

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

THE WESLEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

was founded in 1893 to promote the study of the history and literature of early Methodism; to accumulate exact knowledge; and to provide a medium of intercourse on all related subjects. In 1981 it became registered as a Charity (No. 283012). www.wesleyhistoricalsociety.org.uk

Current Subscription Rates

Subscriptions start in January for a calendar year

British Personal Subscription Rates

One Year £10
Four Years £36

Overseas Personal Subscription Rates

One Year £13. US\$26. Eur20
Four Years £47. US\$94. Eur70

British Libraries and Institutions Rates

One Year £13

Overseas Libraries and Institutions

One Year £17 US\$34 Eur29

All members receive post-free the tri-annual *Proceedings*, and may purchase extra copies or back numbers where these are still available. No complete volumes of back numbers earlier than Vol. XXVIII (1950) can now be supplied, though a miscellaneous collection of issues from before this date still remains in stock. Members should inquire from the Marketing Officer, stating their needs. Extra copies of *Proceedings* of recent date may be purchased at £3.00 (non-members £4.00) per issue.

All members may attend the Annual Tea, the Annual Meeting, and any other functions arranged by the Society. All members enjoy the facilities of the Society's Library.

OFFICERS

President: REV. DR. JOHN A. NEWTON, 3 College Road, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol, BS9 3EJ.

Tel: 0117 959 3225. e-mail: jnewton@lineone.net

Treasurer: MR NICHOLAS J. PAGE BA, ARCO, FVCM, FLCM, 6 Straylands Grove, York YO31 1EA.

e-mail: njp64@hotmail.com

Registrar (who receives subscriptions): REV. DONALD H. RYAN MTh, 15 Foxlands Drive,

Lloyds Hill, Penn, Wolverhampton, WV4 5NB. Tel: 01902 335556. e-mail: donaldhryan@hotmail.com

General Secretary: DR. E. DOROTHY GRAHAM, B.A., B.D., 34 Spiceland Road, Birmingham,

B31 1NJ. Tel: 0121-475 4914. e-mail: edgraham@tesco.net

Librarian: MR JOHN H LENTON, M.A., M Phil., 21 Vineyard Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire,

TF1 1HB. e-mail: jlenton@fish.co.uk

Editor: MR. E.A. ROSE, B.A., 26, Roe Cross Green, Mottram, Hyde, Cheshire, SK14 6LP.

Tel: 01457 763485.

Reviews Editor: REV GILBERT D BRAITHWAITE M.A., 2 Wynfields, Newtown, Powys, SY16 1HB

Local Branches Secretary: MR. R. F. S. THORNE, J.P., C.Eng., 50 Well Oak Park, Dryden Road,

Exeter, EX2 5BB. e-mail: rthorne@fish.co.uk

Marketing Officer: DR PETER FORSAITH, 66 Besselsleigh Road, Wootton, Abingdon, OX13 6DX.

e-mail: peter@forsaitth-oxon.demon.co.uk

Conference Secretary: MRS SHEILA J HIMSWORTH BA, 22 Broadway Road, Evesham, WR11 1BG

e-mail: himsworth@bigfoot.com

Elected Member: REV. TERENCE HURST BA 36 Moor Crescent, Newcastle-on-Tyne NE3 4AQ

e-mail: rev.terryhurst@freezezone.co.uk

Executive Committee: Officers of the Society whose names are enumerated above, together with -
REV. DR. MARTIN WELLINGS., M.A., 53 Oxford Road, Kidlington, Oxford, OX5 2BP

*Communications to any of the above requiring a reply
should please include a stamped addressed envelope.*

Honorary Auditor: MR. J. R. HUDSON, F.C.A.

Proceedings

OF THE

Wesley Historical Society

Editor: E. ALAN ROSE, B.A.

Volume 55

May 2005

2005 marks the 200th. Annual Meeting of the Independent Methodists, one of the last remaining historic Methodist divisions. They currently number eighty-eight churches, most of them in the north of England.

Historically, Independent Methodism stood for two major principles - the autonomy of the local church and the belief that local church ministry should be voluntary and unpaid. Some IM churches took the name 'Free Gospel Church', to convey their emphasis on non-payment. This article focuses on the pattern of ministry which developed in the denomination over the 200 years of its history.

THE VOLUNTARY MINISTRY OF THE INDEPENDENT METHODISTS

AS with many dissident groups, the Independent Methodists developed their particular form of ecclesiology first and defended it later. Within a few years of their formation, they were claiming a biblical case for their views on unpaid, lay ministry; they also sought support from the example of earlier sects such as the medieval Waldensians.¹ However, the factors which led directly to the IM pattern of ministry belonged to much nearer to their own time, notably the eighteenth-century revival which, as W. R. Ward has pointed out, demonstrated the real force of the great Protestant doctrine of the priesthood of all believers.² As the Methodist revival spread, people with no previous experience of leadership and no standing in the Church of England became itinerant and local preachers, class leaders and band leaders. This would be one of Methodism's great strengths but also the seedbed of some of its divisions as expectations of ministers and lay

¹ 'The Waldenses, whose praise is in all the Churches, a Stimulus to Independent Methodists', *Independent Methodist Magazine* 1826,p.943. (Hereafter referred to as 'IMMag')

² W. R. Ward, *The Protestant Evangelical Awakening* (Cambridge: 1992), p.353.

people clashed. Conflicts ensued in northern towns such as Manchester , Warrington and Macclesfield, leading to the formation of Independent Methodist Churches which rejected all forms of paid, separated ministry and met together for their first Annual Meeting in 1806. Some were augmented by dissident Quakers, whose egalitarian views helped shape both the character and form of ministry which gradually evolved among the Independent Methodists.

The IM Practice of Ministry

The crux of the Independent Methodists' view of ministry stemmed from their conviction that the distinction between 'clergy' and 'laity' was post-biblical, lacked divine authority and falsely distinguished one group of God's servants from another . They argued that the *λαός*, the people of God, were a single entity and even to describe their ministry as 'lay' was of doubtful acceptability, since this implied that the church contained a body of people which was other than lay.

Non-payment was a firm rule, agreed among all the churches. Ministers would work in secular employment and provide their ministry additionally. The only exceptions allowed were for evangelists who were sent to places away from their homes to conduct missions or plant new churches. In their minds, this distinction dealt with Bible passages which appeared to allow for some form of payment. Alexander Denovan of Glasgow (1794-1878), for example, accepted that 1 Corinthians 9 allowed for apostolic maintenance but rejected it as an argument for pastoral payment:

'Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereon Or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock.' (1 Cor. 9:7) Surely every man who feedeth a flock hath this liberty; and therefore, as he had put the question, Should not apostles have the same liberty with that flock they feed? Pastors, it is true, feed their respective flocks likewise; but it is not for them the apostle here is pleading; and no man has any right to apply that to their case which the Holy Ghost has not applied.³

There were also pragmatic reasons behind the argument for non-payment, not least the fact that the Independent Methodists emerged in the poorest of communities and catered for the poorest of the people. They had no wish to burden them with the support of a minister. William Sanderson (1811-1899), whose Liverpool Church was situated in a very poor area, drew heavily on the theme of poverty in his advocacy of an unpaid ministry . He cited the fact that the Quakers were better able to support their poor as a result of having no ministers to pay:

³ A. Denovan, *An Appeal to the Christian World* (Glasgow: 1866), pp120f.

... they do what no church recognising a hired ministry can do - they take care of their poor - they leave not their poor to the tender care of the parish overseer - how do they do it? Instead of paying a man for ministering (which he ought to do for nought,) they minister to the Lord Jesus Christ in the persons of his poor saints, and I trust the Free Churches will follow this noble example.⁴

To his credit, Sanderson practised what he preached and a newspaper obituarist reported at his death, that 'he was known as a kind friend to the poor, by whom he was much beloved.'⁵ By occupation a tailor, when on his evangelistic journeys Sanderson took his trade with him and even refused to accept travelling expenses.

By the 1920s, by which time the Independent Methodists had built some large, opulent chapels, the poverty argument was less potent, but their apologists continued to claim the moral high ground. Bolton IM historian James Vickers saw a paid, educated and titled ministry through the lenses of wealth, privilege and class. In his opinion, the average clergyman was from a different social stratum from most of his congregation, had a better income and was in no position to counsel the poor to be content with their lot. But Vickers was writing during the years of Nonconformity's high point, and overlooked the fact that many Free Church ministers of an earlier age had suffered great deprivation in the fulfilment of their callings, especially those of the Primitive Methodists and Bible Christians, some of whom reverted to being local preachers when they married, as they could not afford to keep a wife and family on a pittance of a stipend.⁶

In addition to their objections to payment, the Independent Methodists firmly rejected all other forms of distinction, such as dress and title. They drew ministers from within their own congregations and deplored the idea of calling a minister from another church. Most churches did not practise ordination, but held 'recognition' services for new ministers. (The notable exception was the church at Glasgow which set great store by ordination from the beginning.⁷) In this respect, the Independent Methodists were not far removed from other branches of

4 W Sanderson and T. Sturges, *Is a Located Hired Ministry in direct opposition to the letter and spirit of the Scriptures, particularly the New Testament? A Discussion between William Sanderson and the Rev. Thomas Sturges* (Liverpool, 1852), p.18.

5 *Liverpool Mercury*, January 13, 1899.

6 K. Brown, *A Social History of the Nonconformist Ministry in England and Wales 1800-1930* (Oxford: 1988), p124. William Clowes and his wife lived off suet, potatoes, bread and water, and had to sell off their only luxury, a feather bed, to avoid debt. J. T. Wilkinson, *William Clowes 1780-1851* (1951) p31. Their experience was by no means unique. It fell well short of the Independent Methodist charge of preaching the gospel for monetary gain.

7 See *Independent Methodist Magazine*. 1868, pp435ff. for a full account of the form of ordination service used at Glasgow.

Methodism, such as the Bible Christians and United Methodist Free Churches which never adopted ordination by the laying on of hands, believing it to reflect high church superstition.⁸

Ministry was primarily regarded as plural, which had the obvious advantage, at least theoretically, of ensuring that individual ministers who were engaged in secular employment did not carry an impossible workload. This was rooted in an appeal to the New Testament pattern of elders or presbyters, whom the Independent Methodists cited as the equivalent of their ministers. In fact, a plural ministry in an autonomous church approximated more to Brethren and Church of Christ than Methodist concepts of ministry, though this was never admitted.⁹ The Independent Methodists still held to their Methodist identity, while abhorring the increasing professionalisation of the Wesleyan Methodist ministry.

Historical Development

For at least their first one hundred years, Independent Methodists used terms such as 'minister', 'preacher', 'elder' and 'pastor' interchangeably to mean the same thing.¹⁰ This reflected the varied origins of the churches, but fostered ambiguity and confusion. As most of the churches were in circuits which maintained the specifically Methodist practice of the 'preachers' plan', this would implicitly define a minister's work mainly in terms of preaching by rotation around the local churches, with the result that he was rarely seen in his own church on Sundays. However, the rules agreed by the churches in 1822 incorporated the principle of pastoral oversight:

It is the duty of the pastors to read and preach the gospel publicly; to administer baptism and the Lord's Supper; to examine those who are in fellowship quarterly, and those who wish to communicate, and, as their time will permit, visit and teach from house to house.¹¹

Unpaid preachers were therefore expected to fulfil the role of paid ministers, albeit on a shared basis and within their obvious time constraints.

A more decisive attempt to formulate an agreed denominational position on ministry came with the adoption of the Testimony and Principles of Union (1855) which proposed a thoroughly Presbyterian

⁸ JA Vickers (ed.) *A Dictionary of Methodism in Britain and Ireland* (2000), p260.

⁹ R. Coad, *A History of the Brethren Movement* (Exeter: 1968)p75. D.M. Thompson, *Let Sects and Parties Fall* (Birmingham: 1980) p18.

¹⁰ The term 'minister' rather than 'preacher' is used throughout this article, but with the loose meaning that the Independent Methodists gave to it

¹¹ Doctrines, Church Government and Discipline considered by the Independant [sic] Methodists to be consitent [sic] with the Word of God (Sheffield, 1822),p8

pattern, based on elders (or pastors) and deacons.

These would be accountable only to the individual church; there was no thought of any connexionally accredited ministry. The author of the Testimony, Alexander Denovan, clearly wanted to see the churches operate a form of ministry which carried more weight than was currently the case. In so doing, he boldly introduced the contentious subject of authority which had been studiously avoided up to this time. In the absence of the rule of a single pastor in a church, where did the church's locus of authority lie?

Denovan tackled this issue by proposing the following definition:

Regular officer-bearers, chosen by the brethren from among themselves, shall be appointed in each church, so soon as properly qualified persons are found. These are presbyters or elders and deacons - the elders also being called overseers or bishops and may be designated pastors.

The duty of the pastors shall be to teach, rule, baptise, dispense the Lord's Supper, and, when sent for, visit the sick of their charge; at the same time they are to watch for the souls of their flock as they who shall give account, and be careful that no one lead any of them astray, and that whoever may attempt to instruct them, may do so with sound doctrine.¹²

The importance of the pastoral office was then further stressed:

Pastors, having been regularly installed into office, should have the authority given them by Christ, through the choice made of them by the brethren, upheld and respected; their instructions listened to with a seriousness and attention; and a cheerful obedience manifested to all that they require according to the Scriptures.

The terminology of 'rule', 'authority' and 'instructions', together with explicit responsibility for oversight, suggested a role for elders/pastors which was comparable with that of their paid counterparts in other denominations. However, this language aroused considerable hostility and exposed wide differences among the churches and their leaders. While the advocates of the Testimony saw the proposals as conducive to good order, to others they raised the spectre of the kind of authoritarian leadership they had already rejected. Many of the churches were plainly not prepared to see authority placed in the hands of a pastoral oligarchy. Some kind of compromise was inevitable. After the testimony had been debated, the clause which specified the role of pastors was altered to make their functions less exclusive. The statement, 'The duty of pastors

¹² A. Denovan, 'Proposed Testimony and Bond of Union' (Glasgow, 1852)

shall be to teach, rule, etc. ' now read, '*While the brethren are not be excluded from what is required of them. . . it shall more especially be the duty of the pastors to teach, rule, etc.*' ¹³ In other words, no function was to be exclusively ministerial. This went some way towards allaying the fears of those who foresaw the rise of a new ministerial hierarchy, but left the degree of authority accorded to a minister unclear. The amended (and somewhat emasculated) Testimony was duly adopted.

In subsequent years, pressure grew from the more democratic wing of the churches to place authority in the hands of the whole membership of the church, but others had seen this lead to agitation and instability. William Sanderson urged the 1869 Annual Meeting to find room for churches which did not necessarily follow the democratic pattern:

... Mr. Sanderson said that they might have churches wishing to join them which recognised a Presbyterian form of government, and there were some among them that had leanings towards that mode, and the Liverpool church was one. They saw that democracy in a Church frequently led to consequences anything but amicable. ¹⁴

On another occasion, he expressed the view that each church should have a principal pastor, to ensure that discipline was maintained.¹⁵ This reflected the practice in his own church and also Denovan's church at Glasgow, both of which operated on a Presbyterian system, with one pastor in overall leadership. These were the two largest churches in the Connexion, but the calibre of their leaders was undoubtedly a reason for their success.

With the passing of Alexander Denovan in 1878 and the gradual withdrawal from Connexional work by William Sanderson from the 1880s, no one else of equal stature emerged to champion their belief in strong pastoral oversight. Ideas of political democracy increasingly impacted on all aspects of church government, with inevitable implications for ministry. In one of his papers, William Brimelow of Bolton (1837-1913), a staunch Liberal, appealed to current democratic practice to rebut aspects of ministerial authority which were being advocated by the Wesleyan J. H. Rigg:

In a book written by him [Rigg], and recently published, if I understand him correctly, he lays it down as the prerogative of the Minister, as distinguished from the Layman, that he holds the keys of the spiritual kingdom on earth; and whom the Minister receives is received, and whom, he rejects is rejected. And this is told us near the close of the nineteenth

¹³ new words italicised

¹⁴ *Independent Methodist Magazine*, 1869, p176.

¹⁵ *IMMag.* 1871, p230

century, a time when democratic principles reign in every department of life!¹⁶

James Vickers also played down the role of ministers when he said, 'An elder could speak or pray. He had the same right as other members but no more.'¹⁷ The language of 'rights' ignored the fact that a first century elder also had prerogatives and responsibilities, but Vickers reflected the thinking of his own age and his writing strongly influenced his own and subsequent generations. To the Independent Methodists, the church members' meeting became inviolable. The supreme authority of ministers had become the supreme authority of members. The powerful pastoral office of the early Wesleyan Methodists now stood in sharp contrast to the powerlessness of Independent Methodist ministers, who had no prerogatives of oversight and direction.

Functions which would normally have fallen to a minister now fell to a body of leaders or Church Meetings. Moreover, under some constitutions, many of the pastoral tasks were delegated to officers carrying other descriptions. No minister had actual oversight of a church purely by virtue of being a minister; he might also be Church President (administrative leader), in which case he gave both spiritual and temporal leadership, but he could conceivably have no leadership role at all. Indeed, the office of Church President could be held by someone who was not a minister. All of this blunted any sense of difference between ministers and members - a situation which many approved, but which gave very mixed messages about what it really meant to be a minister. The Independent Methodists wanted total equality between their ministers and members but they also wanted their ministers to have total equality with those of other denominations. Equality on one front was achievable, but not on both, as the following account indicates.

The Independent Methodist ministry drifted further apart from that of other denominations during this period, as the main Free Churches moved towards a college educated ministry. The miners, millworkers and small tradesmen who made up the bulk of IM ministers began to look decidedly inferior and less competent in educational terms to their paid counterparts. In due course, this affected inter-church relations and public life, partly arising from the gradual removal of religious disabilities which had benefited the larger Free Churches. In 1872 the Free Churches of Bolton had an arrangement with the local Burial Board whereby a number of ministers took charge of cemetery services on a rota basis, but Independent Methodists were not included. When the Bolton Circuit meeting challenged this, the local Free Church ministers replied that 'the duties pertaining to cemetery interments are distinctly trusted

¹⁶ W. Brimelow, 'The Merits of Lay Agency' (1887) in *A Freechurch and a Free Ministry* (nd) p.87

¹⁷ J. Vickers, *History of Independent Methodism* (Wigan, 1920), p87

by the Burial Board to those who are bona fide ministers and pastors of congregations' and that exceptions could only be made 'wherein it is intimated by the friends of the deceased that they prefer the service of someone not ordinarily recognised as a minister.' In a rather condescending sideswipe at the Independent Methodists, the writer added,

If the public and the Burial Board will admit that about 50 tradesmen be put upon the cemetery list, I shall be very thankful that thus it may be ... But there can be no doubt that if the congregations now enumerated with your own, and others becoming destitute of an officiating minister, are to be generally represented by tradesmen who shall take religious duty at the cemetery, other societies not professedly Christian, will ask for a similar privilege of appointing a nominee to take a turn with the rest.¹⁸

In other words, the 'ministers' of the Independent Methodists were no ministers, but merely tradesmen appointed by their churches to officiate at services which should normally be conducted only by *bona fide* ministers, as the larger Free Churches understood them. The Independent Methodists experienced similar treatment of their ministry by other Free Churches well into the twentieth century and found it even more galling than their accustomed experience of rejection by the Anglicans who accorded no recognition to any form of Free Church ministry.

Connexional accreditation of ministers happened gradually and almost accidentally. In 1873, a proposal was advanced to establish a fund to make provision for aged and infirm ministers. While this mirrored similar initiatives in other denominations, for the Independent Methodists it represented a step towards identifying ministers as a distinct body. Not surprisingly, when it was raised at the Annual Meeting, some delegates expressed the view that such a fund should cater for all members, not ministers alone, while others wondered whether it would bring people into the ministry for the wrong reasons.¹⁹ The formation of this fund created more than one anomaly. It ran counter to the movement's earlier beliefs that no distinction should be made between one servant of God and another. It also led to a situation in which the Connexion gave implicit recognition to existing ministers in circuits, without having been involved in their accreditation.

The need to educate ministers proved to be another pointer towards centralisation. By the 1870s, in a world of school boards, libraries and public examinations, demands for improvement in standards of ministry were inevitable.²⁰ The various Methodist denominations gradually set up

¹⁸ 'Claiming Equality with other Ministers', *IMMag.* 1874, pp 270f.

¹⁹ *IMMag.* 1873,p239

²⁰ Brown, *Nonconformist Ministry*, p62, p80.

theological institutions, beginning with the Wesleyans in 1835. The Primitive Methodists introduced oral examinations in 1855 and written ones afterwards. Part of their initial tardiness in bringing about change was attributed to the survival among them of 'free gospelism' and the belief that their mission to the lower orders did not necessitate a highly trained ministry.²¹ Nevertheless, the tide for change was irresistible and, by 1868, they had established their Theological Institute at Sunderland.

Not until 1893 did the Independent Methodists institute any form of ministerial education, not least because they lacked the means to deliver it. Even then, it was operated by their own self-taught ministers whose theological knowledge was, at best, basic. The scheme placed the responsibility for tuition on each local circuit, while the Connexion provided books and appointed examiners. However, for many years, the adoption of the scheme by circuits remained a voluntary matter and some retained courses of their own or had none at all. By the Annual Meeting of 1894 it was operative in only seven out of sixteen circuits, though the total number of students was 124 - a healthy average of nearly eighteen per circuit.

The final step towards a connexionally accredited ministry arose from the 1916 Conscription Act, which allowed Ministers of Religion to be exempted from military service. This gave the Independent Methodists a dilemma. Of the 402 voluntary ministers listed by the circuits, sixty-eight were of conscription age. Should they retain their emphasis on the equality between ministers and members and thereby lose these younger ministers to the armed forces - or should they set out to prove that their ministers were a defined body of people, differentiated from other members by the work they did, and thereby risk creating the very kind of spiritual caste which they had always rejected? In the event they opted for the latter course and effectively moved from a semi-Quaker view of ministry to one which bordered on a clerical order. A test case took place before a magistrates' court, leading to the conclusion that the minister in question (and thereby every other IM minister) was 'a regular minister of a religious denomination'. Not all Independent Methodists agreed with this course of action and, for many years, some regarded it as the betrayal of a principle. At least one minister went to prison as a conscientious objector rather than benefit from what he saw as a distinction which now set ministers apart from other church members.²² In fact, the test case created a situation whereby some kind of common standard would become necessary in order for this recognition to be sustained. Gradually, the Connexion, rather than the Circuits, became the monitoring and accrediting body.

In 1927, the Connexion adopted a modified version of the 1917 Statement of Faith and Practice of the Federal Council of the Evangelical

²¹ Ibid, p.63

²² W. Wellock, *Off the Beaten Track* (India: Sarva Seva Sangh Prakashan Varanashi, 3rd edition, 1980), p33

Free Churches. Most of its modifications related to ministry and, despite the implications of the test case, were designed to eliminate where possible all distinctions between ministers and members.

They removed the phrase 'ministration of the sacraments' from the role of ministers and stated 'We do not reserve the ordinance of Baptism and the Communion Service to be ministered only by recognised ministers.'²³ The FCC term 'ordination' (by now broadly acceptable to other Free Churches) was replaced by 'appointment'. The Independent Methodists saw ministry in functional rather than ontological terms and shrank from any idea that special grace was imparted by the laying on of hands.

A supplementary section to the *Statement*, exposed traces of continuing sectarianism, through the Independent Methodists' emphasis on *distinctive* features of principles and polity. A single sentence - 'There is equality of Christian fellowship, all members, men and women, sharing equally in the government of the Church, and all equally eligible for any office' - made democracy the privilege of everyone and leadership the prerogative of no-one, including ministers.

Policy documents, whether legal or doctrinal, are often as significant for what they omit as for what they contain. This was notably the case with the *Statement of Faith and Practice*. Absent was any suggestion of a doctrinal test for entrance into the ministry, simply a vague statement that successful students of the course who were 'of a right spirit' would be accepted. Women were eligible for all offices, including ministry, but since ministers had no role in government or pastoral direction, it meant little. Ministry included 'the care of souls' but there was no indication of what this entailed.

Not until the late twentieth century did any further significant change take place. By this time, views on non-payment were less uniform, some churches were appointing paid pastors and some IM ministers had taken up appointments as hospital and prison chaplains. In 2000, these changes were acknowledged in a *Statement on Ministry* which, for the first time in IM history, acknowledged that the primary responsibility of ministers was to oversee their own churches, rather than to spend most of their time preaching elsewhere. This was the most significant conceptual and practical change for the Independent Methodists' view of ministry since their earliest days and effectively brought them nearer to parity with other denominations.²⁴

Ministry and Employment: An Occupational Analysis

²³ *IMMag*. 1926, p119

²⁴ *Statement on Ministry* (Wigan. Independent Methodist Churches, 2000).

²⁵ Figures drawn from the websites. Family Search, www.familysearch.org, © 1992-2002 Intellectual Reserve Inc.; The 1901 Census for England and Wales, Public Record Office, www.census.pro.gov.uk, © Crown Copyright 2003

Using data from the census returns of 1881 and 1901²⁵, together with Independent Methodist Year Books and church returns, it is possible to build up a picture of the occupations of those who served as ministers at these times. In 1881, the churches returned 261 ministers; occupations have been traced for 180 of them and these indicate that a total of 70% of the people concerned were either white collar workers of modest status or skilled manual workers.²⁶ Figures for people at the upper and lower end of the occupational scale were much smaller; the unskilled labourer and the large employer were both atypical of Independent Methodism's corpus of preachers.

Aside from their actual occupations, their spheres of work reflected the predominant industries of areas where Independent Methodists were to be found. Eighteen were involved in the coal industry and thirty in textiles. Few were agricultural workers, which illustrated the largely urban nature of the denomination. Twenty-three were retailers. An average IM congregation, as baptismal registers show, tended to be made up of manual workers, often with the neighbourhood grocer, coal merchant or subpostmaster as the leading figure.

The 1881 census brought out one feature which had virtually disappeared by 1901. Twenty-seven of the respondents to the census indicated not only their occupations, but their preaching ministries too. This is perhaps most significant for the fact that twenty three of these styled themselves as 'local preachers' rather than 'ministers' - perhaps the clearest single piece of evidence from the late nineteenth century of their self perceptions. Descriptions varied from 'Free Gospel Minister' to 'wheelwright and Methodist local preacher', 'bricklayer and lay preacher', 'independent preacher' and even one who declared himself as 'provision dealer and vagrant Methodist local preacher.' Of the four who used the word 'minister', two were currently working as evangelists for the Connexion and had no other occupation. Whatever the later claims made for the Independent Methodist ministry, its nineteenth-century practitioners saw themselves primarily as preachers, with no pretensions to be anything else.

In 1901, the churches returned the names of 372 ministers and occupations have been ascertained for 244 of them. An analysis of these shows that the percentage of skilled manual workers was now higher than two decades earlier, with corresponding reductions in the percentages for other categories. However, comparisons between 1881 and 1901 are made difficult by the fact that the denominational constituency changed significantly during these years. The addition of

²⁶ For comparable figures of local preachers in other branches of Methodism, see C. D. Field, 'The Methodist Local Preacher: An Occupational Analysis' in G. E. Milburn and M. Batty (eds.), *Workaday Preachers* (Peterborough: 1995), p223f See also Brown, *Nonconformist Ministry*, p20ff. for analyses of entrants into nonconformist ministries in the nineteenth century.

the Christian Lay Churches of NorthEast England, together with churches in Nottinghamshire, Bristol and South Wales, altered the demographic balance. Independent Methodism grew particularly rapidly in the Durham coalfield during the 1880s and 1890s, as chapels sprang up in many of the pit villages. As a result, many of the ministers who were added to the list during this time were skilled workers in the mining industry.

In terms of industrial profile, there was a decided shift of gravity from 1881. Thirty-two people were now involved in textiles, which was little different from twenty years earlier, but coal had now become the predominant industry for IM ministers, providing employment for forty-five of them as against eighteen in 1881.

In the figures for both years, there was a conspicuous absence of professional people: no doctors, bankers or lawyers, only one accountant and one schoolteacher. However, there were a few managing directors and owners of companies. Industrial prowess and commercial acumen rather than academic attainment would therefore characterise the highest achievers in the ranks of this body of lay ministers. While this imbalance probably mirrored the constituency itself, it may also indicate Independent Methodism's lack of appeal to people of a strongly educational or cultural bent.

Occupation was an important factor in a person's capacity to fulfil the functions of ministry. Most pastoral visitation (where it was done) would be covered in evenings. Baptisms took place on Sundays and weddings on Saturdays, so employment demands, in most cases, allowed room for these. The difficulty came with funerals which, invariably, took place on week days. For the shopkeeper who could leave his shop to an assistant or the self-employed tradesman who managed his own working hours, this presented no difficulty, but for a miner or mill worker to take time off to conduct a funeral meant loss of income for someone who was already on a low wage. Despite its no-payment policy, recompense for loss of earnings was permitted within Independent Methodism, but, since this was dependent on arrangements by local churches, it is impossible to establish how many ministers received recompense and how many simply forfeited their income.

Women Ministers

The subject of female ministry provides one of the most striking examples of the impact of Quakerism on both Independent and Primitive Methodism. It came to the surface at the 1808 Annual Meeting of the Independent Methodists, just five years after Wesleyan Methodism had placed a prohibition on female preaching.²⁷ This issue led to a debate which proved contentious. Hugh Bourne, who was present, had already

²⁷ *Minutes of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference 1803* (1862 ed.), p187.

acknowledged the role of women in ministry, having used the services of Mary Dunnel of Macclesfield at his first camp meeting. The outcome of the discussion among the gathered delegates was that he should write a tract on the subject. This he did, completing it a few days later at the home of the Warrington IM leader Peter Phillips who concurred with all that he had written and sent it on to John Beresford, IM leader at Macclesfield.²⁸ Bourne's tract, entitled, *Remarks on the Ministry of Women*, gave a strong series of arguments from Scripture in favour of using women in the preaching ministry. It was not adopted as a policy document by either Primitive or Independent Methodists, but it undoubtedly served as a strong influence for years afterwards, paving the way for the female travelling preachers of Primitive Methodism and the unpaid female preachers of the Independent Methodists.

In some instances, the Independent Methodists' use of women preachers aroused adverse reactions. John Landless recorded what happened in Nelson when Salem Church, only three years into its existence, received the talented Sarah Fitzgerald of Lancaster to preach in 1855:

After our placards were put out, numbers of the Brethren were attacked by the opposers of female preaching, who stated that we were wrong in permitting our females to preach. Our sister in her first discourse was, without any previous knowledge of such opposition, led to dwell on female preaching, and very ably proved to the delight of the Brethren, and the entire satisfaction of all that heard her, that she had a right to labour in this important work.²⁹

The Independent Methodists resisted all such pressures to discontinue female preaching and in 1894, their Evangelistic Committee engaged the services of their female evangelist, Clara Green of Oldham. There was no formal policy to recognise women as preachers at any given point; it was simply understood that if a woman had a calling and a gift, then like a man she would be given the opportunity to use it. The number of female IM ministers remained very small over the first hundred years; there were three in 1881 and five in 1901, but the proportion of female to male ministers increased steadily throughout the twentieth century.

Conclusions

From its earliest beginnings, Independent Methodism brought opportunities for lay people to develop their gifts and to operate autonomous churches which did not depend on a salaried ministry. But

²⁸ The full text of the tract is contained in J. Walford, *Memoirs of the Life and Labours of the Reverend and Venerable Hugh Bourne* (2 vols.; 1855) 1:pp172ff.

²⁹ *IMMag.* 1855, p19 Sarah Fitzgerald, originally from the IM Church at Oswestry, but latterly a Wesleyan Methodist, was a successful author of Methodist fiction

what began as freedom and opportunity turned into an all-consuming ideological pursuit which gave it the continuing character of a sect while attempting to become a denomination alongside others.

Despite some of the flaws in Independent Methodism's ministry, it would be a mistake to conclude that nothing of value came from it. The emphasis on using the gifts of all members, stressed consistently throughout the denomination's history, most certainly led to distinguished and honourable results in terms of empowering and enabling ordinary people, many from the humbler spheres of life, to realise their full potential as sons and servants of God. From those who took their first faltering steps in public speaking in the pulpits of the Independent Methodists would come people who were to take civic office, leadership in commerce and even seats in Parliament. Moreover, many of them took their godliness into their working environments, while the churches under their care, in some cases at least, thrived and flourished. Thus, the Independent Methodist bi-vocational view of ministry led to positive results through its affirmation of both secular work and divine calling. This has since been recognised by other denominations which have adopted the use of worker priests, non-stipendiary ministers and unpaid local pastors. However, theological issues aside, three aspects of the IM ministry would prove to be sources of weakness.

Firstly, by denying any place for a separated (and therefore paid) ministry, those who had a calling to give themselves fully to a pastoral ministry had to leave the denomination in order to do so. No comprehensive details exist to show how many took this step, but it certainly occurred throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and took away some of the Connexion's most able people.³⁰ By the same token, people needing pastoral support often felt let down by the limited availability of ministers who were engaged in secular employment. IM ministers could never match the amount of visitation and pastoral work done by their paid counterparts.

Secondly, the educational level of the IM ministry, provided on a part time basis, usually by people with little by way of personal qualifications, could never keep pace with the education which others received in theological colleges. This was not so much an issue in the early nineteenth century, when the same held true for the Primitive Methodists and Bible Christians, for instance, but the educational gap widened in the later years of the century. In an age when congregations increasingly consisted of people who were themselves educated, many were no longer prepared to sit under what they regarded as an inferior quality of

³⁰ Notable examples in the nineteenth century were: John Eckersley, Lowton (Primitive Methodist), Joseph Woolstenholme, Bury (Protestant Methodist), Joseph Renshaw, Stretford (Free Methodist), Joshua Denovan, Glasgow (Baptist) and William Daugherty, Birstall (Congregationalist)

ministry.

Finally, (and perhaps most of all) the ambiguities and ill-defined nature of the IM ministry led to frustration and confusion in pulpit and pew alike. Were IM ministers really ministers in the sense that other denominations used the term, or were they simply preachers, some of whom added rites of passage and church leadership to their duties? And even the term 'leadership' has to be qualified, given the democratic shape of the churches. The mixed expectations of ministers and congregations alike was a recurring source of irritation to both parties, leading to repetitious internal debates which never seemed to reach any conclusions.

JOHN DOLAN

(John Dolan is an Independent Methodist minister and Publications Editor for the Independent Methodist Connexion.)

SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF BRITISH AND IRISH METHODISM AND GENEALOGY: SOME PRINTED DONATION LISTS.

Introduction

THERE are many printed lists of Methodists and their donations to different Methodist causes in the nineteenth century. Most of these have been under used by Methodist historians and others. They are particularly useful to local historians and to genealogists, but can often throw light on more general questions, such as the relative wealth of areas, local churches and individual circuits at different periods. Most evidence relates to the Wesleyans, but there is some for the other Methodist branches.

Many may know the lists of missionary donors printed regularly in some Wesleyan Methodist Magazines. Similar lists exist in some of the magazines of the other denominations, also of donors to the National Childrens' Home and Orphanage and the Deaconess Order in such magazines as *Highways and Hedges* (NCHO) or *Flying Leaves* (Deaconess Order).

I suggest that those additional lists which were printed separately, as listed below, are an unusual set of evidence, in their cover of most circuits and many churches, not least in the fact that many provide evidence for

Ireland and Missionary Districts as well, partly due to the detailed provision of names, often arranged by family.

1. *Report of the Wesleyan Centenary Fund, 1844*

This fund began in 1839 to celebrate the Centenary of the beginning of Methodism and the report was published in 1844, being printed at Leeds. Almost £220,000 was raised, mostly spent on the Theological Institution, buying the colleges at Didsbury and Richmond, but also buying a headquarters, the City of London Tavern, for the Missionary Society in London, and their 'Triton' missionary ship to sail to the South Seas. Money was also used to help missionary and other pensions, fund mission chapels and schools in Ireland and reduce the Missionary Society and Chapel debts. The General Treasurer was James Wood, of Bristol, local magistrate and member of the Bristol Corporation, brother and son of ministers. There were five General Secretaries, the first, and the only minister, being the Rev Francis A. West. The lay secretaries were the Manchester solicitor son of Jabez Bunting, Percival Bunting, also John Lomas, John Westhead, and John D. Burton. The three Johns were all wealthy manufacturers in the Manchester area, closely connected to Jabez Bunting and the ruling group of laymen and ministers who controlled Wesleyanism in the period up to the Disruption of 1849-51.¹

There is first a report of 37 pages, summarising why the gifts were being made and on what the money was to be spent. Then there are about 300 (unnumbered) pages of names and amounts arranged by District, Circuit and Society. The list covers Ireland and the mission stations. As the first of these lists it is particularly important, and often has references as far back as Wesley .

An example of the kind of detail provided:

West Bromwich Circuit.

Marsland, Rev George	£21-0-0
Mrs Marsland	£21-0-0

¹ Francis A. West, son of a minister, was Secretary of the Chapel Fund from 1834 and eventually President of Conference (1857) and Governor of Kingswood from 1860. John D. Burton was a calico printer at Rhodes in Middleton. His sister Mary (died 1843) married James Wood of Bristol. The Burton family gave £525. John Lomas of Oxford Road Manchester (1787-1860), son of George Lomas, calico printer of Strangeways (obit *Methodist Magazine* 1811; 481), was the Treasurer of the Theological Institution and married to a member of the powerful Walker family of Bolton. His sister married the Rev George Marsden (twice President). John Westhead was a partner in the Manchester firm of Wood and Westhead, whose senior partner was Bunting's close friend and the first Chairman of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, James Wood of Manchester who gave £1,300 (to be carefully distinguished from James Wood of Bristol). See for most of these Ward W.R. *Early Victorian Methodism* (1976) p14, pp48-9, p93, p300 and notes.

Marsland, Master George	£5-5-0
Marsland, Master Robert	£5-5-0
In Memory of three beloved Children, deceased	£15-15-0
In Memory of Mrs M's beloved Parents, John Wood Esq and Mary his Wife, who were personal Friends of the Rev John Wesley and entertained him at their Residence, Brown's Hill, near Burslem, when he visited the Staffordshire Potteries	£5-5-0. ²

2. *Report of the Wesleyan Methodist Relief and Extension Fund 1853-57* 112pp (London. Clowes and Son 1857) (copy in WHS Library)

This raised £82,000. Of this £39,000 went to the Chapel Fund, £7,000 to the new Kingswood School building, £5,000 to the Kingswood and Woodhouse Grove schools funds, £11,000 to the Contingent Fund, £5,000 to the Worn Out Ministers Fund, £6,000 to Property, the Defence Fund etc. Lists are by circuit. Some gifts list individual families eg the Grooms of Wellington, Shropshire, but not many. James Heald and John D. Burton were the Treasurers and the Manchester District raised much more than any other i.e. £15,000, then London with £10,000, Leeds £5,000, Halifax £5,000.

3. *Report of the Jubilee Fund of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society 1863-8* (1869).

This has a Report of 55 pages, followed by 157 pages, very closely printed, of donations by District, Circuit and sometimes church, with donations by individuals listed. In terms of Districts, the Manchester and Bolton District was the most generous despite the Cotton Famine of the period, giving nearly £32,000, well in front of London's £19,000 and Liverpool's £18,000. £7,000 was received from Overseas Districts, most with long lists of individuals and their gifts. Thus in Cape Coast Circuit it is recorded that Mrs. Rebecca Freeman gave £1 10 shillings '...and in memory of two children in heaven and of her aged father Insaidoo, who embraced the Gospel in his last sickness' This looks like the famous missionary Thomas Birch Freeman's third (African) wife. There is a Mr. and Mrs. J.M. Insaidoo who give £1 -5 shillings in the neighbouring Anamabu Circuit, who could be related. Ireland is included (as the Hibernian Missionary Society). The total raised was £188,000, £30,000 going to pensions, £37,500 paying the Theological Institution for the transfer of Richmond to the Missionary Society (an interesting piece of financial accounting which received its reward in the late twentieth century when Richmond shut and its value went to the Missionary

² *General Report of the Wesleyan Centenary Fund* (Leeds Printed by Anthony Pickard 1844) (no author given, but Rev Francis A. West first of the five General Secretaries). No pagination. West Bromwich is in the Birmingham District.

Society not Ministerial Training) and £20,000 being a capital fund for Richmond. The Secretary, the Rev James Brocklehurst, is otherwise unknown³.

4. *Contributions to the Wesleyan Mission Fund 1868*

This is a different list from the preceding, with, for example, different bankers and is in fact the annual list printed each year at this period, given here as an example of what happened annually. As with the others, it is arranged by District, Circuit, and sometimes church. However the Mission House List itself is quite large, and generous. Whereas in the previous special list there were 40 names raising £319, in this annual list there are 3 pages made up of sums raised from individuals totalling £3,606, some sums being specifically for the Italian Mission (£484), legacies, already sizeable at £8,359, and an additional list for the Ladies Committee totalling £1385 including one legacy. The legacies give details of the deceased's address and the executors. There are large numbers of names with donations. However, unlike any of the others, there are many 'collectors' named in addition. So at Witney in the Witney Circuit it begins:

Collected by Miss Lea

Early, Mr. Charles1-1-0
Early, Mrs. C.1-1-0
Early, Miss S.V.M1-1-0
Early, Mast. C.W.1-1-0
Early, Mast. J.V1-1-0
Early, Mr. R.2-2-0
Early, Mr. H.1-1-0
Lea, Mr.1-1-0
Lea, Mrs.1-1-0
Miss Vanner.1-0-0
Small sums2-0-4

and then the next collector and her list.

In the 1863-8 list the wealthy blanketmaker Earlys had already given over £150 between them. These were therefore their regular annual contributions, at a considerably lower level. This list also includes Ireland and 'Foreign (i.e. missionary) Contributions,' including oil from the Friendly Isles (Tonga), Fiji and Rotumah to a value of £1,841-12-6. These Foreign Contributions totalled £34,000, much more than the previous

³ *Report of the Jubilee Fund of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society 1863-8* (1869, London, Wesleyan Missionary Society, printed William Clowes and Son, Secretary Rev J.D. Brocklehurst). James Brocklehurst entered in 1841 and died in 1874. His obituary (*Minutes* 1874 p23) says he worked so hard as Secretary he was exhausted and a 'period of constrained silence' followed, leading to his early death.

special collection. The overall total raised was £132,000, a very creditable amount for a single year, much more than the average for this period. It is noticeable that most industrial and wealthy areas (e.g. London, Liverpool, Manchester and Birmingham) did less well than in the 1863-8 collection. On the other hand there were many rural districts, particularly a band up the east coast (Kent, Norwich, Lincoln, York, Whitby), whose giving in 1868 compared favourably to the 1863-1868 figure. Did collection by boxes enable the farmer, fisherman, farmworker, small shopkeeper or tenant to give more? Certainly such areas often held special collections at Christmas for Missionary funds. In Whitby there were even boxes going out on many of the fishing cobbles from the town!

The 1860s were very good years for the WMMS. They had put the problems of the Disruption years behind them. Their annual income increased from c £90,000 in 1860 to over £120,000 in 1871. The real value of the 1863-8 fund was the capital provided to see them through the next period. The 1880s in particular were a period when giving was likely to decrease rather than increase, at best staying on a plateau of just over £100,000 per annum. It was only after 1900 that missionary giving was going to pass permanently the peak of 1871⁴

5. *The Report of the Wesleyan Methodist Thanksgiving Fund 1878-83*, (n.d.c,1884).

This begins with a 29 page report summarising the reasons for the collection and on what the money was spent. The 'Thanksgiving' was for the admission of laymen to the Wesleyan Conference of 1878. £293,000 was raised. £63,000 went to the Missionary Society, most to remove part of the debt. £35,000 went to the Home Mission and Education Funds again to remove part of the debt. £38,000 went to the Schools Fund to enable the reorganisation of Kingswood and Woodhouse Grove and provide a southern school for ministers' daughters (Queenswood). £33,000 went to the Theological Institution, most going to establish Handsworth College. £24,000 went to the NCHO, mostly to the establishment of the Princess Alice Orphanage near Birmingham. This is expenditure I find of particular interest, my father having served there for 20 years as Governor. £2,000 went to the building of the Wesley Memorial Church in Oxford. £40,000 went to the Fund for the Extension of Methodism in Great Britain. £10,000 went to provide 'lower middle class schools' (like Rydal). £8,000 went to help Chapel Loan Funds in Wales and Scotland. There are many smallish amounts for such causes as a manse at Unst in the Shetlands, or the 'Wesleyan Association for the Abolition of the Regulation of Vice by the State'. There are then 507 pages

⁴ *Contributions to the Wesleyan Mission Fund 1868* (no printer or editor given, nd.) Findlay, G.G. and Holdsworth, W. W. *The History of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society* (1924) I, pp185ff.

of lists of donations arranged by District, Circuit and usually Church. This includes Scotland but not Ireland. It covers the Missionary stations, but there is a less good coverage here than in 1839.

In Halifax (Wesley) Circuit at Wesley Chapel for example we find the Rothery family.

Rothery, Mr and Mrs JW	£2-2-0
Rothery, Herbert Edward	10-0
Rothery, Harold Akroyd.....	10-0
Rothery, Edgar Shaw	10-0
Rothery WO Vincent.....	10-0
Rothery E Gertrude.....	10-0
Three gathered home	£1-11-0 ⁵

6. 20th Century Fund otherwise known as the Million Guineas Fund

This was the brain child of Sir Robert Perks, the leading layman in Wesleyanism in the early twentieth century. The idea was that the million Wesleyan Methodists would give a guinea each, the richer paying for those who could not afford the payment themselves. He described it as 'a democratic appeal'. The name of everyone who gave was to be recorded (again by District, circuit, and church,) in the Historic Roll, but without the amount of money given. It was to be suitably engraved. There is no order of precedence upon it. There is nothing to indicate who the signer was or their age, or whether they were rich or poor. It was a first sign that the class ridden lists of the nineteenth century we have been describing were coming to an end.

The Historic Roll is preserved at the Methodist Central Hall, Westminster, and some of the public still go and look at it each day. This is most appropriate because much of the Million Guineas was spent by Perks on purchasing the site in Westminster and erecting the remarkable edifice which still stands there. He also wanted it to be the Headquarters of Methodist organisation and for most of the twentieth century it was. However in 1996 the new Connexional team were centralised to the more modern building of the Mission House, now Methodist Church House, on Marylebone Road, leaving the Central Hall to the worshipper, the tourist and office and other uses.⁶

The Historic Roll can still be viewed there. In addition it has now been microfilmed thanks to the work of Richard Ratcliffe and sets of the microfiche and photocopies of pages are available from the Central Hall for purchase. Further, an index of Wesleyan Chapels in the Historic Roll is now on the Central Hall web site and is downloadable in Word from www.methodist-central-hall.org.uk/history/historicrollindex.htm

⁵ *The Report of the Wesleyan Methodist Thanksgiving Fund 1878-83*, (n.d. 1884 Wesleyan Methodist Bookroom. Rev T.B.Stephenson's name appears first in the list of eight General Secretaries).

This has happened recently and is an important new tool for use. Please contact the Westminster Central Hall Visitor Services at <www.c-h-w.com>.

In Ireland there was a similar Fund of 50,000 guineas inaugurated by the 1898 Conference. By 1904 £52,000 had been received. £15,000 was spent on Home Missions, £18,000 on Chapel Extension Funds for Belfast and Dublin, £7000 on Education and Orphanages. The subscribers to the Fund in Ireland also signed a Roll which was laid up in the strong room of the Conference.

This list was never printed separately, but lists of donors appear in the *Irish Christian Advocate*.⁷

7. *Report of the Centenary Fund of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society 1911-1913 (1914)*

This begins with a report of 26 pages explaining why the money was raised, to celebrate the centenary of the formation of the Society in Leeds in 1813. It also explains how the money was raised, with promise forms in the hymn sheets at the original fund raising meetings in 1911 headed 'not grudgingly...' The noted evangelist 'Gipsy' Smith, accompanied by the Rev William Goudie, a former missionary in India who was Missionary Secretary, travelled the country holding meetings in February 1913.

This is followed by 297 pages of lists of donations by District, Circuit and (usually) church. It has no donations by individuals, so is less use than the others, though the relative strength of different churches at this point can be estimated. The total raised was £284,000, with Liverpool, where the scheme was launched, well away as the most generous District contributing £21,000, compared to the second District (London 2nd) £15,000.

£153,000 of this was invested, a wise policy in view of the financial difficulties about to hit all missionary societies as they entered a period of war and economic depression. From the historians' point of view it is interesting to note that £1,138 was spent on preparing the eventual Findlay and Holdsworth *History of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society*.⁸

8. *Irish Methodist Funds*

⁶ *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* 1900, Vickers, JA (ed) *Dictionary of Methodism in Britain and Ireland* sub Perks, Twentieth Century Fund, F.R. Smith *The Making of the Million* (1899). See also *Wesleyan Methodist Twentieth Century Fund; A Million Guineas from a Million Methodists* (nd 35pp).

⁷ A McCrea *Irish Methodism in the 20th Century; A Symposium* (1931), pp.152-7. R Lee Cole *History of Methodism in Ireland 1860-1960* (1960) pp.74-76. There is no information about the current whereabouts of the Irish Roll.

In 1801 the British Conference refused to pay the Irish Conference debts. This led to a long period of debt for the Irish Conference, partly alleviated by levies on the (poorly paid) preachers, which raised over £9,000 between 1805 and 1828. In 1829 the total debt of £8000 was paid off, largely because of an appeal throughout Ireland which raised £7,203, £5,323 coming from lay 'friends.'

In 1880 an Irish Methodist Thanksgiving Fund was launched to raise £20,000. This was to be used to reduce the debt on Wesley College Dublin, for the Home Mission Fund, to create a fund to educate ministers' daughters, and other smaller causes. This, planned to be complete by 1884 in parallel with the British Fund, was not actually completed till 1887. That same year the Victoria Jubilee Fund was launched to raise £10,000 for the education of ministers' daughters by 1889 and for Wesley College Dublin. No separately printed lists of donors are known for either of these, though Sir William McArthur was a leading light, and one Treasurer was Mr T.F. Shillington. However lists of Irish donors for these and the Twentieth Century Fund appeared in the *Christian Advocate*.⁹

Non Wesleyan lists.

9. Primitive Methodists

In 1860 the Primitive Methodists held a Jubilee Fund. This produced a printed Report of the Primitive Methodist Jubilee Fund in 1865, raising £4,728¹⁰. There was a similar Twentieth Century Fund among the Primitive Methodists, which started in 1892. Sir William Hartley backed this, gave much money towards it and much went to Hartley College in Manchester. It raised £50,000 by 1900, of which Hartley provided £7,500. Though the details of what was spent are there in the accounts, the amounts raised lack the detail of the Wesleyan lists. The money was equally divided between the Church Extension Fund to pay off Chapel debts, the College Fund to extend Hartley College in Manchester, the Missionary Fund, and the Superannuated Ministers Widows and Orphans Fund. The money raised was substantial when we realise that

⁸ *Report of the Centenary Fund of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society 1911-1913* (Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, London, printed Wilsons 1914, no authors given but presumably Rev William Goudie and the lay Secretary, Stanley Sowton). The School of African and Oriental Studies Library (soas.ac.uk) has a complete list of publications about the Centenary eg *Centenary Fund. Report on grants made up to...1917* (40pp c 1917).

⁹ I am indebted for this section to much information from the Revd Robin Roddie of the Irish branch of the Wesley Historical Society. In 1899 and 1900 for example the *Irish Christian Advocate* had lists each week of the amounts contributed. Smith *History of Wesleyan Methodism in Ireland* (1830) pp174-8, *Irish Minutes* 1829, 1880 pp67f, 1887, pp67.

¹⁰ S.G.Hatcher *A Primitive Methodist Bibliography* (1980) R13.

the total money raised by Primitive Methodism for Foreign Missions in the year 1903-4 was only £16,000.¹¹

10. *Bible Christian Twentieth Century Fund*

No completed bound volumes are known to have survived.¹²

11. *Methodist New Connexion Centenary Commemoration Fund 1894-1898*

There was an earlier Jubilee Fund of 1848, but no lists of donors or donations have survived. The 1898 list, had begun in 1894 with spontaneous promises of £11,500 and was sometimes bound up with the *MNC Magazine*. In the end much more was raised, but most of it (£126,000) for local Funds. From the Connexional £10,000 raised, the privilege of joining the Local Preachers' Mutual Aid Association was gained for all the Methodist New Connexion Local Preachers by the payment of £1,500.

George Packer, the Secretary, was a leading minister, who from 1897 held the position of Overseas Missionary Secretary. He was President in 1895 and was to be President of the United Methodist Church in 1911, in which church he was to hold the key position of Secretary of the Conference from Union in 1907 to 1919. The 75 pages of lists of donors were arranged by District, Circuit and Church, but they do not have families shown together giving different amounts, or amounts given in memory of the dead. It is therefore less use than the Wesleyan lists for genealogical purposes.¹³

The MNC produced very useful lists of donors to Overseas Missions each year, arranged by District, Circuit and Chapel. I have consulted one for 1872/3 in the Bridwell Library, SMU, Dallas, USA.

12. *The United Methodist Free Churches*

In 1882 the UMFC held a celebration of their foundation in 1857, when the Wesleyan Reform Churches had joined with the Wesleyan Methodist Association. They called this their 'Silver Wedding' and hoped to raise £30,000 in this, 'Commemorative Fund.'¹⁴ By 1898 they had raised this.

¹¹ Kendall, H.B. *History of the Primitive Methodist Church* (nd c 1905) IIp533, *Primitive Methodist Minutes* 1904pp 152-3.

¹² R.F.S.Thorne *The History of Religion in South West England The Bible Christians 1815-1907* (1989 R. Thorne, Ottery St Mary, Devon) p 20.

¹³ *Methodist New Connexion Centenary Commemoration Fund 1894-1898* (ed (Rev)G(eorge) P(acker) nd c 1898, printed J.S.Newsome, Batley), O.A.Beckerlegge *United Methodist Ministers And Their Circuits (1968)* and information from E. Alan Rose.

£8,739 went to local purposes, £5,000 each to the Mission Fund and Superannuation, £2,550 to the London Extension Fund, £1,911 each to Chapel Relief and Chapel Loan, £1,272 each to the Theological Institution and Ashville College. In 1891 they decided to start a Wesley Memorial Fund to celebrate the Centenary of Wesley's death by raising £15,000 for 'Aggressive Christian Work' by which they meant the kind of Missions that Hugh Price Hughes and the Forward Movement were leading among the Wesleyans. 'Unfortunately' (as Askew put it) this 'laudable enterprise was sandwiched' between the Commemorative Fund and the £20,000 Endowment Fund for the Theological Institute which was started in 1893. As a result it had only raised £8,578 by 1898. Of this £4,000 went to Foreign Missions, mostly Sierra Leone, and £3,000 to Home Missions with £832 going to Chapel Relief.¹⁵ Neither of these funds have lists of donors printed.

Copies of the different lists, though important, are often difficult to find and only some are in Methodist libraries, such as the Rylands and SOAS. I am conscious therefore that there is more to be discovered. If any reader has further knowledge of these lists I would be interested to hear it.

JOHN H LENTON

¹⁴ Kirsop, J. *Historic Sketches of Free Methodism* (1885) pp69- 77

¹⁵ Askew E. *The Free Methodist Manual* (1898) pp215-6, 217 -8

Harry Heap's Joyful News: the inspirational life of William Harry Heap, Methodist minister and communicator by David Lazell, (The Author, East Leake, 2005. pp63(2) available at £5.00 including p&p from David Lazell, 23 Carlton Crescent, East Leake, Loughborough, LE12 6JF)

W.H. Heap, later the editor of the *Joyful News*, was one of a number of Wesleyans whose ministry was particularly associated with its central missions, in his case Manchester & Salford, Huddersfield and Hull, before being appointed East Anglia District Missioner, 1924-1937; his own roots were in what would become the Bradford Mission. This booklet is essentially a collection of memories which convey something of the nature of Heap's ministry in a society far removed from today's. A brief introductory essay outlining Heap's life would have been helpful to set the context of these reminiscences and the significance of such increasingly forgotten names as Kenneth Hulbert and William Wallace could have been brought out by the use of biographical footnotes. Nevertheless, minor criticisms apart, to have an account of one of Wesleyan Methodism's once popular missionaries is most welcome and the author is to be congratulated on his initiative in writing and publishing this booklet.

D COLIN DEWS

THE WHITEHEAD CONTROVERSY: A PROVINCIAL VIEW

One of the earliest documents recording Norfolk Methodism in the County Record Office is a vellum-bound book. It is inscribed in copper-plate handwriting on the front cover 'The Lists of the Societys of the Norwich Circuit.' Below, in different writing, there are several words of which only 'Yarmouth' and 'Circuit' can be made out. In a third hand 'Yarmouth' is written again.¹

The book spans the years 1785 to 1797. It is clearly the circuit book, with annual entries made by the different senior itinerant ministers. It contains their names, as well as the local preachers and class members in the different societies year by year with their occupations and places of abode, as well as various comments and observations. It also contains interesting information concerning the writing of the official biography of John Wesley.

In the summer of 1792, Conference ordered that the Yarmouth circuit should be carved out of the large Norwich circuit. Immediately prior to this Conference meeting, the itinerant preacher had noted the names of the members and their societies in the extreme east of south Norfolk and north Suffolk only, with the note - 'N .B. as the Circuits are likely to be divided this year, I have rather chose to set down the People in two separate Books. A few of the forementioned places I have not lately been at consequently there may be more attention. But I have set them down as near as I could.'² Thereafter the book was used for the Yarmouth circuit only.

Who wrote this list of members in July 1792 and the information about the division of the circuit? The senior itinerant preacher in the Norwich circuit at that time was John Reynolds. He had been stationed in the circuit since the Conference of 1790 and left at the end of July 1792. The three other preachers stationed in the Norwich circuit in 1791-2 were Thomas Simmonite, John Wilshaw and Isaac Lilly, all of whom were on trial and so unlikely to have been charged with keeping the circuit book.

At the back of the book, two letters have been transcribed. The book has been reversed so that they appear as the first entries. These letters are in the same hand as the 1792 lists of members so, presumably, they were written by John Reynolds, too. The entries which immediately follow the letters are dated 1794 and are written in a different hand from the letters.

These letters look like rough drafts for there are a number of crossings out of words and phrases and substitutes added. It would seem that the author felt they were important enough for him to want a copy kept and for the copy to be kept in the circuit book although no other letters are

¹ Norfolk Record Office, FC16/1

² Ibid.

transcribed into this book. Did this happen so that others might see his point of view and the advice he gave? Was it so that his opinion might be officially recorded? Might it be a way of making sure that in future he could prove which side he had supported? Perhaps he viewed the matter as so important that he wished his part to be clear.

The letters are as follows.

I

'Dear Sir.

Having receiv'd two printed letters fr. you and likewise two fr. the preachers In London, and having maturely weigh'd the contents of both, In compliance with your request I take the opportunity of writing you my sentiments. I shall not attempt to go through the whole as that would take up much time, I shall only make some remarks upon those particulars which appear to me to be the most weighty - you blame the preachers for "violating a principle held sacred by all men of honour and conscience (viz.) publishing a private correspondence." To violate the rules of friendship [crossed out] In whatever right others may look upon what passed betwixt the parties concerned, I confess I do not look upon it to be a private correspondence, but an affair which concerns the whole connection, at least every preacher that [crossed out] who has travel'd five years and the committees declair that they were acting for the conference how then can that be considered as a private correspondence, which every preacher in connection has a right to be acquainted with? - I always understood that the Book was to have been printed and sold for the purpose which all our other books are printed and sold for and am sorry that any dispute should arise- [crossed out] happen concerning the copyright, I think if you had submitted to have had the manuscript read over according to the proposal made, there would have been no essential alteration made, and I would hope none contrary to your judgement, but the fear of consequences which in all probability would never have followed seems to have been the chief cause of your refusing to accede to it - I was entirely ignorant of any dispute betwixt you and the committee till I receiv'd the first printed letter of Octr 31 --- [illegible crossing out] and as it was sign'd by men of whose veracity and piety I have a very high opinion, I did not doubt of [crossed out] the truth of it and believe still, they have not wilfully misrepresented any one article - I am entirely ignorant of any party in London whose design was to prejudice you against the preachers or the preachers against you. If this was the design it seems to have succeeded but too well on your part, as the invectives you have thrown out against the Preachers' evidence that your mind was at yt time prejudiced. Thus I have written my sentiments freely upon what I at first intended. You beg the advice of the preachers upon the whole I confess myself inadequate to so important a task as to advise those who are —[illegible crossings out] much wiser than

myself but as you request it I will do it in the best manner I am able - If you intend to publish before conference Would it not be well for you once more to try if you cannot accommodate matters with the Committee by proposing to read the manuscript over to them and to submit it to their judgement, provided that [crossed out] they do not alter any part without your consent; - But if matters cannot be thus accommodated betwixt you and them would it not be most prudent for both you and Dr C. and Mr M. to defer the publication till after the Conference has met. To persist in opposition to each other at this time in my opinion would be productive of much hurt both to the sale of the Books and the cause of God which latter ought to be considered before any other thing. What will the [crossed out] world think of us if we bite and devour one another. that the Lord may heal every breach and unite us all in the bonds of Brotherly affection is the prayer of

Yours etc ,

II

'My dr Bro.

I am very sorry that such a disagreeable circumstance has happened between you [crossed out] the preachers in London and Dr Whitehead - I have receiv'd the Letters and maturely weighed their contents. It appears to me that too hasty a step has been taken in appointing Dr Coke and Mr Moore to write the life of Mr Wesley without informing the preachers in the Country had they been informed might [crossed out] The Committees of the Districts might have met and given their judgement upon so important a matter which might have prevented some disagreeable consequences which [crossed out] that are now likely to follow - For in the first place the Doctor has the Manuscripts in his hands, as well as other papers which will enable him to write the life of Mr Wesley in a more compleat manner than it's possible for them to write it not having those helps. In the second place, his work will I suppose be patronized by the executors which will contribute very much to the sale of it, especially in Town and consequently will hurt the sale of ours. But the worst consequence will be unhappy division which it is likely to cause both among preachers and people and perhaps who [crossed out] you are not insensible that many of the preachers are attach'd to Dr Whitehead and perhaps some who were not consulted upon the business till the first printed letter was circulated, and who perhaps may look upon themselves to be aggriev'd on that account, will not this induce them to recommend the Drs Book, and consequently to neglect the other I can truly say I wish for those steps to be taken which will be for the peace of the Church and the glory of God I have no partiality to the Dr having never exchange' d a word with him in my life, I have written to him and have given him my sentiments freely so far as I was capable of judging - The advice that I have given him I would recommend to the committee (viz.) either in an amicable manner to come to an agreement,

or else not to publish the Book till after the conference has determined upon it - Believe me I am still (as ever) attach'd to the Methodist cause and shall always account myself happy in subscribing myself

Yours etc ,

A first glance at the letters does not state to whom they were written. However, there are clues within the texts which are helpful.

The letters obviously relate to each other. The first is a response to one sent by someone who is engaged in writing a biography of John Wesley and who is wanting to publish it quickly. This suggests that it is likely to be John Hampson or John Whitehead or Thomas Coke and Henry Moore, all of whom were early biographers of Wesley. In the first letter, Reynolds refers to 'you and Dr C. and Mr M.' so clearly the last two can be ruled out. Moreover, the writer contrasts the recipient of the letter with 'the preachers' so it would appear that he was not one of their number.

Whitehead had ceased his itinerancy in 1769 and Hampson had resigned from the Connexion in 1785. Hampson, however, had already composed most of his biography in Wesley's lifetime, publishing one volume before Wesley's death with the second and third volumes published in June 1791, only three months after Wesley's death.³ It had not been officially sanctioned by John Wesley or by Conference. It would seem, then, that the recipient of the first letter must be John Whitehead.

The second letter which is written to another person begins 'My dr Bro.' and is different in its tone. It refers to differences of opinion between the preachers in London and Dr Whitehead and suggests that Whitehead may be the better man to write Wesley's biography. It goes on to say that he, the writer, has never met Whitehead although he has written to him giving him his views. Perhaps that points to the recipient of the first letter being John Whitehead and the fact that they had never met would explain the formal address compared with the recipient of the second letter who is addressed more warmly.

For a time, John Whitehead was one of the body of itinerant preachers. Subsequently, he became a physician. Indeed, in January 1785, John Wesley had written of him, 'If he lives some years, I expect he will be one of the most eminent physicians in Europe.'⁴ He had attended both Charles and John Wesley during their final illnesses and had been present at John's deathbed. In his will, John Wesley had bequeathed his manuscripts to John Whitehead, Thomas Coke and Henry Moore 'to be burned or published as they see good.'⁵

After Wesley's death, Whitehead was requested by the Book Committee to compose a biography on behalf of the Connexion. Coke and

³ *The Memoirs of John Wesley*, John Hampson, 3 vols, (1791)

⁴ *Standard Journal* ed. Nehemiah Curnock, (1909), vol.viii, p.342-4

⁵ *Ibid*, vol. viii, p.342-4

Moore, busy in their circuits and out of London, were ready to allow Whitehead sole possession of the necessary manuscripts, but when Whitehead appeared to be making unwarranted financial stipulations about the publication, insisting on retaining the copyright, refusing to relinquish the manuscripts until his biography was complete and declining to submit his work for criticism before its publication, the Book Committee withdrew its support.

Instead, Coke and Moore rushed to produce their own biography of Wesley although they lacked the benefit of the relevant manuscripts still retained by Whitehead whose own first volume did not appear until 1793 and the second in 1796.⁶

A pamphlet campaign was waged by both sides during the dispute. It appears that the protagonists were attempting to attract support for their cause from the preachers in the provinces. For Whitehead, not only was his personal prestige as the author of the official biography of John Wesley at stake, but also the financial benefit he would receive from the royalties produced by the sale of the publication. Coke and Moore, for their part, wished to secure the finances generated by the project for the customary connexional purposes - which Whitehead capitulated and agreed to in his pamphlet of 1792 - *A Defence or True Narrative of the Origin and Progress of the Difference between Dr Coke, Mr Moore, Mr Rogers and Dr Whitehead*. They also wanted to ensure that Whitehead's biography should be carefully scrutinised before its publication in order to remove any criticism of John Wesley. That, Whitehead was not prepared to allow, fearing that what he had to say might be censured. Indeed, his fears were borne out when his work was reprinted in Dublin in 1806 and a number of his criticisms of Wesley were removed.

So, what attitude is taken by the Norwich preacher in the first letter in reply to the one which appears to be from Whitehead? He is conciliatory but firm. He encourages Whitehead not to be suspicious of those he sees as his opponents and to believe in their good faith. He says, 'You beg the advice of the preachers' so Reynolds is not the only person whose support is being canvassed. He advises Whitehead to allow his manuscript to be assessed and to consider modifications which might be suggested. In the last resort, he recommends that all parties refrain from any precipitate action.

His second letter is more supportive of Whitehead. It appears to have been written to a fellow itinerant preacher close to the heart of the dispute for he regrets the conflict between Dr Whitehead and 'you, , a word which

⁶ John Whitehead, *The Life of John Wesley*, 2 vols, (1793 & 1796)

has been crossed out and replaced by 'the preachers in London.' It might also explain the greeting, 'My dr Bro.'⁷

He also appears to reveal where his support lay. Although acknowledging that with the manuscripts Whitehead would be able to write a more complete biography, yet he allies himself with the other party, describing a book written by Coke and Moore as 'ours.'

The letters with their interesting contents raise a number of questions. Not least is that relating to how much support was there amongst the laity, the local preachers and the itinerant preachers for Whitehead and how much for Coke and Moore? Such a direct assessment is almost impossible to determine on the basis of the biography quarrel alone for the matter was compounded by the numerous issues which beset Methodism at this time. Each of these groups was divided amongst itself and was far from being of one mind on any of these problems.

The laity

In spite of John Pawson's assertion that Joseph Bradford, an itinerant preacher in the metropolis at that time, had told him 'Even in London, very few of the people take Whitehead's part,' and that those who did so were a troublesome minority who had supported the itinerant preacher, John Atlay, in a separate dispute 'against the whole Connection,'⁸ Whitehead appears to have received considerable backing from the trustees of City Road chapel. Further support came, according to Henry Moore, from 'a few persons, but of considerable influence'⁹ who felt that the executors of Wesley's will had been treated in a cavalier manner by the preachers. Moore says that their resentment 'spread from those who had first entertained it to their intimate friends, relatives and dependents.'¹⁰ These were people, Moore claimed, who supported Whitehead in his capacity as a physician and to whom Wesley had recommended him.

As the dispute between Whitehead on the one hand and Coke and Moore on the other gathered pace, a committee was formed in November 1791 to support Whitehead. It consisted of about thirty laymen and included the three who had been appointed as the executors of John

⁷ Henry Rack suggests the recipient of this letter may well be James Rogers who seems to have been the main spokesman of the opponents of Whitehead. I am very grateful for the generous advice and help of Dr Rack in the preparation of this article.

⁸ John C. Bowmer & John A. Vickers, eds *The Letters of John Pawson*, (1994), vol. i, p.112

⁹ 'A Plain Account of the Conduct of Dr Whitehead Respecting Mr Wesley's Manuscripts etc In Reply to what the Doctor has Published on that Subject, by Henry Moore, published in *Faithful Unto Death: Last Years and Legacy of John Wesley*, by Richard Heitzenrater, (1991), p.85-124

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.99

Wesley's will. This committee published a document in May 1792 in support of Whitehead's authorship of the official biography of Wesley. It refuted the accusation that Whitehead was motivated by monetary gain and explained his insistence on the retention of copyright was to secure his book against possible modification or censure.

It may well be that much of the lay support given to Whitehead was by people who resented the power of the preachers and who feared an increase in those powers now that John Wesley was no longer in control of the Connexion. Other issues such as the management of the stock of books, clerical mastery of Conference, ordination and the sacramental dispute may also have increased lay championship of Whitehead.

Outside London, lay support for the contending parties is far more difficult to identify. In general, the evidence has simply not yet been found. However, in a letter to Richard Rodda of 8 February 1792, William Thompson, the first President of Conference following John Wesley's death and then stationed in Wakefield, mentioned 'Holy women in different places, who were attached to the Dr and, therefore, said and reported many unjust things of the preachers in general. '11 Conversely, he claimed in the same letter, 'Dr Whitehead has not got one subscriber in my circuit,' but were potential buyers of Whitehead's biography in Thompson's Wakefield circuit given any chance to subscribe?

The local preachers

Whitehead, a local preacher, was, at least initially, supported by his fellow local preachers in London.¹² However, Moore, in his account of the dispute, wrote, 'The local preachers in London, a very respectable body of men to the number of nearly forty, with only one dissenting voice, resolved that Dr Whitehead should not be considered as one of their body nor preach among them until he consented to fulfil Mr Wesley's will respecting these manuscripts.'¹³ This decision was taken at the Quarterly meeting held on the 9 December 1791. Although Whitehead saw this as a direct and hostile manoeuvre of Thomas Coke, it demonstrated Coke's influence that he was able to persuade or press those local preachers who attended the meeting to agree to his proposal and change the allegiance they felt to one of their number. Coke's reputation was that of an intriguer, but to have secured a change of heart from all but one of the local preachers was a remarkable feat in view of the tension which existed at that time between itinerant preachers who were evolving into ministers and were in sole control of Conference on the one side and the local

¹¹ Rupert Davies, A. Raymond George & Gordon Rupp, eds, *A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain*, 1986 vol. iv, p.248

¹² Heitzenrater, op. cit., p.30

¹³ *Ibid.*, p.113

preachers and laity on the other .

Whitehead's account of that Quarterly meeting was somewhat different from that of Moore. The doctor claimed that 'a false charge' was made against him by Coke and Moore and another itinerant, James Rogers, 'without giving him any notice of their intention to accuse him.' He went on, 'Dr Coke, contrary to the intention of that meeting, expelled Dr Whitehead from the pulpit....saying many things injurious to Dr W. [sic] and tending to inflame the minds of the people which he knew to be false.'¹⁴

No evidence has yet been found as to the opinions held by local preachers outside the metropolis.

The itinerant preachers

The attitude of a number of the itinerant preachers appears to demonstrate that, on the whole, they sided with Coke and Moore in the dispute and were opposed to Whitehead.

Those members of the committee appointed by Conference to determine what material should be printed by the Book Room and who were also preachers, stood firmly behind Coke and Moore. Originally, they had been fully in favour of a biography written by Whitehead, but disliking the stand he had taken, they relinquished their support for him and in the autumn of 1791, they transferred their support to Coke and Moore and invited them to write the official biography. Amongst them, James Creighton had assisted at the ordination of Thomas Coke by John Wesley in 1784; the others appointed were Coke himself, Peard Dickenson, James Rogers, Richard Rodda and Joseph Bradford. This committee, which also included George Whitfield, the Connexional book agent, made no progress in its negotiations with the representatives of Whitehead when they met to negotiate a settlement in October 1791.

Although it might be argued that Whitehead had a case for receiving a fee for his work and recompense for his expenses - and from James Rogers' account, this point was agreed to early on - Whitehead does give the impression that he is repeatedly raising his demands. Moreover, Reynolds' remark that he had always understood the biography would be published for the same purposes as all other books published by the Connexion, that is, to benefit the preachers' retirement fund, reflected the instinctive distaste the preachers felt for Whitehead's apparent profiteering.

¹⁴ John Whitehead, *Defence of a True Narrative....*, (1792), p.9-10

In contrast, Thomas Lee, an elderly itinerant preacher, discussed the quarrel in a pamphlet published in July 1792. He took a stance which was critical of Coke, believing that Coke's exercise of power was an on-going threat to harmony within the Connexion. In general, he supported Whitehead's position as expressed in his first pamphlet *A True Narrative...*¹⁵

John Reynolds, in the circuit book letters, complained about the lack of consultation. He suggested that if an attempt had been made to give the provincial preachers the opportunity to discuss the disagreement and then to consider the appointment of Coke and Moore as the official biographers, much of the ensuing bad feeling and rivalry might have been avoided and the dispute peaceably resolved. He pointed out that many of the preachers were kindly disposed towards John Whitehead and might feel themselves aggrieved at not having been allowed to debate the matter before the printed letters were received.

Further evidence of support for Whitehead amongst the itinerant preachers comes from William Thompson who, in a letter to Richard Rodda in February 1792, complained, 'I am sorry to say that some of our preachers have been so foolish as to give me a good deal of trouble "on his account" [that is, Whitehead] to keep them quiet, but hope they are now pretty well satisfied.' He claimed that Whitehead's behaviour in retaining the Wesley manuscripts and making demands about the finances has 'stopped their mouths at present.'¹⁶

Two months earlier, in December 1791, John Pawson in Halifax, had reluctantly taken an anti-Whitehead stance. He wrote to Joseph Benson about 'this most unhappy breach.' He felt that Whitehead, for whom he 'always had a very great regard' is the more culpable party and 'very much to blame....His last printed letter displeased me very much as there seemed an evident design to divide us.'¹⁷

Pawson urged Benson to write to Coke or Moore or to both of them to express his views and says that he himself has written to Whitehead, although he had received no reply. Like John Reynolds, he also 'answered his last printed letter and desired him not so easily to suspect our friends of having....bad designs. I desired him to go to them and endeavour to settle the matter in a loving and brotherly way and if he could not come to a good agreement with them, then I told him that if I was in his place, I would write no Life at all, as he might be sure that our Preachers would

¹⁵ Heitzenrater, op. cit., p.34

¹⁶ Davies, George & Rupp, op. cit., vol.iv, p.247-8

¹⁷ Bowmer & Vickers, op. cit., vol. i, p.111

only sell the Life as published by our own friends.’¹⁸

It would appear, then, from the evidence of both Pawson and Reynolds, that in the late autumn of 1791, several months before the pamphlet war began, John Whitehead was sending printed letters to the itinerant preachers relative to the dispute. This, therefore, would date the letters in the Norwich and Yarmouth circuit book to this part of the year. It also appears that some of the preachers were writing replies to these letters to express their feelings whilst also writing to each other about the matter .

Yet, according to Henry Moore in his account of the dispute, the first circular letters were sent round to the itinerant preachers not by Whitehead, but by the trustees of Wesley’s will in collaboration with the members of the Book Committee. They explained the action they had taken in transferring their request for a life of John Wesley from Whitehead to Coke and Moore. Moore claimed that ‘this was well received and we soon had abundant encouragement to proceed.’¹⁹

According to Moore,

The Doctor now changed his ground. Instead of the deep contempt which he had expressed for the preachers, to our great surprise, he appealed also to them by circular letters! He apologised for the expressions he had used respecting them, declaring that he had been betrayed into them by designing men who had laid a snare for him ! He strove to prejudice their minds against those who had treated with him in London; offered them large allowance if they would recommend and dispose of his book; protested that *money never had been his object* (though he could not but know that his letters to the committee would demonstrate the contrary); said he would give up the whole of the profits ‘*if they desired it....*’²⁰

This was, presumably, the letter to which John Reynolds was responding. Yet Whitehead, in appealing to the preachers, was doing no more than following the example of his adversaries.

Publication

With enormous speed, Coke and Moore composed and published their biography of John Wesley in April 1792. As Whitehead still retained possession of Wesley’s documents, they were forced to rely for their information on their memories of the contents of those manuscripts when they had been in Wesley’s own hands at City Road. They also used the material contained in John Wesley’s journals as well as their own personal

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p.111

¹⁹ Heitzenrater, *op. cit.*, p.111

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p.III-2

memories of Wesley in later life and of his part in significant events and actions.

Within the first six weeks, 10,000 copies had been sold, with a second edition printed in time for the London Conference in July 1792. With such sales, it was inevitable that any profits which Whitehead might have expected from his publication were savagely undercut. Even after this publication, printed pamphlets were circulated by the protagonists and their supporters for several more months. Henry Moore's lengthy account of the dispute was not published. Perhaps the writing of it was sufficiently cathartic for him not to feel that publication was essential.

Following the appearance of Whitehead's second biographical volume in 1796, a reconciliation seems to have been effected. In 1797, he was reinstated as a local preacher after relinquishing the disputed manuscripts²¹ and in the following year, Whitehead's suggestion for an inscription for the Wesley memorial in City Road chapel was readily accepted. On his death in 1804, his funeral was attended by crowds of people.

The Norfolk letters illustrate the views of an itinerant preacher far from the London scene concerning a sharp and bitter quarrel within Methodism. It was a controversy which had implications far beyond the actual dispute about the biography of John Wesley. Do any similar letters exist in other regional archives?

NORMA VIRGOE

²¹ Once Whitehead had given up the Wesley manuscripts, Henry Moore became exceedingly possessive of them. This may simply have been the result of his experience with Whitehead, but he may also have wished to keep them to facilitate his own biography of Wesley which was published in 1824-5. He certainly stopped Adam Clarke's projected biography of Wesley by refusing him access to the manuscripts.

INDEXING WESLEY'S JOURNAL AND DIARIES

At long last the new edition of John Wesley's Journal and Diaries is complete, after what must to many have seemed an inordinate delay between volume 6 and the final volume. Much of the delay may be blamed on the fact that the latter included a general index which took many months to complete, even though draft indexes to the earlier volumes had been prepared as each one appeared. A complex index of the length required by such a seven-volume work as this requires extensive checking and editing in the closing stages, and all concerned were determined that the indexing should be worthy of both the text and the high standard of editing. That volume 7 has now been available since early in 2003 may come as a surprise to many, in the absence of either effective publicity or serious reviews in Britain. (Things are maybe different in the States.) What follows is no more than the musings and jottings of the compiler of the General Index which accompanies an extensive 'Bibliographical Index of Works Cited' and an 'Index of Scriptural References' in volume 7.

The indexing involved a great deal of consultation with Dr. Richard P. Heitzenrater in his dual capacity of General Editor of the new edition of Wesley's Works (in succession to our own Frank Baker) and editor of the Diaries themselves. Over a period of about two years e-mail enquiries and responses shuttled back and forth across the Atlantic in very considerable numbers and with the speed and efficiency that would have been impossible before the advent of electronic communication.

In one respect this index was considerably more straightforward than those compiled for earlier units in the new edition. The Journal contains very few references to theological or other abstract concepts, and the Diaries still fewer (if any). So for once they presented no great problem. Instead, it was the *complexity* of the material, rather than its profundity, that provided the main challenge. It was necessary, for example, to differentiate between several layers of material: (a) the text of the Journal, (b) the parallel text of the Diaries, (c) references in the editorial footnotes which were not explicitly mentioned in the main text, and (d) material in the list of errata at the end of volume 7, correcting what was found in the earlier volumes. This last category was dealt with by adding '[e]' to the volume and page number of the original reference.

Most of the problems arose from the intensely concentrated nature of

the Diary text. This made it arguably impossible to index, but to have shirked the task would have left readers (or, at the very least, a minority of serious students of Wesley's life) bereft of access to potentially important information. There are, nevertheless, places where the index breaks one of the golden rules of indexing by making selective and, one hopes, judicious use of 'passim'. (This occurs almost exclusively in the Georgia diaries, where Wesley is encountering some of the settlers in Savannah or Fort Frederica on a daily basis.) The alternative to 'passim' would have been unhelpfully long strings of references to more or less consecutive pages of the Diary, on each of which the person was mentioned at least once, and often several times. In dealing with this aspect of the Diaries I effectively jettisoned another sacred cow of professional indexers, by refusing to differentiate between incidental references to a person or place and more substantial ones. It is axiomatic among indexers that good indexing is not indiscriminate, but spares the reader from looking up 'trivial' or uninformative references. But, as any historian knows, the distinction is an impossible one to draw, especially when it is a primary source that is being indexed, since as much depends on the context of the reference as on its actual occurrence, and even more depends on the purpose for which the entry is being sought.

Indexing the Diary text as well as the Journal is particularly necessary because, unlike Curnock's 'Standard Journal', the new edition prints the diary text not on the same page as the parallel text of the Journal, but in a separate sequence at the end of the volume. In both editions Diary references are identified in the index by adding 'd' to the page numbers. Similarly, references found in the editorial footnotes, but not in the Journal text itself, are identified by the addition of 'n'; while '(n)' after a page number indicates a reference that is found in the Journal text, but is made explicit only by the accompanying editorial note. (Thus, the reference to John Kyrle, whom Wesley mentions merely as 'the man of Ross', is indexed as '21:296(n)').

The vast majority of index entries refer either to places or persons. Each of these categories presented its own problems. In the case of the places most frequently visited or mentioned by Wesley, another sacred cow of indexing was sacrificed on the altar of usefulness. By far the clearest example of this is the entry on London. This opens with a very long string of undifferentiated references, to serve the needs of any student wishing to work through *all* Wesley's visits to the capital. On its own, such a list would be quite useless to any reader searching for a particular visit or incident. It is therefore followed by many sub-entries drawing attention to such details as the earthquake of 1750, mobs and the

relief of poverty. Within this alphabetical sequence is a sub-section headed 'localities', under which are listed the many places within London, including parish churches, to which Wesley refers. Within this a problem presented itself in the form of references to 'the Chapel' after the opening of Wesley's 'new chapel' in the City Road in 1778. Before that it was easy to identify 'the Chapel' as the one in West Street, Seven Dials, which the Wesleys had used ever since 1743; after that, no one could be sure which of the two was referred to, so some cross-referencing was called for, together with a non-committal entry under '(the) Chapel', leaving the question open. (A similar problem arose out of Wesley's references to 'the school' and 'the schools' when he was in the Bristol area: were these the ones he established at the New Room, or the colliers' schools at Kingswood, both, of course, to be distinguished from what became known as 'Kingswood school'? It is not always easy to determine.)

Clearly, a working definition of 'London' was needed and at an early stage in the whole project, Frank Baker and I reached a decision to define it as the area north of the Thames that was already built up in Wesley's day; this left areas such as Southwark and Lambeth south of the river, and places such as Islington and Marylebone, which were still separate villages, with entries of their own; with Westminster also featuring in its own right. A list of cross-references to such places, long since swallowed up by the London sprawl, is given at the close of the 'London' entry. .

The indexing threw up an interesting detail, correcting the assumption of Sugden and others that the Long Lane to which Wesley frequently refers was the one in Southwark; but a careful examination of his movements as recorded in the Diaries makes it clear that it must have been the Long Lane that runs between Aldersgate Street and West Smithfield, i.e. not far from the Foundry. There *was* a later Wesleyan chapel in Long Lane, Southwark, but not until the early nineteenth century.

It was necessary to distinguish Newington in Southwark from Newington Green and Stoke Newington to the north of the City, even though Wesley himself had not done so in every case. Similarly, because some place-names occur several times in various parts of the country, it was necessary to be on the alert for this and to distinguish between, for example, Newport (Glos.), Newport (IOW), Newport (Mayo), Newport (Mon.), Newport (Pembs.) and Newport (Salop). The initial decision to adopt the recent county changes was soon abandoned as it became clear that the situation remained unstable and subject to further tinkering, so

that the only safe course was to revert to the county boundaries of Wesley's own time.

A further hazard lay in the fact that some of the footnotes had been drafted in America by someone with limited knowledge of British topography. Thus to note, under the date 7 April 1743, that Sand Hutton is 'a small chapelry in the parish of Thirsk' and that 'Wesley always spells the name "Sandhutton"' is to miss the point that Wesley's spelling is the correct one, distinguishing his destination that day from an entirely different Sand Hutton near Stamford Bridge. The 'new house at Melcombe' in which Wesley preached on 6 September 1776 was at Melcombe Regis, now part of Weymouth, Dorset, not the tiny hamlets of 'Melcombe Bingham', 'Higher Melcombe' or 'Melcombe Horsey' to which the footnote at 23:31 erroneously refers. Again, the Winterbourne at which he preached on leaving Salisbury for London on 6 September 1750 was Winterbourne Earls, where from quite early on there was a group of Methodists connected with the Salisbury society - not the remote hamlet in Berkshire wrongly named in the footnote. Sometimes Wesley himself is the source of such errors, as when he refers to visits to Llandeilo near Carmarthen, but spells it 'Llandilo', which is a different place some miles to the west. Such problems of identification could be multiplied, the most problematic of all occurring in Ireland; notably the fact that the Pallas, Pallaskerry and Newmarket were all names for the same village in County Limerick, where Wesley visited the Palatine settlement on various occasions. Since there are several other places named 'Pallas' and at least three different 'Newmarkets' in Ireland, the indexer would have been entirely at sea at this point but for the expert advice of the Rev. Robin Roddie.

Personal references offered rather fewer problems, though once again it was the Diary text that threw up most of the queries, as when Wesley gives only a surname, with no first name. Among the early settlers in Savannah, Mr. and Mrs. Dean and Mr. and Mrs. Dearn proved to be different couples, for whom Dr. Heitzenrater was able to provide first names from his encyclopaedic knowledge. Similarly 'Anton' could confidently be identified as Anton Seifert, especially as he was always found in association with his fellow Moravian Johann Toltschig. It seemed reasonable to assume that Mr. and Mrs. Jones of Bristol were not the same people as the Mr. and Mrs. Jones in London. On the other hand, Mr. and Mrs. Ball of London may well have been the same couple throughout the period covered by the diaries, even though there are no references to them between 1741 and 1783: a Mr. Ball was one of the original members of the Foundery society and the gap may simply reflect

the fact of the missing volumes of the diary covering that period. Whether the 'Mrs. Lieuliet' whom Wesley met at the Hague was the same (or related to) the 'Sister Lieuliet' who turns up in Rotterdam a few days later remains an unanswered question. But it serves to raise the further question of the significance in Wesley's mind of the difference between 'Mrs.' and 'Sister'. I reached the tentative conclusion that 'Sister' may have implied membership of the local Methodist society; but it may denote no more than a degree of intimacy in the relationship, or perhaps been used of single rather than married women.

The 'letter from Yorkshire' which Wesley quotes in the Journal under 4 August 1746 can hardly have been from Henry Thornton as the footnote says, since he was not born until 1760, but may well have been from his father John and is indexed as such. It was possible, often with the help of local knowledge provided by correspondents, to identify by name some of the persons mentioned only by their title in the Journal; e.g. the Rev. Jacob Mould of Pebworth in Worcestershire (Journal, 18 March 1768). But other tantalisingly elusive allusions remain. Someone referred to simply as 'John' in the Georgia diaries and a Roger Penry who frequently crops up in the diaries in the 1780s (usually as just 'Penry', and invariably on a Saturday evening) may have been servants whose existence is otherwise unknown to us. And who was the Theomachus whose 'deplorable case' Wesley mentions in the Journal under the date 16 August 1737? So far he remains unidentified - as do a number of persons whom Wesley identifies only by initials. The easy solution here would have been to omit these faceless ones from the index, and such a course could quite easily have been justified. In the event they were included, but with the initials inverted, to bring them into their right alphabetical position. 'F .B. ' of Clones (on 28 May 1787) thereby becomes (perhaps slightly unfortunately) 'B---, F---' in the index.

Finally, to note one or two questionable features of the lengthy entry on Wesley himself. It is arguable that the sub-heading on his health, consisting mainly of sub-sub-headings listing his various ailments, might have been more accurately headed 'ill-health' ! I still have little idea of the difference, if any, between 'ague' and 'fever', and am glad to note that I indexed these separately, following Wesley's own usage, with appropriate crossreferences. The equally lengthy sub-entry on his 'travelling' ends with a cross reference to 'weather'; and under the latter as a heading in its own right I attempted to list all his main references to whatever the British climate threw at him, from 'cold' through to 'wind', via a hopelessly long sub-entry on 'rain'. My justification for this rather desperate attempt to reflect his travelling conditions over half a century

was my recollection of an article on this very topic in these *Proceedings* some years ago which was so selective and sketchy that I have still not convinced myself that it was not just a parody of what purports to be 'historical geography'.

The indexing of these volumes proved challenging and arduous, but also rewarding. The real test, however, is how well the resulting index serves users of the new edition. If it proves as useful as Curnock's index has done over nearly a century, it will have justified its existence.

JOHN A. VICKERS □

Nineteenth-century Methodist hymn books - three differing streams.

Methodists have always sung their faith. The Preface to the 1933 *Methodist Hymn-Book*¹ was patently wrong when it declared, 'Methodism was born in song' - for Methodism was *born* in preaching the gospel - but it remains true none the less that Methodists were *nurtured* in song. And since the days of John Wesley's definitive collection, the 1780 *Collection of Hymns for the use of the People called Methodists*,² our hymn-books have both structured and ordered our faith on one hand, and declared it on the other. In Methodism therefore, the study of the content and the structure of our hymn-books has provided a valuable clue to what was significant in the faith and spiritual perception of the particular Methodist branch publishing that book at that time.³ This note, however, seeks to identify the different forms of book evolving in the nineteenth century.⁴

Three different streams of hymn-book tradition in Methodism might be identified in the nineteenth century .

The *first stream* consists of the 1780 hymnal in its entirety with

1 *The Methodist Hymn-Book* (1933). London: The Methodist Publishing House. p. v.

2 I refer to *The Works of John Wesley. Volume 7. A Collection of Hymns for the Use of The People Called Methodists.* F.Hildebrandt, O.A.Beckerlegge & J.Dale, Nashville: Abingdon, 1983 (*The Bicentennial Edition of Wesleys Works*); cited as the 1780 hymnal. Originally 525 hymns, its content evolved.

3 Indeed, anyone wanting to explore the myth that there were no doctrinal differences between the three Methodist branches that entered into union in 1932 - or in 1907 - might usefully study the hymn-books of the uniting communities. The variant forms adopted of 'Love Divine' and the omissions/alterations might be a good starting place.

4 It arises from an ongoing study of Bible Christian hymnody.

additions and supplements. Sometimes these supplements were separate volumes in their own right.

The Wesleyans had seen the '1780' content continue to expand since it was first published, rising from 525 hymns to 560.⁵ Major supplements were bound with the 1780 in 1831⁶ and 1876. The 1876 edition (of 539 hymns) with its 'New Supplement' continued in use until 1904, and is probably the best known form of the 1780.

The Methodist New Connexion continued to use the 1780 book, but published as a separate volume, a Supplement, also designated *The Small Hymn Book*, (fifth edition, 1810)⁷ The MNC diverged from this stream in 1835.

The United Methodist Free Churches 1860 hymn-book was the 1780 hymnal (of 540 hymns) with their supplement, and the books of both the Wesleyan Methodist Association and the Wesleyan Reformers had also been based on the 1780 hymnal with supplements.⁸ By 1875-83⁹ a further separate volume had been produced, entitled *Psalms and Supplemental Hymns* incorporating 34 psalms in the 'Chant Book' and 86 hymns. The UMFC diverged from this first stream in 1889 with a book that continued to union in 1907, and thereafter as one of the books of United Methodism until 1933.

Not unexpectedly, the first hymn-books of the Primitive Methodist tradition followed an independent course: a *second stream*.¹⁰ The Wesley hymns were by no means neglected, but the first definitive book, *A Collection of Hymns for Camp Meetings, Revivals &c for the use of the Primitive*

⁵ See Hildebrandt et.al. p29f

⁶ G.J.Stevenson In J.Julian(ed.) *A Dictionary of Hymnology* (1892), p.728, suggests that the definitive 1831 edition was published as a result of 'pirated' editions published by others ignoring such copyright as then existed, notably at Manchester. The Wesley Historical Society Library at Westminster College, Oxford Brookes University contains a pirated edition published by D.May in Plymouth, in 1818, with an Appendix of five hymns 'not in any other Editions'. There are also in the WHS collection editions published by Mozley in Gainsborough and Derby which are possibly pirated.

⁷ Stevenson op.cit. p.729.

⁸ See the Preface to *Hymn Book of the United Methodist Free Churches* (1860), London: Reed, p.v., and Stevenson, op.cit. p.730f.

⁹ The dating is based on the copy in the Cornish Methodist Historical Association's Library at the Cornwall Studies Library, Redruth, published over the name of Book Steward T. Newton: 1875-83.

¹⁰ G.Milburn *Exploring Methodism: Primitive Methodism*, Peterborough: (2002), pp.63-66.

Methodists, by Hugh Bourne, was a free standing book of truly independent spirit. The only indication of sections or themes in this book consisted in the headings given to each page. However, its second stream form was not adopted by the next book for Primitive Methodists. The MNC book of 1835 followed this second stream, as did its successor in 1865.¹¹

The scope of Primitive Methodist hymnody expanded considerably in 1825 in Bourne's *Large Hymn Book for the use of the Primitive Methodists*. This book is in a new style, a reworking of the 1780 outline with new hymns and deletions; it is in a *third stream*. This and the earlier book were often bound in one volume, giving the Connexion a revivalist book quite unlike the first stream books.¹² Yet in the *Large Hymn Book* Bourne essentially followed the 1780 outline, with all his sections appearing in the same order. Significantly he omitted section V of the 1780, 'For the Society...,' but did append 36 hymns for an institutional church, almost as a Supplement in the way of stream one. Many Wesley hymns were transferred directly, albeit often edited, especially reduced in size,¹³ but much new material is provided within the sections owing their heading to the 1780. Indeed. . .

'The book's emphasis remains experiential, rather than ecclesiastical or doctrinal...'¹⁴

The result is a book with an independent spirit, and much new material.

¹¹ I understand that the Independent Methodist books were also of independent compilation - and therefore part of this stream - but they are given no more consideration in this study.

¹² My edition of the combined book is undated, but is signed 'W(?) Shields, Anlaby Common, July 3rd 1852.' It comprises the fourteenth edition of the Camp Meeting Hymnbook and the twelfth edition of the Large Hymnbook.

¹³ Thus three of the four hymns from 1780 II.II 'Describing Inward Religion' appear in Boume's 'Inward Religion,' but one is reduced to four four-line verses from six eight-line, and another from six six-line to four six-line.

¹⁴ Milburn, op.cit. p64

When the Primitive Methodists replaced their *Large Hymn Book*, John Flesher's *The Primitive Methodist Hymn Book* reverted to the second stream pattern. The book has been critically condemned:

'This book, issued in 1854, may be safely described as the worst edited and most severely mutilated collection of hymns ever published.'¹⁵

There is some evidence that the 1864 edition by Connexional Editor, Dr. William Antliff, removed some of the worst extravagances in his 'few slight alterations'.¹⁶ When the Primitive Methodists published a further, much improved book in 1886 it was also of the second stream type. In this stream also lies the 1889 UMFC *Methodist Free Church Hymns*. And when in 1904 the Wesleyans and the Methodist New Connexion cooperated in the production of a new book, called *The Methodist Hymn Book*, it was of stream two pattern.¹⁷

Then there is the oft over-looked Bible Christian contribution.¹⁸ As a movement emerging from Wesleyanism the earliest Bible Christians continued to use the 1780 hymnal, and to purchase copies of it from the Wesleyan Book Room. However in 1820 William O'Bryan, their first leader, issued a supplementary volume of about 160 hymns as the first Bible Christian hymn-book.¹⁹ It seems clear that it was intended to be a separately published first stream supplement, rather than a second stream book, for the inconvenience of having to carry two books²⁰ was one factor in the publication of a new book in 1824.

This entirely new volume was published by O'Bryan and James Thorne with a Preface dated 1823.²¹ Of this volume Shaw wrote:

'What they did in effect was to intrude a number of hymns from the Primitive Methodist I hymn-book of that date together with a few original ones into the general framework of Wesley's 1780 collection.'²²

¹⁵ Stevenson op.cit. p730.

¹⁶ Preface p. v. My 1864 copy does not correspond exactly with the excesses quoted by Milburn.

¹⁷ The repetition of the title in 1933 can be a source of confusion.

¹⁸ As a sample of the over-looking consider A.S. Gregory's *Praises with Understanding* (1949) (reprinted 1972), which although referring correctly to four hymn books in use at the 1932 union, consistently refers to the UMFC 1889 book as the United Methodist Hymnal, and never refers to the 1888/9 *Collection of Hymns for the use of ... Bible Christians*, also in use in the United Methodist Church.

¹⁹ T.Shaw *The Bible Christians 1815-1907*, p87; *proceedings* 55, pp13-16

²⁰ Quoted by Shaw, op.cit., p88.

²¹ Beckerlegge, op.cit. p 15.

²² Shaw op.cit. p88.

This reflects its nature as a third stream book. However, the general accuracy of the statement will not stand deeper scrutiny. The book has extra sections over and above the 1780, beginning with sections headed 'For Ministers' and 'Missionary Exertion' and contains 60 hymns - including some taken from the 1780 - before reaching the 1780 framework. It often represents a considerable editing of the 1780 material. It was a book for an institutional church, and as original as anything the Primitive Methodists produced. There remains a suspicion indeed that any dependency could have been the other way round. This book went through several printings until Thorne on his own²³ produced a Second Edition in 1838.²⁴

When in 1888 the final Bible Christian book was produced (*Collection of Hymns for the use of ... Bible Christians*), it was of the second stream type. Like its UMFC counterpart, it continued to be used by United Methodism until 1933.²⁵

By the end of the century, third stream type hymn books were obsolete. The Wesleyans were still using a first stream book - the 1876 version of the 1780 - but all the other branches were using second stream type hymnals.

COLIN C. SHORT

²³ in 1829 William O'Bryan separated from the Connexion he founded

²⁴ *A Collection of Hymns for the use of the people called Bible Christians*. Second Enlarged Edition. (1838). Shebbear: Thorne. The Preface is dated 1838, and subsequent editions were printed with the same Preface. My edition is the Seventh Enlarged Edition of 1859. The volume was revised, and the Preface extended to indicate alterations, and re-dated in 1862. This version carries author's names, where known, with the hymns. My copy of that is the Third revised Edition of 1864. See also R. Thorne *The Bible Christians 1815-1907 A Catalogue* (1989) p15.

²⁵ A peculiarity of Bible Christian hymnody is that they never produced a tune book edition of their hymns, although the Sunday School collection did appear with tunes. To the head of each hymn in the 1888 book was appended a number in brackets: the recommended tune in the *Bristol Tune Book*. In a few cases this number is prefixed by 'S.S.& S.' - the only official acknowledgement in Methodism of Sacred Songs and Solos.

BOOK REVIEWS

Billy Bray in his own words, by Chris Wright. (Godalming: Highland Books 2005 284 pp., map, illus £8.99 paper ISBN 1-897913- 73- 7).

The long standing popularity of F.W.Bourne's *The King's Son* is ample testimony to the fame of Cornish reformed drunkard, miner, Bible Christian preacher and chapel builder, Billy Bray (1794-1868). That volume, first published three years after Billy's death, was based on 'his own Memoranda', with subsequent editions enlarged with further anecdotes and memories from others who knew him.

What Chris Wright has done is to return to that 'Memoranda'. The manuscript of Billy's own journal is held in our archives at the John Rylands University Library of Manchester. Wright has edited this material. An Author's Note and an Appendix outline the difficulties inherent in this task, including the need to put the flowing words into a recognisable sentence structure. It is claimed that the whole of the journal', excluding several repetitions, is now presented.

The result becomes a new popular account of the Billy Bray story, interleaving 'journal' extracts with comment and context. Other stories of Billy, including those told by Bourne, and by the Wesleyan Mark Guy Pearse, are drawn in and analysed. Other near contemporary sources are used, including the autobiography of William Haslam, the vicar of Baldhu, Billy's home parish, converted in his own pulpit, and the manuscript Diaries of John Oates, identified as a Billy Bray source by Barrie S.May in the *Journal of the Cornish Methodist Historical Association* in 1994. Yet the character remains unchanged. Wright writes 'Have I found a different Billy to the one portrayed in *The King's Son* ? Most certainly not.' (p241).

The result is an important and valuable publication, not least in its analysis of some cherished Billy Bray stories, the bringing to light of a few not previously in print, and the clarifying of some issues. Everyone interested in the 'charismatic' elements of nineteenth-century Methodism, in Cornish Methodism, or in the Bible Christians ought to have a copy of this book.

To this reviewer's mind it is a pity that Wright has not given some idea of the sequence in the manuscript 'journal' in which the extracts he quotes occur, for it is plain that he selectively uses material in the story as he tells it. To be fair though, there is no claim that this is a critical edition of the 'Journal'.

However some of the peripheral information contains needless errors and

omissions which are annoying. Reference to five places through the book will suffice. The note on p25 on 'The Bryanites and the Bible Christians' implies that the former title was an official one; it never was. The same note says 'O'Bryan left for America in 1836'; the date was 1831. He returned to visit quite often. On p48 'Wesley's 1779 Methodist Hymnbook' should read 'Wesley's 1780 hymnbook'. The number quoted (361) is that of the 1831 edition; if the original 1780 book is intended the number is 351. On the same page two numbers are quoted for Bible Christian hymn books; 410 is correct for the book Billy would have known; 332 is the number in a different book only published twenty years after Billy died. Thirdly, on p164, Wright declares that 'in 1850 ... the steam railway finished at Plymouth'. Yet the West Cornwall Railway opened in 1837 with steam locomotives, and the Redruth and Chacewater in 1826, although only horse drawn until 1854; it ran through Billy's home area. On the next page too, one might note that there are more up-to-date books on Cornish mining! The illustrations on pp 168,173 from *Half Hours Underground* (1878) were woefully inadequate in 1878: no Cornish miner's hat ever had an oil lamp on it, and the view 'at work underground' looks more like a coal mine than a metal mine. The footnote on p247 referring to John Herridge Batt, fails to note that he too was a Bible Christian minister. Perhaps Wright has not been sufficiently critical in the use of his peripheral sources.

COLIN C.SHORT

More Than a Methodist. The Life and Ministry of Donald English. The Authorised Biography. by B. Hoare, and I. Randall (Paternoster Press, 2003, pp xviii, 230p, £11.99, ISBN 1-84227-203-9)

Dr. Donald English CBE, who died in 1998, only three years after retirement, was the last of the Methodists 'giants' but like Leslie Weatherhead he was not defined by his Methodism. Hoare and Randall title their book 'The Authorised Biography and that is what we get. They give us no sharp analysis of the religious and denominational tensions of the post war years within which English worked. They do give us a personal, affectionate and anecdotal account of an internationally respected minister who was as much claimed by the evangelical constituency of the wider church as by his own Methodism. His circuit ministry was limited to six years in Cullercoats (he filled his church of course and much of his ministry was as a theological college teacher. Predictably English ended his ministry as General Secretary of our Home Mission Department but less predictably he was called twice to Wesley's chair (1978 and 1990). He was awarded four doctorates - all honorary.

After his degree at Leicester and National Service, English became IVF's

Travelling Secretary and when he candidated for the ministry, the committee '...found itself in an unusual position, interviewing someone so thoroughly immersed in the world of inter-denominational conservative evangelical thought. However Conference accepted him...' And well for Methodism that it did.

ROGER THORNE

THE ANNUAL LECTURE

Will be delivered in Teignmouth Methodist Church
on Monday, 27 June 2005 at 7.30pm
by Dr John A Hargreaves, BA, MA, FRHistS

'A warmed heart and a disciplined mind perfectly joined': Sister Dorothy H. Farrar and the evolution of Women's Ministry in Methodism.

Chairperson: Baroness, the Revd Kathleen M. Richardson OBE

The Lecture will be preceded by TEA* for members at 5pm and the annual meeting at 6pm.

* Please book with the General Secretary by 11 June, cost £2.50 per head.

TRAVEL DIRECTIONS

Teignmouth is well served by buses and trains from Torquay and Exeter. The church is in Somerset Place in the centre of the town.

DIRECTIONS FROM THE RIVIERA CENTRE TO TEIGNMOUTH:

From the centre go down the hill to the coast road. Follow the coast road and then the signs for Teignmouth A379 Babbacombe road and via Watcombe, Maidencombe and Shaldon. Cross Shaldon bridge and turn right at the traffic lights towards Teignmouth, Bitton Park Road. There are two sets of pedestrian lights, then take the right hand lane at the traffic lights, signed Exeter left and Teignmouth town centre straight on. After the lights stay in the right hand lane and turn right at the next traffic lights into Quay Road which turns left and the car park is on the left. It is a Pay and Display car park prior to 6 o'clock (At the moment 60p will cover from 5 o'clock until 6 - it may go up in the summer!).

Come out of the car park and continue along Quay road and Somerset Place and the church is on the left.

WESLEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Registrar: Rev Donald H. Ryan M. Th., 15 Foxlands Drive, Lloyd Hill, Penn,
Wolverhampton, WV4 5NB. Tel: 01902 335556

NEW MEMBERS

Dr Christopher P Burnham M.A., M.Sc., - Ashford Kent

Mr Geoffrey D King - Cranleigh Surrey

Dr Jennifer Lloyd M.A. - Pittsford NY USA

Rev Alan Warrell M.A. - Hastings East Sussex

Rev Timothy R Woolley B Sc. CTM - Cranleigh Surrey

Mr Tim Brinton - Macclesfield

Mr Robert A. Ker - Newtownabbey, Co. Antrim

Mr & Mrs William & Joan Parkinson - Ballymena

Rev. Robin P. Roddie BA - Belfast

Miss E. Maureen Weir - Lisburn

DECEASED

Rev Martin V Caldwell

Mr John I Miller

ADVERTISEMENTS – the charge for the announcement of books, etc, Wanted or For Sale, is 12p per word for each insertion. Copy should be sent *with payment in advance* to the Editor. Special terms for display advertisements.

WANTED – Methodist Commemorative Medals pre-1933, including: Asbury, Bunting, Thomas Charles, Kilham, O'Bryan, Selina, Wesleys, Whitefield: Methodist Sunday and day Schools and Colleges, including prize medals. Methodist Friendly Societies, communion tokens and bazaar tokens. Also medals of Caleb Evans, Howell Harris, William Romaine, Daniel Rowland, William Williams, and Zinzendorf. Baptist and Slavery medals also wanted. Do not clean. Good prices paid by collector, Graham Kirby, 13 St. Mary's Close, Kidlington, Oxon. OX5 2AY Tel. 01865 371494

METHODIST BOOKS – bought and sold. Please send for lists enclosing SAE to 27 Riverside Close, Kingston Upon Thames, KT1 2JG.