

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_whs_01.php

Proceedings

OF THE

Wesley Historical Society

Editor : REV. JOHN C. BOWMER, M.A., B.D., Ph.D.

Volume XXXVIII

December 1972

POETRY IN THE HYMNS OF JOHN AND CHARLES WESLEY

(Continued from page 135)

The third part of the thesis is concerned mainly with John Wesley's translations. The German texts have been used where possible, and established renderings re-examined.⁸⁵ The point is stressed that, like Chaucer and Shakespeare, Wesley often used his material as a means of self-expression. In his own words, which Dr. Henry Bett quoted, "I did not take all that lay before me, but selected those [of the German poems] which I judged to be most scriptural, and most suitable to sound experience."⁸⁶ In fact they were new poems, in that from each, as he thought necessary, he omitted, expanded, adapted, abbreviated, reconstructed the poetic pattern, added new imagery, and incorporated quotation.

The choice of poem alone indicates John's art. It is difficult not to dwell on the Shakespearian quality and smooth-running elegance of his first rendering from Tersteegen :

Thou hidden love of God, whose height
And depth unfathomed no man knows . . .⁸⁷

The German and English versions are given side by side, both here and in the illustrations from Gerhardt and Scheffler, so that the creative methods mentioned can be estimated.

John's greatest work is achieved in the "grand style". The Miltonic here shines in his best lines. When necessary for his purpose,

⁸⁵ Bibliography includes Theodore B. Hewitt: *Paul Gerhardt as Hymn-writer* (Yale, 1918) and John W. Herbert: *John Wesley as Author and Editor* (Princeton, 1948).

⁸⁶ See Henry Bett: *The Hymns of Methodism*, p. 18; John Wesley's Sermon CXVII in *Works* (Jackson's 3rd edn.), vii, p. 273.

⁸⁷ "Whose worth's unknown although his depth be taken" (*Sonnets*, "True Love"). Dr. Bett (op. cit., p. 13) quotes Emerson: "the greatest hymn in the English language". One might substitute "religious poem" for "hymn"; though possibly Charles's "O Thou who camest from above" (MHB 386) would qualify.

the German lyrics are converted to the Ambrosian iambs,³⁸ which yet have the variations of stress and pause and continuity of line-division that raise his verse-paragraphs to classic proportions:

Térrible | Májesty | is Thine.

Two dactyls produce the required weight, pace and emphasis before the line is brought back to its base. Similarly do the trochaics in

Strénghen my féet with stéady páce
Still to préss fóward . . .

If Shakespeare brought blank verse to its highest potentiality, there is something to be said for believing that Wesley did the same for this measure. All the Greek-Hebrew-Herbertian parallelisms and repetitions beloved of Charles were first used by John. Like Charles, he achieves poetry³⁹ in the presence of—rather than because of—these “rhetoricians’ tools”. Thus he retains Gerhardt’s “Hypotyposis”⁴⁰ in

Extended on the sacred tree,
Besmear’d with dust, and sweat, and blood,
See there, the King of glory see!
Sinks and expires the Son of God.⁴¹

“O World”—Wesley ignores this, Gerhardt’s homiletic opening, and gets the scene immediately on the canvas. He proceeds to drama in

I, I alone have done the deed!
'Tis I Thy sacred flesh have torn;
My sins have caused Thy hands to bleed,
Pointed the nail, and fixed the thorn.⁴²

Dr. Bett—and Nehemiah Curnock—noticed John’s early interest in drama as a means of literary expression. Many of his additions to the German texts have this dramatic quality, which—apart from the supreme exception of *Wrestling Jacob*—does not seem characteristic of Charles. Though not translations, “Peace, doubting heart!”⁴³ and that conversion manifesto *Free Grace* occur to mind. The structure of the first shows John’s⁴⁴ disregard of “mathematic form” (Blake’s anathema!) and, like Chaucer in the *Canterbury Tales*, achievement of “poetic form”.⁴⁵ The temptations of fire and water do not succeed one another, but are commuted. But

³⁸ But, significantly, the best German originals for Wesley’s versions from Tersteegen, Gerhardt and Scheffler were in the classic metre already.

³⁹ That is, according to the Sidneyan canon of sublimity, in contradistinction to mere verse.

⁴⁰ To use the term quoted by Dr. Frank Baker (op. cit.) for Charles—the power of bringing a scene vividly before our eyes.

⁴¹ MHB prints only the *result* of these visualizations (No. 388):

My Saviour! how shall I proclaim,
How pay the mighty debt I owe? . . . (Wesley, stanzas 6 and 7).

⁴² The vivid participial phrases are John’s own—and Pope’s.

⁴³ *Hymns and Sacred Poems* (1793), p. 153; MHB 500.

⁴⁴ Failing factual evidence, I still support Dr. Bett’s view that this poem is mainly John’s. See also “Talk with us, Lord”, Appendix I, p. 404 of my thesis.

⁴⁵ Cf. Prof. Harold Brooks: *The Canterbury Pilgrims* (1962), p. 10.

Free Grace ("And can it be . . .") shows orderly progression, rising to a highly dramatic climax in the fourth stanza.⁴⁶ For style and tone, it offers comparison with the great hymn from Rothe :

Now I have found the ground wherein
Sure my soul's anchor may remain— . . .

The insistence on the personal rediscovery of faith—the "I", "me" alternating with the majesty of God—is as much a part of the romantic individualism that was to succeed Augustan literary standards as were the *Lyrical Ballads* of 1798.

Because of the acknowledged excellence of the translations, their authorship has been questioned. Some poems have been ascribed to Charles, who has been made a German scholar for the purpose. Dr. R. Newton Flew (as well as Coleridge) has doubted John's capacity for direct emotion.⁴⁷ Dr. Frank Baker,⁴⁸ "chiefly on the grounds of metre", questions whether it was John who translated Scheffler's *Jesu loben vir*. The rendering in *Hymns and Sacred Poems* (1739) is not one of the best, but it painstakingly plods through the twelve somewhat staccato stanzas of alternate praise and plaint with some such typical words as "undaunted", "unexampled", "unashamed"—giving some substance to Scheffler's irregular lyric, which, as in other examples quoted for John here, is left to its own metric pattern (6 6.7.7.7.7).⁴⁹ To discard it on the score of metre seems mistaken. John could use any metre he liked. Dr. Schmidt established that his first rendering of Freylinghausen's *Wer ist wohl wie du*—another poem supposed to be beyond John's metrical capacity—was the German's 5 5.8 8.5 5. line-division. Thus :

Then the dauntless mind
Which, to Jesus joined,
Neither life nor treasure prizes,
And all fleshly lust despises,
Grant him, Highest Good,
Through Thy precious blood.⁵⁰

John Wesley wrote to Count von Zinzendorf from Georgia in March 1736, enclosing the above for the Moravian leader's approbation. Zinzendorf kept him waiting five months, and then returned his somewhat censorious correction, with its "soteriological" bias.⁵¹ Dr. Schmidt wondered why this correspondence had not been used. It is possibly not surprising that Wesley changed both the tone and

⁴⁶ MHB 371; *Hymns and Sacred Poems* (1739), p. 117 f. Mr. Neil Dixon, in *Proceedings*, xxxvii, p. 43 ff., supports Dr. Bett in ascribing this hymn to John Wesley, as his "conversion hymn". The reference in stanza 4 is to the "drama" in Acts xvi. 26 f.

⁴⁷ "Did John shout?" (*The Hymns of Charles Wesley* (1953), p. 30).

⁴⁸ op. cit., p. 5.

⁴⁹ "Thou Jesus art our King" (*Hymns and Sacred Poems* (1739), p. 175).

⁵⁰ *John Wesley: A Theological Biography*, vol. I, translated by Norman P. Goldhawk (1962), p. 151.

⁵¹ "Now may Westley own
Through Thy blood alone

A dauntless mind . . ." (op. cit., p. 163).

the metre for his Charleston *Collection* published a year later, producing, in a poem beginning "O Jesu, Source of calm repose", something quite untied to Freylinghausen but retaining its beauty and ethical vigour. Thus:

A patient, a victorious mind
That life and all things cast behind,
Springs forth obedient to Thy call,
A heart that no desire can move
But still to adore, believe, and love,
Give me, my Lord, my Life, my All.⁵²

This, it may be said, is not Charles's "Thou hidden source of calm repose",⁵³ which appeared in his independent production of 1749, when John was in the throes of evangelistic touring. It would be fair to say that Charles never missed a line of superlative excellence,⁵⁴ and seldom failed to use it to produce a more finished poem. John was the great originator. A reading of Schmidt also disposes of the idea that Charles must have known German early, for his supposed translations, on the ground that he would have to converse with Peter Böhler, who meant so much to both brothers in their coming to have their first-hand experience of God's pardoning love. Böhler says he learnt his English for the purpose of talking freely to Charles!⁵⁵ John, of course, almost lived with the Germans in Georgia, and had published a tentative German dictionary in 1728.⁵⁶

Wesley as a rule shows nicety as well as theological discernment in his selections from the Pietist group. His translations are rarefied, and he reserves open mockery⁵⁷ for the sort of language that J. Sparrow admires in the English Moravian hymn-book.⁵⁸ Even in rendering the earlier Scheffler, John distinguishes between the German mystic's *liebe-kunst* (literally, "love-knowledge") and the Greek-Christian *agapé*; whilst the lover's *begihr* (desire, including erotic desire) becomes "The love that all heaven's host inspires". *Süsse thränen* (sweet tears) must be "refreshing"; and the *feuschebrunst* (burning fires) "chaste, hallowed". Yet, with all this, it is John, not Charles, who first uses the Shelleyan⁵⁹ "dying away" before the greatness of God ("O'erpowered, I sink, I faint, I die") in the part

⁵² Charleston *Collection* (1737), No. XL, stanza 6; this hymn is No. 343 in John Wesley's 1780 *Collection of Hymns*. ⁵³ MHB 98.

⁵⁴ That is, John's "O Jesu, Source of calm repose".

⁵⁵ Martin Schmidt, op. cit., p. 229. ⁵⁶ See *Journal*, i, pp. 278, 295, 300.

⁵⁷ In a pamphlet preceding his edition of *The Moravian Hymn Book*, purporting to be by Zinzendorf, "for the benefit of all mankind". Wesley, however, whilst "omitting all meaningless epithets, cant phrases" (Hatfield), uses Zinzendorf's imagery in "Jesu, Thy blood and righteousness" (*Hymns and Sacred Poems* (1740), p. 177), and prints some original verses in his edited version of the German hymn-book.

⁵⁸ "Expression in personal terms and deeply passionate language", and given as

"I cannot possibly leave off,
I have not thee embraced enough,
I kiss thee yet once more . . .
On thy unnumbered wounds and sores."

—*Hymns Unbidden* (New York, 1962), by Prof. England with John Sparrow, p. 7.

⁵⁹ See Murray Roston: *Prophet and Poet* (1965).

now omitted from his twelve-line verses from Ernst Lange: "O God, Thou bottomless abyss".⁶⁰ Charles virtually repeats this line in the stanza omitted from his poem "Jesu, Lover of my soul" (1740). Charles wrote:

Wilt Thou not regard my call? . . .
Lo, I sink, I faint, I fall.

Again, John came first.

John Wesley cannot be held to account, either, for his lack of immediacy in the love-theme in his *Recollections of Former Mercies*—the lines composed in his first distress at the loss of Grace Murray.⁶¹ Narrative love-poems were not realistically treated in the eighteenth century. An analysis, printed as Appendix III in the full thesis, shows a likeness to Wordsworth's formal—not to say dull—verses on the loss of Lucy.⁶² John could liberate his emotions in expressing his love to God who is to be loved above all creation, but—alas for this happiness on earth!—not in love concerning women. (Neither did Swift achieve marriage with Stella.) J. Augustin Leger has noticed a "rich, grave, psalm-like tone in the Grace Murray verses".

As an ironist, in verse as well as in prose, he was—again like Swift—supreme. In the thirty-eight paragraphs in doubled long metre, written against Predestination and Moravian "stillness",⁶³ he can even make us laugh, as they are wholly free from the slightly acrimonious note appearing in Charles's clever political verse-satires. In this quality John showed something of his Irish ancestry, and approached another famous compatriot, George Bernard Shaw.

Canon Hutchinson and Dame Helen Gardner have done justice to John Wesley as editor of George Herbert.⁶⁴ After making superhuman efforts to render "singable" the poems of one who has been called "not choric, but the superlative of solo",⁶⁵ John recognized in 1773 that *The Temple* must be republished intact, and withdrew his own versions. His unusually sensitive reaction—for the age of Johnson—to external nature is mentioned,⁶⁶ and, with some minor verse still unidentified, certain poems in *Hymns and Sacred Poems* (1740)—including "Talk with me, Lord"⁶⁷—are claimed for John.⁶⁸ The writer believes that more rather than fewer of the verses in the early anthologies may be found to be of his authorship.

E. M. HODGSON.

⁶⁰ *Charleston Collection* (1737), No. XVI; MHB 42.

⁶¹ While Charles, in ignorance of his brother's actual engagement, was carrying out his schemes to prevent what he thought an unsuitable marriage, John had a dream in which he saw Grace being hanged, and he himself was doing nothing to save her. (*Journal*, iii, p. 435 (1749).)

⁶² These, of course, are not to be confused with Wordsworth's romantic *lyric*,
Lucy is in her grave, and Oh!—
The difference to me!

⁶³ See Appendix III of the thesis.

⁶⁴ See Appendix II of the thesis.

⁶⁵ Cf. England, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

⁶⁶ See Appendix IV of the thesis.

⁶⁷ In the 1780 *Collection of Hymns*, "Talk with us, Lord"; MHB 460.

⁶⁸ See Appendix I(b) in the thesis.

WESLEY: SEPARATIST OR SEARCHER FOR UNITY?

DR. FRANK BAKER, in his fine book *John Wesley and the Church of England*, expounds the thesis that Wesley moved towards the founding of an independent denomination—and did it consciously from 1784 onwards. In the process of his argument he criticizes some of my contentions, and to these criticisms I wish to reply within my different outline of Wesley's motives.

Consider, first of all, Wesley's "Catholic approach to unity". In dealing with the well-known document recording the resolution about "High-church" liturgical practices made by Wesley, Dr. Baker says: "Page 2 contains other notes from some pages numbered between 58 and 99, but contrary to Mr. Hunter's statement these are not from any part of Beveridge's two volumes." He means *Synodikon; sive Pandectæ Canonum . . . Conciliorum . . .*; and he is right.¹

In dealing with Wesley's reading of Beveridge in September 1736, Dr. Baker does not mention that one of Wesley's notes in the *Journal* is closely—but not completely—parallel to one of the above-mentioned notes, namely that about page 65. Wesley also criticizes Beveridge for saying on page 159 (and not page 1) that "many parts of it [the Apostolical Canons] were useless and obsolete . . . when the Council of Nice met".² Dr. Baker³ finds this an incidental reference on page 159 of *Synodikon*, but this is not the passage Wesley had in mind.

How did we make our mistakes? The editor of the Standard edition of Wesley's *Journal* assumed that Wesley read one book by Beveridge in September 1736, namely *Pandectæ Canonum Conciliorum*, and that he criticized this later under the title *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ*. Dr. Baker turned to the former; I made the same mistake in reverse. I asked the Reference Library under the two titles for what I assumed was the one book, but received *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Primitivæ*—a book written by Beveridge later than *Synodikon*. Readers will find in this later book the sources, first, of Wesley's notes in the Resolutions MS. on pages 58-99; second, the comment in the *Journal* based on page 65; and third, not a vague, inferential source, but an explicit source for the *Journal* comment on page 159. My apology for assuming that Wesley had read but one of Beveridge's books is that I erred in good company. That I stumbled on the right source was mere serendipity!

Dr. Baker questions the assumption that the Resolutions "belong to 1736 because we know that in [September] that year, Wesley read Beveridge, for he had at least dipped into it earlier"—meaning 25th

¹ Baker, op. cit., p. 350. See also my *John Wesley and the Coming Comprehensive Church*, pp. 52-3.

² *Journal*, i, p. 278.

³ op. cit., p. 49.

February 1734/5.⁴ Now the question to ask is: "Which of Beveridge's books is mentioned there in the *Diary*?", for the answer could affect the dating of the Resolutions.

With respect to Wesley's important interest in Church unity, the continuance of his interest in the Non-juror Usages is more important than its commencement. This is obscured in Dr. Baker's treatment. He says that Wesley's resolution to make "Oblation of the Elements" was supported by the 1662 Book of Common Prayer.⁵ If so, why did Wesley need an obviously daring resolution to practise it? Like the Non-jurors, he held that the 1549 book contained the Four Usages, that the 1662 book did not, and that they ought to have been restored. Deacon did this on the basis of the Apostolical Constitutions, believing it could promote a "Catholick" Union.

It is strange that although Dr. Baker finds "Oblation of the Elements" in the 1662 book and in the Wesleys' *Hymns on the Lord's Supper* "a deliberate attempt to recapture the liturgy of the apostolic church, as in the use of the mixed chalice . . . and even . . . of the epiclesis";⁶ two other of the Usages, he ignores the presence of "Oblation of Elements" in these hymns. This is expressed there by the use of the verb "offer"; and Dr. Baker provides evidence that in 1755—ten years after the *Hymns* were first published—Wesley insisted at the Conference: "He that *offers* this [the Christian sacrifice of bread and wine] as a memorial of the death of Christ is as proper a priest as ever Melchizedek was".⁷

Similarly, Dr. Baker ignores the evidence of Wesley's lifelong interest in the Usages, as shown by his nine editions of the *Hymns* and in his sermon of 1732 entitled "The Duty of Constant Communion", re-issued here in 1787-8 and even more significantly in the American *Arminian Magazine* for March 1790. This could have facilitated the reunion proposed by Dr. Coke in 1791 of American Methodists and Protestant Episcopalians, for their Prayer Book of 1789-90 included the Four Usages, now provided by recent Church of England revisions, adding to affinities with the Orthodox Church.⁸ Their book also included some revisions like Wesley's of 1784, both inspired by former schemes of comprehension—theirs of 1689, Wesley's of 1661-2.

Secondly, we turn to Unity by Comprehension, dealing first of all with Wesley's revision of the Prayer Book in 1784. Dr. Baker says of an article I wrote on the subject,⁹ "Hunter's claim that Wesley worked with the physical aid of Baxter's *Reformed Liturgy* is just possible but unlikely."¹⁰ In fact, I nowhere argued that Wesley's revisions were inspired by Baxter's *Liturgy*, but that he drew on suggestions made by the whole group of Puritan divines at the Savoy

⁴ *ibid.*, p. 351.

⁶ *ibid.*, p. 86.

⁸ My book, pp. 88-90, 96-8, 109.

¹⁰ Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 388.

⁵ *ibid.*, pp. 352-3.

⁷ *ibid.*, p. 333; see also my book, p. 65.

⁹ *Proceedings*, xxiii, pp. 123 ff.

Conference of 1661, as recorded in Calamy's *Abridgement of Mr. Baxter's History of his Life and Times*.

Dr. Baker says "the Puritans, and especially the Savoy Conference, may well have influenced Wesley, but *only in a general way*".¹¹ Later, he says of the period 1784-8, "Wesley was carrying out most of the reforms desired by the Puritans more than a century earlier, and by John Jones and company more recently"; but he himself gives evidence that in 1755 Wesley was influenced by the Puritans rather than Jones, that the influence was specific rather than general, and was at least reflected in 1784.

Wesley read Jones's *Disquisitions* in 1750. Jones includes revisions collected from contemporaries, and ends with quotations on Prayer Book revision from Bacon (d. 1626) to 1748. Dr. Baker gives specific evidence from the valuable document on "Ought we to separate from the Church of England?" which Wesley read at the 1755 Conference. In this document Wesley named seven things in the Book of Common Prayer which "we do not undertake to defend".¹² His eighth objection—to "Hopkins and Sternhold's Psalms"—he clearly derived from his father. None of the suggestions was in Jones alone. All were made by the Puritans, and Wesley read of them in 1754, in Calamy's book. In letters of September and November 1755, he identifies himself with the Puritans of 1661 in respect to their objections to the liturgy. Dr. Baker continues: "All these faults Wesley was later able to put right in his own *Sunday Service*, and they form indeed the backbone of his revision."¹³ In my article I instanced, in addition to these seven revisions found in Calamy's record of Puritan suggestions, another ten or so used by Wesley in 1784. If seven were the backbone, what is the anatomical equivalent of seventeen?

A number of writers have made use of my article, mainly with acceptance, but the argument is carried a stage further by Dr. G. J. Cuming's excellent *History of the Anglican Liturgy*, published in 1969. Dr. Cuming accepts my claim of Puritan influence, as supported by Peaston's *Prayer Book Revision*, chapter 3, but thinks "Wesley was also much influenced by Theophilus Lindsey's book"¹⁴ and possibly by other proposals such as Jones's *Disquisitions*.¹⁵ I know of no external evidence that Wesley read Lindsey's book, but some of his revisions—few compared with Puritan suggestions—parallel Lindsey's distinctive suggestions. I am doubtful of others, and Wesley takes a different line from Lindsey in some of his revisions. Dr. Cuming does not suggest that Lindsey was the channel for the Puritan suggestions of 1661 adopted by Wesley in 1784-8.

The second point with regard to Unity by Comprehension is that of Superintendents. Dr. Baker is content to show that "Superintendent" was a non-emotive synonym for "Bishop". But Wesley

¹¹ *ibid.*, p. 243.

¹² *ibid.*, p. 331.

¹³ *ibid.*, p. 236.

¹⁴ *The Book of Common Prayer Reformed (1774)*.

¹⁵ Cuming, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

knew that the title and office had been widely acceptable to Lutherans, Presbyterians, French Protestants, and the Church of England. He was also aware that the Moravians had accepted it temporarily before accepting bishops. Mr. John Vickers has shown¹⁶ that William White, who became American Protestant Episcopal Bishop in 1787, proposed in 1782 the temporary appointment of "Superintendents" in this way—which I claim was a possibility in Wesley's mind. Thus Wesley's lifelong interest in the Usages, his *Sunday Service*, and the ordinations of 1784 are more significant when interpreted in the light of his knowledge of—and his sympathy with—historic moves towards "Catholic" unity and wider Comprehension of orthodox Protestantism here and on the Continent.

Since writing my book, I have had the advantage of spending almost twelve months in the United States of America. There and here I have found further confirmation of my claim that Dr. Coke's dramatic move towards the reunion of American Methodism and the American Protestant Episcopal Church was inspired by the fusing of some "Catholic" and "Comprehension" elements in the desires for unity of the aged Wesley; but I must crave space for this later.

I shall not cease to be grateful to Dr. Baker for his magnificent and fruitful toil for Methodist historians in so many areas. We all ought to be grateful for this portrait of Wesley. I see Wesley in other light from his century, which I pray may also be the dawning light of the next century, that Christ's prayer for the unity of His church may be more closely fulfilled. FREDERICK HUNTER.

¹⁶ *Thomas Coke: Apostle of Methodism*, pp. 181-2.

We gratefully acknowledge the following periodicals, which have come to hand since the publication of the list in our last issue. Some of these are received on a reciprocal basis with our own *Proceedings*.

Cirplan, Michaelmas 1972.

Blackmansbury, June and August 1972—continuing the story of W. F. Pocock.

The Baptist Quarterly, October 1972.

The Wesleyan Theological Journal (Kansas City), Spring 1972.

Methodist History, July and October 1972.

The Local Historian, Vol. 10, Nos. 3 and 4.

Bathafarn (the Welsh Methodist historical journal), 1971-2.

The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society, 1971.

Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society, October 1972.

The Journal of the Historical Society of the Presbyterian Church of Wales, October 1972.

Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society, October 1972.

In addition, the following publications of interest coming to hand have been placed in the Library.

Wesley's Interpretation of the Bible—"Wesley and Methodism, No. 6", published by the Japan Wesley Association. (Various writers.)

Methodist Student Evangelism in Japan, by J. W. Krummel. (Japan Wesley Study Society Research Report.)

ANOTHER "SON TO SUSANNA(H)"

Benjamin Ingham, 1712-72

SON of William and Susannah Ingham, Benjamin was born at Ossett, in Yorkshire, on 11th June 1712. At Oxford University he became a member of the Methodist society in 1733 and was ordained into the Church of England in 1735. With John and Charles Wesley and Charles Delamotte (son of a London merchant), he went to America in 1735 to preach to the Indians. He shared the disciplines of the Wesleys, but, like them, achieved no great success in Georgia. Like them, too, he became acquainted with the Moravians on the way to America and while there. Unlike them, however, he maintained with the Moravians an intimate and lasting association. The Moravians, coming to Yorkshire at Ingham's invitation, were later to care for his converts, who became numerous when he returned to preach in his native county in 1737.

These Moravians, however, had doctrinal differences with the Wesleys at the Fetter Lane meetings in London. Ingham's attempt to mediate in 1740 failed. The Wesleys went their own way, Ingham returned to preach in the north, and the Moravians soon followed him. They tenanted a house and buildings near Halifax for their Yorkshire headquarters, and in 1742 they agreed to care for Ingham's converts.

Though Ingham does not appear to have left the Church of England to join the Moravians, he worked with the Moravians for a number of years. With his wife,¹ Lady Margaret (formerly Lady Margaret Hastings, who was sister-in-law to Selina, Countess of Huntingdon), Ingham helped to finance Moravian undertakings. Gradually, however, he moved towards independency, ordaining his own preachers in 1756, and having built a chapel—at Wheatley, in Lancashire—as early as 1750. In 1760 he read the writings of John Glas and Robert Sandeman, leaders of the Glassite sect in Scotland. Ingham's chief helpers, William Batty and James Allen, went to visit these Scottish Independents, and returned infected with Glasite heresies numerous and serious enough to help to cause an Inghamite schism, reducing the number of societies from upwards of eighty flourishing causes to thirteen. These were all to be found in Westmorland, Lancashire and Yorkshire. In 1792 there are five societies: Wheatley, Winewall, Cotton Tree and West Street (in the Nelson-Colne area of Lancashire), and Salterforth, quite near to the others, but just in Yorkshire.

Ingham's only written work was *A Treatise on the Faith and the Hope of the Gospel* (1763), though he also wrote a few hymns and, of course, letters, some of which have survived. His journal, now kept in the library of Lincoln Cathedral, only covers that part of his

¹ Happily married, they lived at Aberford, in Yorkshire. A present-day relative of Benjamin Ingham is Lady Jean O'Neill, wife of a former Prime Minister of Northern Ireland, who is herself a Moravian.

life which was spent travelling to and preaching in America. Luke Tyerman quotes much of it in *The Oxford Methodists*,² though not quite as verbatim as he says.³ (The details of that famous Atlantic crossing and the reception on arrival in Georgia, however, form a valuable guide to some of Ingham's earlier thinking, and there is a wonderful description of the storm: "The sea sparkled and smoked as if it had been on Fire. The Air darted forth Lightning . . .").

Historians, including Tyerman, have said that Ingham's association with the Glassites was the chief cause of his failure to maintain what had seemed, in the middle of the eighteenth century, to be a growing religious movement. But this was not the whole explanation, and, moreover, Tyerman could not have known about *Inghamite Conference Minutes* (1755-60),⁴ which were taken to Canada by Lancashire emigrating Inghamites soon after the battle of Waterloo. These show how Ingham's authority as a leader of his sect was gradually usurped, and how his colleagues, Batty and Allen, were unable to give necessary direction to the movement. Ingham therefore died a disappointed man, and a search in and around Ledsham parish church, near Leeds, shows no known grave, though this is where he is known to have been buried.⁵

A separate article could of course be devoted to Ingham's inheritance and Ingham's legacy: an England in slumber and a nation shaken into revival. Keeping within the confines of Ingham's own life, however, we note four main influences in his evangelistic career: the Church of England—to which he truly belonged, the Methodist movement—which formerly had provided him with a pattern of discipline in his devotional life through fellowship with the Wesleys at Oxford, the Moravians—who gave pastoral care to his early converts, and the Glassites—whose ideas would have been better kept in Scotland.

* * *

The established Church had among its number parish priests whose character and ability varied a great deal. Some found more time for fox-hunting, drinking, local government and learning than for the preaching and pastoral duties which belonged to their vocation. Others were far better than some of the pictures historians have painted; and among episcopal varieties it should be remembered that Bishop Nicolson (bishop of Carlisle, 1702-18) spent so much time in the saddle, as part of his pastoral concern for Cumberland

² Published in London, 1873.

³ Tyerman, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-80. He omits, for example, the entry for 14th April 1736, where Ingham writes: "I baptized a child by . . . Immersion being the first I ever did that good old Way." Dr. Bernard G. Holland in his book *Baptism in Early Methodism* relies on Tyerman for some of his material, and one wonders whether this entry may have escaped *both* Methodist historians!

⁴ Now kept at Farrington Independent Church, Brantford, Ontario.

⁵ On 10th December 1772. December 1972 thus marks the bicentenary of Ingham's death.

and Westmorland, that he must surely rank with John Wesley as one of England's eighteenth-century horsemen. Indeed, as G. R. Cragg points out, "In remote country livings much faithful work was quietly done".⁶ Even so, the Church needed a vital and experiential religion, and "In the end," writes John Moorman, "the Church was saved not by its natural leaders but by a handful of individuals who dedicated themselves and all they had to the salvation of society".⁷ Ingham was one of these.

In the early days of the Revival, some of the parish priests demonstrated a violent opposition to Ingham, the itinerating evangelist. But his early successes in the West Riding of Yorkshire (1737-40) and in Lancashire (from 1742) may well have been as much due to varieties of Anglican persecution as to his own preaching zeal. The vicar of Dewsbury, the Rev. William Bowman, stirred up opposition with his pen (in 1740), but the vicar of Colne, the Rev. George White (in 1748) found rod more hateful than quill, and led a rioting mob against the fearless Revival preacher.

The Church of England was fortunately endowed with variety, and Ingham's real attachment to it was because of happy acquaintance with such men as the Rev. William Grimshaw. William Batty writes,⁸ of 16th October 1747: "Mr. Grimshaw said both Benjamin Ingham and anyone sent by him was free to preach in his parish". This friendship between Ingham and Grimshaw was of lifelong duration, and in 1763, when fever raged in Haworth, and Grimshaw became fatally ill, Ingham repeatedly visited him, at great risk. William Romaine (1714-95), the Anglican scholar, also admired Ingham. But the fury of opposition, whilst it never caused Ingham to leave the Church into which he had been born, later led him—in 1756—to ordain his own ministers. As the need for the Sacraments grew, he saw that it would be necessary to create an independent structure, at the heart of which was his desire to save the North of England.

* * *

The desire to see the North of England converted arose out of Ingham's associations with the Wesleys. In 1733 Ingham began to share fellowship and spiritual discipline with John and Charles Wesley in the first Methodist society at Oxford. It was the beginning of a fellowship which continued until 1740, spanning seven momentous years. Thomas Coke and Henry Moore wrote of the Methodists at Oxford:

Being so strict in their deportment, so constant in the means of grace, and zealous of good works, they soon began to be noticed and ridiculed by the young gentlemen of the University.⁹

⁶ G. R. Cragg: *The Church and the Age of Reason (1648-1789)* (Penguin Books, 1960, 5 vols.), iv, p. 128.

⁷ John Moorman: *A History of the Church in England* (London, 1953), p. 297.

⁸ English MSS. 1062 in the Rylands Library, Manchester.

⁹ Coke and Moore: *The Life of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.* (London, 1792), pp. 58-9.

But on leaving Oxford, though their intensity of devotion and discipline was maintained, Ingham's relationship with the rest of the Methodists underwent a time of testing.

On 10th December 1735, the two Wesleys and Ingham, with Charles Delamotte, sailed for America to preach to the Indians in Georgia. It was not a successful mission. Indians were suspicious of white missionaries, and there was always an element of danger. To complicate matters, John Wesley met Sophy Hopkey. Charles Wesley found some quarrelling women difficult to reconcile, and whilst Ingham's advice—"Go out of town for a few days"—might have been useful to a lover, it was of no use to a mediator. The Georgian mission, as far as Ingham was concerned, lasted fifty-five weeks, and it was completely abandoned soon afterwards because there was no immediate prospect of success among the heathen and because the expedition was dogged by the difficult and unfortunate experiences of the Wesleys.

It was during the Georgian mission, however, that Ingham found a new and personal relationship with his Saviour at the beginning of 1737. Here, also, began a relationship with the Moravians which became even more intimate back in England. So intimate was it, in fact, that it estranged him from his Methodist friends. The Fetter Lane dispute in London in 1740, occasioned by doctrinal quarrels about "stillness",¹⁰ split Methodists and Moravians, and drove a wedge between Ingham and the Wesleys. Ingham's attempts at reconciliation failed, largely because John Wesley intensely disliked the Quietist doctrines of Zinzendorf and Molther, and Ingham could not agree with Wesley about Perfection.

Ingham also separated from John Nelson,¹¹ though for a time the two had worked together.¹² But the stonemason, like the Wesleys, also saw danger in the lack of attention which Moravians gave to the means of grace. Thus, whilst the Methodist friendship declined, Ingham's Moravian friendship intensified, particularly after 1740. Even so, this longer and closer association had also deteriorated by 1754.

* * *

In September 1738, Ingham sent a letter to Zinzendorf. It ran:

B. Ingham sends greetings and bids grace to the most Reverend Bishops, Lord Count Zinzendorf and David Nitschmann, and to the other esteemed brethren in Christ. I shall be greatly pleased if, with your consent, my beloved brother, John Toltschig, be permitted to stay with me in England as long as our Lord and Saviour shall so approve. I am heartily united with you in all the bonds of love.¹³

¹⁰ See John Wesley's letter to Ingham, 8th September 1746 (*Letters*, ii, pp. 80-4).

¹¹ This was probably in 1741, but Nelson in his journal gives no dates.

¹² During 1740 Ingham gave Nelson permission to preach in his Yorkshire societies, which had sprung up in the West Riding in considerable numbers since his return from America and as a result of his itinerant evangelism.

¹³ *The Moravian Messenger*, 6th June 1896, quoted in F. S. Popham's *History of Christianity in Yorkshire* (Wallington, 1954), p. 124.

His persuasive tone brought Toltschig—a direct descendant of the *Unitas Fratrum* of 1457—to Ossett in Yorkshire in November 1739. Equally agreeable to Yorkshire converts was Peter Böhler, Toltschig's successor in 1741.

So, whatever their part in the London controversy of 1740, the Moravians were in England by invitation and not because of any sectarian motives; and Ingham was determined to co-operate with them in the North while there was opportunity. On 26th May 1742 he invited twenty-six Moravians to come from London to take pastoral care of a growing number of his Yorkshire societies and thus enable him to devote himself wholly to the work of preaching. On 30th July a public meeting was convened, attended by about a thousand persons from these societies. Ingham's proposal that the Brethren should be in charge of his societies was submitted and heartily accepted. Ministers of the Brethren's Church would shepherd his flock, preaching among them, visiting, and offering them spiritual counsel.

In 1743 Ingham was regarded as one of the most influential members of the Moravian Church in England. On 20th May of that year he set out to attend a Moravian Synod at Hirschberg in Germany, the purpose being not only to help supervise English Moravians but also the affairs of the Brethren on the Continent. In 1744 Ingham and Lady Margaret provided land for new Yorkshire Moravian headquarters at Pudsey,¹⁴ and Fulneck's foundation-stone was laid in 1746.

Even so, relations between Ingham and the Moravians were not always happy. Ingham disapproved of their running into debt, and the Moravians disapproved of his association with the Wesleys—though by the 1740s that friendship had become almost non-existent. Connexions with Pudsey continued until 1751, even if they only extended to helping to plant trees in the orchards on 25th February. Ingham withdrew Ignatius, his only son, from the Fulneck school in 1752. We have few details of any useful association with the Moravians in the late 1750s, and the early successful alliance gave way to more independent Inghamite evangelism in Lancashire and Westmorland.

* * *

This movement into Lancashire was accompanied by the building of chapels in the Colne area. Ingham also journeyed to Roundthwaite,¹⁵ near Tebay, in Westmorland; and Birks, near Appleby (built in 1757) seems to have been one of the last chapels to be erected. Batty and Allen (ordained by Ingham in 1756) were his two chief colleagues and itinerant preachers in these remote districts.

¹⁴ Their first base was at Smith House, Halifax. In 1743 Mr. Holmes, the proprietor, died. His widow was not as well disposed to the Moravians as her husband had been, and the Brethren found themselves in need of another more permanent establishment.

¹⁵ A north-bound passenger on the M6 motorway can just catch a glimpse of this once-remote hamlet.

But Allen's authority increased. With Batty he went, with Ingham's approval, to visit the Glassites in Scotland in 1761, with the object of discovering ways of organizing the Inghamites more effectively, though not necessarily in one whole connexion.

The writings of John Glas and Robert Sandeman (his son-in-law) had become more widely known through James Hervey's *Theron and Aspasio*.¹⁶ Though his writings were not intended to be controversial, Hervey innocently stirred these two Scottish Dissenters into a dogmatic expression of their views—which Ingham unfortunately read. So “a pebble dropping into the pool of Scottish Presbyterianism, sent a ripple coursing through the hills and dales of Northern England.”¹⁷ Ingham never even met Glas or Sandeman, but they made a great impression upon their English visitors.

On the return of Batty and Allen, Ingham's societies were thrown into confusion as they discussed church order (especially the appointment of elders, and Ingham's own authority) and Scripture interpretation (especially the Inghamite use of the lot, and the vast subject of predestination). Chaos won the day. Allen joined the Glassites, who cared nothing for any connexional system nor for any use of the lot, which, they believed, could have no place in God's unalterable plan of predestination. Lady Huntingdon tried to prevent schism, but even she could not keep order. According to Luke Tyerman

The great work over which Ingham had most religiously watched, was nearly wrecked. Out of upwards of eighty flourishing Churches, only thirteen remained under Ingham's care.¹⁸

This outcome distressed Ingham for the rest of his life. It also meant that in 1813 there were only two hundred and fifty Inghamites left in the whole of the North of England. A lesser-known chapter in the history of the Revival had ended.

* * *

We conclude with some brief observations and comparisons—always very much aware, of course, that John Wesley was also equally keen to evangelize, not only the North, but South, East and West as well. Particularly we observe, as John Wesley may also have done, that when authority gives way too soon to an attempted democracy, an organization is doomed. This, in Ingham's case, certainly led to failure, and may have been in Wesley's mind when he wrote on 13th January 1790 to John Mason:

As long as I live the people shall have no share in choosing either stewards or leaders among the Methodists. . . . We are no republicans, and never intend to be.¹⁹

Doctrinally, Ingham never pressed any theological point far enough for him to be placed in any particular position. He is not

¹⁶ Published in London, 1755 (3 vols.).

¹⁷ James F. Riley: *The Hammer and the Anvil* (Clapham, 1954), p. 4.

¹⁸ Tyerman, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

¹⁹ *Letters*, viii, p. 196.

identifiable with any *extreme* Calvinism, but this is the way he leans. He was more likely to preach imputed righteousness and personal obedience than to elaborate on the finer points of dogmatic Calvinism. He had much in common, theologically, with the evangelical wing of the Church of England.

It is a remarkable fact of English history that the great Revival preachers all began to appear in the short period 1736-9. Wesley, Whitefield, and Ingham, in particular areas, together launched the great awakening. Wesley became an efficient administrator as well as an effective preacher. Whitefield's ability was more in preaching than organization; and Ingham, too, was preacher rather than administrator, though his preaching was never so compelling as that of Whitefield or of Wesley.

Narrowing the field of comparison, and of interest rather than significance, we note that Ingham was converted in America in 1737, a year before Wesley. Ingham first preached salvation in 1737, in Yorkshire; Wesley first preached salvation a year later, in London. Ingham first visited Lancashire in 1742; Wesley's first visit was in 1744. Ingham first visited Westmorland in 1748; Wesley first passed through this county in 1749. Ingham ordained fellow-helpers in 1756; Wesley took this unusual step twenty-eight years later. Of significance rather than mere chronological interest is the fact that Wesley was always at the head of his movement, never relying on Moravian assistance nor ever distracted by the opinion of Scottish Dissent.

Of Ingham we note, in conclusion, his interest in the education of children. His concern first showed itself in Ossett, in 1734, when he taught forty-two children to read. He taught twelve children on the boat in his journey to America, where, on arrival, he spent the first three months in charge of a school. In the late 1750s, in a land (England) where every child born was as likely to die as to live, we note (from the *Farringdon Conference Minutes*) that on Sunday, 2nd April 1758, and on following Sundays, Ingham arranged a Sunday school at Salterforth. If this is the first known instance of a Sunday school in England, then the honour belongs to Ingham's native county.

DAVID F. CLARKE.

[The Rev. David F. Clarke, B.A., M.Phil. is a Methodist minister under the British Conference. His M.Phil. was awarded by the University of Leeds for a thesis on "Benjamin Ingham, 1712-72, with special reference to his relations with the churches of his time".]

The Editor or the Publishing Manager would be pleased to accept back numbers of the *Proceedings*. Students and libraries are constantly requesting these (early issues in particular), and we would ask our members not to destroy their copies. Carriage will be refunded.

We still have a list of members with whom for the time being we have lost touch, and would ask to be informed of changes of address except where these may be ascertained from the *Minutes of Conference*.

THE METHODIST NEW CONNEXION IN LONDON, 1797-1907

I

IT has often been observed that when the Methodist New Connexion was formed in 1797, its principal centres were the rising towns of the North and Midlands. Indeed, the first published membership figures (1798) show that the entire Connexion lay north of Leicester. It may be surprising, therefore, to learn that, from the first, there was a small group of Kilhamites in London. As early as September 1796, Kilham sent one of his supporters a list of sympathizers which included three London names.¹ In due course, some of Kilham's pamphlets and broadsheets found their way to London, even if Kilham himself did not, although at least one parcel was seized by John Pawson, who wrote to Charles Atmore: "I will prevent the spreading of the poison as far as I can, the Lord being my helper."²

It is from a later letter of Pawson that we get our first glimpse of the London New Connexion. On 23rd January 1798 he told Joseph Benson:

They have been doing all in their power in London. They have had meetings at a man's house in Wood Street for some time. . . . A few of the lowest of the Local preachers and a few of the Workhouse preachers met with them, and could they have made a party, they would no doubt have invited Kilham. But if I am rightly informed, they are nearly broken up. . . .³

The house in Wood Street, Cheapside, was occupied by David Morley, who had been in correspondence with Kilham from August 1796. In February 1798 he reported:

We go on poorly, but have no doubt but we should do better had we preaching. The last meeting we had (on Tuesday last) it was agreed that we were to look out for a place & count the . . . costs & then you will hear more from us. There are some openings about 8 or 10 miles round London, but it is thought best to begin here first. . . .⁴

Numbers were evidently too small and the supply of preachers too scanty to justify Conference sending anyone in 1798, but the little band were somehow kept together until 1800, when London appears in the *Minutes* with 33 members. A preacher was to be sent by the Annual Committee. The *Minutes* for 1801 announced that a chapel had been opened during the year. Its whereabouts remained unknown until 1807, when the centre of the London work was revealed as Gibraltar chapel, Church Street, Bethnal Green Road. Membership reached 105 in 1803, but thereafter declined, and London ceased to appear as a circuit after 1810.

¹ Alexander Kilham to James Harrop, 19th September 1796. (MS. letter at Hartley Victoria College.)

² John Pawson to Charles Atmore, 15th December 1795. (MS. letter at Methodist Archives.)

³ MS. letter at Methodist Archives.

⁴ David Morley to Alexander Kilham, February 1798. (MS. letter at Hartley Victoria College.)

II

The re-establishment of the work in London came about in a significant way. In November 1816 there had been an outbreak of revivalism among the Great Queen Street Wesleyan society. It continued through the winter, and was looked on with disfavour by the preachers and leaders. The opposition culminated in the expulsion of one of the revivalists; this in turn precipitated a secession in the summer of 1817.⁵ A chapel was fitted up in Holborn, but the difficulties of their position soon drove the seceders to look for some recognized denomination with whom they could link up. They appear to have absorbed a number of other groups, and it was a strangely mixed body of people who, eighteen months later, offered themselves to the Methodist New Connexion. The MNC Annual Committee were not without misgivings, but the 1818 Conference had selected London as a suitable missionary station, and so the Rev. William Haslam, the superintendent of the Nottingham circuit, was stationed in London until the ensuing Conference,⁶ which accepted London as a circuit, with five chapels and 186 members. The two principal centres were Princes Street, near Leicester Square, and Squiries Street, Bethnal Green, with smaller causes at Greenwich, Bell Street, and Ewer Street. All these premises were rented, and the locations of the smaller centres were to vary bewilderingly in the next few years.

The work did not prosper. Members were poor and scattered. Even for wealthy and well-established chapels, London was a difficult field of labour. Membership fell steadily to 88 in 1826. A society in Southwark was established, however, and on 2nd February 1827 a large chapel was opened in Deverell Street, near to the present Old Kent Road.⁷ But the crisis of identity had not yet been resolved, and young Andrew Lynn, who was appointed to the circuit in 1828, was surprised to find that at Deverell Street "in the forenoon of the Sabbath, a portion of the Church Service is read". He went on:

I felt sorry that it should be so; but, there is such a strong prejudice in favour of it, among the Londoners, that our people seem to think it best to have it . . . I liked the service better than I expected; yet nothing meets my taste like a plain Methodist service.⁸

Congregations were small; there were only six attenders at Lime House Fields on 5th November 1828: "I suppose the people were afraid to venture out on account of the squibs."⁹

Not for the last time the flagging fortunes of the London MNC

⁵ See J. P. Fesenmeyer: *An Appeal to the Wesleyan Methodist Societies throughout the Kingdom against Acts of Injustice and Oppression calculated to extinguish A Revival of the Work of God in the London West Circuit . . . in a letter to Joseph Butterworth Esq. M.P.* (London, 1817).

⁶ MS. Report of the Annual Committee to Conference. (Methodist Archives.)

⁷ MNC *Magazine*, 1827, p. 124.

⁸ J. Stokoe: *Methodist Records; or selections from the Journal of the Rev. Andrew Lynn* (London, 1858), p. 166.

⁹ *ibid.*, p. 176.

were revived by a fresh influx of Wesleyan seceders. The aftermath of the Leeds Organ controversy brought the circuit membership up to 164 by 1829. Among the newcomers were James Leach, a well-to-do former member of City Road, and P. J. Wright (1810-63), who later entered the MNC ministry. Even so, the accessions were not sufficiently numerous to support the burden of three over-large chapels. One by one, they were abandoned—first Paddington, then Squiries Street, and finally Salem (Deverell Street), liturgy or no liturgy. P. J. Wright, though hardly out of his 'teens, assumed leadership of the Southwark society, and kept it together by preaching in the upper room of a private house until a carpenter's shop was rented for services.¹⁰

The events of 1834 brought reinforcements in the shape of another batch of disaffected Wesleyans, in greater numbers than before. The New Connexion membership in London doubled in two years—from 108 in 1834 to 229 in 1836. More important, the seceders included several men of substance. In a new mood of optimism, plans were made for a new chapel in Southwark, to be the centre of New Connexion work in the metropolis. There is evidence that it was financed on the share principle—a sure sign of Warrentite influence.¹¹ Brunswick chapel, Great Dover Road, was opened in January 1835. It could accommodate 800 worshippers, and there was a large room beneath for the Sunday school. For the first time, as the writer in the *MNC Magazine* observed, the members of the New Connexion in London "assembled in a chapel erected by their own community, after worshipping so long in shifting tents".¹² The building of Brunswick gave a new stability to the cause in London. Throughout the vicissitudes of the next twenty years it remained a sheet-anchor, and even during the more stable years following, an important circuit chapel.

In May 1835 a small chapel, held on lease, was opened in Watney Street, Tower Hamlets. In addition, eight Wesleyan seceders had begun a New Connexion society in North London, and there was a small remnant in Bethnal Green. These four causes formed the circuit when the Conference of 1835 appointed a second minister. Yet the optimism soon vanished. Societies composed mainly of seceders from another body often exhibit great volatility, and face difficulties when the initial excitement has subsided. Conflicts are not so much eliminated as transferred to a new context. Moreover, much of the East End was already a vast slum, with the consequent religious apathy. The 1851 Census of Religious Worship showed that Bethnal Green had the lowest proportionate attendance in England and Wales.¹³

Brunswick was not the success envisaged, Watney Street struggled

¹⁰ *MNC Magazine*, 1862, pp. 14-15. Unless otherwise stated, all the following references are to the *Magazine*.

¹¹ *MNC Minutes*, 1848, p. 35 (see under "London"). ¹² 1835, p. 196.

¹³ G. Kitson Clark: *The Making of Victorian England* (1962), p. 163.

on with a handful of members, whilst Bethnal Green had finally to be abandoned in the 1840s. North London, in contrast, seemed to present a more promising field of labour. The eight seceders of November 1834 began holding Sunday evening services, and in December a room was rented, probably in President Street, off City Road, until increasing numbers compelled a move to a large school-room in Goswell Road in June 1835. A Sunday school was started, and by 1836 the membership was 52. It was in the autumn of 1836 that the society was joined by Richard Barford, a former Wesleyan of considerable wealth. A chapel in Chadwell Street, Myddleton Square, had become vacant, but the congregation had been deterred by the high rent demanded—£150 per annum. Barford agreed to provide this sum, and Chadwell Street was opened by the New Connexion on 1st January 1837.¹⁴ The chapel proved unsuitable, however, and by 1839 the society was back in President Street. Nearby in Macclesfield Street (now Macclesfield Road) was a small independent congregation occupying a building known as the "Boatman's Chapel". They were seeking a regular ministry, whilst the MNC were looking for a chapel. A union of the two causes took place in September 1839, with the joint congregation occupying the Macclesfield Street chapel. This arrangement produced stability, if not prosperity, for ten years, at the end of which the society moved again, this time across City Road to Wenlock Hall, Hoxton. In 1851 they were forced to leave, presumably because they could no longer afford the rent, and the cause just avoided extinction by meeting occasionally in private houses.¹⁵

Despite the removal of the Book-room to London in 1844, by 1852 the circuit had reached its nadir. Membership, at 117, was scarcely greater than it had been in 1834; Brunswick chapel was dirty and in need of repair, with an extremely small congregation, whilst the faithful few in North London were on the point of giving up altogether. "Our position in this mighty metropolis has long been felt to be a reproach to us as a community," declared a speaker at the meeting in 1852 to welcome the new minister, the Rev. James Maughan. Maughan took up the challenge with great energy. Aided by the Rev. William Cooke, who had been appointed Book Steward and Editor in 1849 and was one of the most influential men in the Connexion, he set to work to renovate Brunswick and double the size of the congregation. His zeal and energy rapidly transformed the situation. Within five months, the chapel had been painted and thirty members added.¹⁶ At the same time Richard Barford was persuaded to promise £500 towards the cost of a new chapel in Islington. A site was secured in Britannia Fields (now Packington Street), in a developing area north of City Road. Despite attempts at economy—one member superintended the building, and Maughan himself acted as clerk of works—the cost far exceeded the original

¹⁴ 1837, p. 119.

¹⁵ 1839, p. 479; *Methodist Evangelist*, October 1890.

¹⁶ W. Cooke: *Memoir of James Maughan* (London, 1872), p. 24.

estimate.¹⁷ By the opening in July 1854, only £937 had been subscribed towards the cost of £3,100. This time the venture could not be allowed to fail, and in 1855 Conference took the unprecedented step of granting £900 for the relief of the estate.¹⁸

III

When Maughan left the circuit after two years, membership had doubled and a new chapel had been opened. But more startling developments were at hand. The last great Wesleyan upheaval had taken place in 1849, and already a party had emerged among the Wesleyan Reformers which desired a modified connexionalism, and opposed Eckett's proposals for complete circuit independence. The leader of this group was E. H. Rabbits, the proprietor of a chain of London shoe-shops. In June 1851 he had persuaded the young William Booth to work among the Reformers, and when in 1853 Booth's thoughts began to turn to the New Connexion, Rabbits encouraged him, and probably put him in touch with Cooke. Cooke himself saw the Reformers as a useful reinforcement for the New Connexion, especially in London, and was in close contact with Rabbits and other Reform leaders from the summer of 1853 onwards.¹⁹ His policy bore fruit when in December 1853 a group of about forty Reformers in Albany Road, Camberwell, joined the MNC, and he followed this up in January 1854 by a speech aimed at the Reformers which he delivered at the stone-laying of Britannia Fields, and which was printed at length in the February issue of the MNC *Magazine*.

After a long period of hesitation, Booth finally offered himself to the New Connexion as a minister, and it was arranged that he should live with Cooke until Conference 1854. Lacking a theological college, it was usual for candidates for the MNC ministry to follow a course of study under Cooke's guidance. Booth arrived in London during February 1854. Like Cooke's other students, he preached in the circuit on Sundays, but unlike them, he made an immediate impact on the placid New Connexion congregations. On 5th March 1854 he was at Brunswick, where, although congregations had improved, "the society was not prosperous". A large number stayed to the prayer meeting after evening service, and fifteen penitents came forward.²⁰ A fortnight later he visited Watney Street. It was Booth's first visit to the East End, where, eleven years later, he was to lay the foundations of the Salvation Army: "Felt much power in preaching. The people wept and listened with much avidity."²¹ A week's revival services followed in May, and further successful services at Brunswick, after one of which "the communion rail was crowded with penitents".

¹⁷ *ibid.*, pp. 25-6.

¹⁸ 1855, p. 375. See also 1854, pp. 80 f., 508 f., 630 f.

¹⁹ Robert Currie: *Methodism Divided* (1968), pp. 226-9.

²⁰ 1854, p. 207.

²¹ F. de L. Booth-Tucker: *Life of Catherine Booth* (1892), p. 114, quoting William Booth's diary; 1854, p. 206.

London was still a single station, and Cooke wanted Booth to be superintendent. When Booth indicated that he was not happy about this suggestion, Rabbits came to the rescue, offering to pay Booth's allowance as second man, and Conference was very willing to ratify these proposals. The new superintendent was the Rev. P. T. Gilton, with whom Booth did not achieve an easy relationship. He was described by his junior colleague as "stiff, hard and cold; making up, in part, for the want of heart and thought in his public utterances by what sounded like a sanctimonious wail".²²

Booth was given charge of the new chapel at Britannia Fields. The society was virtually a new one, and the housing in the vicinity of the chapel had not been completed. By December there were 90 members, 30 of whom had been added as a result of a fortnight's mission just held.²³ "I regard the appointment of Mr. Booth to this circuit as providential," declared a leading member. But Providence was already beckoning Booth to a wider sphere. In September and October the young evangelist had conducted short campaigns in Bristol and Guernsey which had been reported in detail in the *Magazine*. As a result, he was invited in January 1855 to Zion chapel, Longton, one of the principal chapels of the connexion. His circuit agreed to release him for ten days, but the mission was so successful that he was immediately invited, by the President of the Conference, to Hanley Bethesda, the New Connexion's largest chapel. The excitement at Longton was reproduced on a yet larger scale, and invitations flowed in from every important circuit in the connexion. This was the work Booth loved to do, and neither he nor the connexion wished to hide his treasure in a metropolitan napkin. A replacement was found for London—"There can be no question but my Superintendent will be content if not rejoiced," noted Booth!²⁴—and the evangelist continued his triumphant way across the industrial towns of the North.

His fiancée, Catherine Mumford, was still in London; and this fact—backed, perhaps, by a request from his former benefactor, Rabbits—brought Booth back on 6th March 1855 for the opening of the fifth MNC chapel in London: Holywell Mount, Scrutton Street, Shoreditch. It was a very large chapel which had been recently abandoned by the Congregationalists, and provided a home for about forty Reformers who had followed their Albany Road colleagues into the New Connexion. Booth, the ex-Reformer, preached on 11th March, and conducted revival meetings the following week.²⁵ It is one of the ironies of Methodist history that when, in turn, the New Connexion relinquished Holywell Mount in 1866, it was taken over by Booth's "Christian Mission"—the precursor of the Salvation Army.²⁶

Also present at the opening was E. H. Rabbits. In November

²² Harold Begbie: *General William Booth* (1919), p. 226. ²³ 1855, p. 32.

²⁴ Begbie, *op. cit.*, p. 236. ²⁵ 1855, p. 271.

²⁶ Robert Sandall: *The History of the Salvation Army*, I (1947), pp. 61-2.

1854 it became clear that there was no hope of a union of the Reformers and the MNC over the whole country. Rabbits and his sympathizers resigned from the General Reform Committee, and Rabbits formally joined the MNC in May 1855.²⁷ Strenuous attempts were made to woo the other London Reformers—Booth's replacement was an ex-Reformer—and by 1856 six "marriages" had been arranged. In addition to the two already mentioned, these were Chelsea (Paulton Square, King's Road), Deptford, Paddington (John Street, Edgware Road), and Elstree Street. The Chelsea group included William Rabbits, brother of E. H. Rabbits. None of the groups seem to have been very large.

The bait dangled before the hesitant Reformers was the prospect of new chapels, to be financed by Rabbits. The first was Brunswick Road (after 1865, Neate Street), off Albany Road, Camberwell, opened in November 1855, "erected chiefly by the liberality and enterprise of E. H. Rabbits".²⁸ Earlier, the *Magazine* had announced:

... this is the first chapel to be built of a contemplated series by the Wesleyan Reformers of the metropolis, who have united, or intend uniting, with the Methodist New Connexion.²⁹

It soon became clear that not even Rabbits could finance a whole series of chapels, and so was born the "Metropolitan Chapel Extension Society", whose grandiloquent title was rather belied by the modest target of £600 per year. Joseph Love, the millionaire Durham colliery-owner, who has been aptly called "the Joseph Rank of the Methodist New Connexion", promised to give £200 per annum for ten years, if £400 could be raised in London. Rabbits agreed to find half of this, leaving £200 to be subscribed by others. Although the scheme was intended to run for ten years, there is no record of any contributions after the eighth year. At the (apparently) last Annual Meeting in December 1865, it was stated that a total of £5,612 had been raised. Almost £1,000 went to Britannia Fields to reduce the debt, and the remainder was expended as grants towards the cost of eight new chapels.³⁰ Three (Victoria Road, Deptford, 1857, Radnor Street, Chelsea, 1860, and John Street, Paddington, extended 1861) were built for ex-Reformers; the others were erected in areas previously unoccupied by the New Connexion, in the expectation that a society would materialize once the buildings were opened.

The most ambitious of these schemes was at Lorrimore Street, Walworth, not far from Rabbits's home. A school was built at Rabbits's expense in 1857, and a society of three formed. A large chapel followed in July 1858, by which time there were 60 members. Lorrimore Street received the lion's share of the money raised by the Extension Society (£1,508), which was almost equal to Rabbits's entire contributions over eight years. The other new areas were in adjacent parts of South London: Wandsworth Road, Southville

²⁷ 1855, pp. 379, 381.

²⁹ 1855, p. 378.

²⁸ 1855, p. 658.

³⁰ 1855, p. 120.

(1857-8), St. George's New Town, Southwark, "a densely-populated and abandoned district" (1864), and, a little later, Ebenezer, Kinglake Street (1867). One chapel only was built north of the river: Milton Road, Stoke Newington (1863).

In proportion to its size, this spate of chapel-building by the New Connexion was unprecedented, as the Extension Society was at pains to point out. A speaker at the 1865 meeting referred to a survey comparing religious accommodation in London in 1865 with that in 1851. The Wesleyans showed an increase of 19 per cent (44,162 to 52,454); the Primitive Methodists had done better with an increase of 173 per cent (3,380 to 9,230), and the UMFC better still with an increase of 176 per cent (4,858 to 13,422). But none approached the achievement of the MNC in recording an increase of 577 per cent (984 to 6,667). "From this statement it will be seen how much our Denomination is in advance of all the rest . . ." In twelve years they had increased from two chapels and one room to twelve chapels and six rooms; from a single preacher to four married and two single preachers.³¹ Membership had also increased spectacularly, and in 1864 for the first time exceeded 1,000. In 1856 the circuit was divided—London First, headed by Brunswick, consisting of the societies south of the river, and London Second, headed by Britannia Fields, taking those to the north. There was a further division in 1864, when Chelsea and Southville, along with a class in Fulham, became the London Third circuit.

A new departure took place in 1862, when a middle-class suburb was selected as a field of labour. This was chiefly due to the efforts of John Whitworth, a wealthy wholesaler who hired the Sydenham Lecture Hall for services soon after moving into the area. After two years there was a society of twenty-five and a congregation of sixty. Whitworth secured a site close to the railway station in the "beautiful suburban district" of Forest Hill, the inhabitants of whose fashionable new villas were served by only two places of worship. In April 1866 Trinity chapel, in yellow brick with a "short but elegant spire", was opened at a cost of £3,400. Associated with the Forest Hill Mission was a small room in the rather less exalted district of Peckham Fields, opened in October 1864, but this was soon relinquished.³²

IV

The chief architect of this expansion was undoubtedly E. H. Rabbits. Unfortunately for the New Connexion in London, he was compelled by increasing ill-health to slacken his efforts after 1866, and he was completely inactive for some years before his death in 1874. Moreover, it had been a lush growth. Over-large chapels, hampered by debts and facing the migratory tendency of so many Londoners, soon ran into difficulties. Reinforcing these troubles was the remorseless change in the character of the central areas in which the MNC had most of its chapels. As early as 1841

³¹ loc. cit.

³² 1864, p. 136; 1866, pp. 380 ff.

The unmitigated slum stretched from the River through Stepney and Poplar to Bethnal Green, Shoreditch and Finsbury and affected on the South bank, Bermondsey and Southwark.⁸³

In the district which had the greatest concentration of MNC chapels, the changes noted later in the century by Charles Booth had already begun :

North of Peckham Road, is a large district becoming steadily poorer as the fairly comfortable move South and immigrants from Walworth arrive.⁸⁴

An early casualty, as we have seen, was Holywell Mount, Shoreditch, relinquished in July 1866. It was followed by John Street, Paddington, some time before 1873, St. George's in 1874, and Radnor Street, Chelsea, 1875-6. Watney Street—always a rather isolated society—left the New Connexion in 1878, disappointed at not being made a mission station. Lorrimore Street was in “a languishing condition” in 1879—partly, it was hinted, as a result of “adjacent ritualism”⁸⁵—and was closed 1881-2, as was Milton Road, Stoke Newington. These closures were reflected in the membership returns for the London circuits, which declined steadily from a total of 1,034 in 1864 to 467 in 1882.

The one bright spot in this period of gloom was Forest Hill. Here, at least, there were no financial anxieties. The membership, although only about sixty, had no difficulty in securing subscriptions of £1,200 in 1872 to clear the remaining debt on the premises. A Home Mission station until 1876, it continued to be a pastorate, so that its genteel congregation was not subjected to local preachers drawn from less favoured parts of the metropolis. In contrast, they enjoyed the ministry of one of the foremost minds in the connexion. In 1875 William Cooke, who was now resident in Forest Hill, accepted the charge, having retired from his work as Connexional Editor. Within a year, the congregation filled the chapel. Cooke remained for five years, but despite greatly increased congregations, membership grew only slowly. As his biographer states :

His high reputation drew many to the public services who did not incorporate themselves with the church or congregation. The minister was the sole bond of connection between them and the place . . .⁸⁶

It was hardly Methodism as envisaged by John Wesley.

That the membership of the London circuits recovered somewhat after 1882 was due to the success of two new causes—Bethel (West Kensington) and Waverley Park. The society at West Kensington had been started as early as 1862, but had remained feeble until 1873, when a prefabricated iron chapel was opened on North End Road to replace a rented room of which they had been deprived

⁸³ N. Pevsner: *London, except the cities of London and Westminster* (“Buildings of England” series), p. 30.

⁸⁴ Quoted in H. J. Dyos: *Victorian Suburb* (2nd impression, 1966), p. 59.

⁸⁵ 1880, p. 55.

⁸⁶ S. Hulme: *Memoir of the Rev. W. Cooke, D.D.* (London, 1886), p. 296.

shortly before. Numbers began to grow, and in 1886 (by which time there were 73 members) it was made a Home Mission station, with an energetic probationer, W. H. Lockley, as pastor. The iron building had become dilapidated, and Conference had promised £750 towards a new building. Lockley set to work, and a new chapel was opened on the same site (i.e. the corner with Chesson Road) on 11th February 1888. It had a school and classrooms beneath the chapel, and cost £3,200. The opening services included a visit from Hugh Price Hughes on 21st February.

The worship at the new chapel was described by Lockley in a letter to the *MNC Magazine* in March 1889:

We have no long prayers, but two moderately brief ones: the first for thanksgiving and the second for petition and supplication. The latter is followed by the Lord's Prayer repeated aloud by the congregation. In reading the Scriptures, we observe the order prescribed by the Established Church . . . We brighten our services with a chant and occasionally a solo or *Te Deum* . . . Being almost the sole occupant of the pulpit, we have full opportunity to express our mind over the length of sermons by an example of brevity.⁸⁷

When Lockley left in 1889, the congregations numbered 200 and membership was 110.

Waverley Park was even more successful. The estate, on the eastern edge of Camberwell, was begun in 1884.⁸⁸ A mission was started in 1887 by workers from Forest Hill, and in March 1888 an iron chapel was opened amid the bay-windowed terraces of Ivydale Road. It was an immediate success, so that by 1891 a resident minister was required. (The leader of the Young Men's Bible Class at Waverley Park was G. A. K. Hobill, whose incomparable collection of Methodist literature is preserved at Hartley Victoria College, Manchester.) The estate continued to develop, and a chapel was opened in 1896—the last MNC chapel to be built in London. In 1899 the membership was 126 (double that of Forest Hill), and Waverley Park was “already acknowledged to be the strongest, healthiest church in the London District”.⁸⁹ In the same year the membership of West Kensington was 150—although this figure was not maintained—so that the two societies accounted for 42 per cent of the total membership of the London circuits (674).

The prosperity of these two causes can be attributed to a number of factors, the chief of which was the social composition of their respective districts. Both were in newly-developed lower middle-class suburbs. There was an absence of competition: until 1903 the only other church on the Waverley Park estate was a temporary Anglican mission hall. Both MNC chapels were attractive new buildings of moderate size: Bethel seated 400, Waverley Park 377. And both enjoyed a concentrated ministry sustained by connexional funds:

⁸⁷ Cutting in Lockley's MS. diary (in the writer's possession).

⁸⁸ Dyos, *op. cit.*, pp. 131 ff.

⁸⁹ MNC Home Mission Schedules, 1899-1900, in the writer's possession; return for Waverley Park.

West Kensington was still a Home Mission station in 1907, whilst Waverley Park became self-supporting in 1899.

The condition of the older societies was in sharp contrast. The loss of West Kensington in 1886 left Britannia Fields as the one remaining society in the London Second circuit. It declined steadily until 1894, then in its turn became a mission station. Only south of the river did a circuit in the traditional sense of the term survive. A small extension took place in 1886, when a room was rented in Walworth Road, presumably to replace Lorrimore Street, bringing the number of preaching-places up to six within a comparatively compact area. But the population of the inner boroughs was now falling, and at length two more causes were lost—Southville in 1897-8 and Ebenezer (Kinglake Street) around 1902.

The seriousness of the MNC position was exposed by the *Daily News* census of attendances at London churches, published in 1904.⁴⁰ Their largest total attendance (363) was at Waverley Park, followed by Forest Hill and Brunswick, each with a total of 278, but it is noticeable that Brunswick had an above-average number of children at both services. Much the lowest attendance was at Victoria Road, Deptford, where both services produced a mere 51 attenders, 35 of whom were children. The *Free Methodist* published comparative figures for the MNC, the Bible Christians and the UMFC, as follows :

	<i>Chapels</i>	<i>Total Attendances</i>
United Methodist Free Churches ...	58	19,118
Bible Christians	12	3,726
Methodist New Connexion ...	8	1,625

That even the Bible Christians, with smaller resources than the New Connexion, and far from their traditional rural strongholds, could muster twice as many attendances was a bitter commentary on a century of New Connexion work in London. But even the Free Methodists no longer had the resources to follow their members into the ever-expanding outer suburbs. The Union of 1907 was a timely one for the smaller Methodist bodies in the metropolis.

E. A. ROSE.

⁴⁰ Published in the *Free Methodist*, 26th February 1904.

Below and on page 190 are given particulars of further local histories which we have been pleased to receive. Another list will appear in our next issue.

Methodism in the Town of Boston, by William Leary (pp. 50) : copies, price 66p., from Messrs. Richard Kay Publications, 80, Sleaford Road, Boston, Lincs.

Souls for hire—the history of the Northlew circuit, by the Rev. R. Keith Parsons (pp. 223) : copies, price 75p., plus 15p. postage, from Mr. M. T. Balsden, Madworthy, Beaworthy, Devon.

Oxford, Lime Walk, 40th anniversary brochure, compiled by the Rev. Michael S. Edwards (pp. 16) : copies, price 25p., from the author at 9, Ramsay Road, Headington, Oxford, OX3 8AX.

THOMAS COKE : APOSTLE OF METHODISM

Supplementary Notes

SINCE the publication of my book in 1969, one or two further pieces of manuscript evidence have turned up, which throw interesting light on certain aspects of Coke's career.

(a) *Literary collaboration.* (See *Thomas Coke*, p. 333 f.)

The extent of Coke's dependence on Samuel Drew in his literary enterprises, particularly in the last year or two of his life, is illustrated by a letter from Drew to Coke, dated 9th July 1813, at the Methodist Archives and Research Centre. Acknowledging a bill of exchange for £50 in payment of his services, Drew summarizes the contents of an earlier letter which Coke had mislaid :

I informed you that as I had not yet heard from Mr. Jones of London, I had done nothing with the West India manuscripts. Nor can I until I know with certainty what material he can furnish, because in this I must be guided in the retrenchments that must be made, in order to compress the whole into a volume.

"Mr. Jones" was the person in London whom Coke had engaged as far back as 1799 to gather material for his proposed *History of the West Indies*. (*Thomas Coke*, p. 324.) Two volumes of this had appeared in 1808 and 1810. The final volume, though dated 1811, was considerably delayed by the extent of Coke's other activities and responsibilities; and in its completion and other similar tasks Coke leaned heavily on Drew, who wrote :

I have had many enquiries after the History of the West Indies, and also after the numbers of the history of the Bible. [This remained unfinished at Coke's death, and I have not traced any copies of the early parts.] I have endeavoured to pacify those who have urged them with an assurance that these works will be published soon after next conference. This I hope you will see executed [by which Drew means "I hope you will see fit to employ me in executing it"], as I think you are bound to fulfil your engagements with the public.

(b) *Coke's Hymn-book.*

An omission from my checklist of Coke's publications (*Thomas Coke*, Appendix E) is his revised edition of John Wesley's 1780 *Collection of Hymns*, published in Dublin in 1802. This went through a number of editions, the latest known one being dated 1823. (Most known copies are in the collection at Epworth House, Belfast.) In his preface, dated from Raithby Hall, Lincolnshire, 2nd September 1802, Coke mentions the paucity of hymns of praise and hymns from non-Methodist sources as the chief defect of the 1780 book. He has, he says, left out of the new edition hymns which seem "improper for public service", and has abridged or divided up many longer hymns. He has then added "near a hundred Hymns chosen out of the best compositions and collections in the English language", particularly from the pens of Watts and the Wesleys.

In rearranging the hymns, Coke adds several new sections for the major Christian festivals, and one for "Believers Trusting in Providence". His believers do no more than *seek* for Full Redemption, where earlier generations *groaned* for it (which shows how far back one must go in tracing

the decline of Methodism!); and among the sections entirely omitted is one "Describing Hell".

The preface claims that no hymn "has been either suppressed or inserted without the previous approbation of the majorities of all our District Committees in Ireland"; but how far, and by what means, Coke consulted them, and what degree of official backing his revision actually had, is far from clear. Though it went through so many editions, and outlived its editor, it seems to have died a natural death, and was never used outside Ireland.

(c) *Coke's character and motives.*

On this most difficult of all questions connected with Thomas Coke, a new and particularly valuable contemporary witness has turned up, in a letter from John Holloway, a London layman who was a close friend of Coke in the last few years of his life, and whose verdict seems both shrewd and balanced. The original manuscript is at the Methodist Archives Centre.

JOHN HOLLOWAY TO JOSEPH BENSON

Revd. & Dear Sir,

I have read the Sermon with a biass'd mind or—such is my opinion of your judgement I shoud not have differd from it—for the last three years of the good Doctor's life I was a close observer, and I was often astonish'd at those excellencies which the discourse points at— He was a pattern of all that is amiable in the Christian life— I saw nothing that coud make against him but his constitutional warmth of temper— Yet this was properly tempered—his easy & graceful concessions soon obliterated the remembrance of it. Without taking up your valuable time, I think I coud discern an inward warfare—he was perpetually struggling with himself—and probably it was this that gave birth to many suspicions.

Now I am positive that the pious Doctor was aiming at *disinterested love*—in our private devotions & conversations—it was all his wish—his aim to be *a child*—probably he had more natural vanity than most men and this created an ardent warfare— Once after suffering an unusual cross—he fell down upon his knees before me & exclaim'd— O my Friend—my Friend—God has gotten the victory— I am a child— Nothing but such a providence coud have produced it—!

Now admitting—which I am confident was the truth—that he considerd himself unsafe while motives otherwise than pure actuated him—and not being able to sacrifice wholly his vanity or at least the strong inclination to it—but wholly dissatisfied with himself at the same time—I say it is to be wonder'd at—that at times he appeard awkward—absent—& too thoughtful—besides the above memorable time—there were a few instances in which he appeard liberated—and this was at our domestic altar—in the midst of his petitions it appeard as if the holy simplicity had descended—and the child was formd—when he was at prayer on such occasions—his expressions were uncommonly beautiful—all was inspiration—and while the effect lasted which was sometimes for a considerable time—no man coud be more happy than the deceas'd saint.

I hope you will understand my meaning—I think this constant conflict will explain what was at times enigmatical in his character—I will only

observe once more that in all his conduct as a Christian & as a Gentleman he was the most exemplary character I ever met with—

I am

Very dear Sir

Your affectionate

J. HOLLOWAY.

City Road
Decr. 30th. 1814

[Addressed :] Rev. Mr. Benson

[Endorsed in a different hand :] John Holloway Esq. (the father of the Engraver of the Cartoons)

JOHN A. VICKERS.

Continuing the list begun on page 187, the following local histories also have come to hand. Except where a figure is mentioned, prices have not been supplied.

Foulridge (Lancs) centenary brochure (pp. 16) : copies from the Rev. Jeffrey R. Butcher, 14, Linden Road, Colne, Lancs, BB8 9BA.

Trowbridge, Wesley Road, centenary brochure (pp. 16) ; copies from the Rev. Henry E. Foss, 12, Farleigh Avenue, Trowbridge, Wilts.

Crantock centenary brochure (pp. 8); copies from the Rev. Martin V. Caldwell, The Manse, Newham Road, St. Newlyn East, Newquay, Cornwall.

Barnsley, Ebenezer, centenary brochure (pp. 12) : copies from Miss M. Taylor, 109, Blenheim Road, Barnsley, Yorks, S70 6AX.

Oakworth centenary brochure (pp. 24) : copies, price 18p., from Mr. W. T. Edwards, Lilac Cottage, Bogthorne, Oakworth, Keighley, Yorks.

Gloucester circuit records from the time of John Wesley to 1970, compiled by Gordon R. Hine (pp. 52) : copies from the author at 41, Oldbury Orchard, Churchdown, Glos.

East Finchley 150th anniversary brochure (pp. 26) : copies from the Rev. Melvin W. Quick, 3, Elm Gardens, East Finchley, London, N.2.

Headless Cross (Redditch) 75th anniversary brochure (pp. 16) : copies, price 15p., from the Rev. Derek H. Jefferson, 60, Rectory Road, Redditch, Worcs.

Garston, Island Road, centenary brochure (pp. 16) : copies from Mr. G. B. Jennings, 59, Darby Road, Grassendale, Liverpool, 19.

East Ham South centenary brochure (pp. 16) : copies from Messrs. Plaistow Press Magazines Ltd., London, E.15 3JA.

Kingham centenary brochure, compiled by Mr. R. W. Mann (pp. 16) : copies from the author at Durham House, Kingham Hill School, Kingham, Oxford.

Horfield Sunday School centenary brochure (pp. 12) : copies from the Rev. Douglas R. Jones, 92, Hill View, Henleaze, Bristol, BS9 4QG.

Smallbridge centenary brochure (pp. 11) : copies from Mr. J. W. Tweedale, 35, Elm Grove, Wardle, Rochdale, Lancs.

Stanwood (Sheffield) opening ceremony (pp. 11) : copies from the Rev. R. Talbot Watkins, 30, Rockingham Lane, Sheffield, S1 4FW.

Dowlais, Wesley, opening ceremony brochure (pp. 12) : copies from the Rev. George Graham, 19, The Grove, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan.

NOTES AND QUERIES

1238. WORLD METHODIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY: REGIONAL CONFERENCE.

The WMHS (formerly the IMHS) is to hold the first of what may be a series of regional conferences at Wesley College, Bristol, 17th-21st July 1973. Its theme is "Methodism in its cultural and evangelical context". Besides an international panel of distinguished lecturers, there will be sessions on Methodist archival resources in both England and America, an open forum on "Methodism and revolutionary change", and a review of present and future trends in Methodist studies.

Members of the Wesley Historical Society who would like further details of the arrangements should write to the British Secretary, Mr. John A. Vickers, 87, Marshall Avenue, Bognor Regis, Sussex. EDITOR.

1239. R. BENNETT DUGDALE.

Dr. Frank Baker writes to say that Dugdale's two publications (see *Proceedings*, xxxviii, p. 89) are described in his Union Catalogue, page 170, par. 368B, and that there are copies in Dr. Williams's Library and in the Congregational Library, London. Of the *Collection of Hymns*, he says that there are more editions than the ones we mentioned, and refers us to his Union Catalogue item 205.vi, where that of 1792 is fully described. There is a 1792 edition in the Perkins School of Theology, Dallas. (We have also located an edition in the Archives Library.) Dr. Baker is inclined to think that this is the *Select Hymns for the Use of the Singing Society*. EDITOR.

1240. NINETEENTH-CENTURY METHODISM VIEWED BY RECENT WRITERS.

Methodism—especially in its social impact—is by no means neglected by recent historians of nineteenth-century England. The most notable and provocative recent survey is by Professor Harold Perkin of Lancaster—*The Making of Modern English Society, 1780-1880* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, paper-back edition, 1972, £1.50). Mr. Perkin sees Methodism as a significant element in the production of what he calls "a viable class system". It was the analgesic at the birth of a new society. Is this a substitute for Halévy's thesis about the role of Methodism in producing stability? Perkin (following E. J. Hobsbawm) is much more penetrating than Halévy here.

Useful, accurate sections on the religious dimension are to be found in two recent volumes in Weidenfeld and Nicholson's "History of British Society" series—J. F. C. Harrison on *The Early Victorians, 1832-51* and G. Best on *Mid-Victorian Britain, 1851-75*. Both are £1.50 in paper-back.

Interesting articles relating to Methodism are included in *Popular Belief and Practice* (Studies in Church History, volume 8), edited by G. J. Cuming and D. Baker (Cambridge University Press, 1972). Dr. John D. Walsh writes on "Methodism and the Mob in the eighteenth century"—a lucid attempt to find causes for the sporadic outbursts of persecution of early Methodists. In a more speculative but fascinating article, Professor W. R. Ward writes of "The Religion of the People and the problem of Control, 1790-1830". Professor Ward shows the impact of revivalism, social disorder and economic pressure on Wesleyanism in the early nineteenth century, and hazards the opinion that by 1819-20 Wesleyanism had its moment of truth—it was never going to be a popular urban religion. Some of his detail about the impact of economics has an ominously contemporary ring about it!

David Thompson, a Cambridge historian, in *Nonconformity in the Nineteenth Century* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972, £1.50) has produced an important selection of documents with introductions and commentary tracing the fortunes of Protestant Dissent (which includes Methodism) in England during the last century. Wide-ranging, accurate, fair, and not lacking humour, this book is now the handiest one-volume treatment of the subject. Dr. Thompson also contributes to the *Popular Belief and Practice* Symposium an article on "The Church and Society in nineteenth-century England—a rural perspective", showing how complex generalizations in this area can be. "The open village (i.e. one not dominated by the squire) is a paradigm of the situation increasingly common in the nineteenth century. Where the churches had few social advantages, their success depended on the commitment of their members."

All this is a welcome relief from pious hagiography, of which we have had our fill!

J. MUNSEY TURNER.

[Some of these titles have already been noted in the *Proceedings*, but a second mention can do no harm.—EDITOR.]

1241. JAMES EVERETT AND PORTRAITS OF DR. ADAM CLARKE.

The illustration of Everett's sketch of Adam Clarke which faces page 144 of the current volume of the *Proceedings* is a useful commentary on the Reformer's versatility. He was of course a voluminous writer, and not only of the controversial and satirical kind—witness his various biographies, including that of Adam Clarke; he was a preacher of no mean order—Jabez Bunting, no great friend of Everett's (!), said of him: "Mr. Everett would be acceptable in any circuit, and may have his choice"; he was a competent poet—with his friends James Montgomery, John Holland and Ebenezer Elliott at the time of his residence in Sheffield, he was reckoned one of the "Sheffield Poets"; he was often consulted on rare books and the like; and this sketch shows him to be a more-than-average portraitist (comparison with the print of Clarke in the January 1823 *Methodist Magazine* reveals the accuracy of his delineation).

Adam Clarke was frequently drawn and printed; a portrait of him at the age of 33 appears in the *Arminian Magazine*; then there is this one in 1823; another, engraved by Greatbach, was published by Simpkin and Marshall in 1837; another, by Orme, appeared in the *New Evangelical Magazine*; another, painted by Jenkinson and engraved by Thomson, was published by Fisher, Son & Co. in 1846, and what appears to be an adaptation of this portrait forms the frontispiece to the second volume of G. J. Stevenson's *Methodist Worthies* (1884); a different engraving, by Gibbs, appears in Abel Stevens's *History of Methodism*; another, drawn by Derby, was published in two formats, by different engravers, by Tegg—one as the frontispiece to Samuel Dunn's life of Clarke in 1863, the other as frontispiece to (I think) an edition of his Commentary with a reproduced inscription to Everett at the foot; this same Derby portrait, without the background of drapery, and with a reproduction autograph, prefaced Etheridge's *Life*, published by the Book-room in 1858 (2nd edn.).

Everett's sketch is similar to all these, apart from the two early portraits; but the most closely akin is a print by Neeles (?—the engraving is faint), in which, as with Everett, only the head is in detail; where this print appeared I cannot say. There is also the well-known painting, more than once reproduced, of Dr. Clarke and the Buddhist priests in his study at Millbrook; but here, of course, the detail of portraiture is less defined.

OLIVER A. BECKERLEGGE.