Christian chapel in Kent.

I know of no reliable source of information about the use of pew tickets in Methodism. The earliest specimen I have come across is again from Wesley’s Chapel, and is dated 1780. It would appear from this that pews were let from the time the chapel was first opened. John A. Vickers.

[Illustrated in this issue (facing pp. 60 and 61) are the three tickets mentioned by Mr. Vickers and the Rochester ticket previously described by Dr. Beckerlegge.—Editor.]

1165. The “Magic Methodists” of Delamere Forest.

Mr. John D. Walker of 20, Truro Drive, Sale, Cheshire, would be grateful if any readers could supply information about a sect known as the “Magic Methodists” who were located in the Delamere Forest area of Cheshire. Any details would be appreciated. [See below.—Editor.]

1166. James Crawfoot, the “Forest Mystic”.

In Proceedings, xxx, pp. 12-15, the late Rev. Dr. Edward Langton wrote of James Crawfoot, the “Forest Mystic”, leader of the “Magic Methodists” (so called), about whom Mr. Walker inquires in the note printed above. Regarding Crawfoot himself, information taken from the Chester circuit records and kindly supplied by the superintendent (Rev. R. Talbot Watkins) calls in question Dr. Langton’s accuracy in certain particulars. Dr. Langton says that shortly after his conversion in 1783, Crawfoot, then living at Duddon Heath, was placed on the Plan of the Chester circuit. But records dating from 1788 show him merely as a member of society—not even as leader until 1796. His removal from Duddon to Delamere Forest apparently took place in 1803—ten years later than Dr. Langton’s date. His lack of status as a preacher make it clear that if indeed he heard John Wesley’s memorable words in Chester on 6th April 1790, these must have been spoken in the society meeting (Journal, viii, p. 57), and not to “a group of travelling and local preachers”. Alfred A. Taberer.

1 See G. J. Stevenson: History of City Road Chapel, pp. 548 f.