THOMAS COKE'S DOCTORATE

THOMAS COKE was proud of his appellative—Doctor! It was employed far more often than his American ecclesiastical designation—Bishop. Speculation exists as to the nature of his degree: Doctor of Civil Law. How did he come by it? How much stringent academic preparation did it require? The subject, fascinating as it is mysterious, remains somewhat shrouded in eighteenth-century academic inexplicability. More to the point, what prima facie evidence do we have from Coke himself? It is intriguing.

Coke matriculated at Jesus College “6 Apr. 1764”, according to the Battel Book. The University Register mentions 11th April of that year. It was the Paschal Term. His standing was that of Gentleman Commoner. After four exciting, turbulent and immensely significant years, Coke’s Bachelor of Arts degree was conferred “4 Feb. 1768”. The following day—5th February—he became a Fellow Commoner. Ordination as deacon took place at Oxford on 10th June 1770, to be followed by the granting of the Master of Arts degree three days later on 13th June, “1768 Bre. Thos. Coke B.A. 1768 (M.A. 1770).” His ordination as priest was held in Wales on Sunday, 23rd August 1772 at Abergwili. All this time he was serving as curate at South Petherton in Somerset.

4 See Coke’s ordination certificate (Methodist Missionary Society Archives, London).
5 Jesus College Archivist (Mr. D. A. Rees), in a letter to the author, 6th April 1978, citing the University Archives Office.
It is in June 1775 that we pick up the Oxford chronicle again. Coke was back at the university, petitioning, apparently, for two degrees in Civil Law—Bachelor and Doctor. A letter from Lord North, the Chancellor, dated 8th June 1775, from Downing Street, is revealing:

REG. CONV. TERM. TRIN. CONV. 14 June 1775

Mr. Vice-Chancellor & Gentlemen,

I have been moved in behalf of Thomas Coke M.A. of Jesus College who is from his matriculation of full standing for the Degree of Doctor in Civil Law, but was prevented by circumstances from proceeding regularly to the Degree of Batchelor in that Faculty. He therefore humbly prays that by Fav'our of Convocation he may be allowed to accumulate the Degrees of Batchelor and Doctor in Civil Law, paying Fees for both Degrees but doing exercise for that of Doctor only, in order to his being a Candidate for the Degree of Doctor in Civil Law next Term. To this [request I give my Consent, and am

Yr. Affectionate Friend and Servant]

NORTH. 6

A Latin phrase appears at the close of the letter: “Sex hasce Literas Venerabilis Domus ratas habuit.” What does it mean? Thanks to Mr. E. E. Sabben-Clare, the interpretation is:

the phrase *aliquid ratum habere*, used in Classical Latin, means “confirm or approve”. *Venerabilis Domus* is, of course, a reference to the Ancient House of Congregation which is the degree granting body. The entire line can thus be translated: “The Ancient House of Congregation has approved the request in these six letters.” 7

The Prime Minister’s was, therefore, but one of six letters written in Coke’s behalf. What of the other five? Who wrote them? Coke had a penchant for hobnobbing with the great of the earth and seeking their aid, well illustrated at the beginning of his ministry, 1770-1, when he was confident of “church-preferment”. His biographers further mention “certain political men” (probably John Morgan, M.P.); 8 then the anticipated support of a gentleman “still more exalted in rank”, 9 and beyond that a “certain nobleman”, 10 (perchance it was North). Coke himself spoke of expecting “Crown-preferment”. 11 Could these influential friends have been employed in letter-writing? Would one of them have been Joseph Hoare, B.D., who assumed the office of Principal of Jesus College on 27th April 1768 and held it until 1802? Are these letters extant?

6 Copy in the Methodist Missionary Society Archives, London.
7 Oxford University Information Officer (Mr. E. E. Sabben-Clare), in a letter to the author, 17th September 1976.
11 Coke was answering *Strictures on Dr. Coke’s Ordination Sermon* ...—a pamphlet written anonymously. See Drew, op. cit., pp. 98 ff., who believes the author to have been Charles Wesley.
If Coke had acquired the degrees of B.C.L. and D.C.L. "by accumulation", he would have taken both at the same time—the requirements for the doctorate satisfying those for the baccalaureate. The likelihood of two degrees in Civil Law is further substantiated by Coke's letter of 14th May 1791 to Connecticut's Bishop Samuel Seabury of the Episcopal Church:

Being educated a member of the Church of England from my earliest Infancy, being ordained of that Church, and having taken two degrees in Civil Law in the University of Oxford which is entirely under the Patronage of the Church of England, . . .

Are we to assume that Coke actually held the degree of Bachelor of Civil Law? Documentation before us points to the answer—Yes!

What precisely was the nature of Coke's examination for his doctorate? The entry in the Register of Congregation is very helpful:

1775 Thomas Coke, Master of Arts, a student of Civil Law from Jesus College begs etc. In-so-far-as it has been dispensed to him by the venerable House of Convocation in regard to the grades to be required in Civil Law; [and since] he has diligently heard a public lecturer; [and since] he has had according to requirement three lecture courses in the School of Jurisprudence; [and since] he has performed all other things which required by the Statutes (unless in-so-far-as he has been dispensed therefrom etc). It is granted as above petitioned. 17 June

The implication is clear: it was an honest—if not rigorous—examination which may have included Coke's reading a thesis. Too, there would have been extensive resource materials. The Jesus library housed a collection—among many—of volumes given by Sir Leoline Jenkins "particularly rich in Canon and Civil Law". The degree was bestowed on 17th June 1775.

The nomenclature is somewhat confused by the fact of Oxford having conferred the degree of D.C.L., as in Lord North's case, honoris causa (on 10th October 1772, at the time that he became Chancellor of the University), and in the case of Samuel Johnson (1st April 1775) "by diploma", as Boswell tells us.

Was Coke knowledgeable in law? There is a paucity of data regarding Coke's personal participation in the celebrated Deed of Declaration. One can only conjecture. As Wesley's assistant, Coke was a master of theology, not law. He may have been askew of legal issues. One must assume that he was working in the same vein as his contemporaries, which included John Pennington, a lawyer. Coke's participation in the Declaration is uncertain. Although he was a member of the Communion, it is not clear that he had an active role in the drafting of the document. His letters to Seabury and others suggest that he was aware of the need to navigate the legal and political waters surrounding the Declaration. Coke's involvement in the Deed of Declaration is a matter of conjecture.
Coke interviewed William Clulow of Chancery Lane—Wesley’s solicitor. There had been the controversies of the Birstall chapel, Dewsbury, and the New Room at Bristol. In attempting to find the locus of authority—the power and purpose of the Conference—and to give it legal standing, the Deed was prepared. Wesley signed the document on 28th February 1784, and it was enrolled in Chancery on the 9th March following. Coke’s contribution may be little more than insisting that every preacher in full connexion should be a member of the Conference, and admission into full connexion should be looked upon as admission into membership with the Conference.

Was Coke’s activity simply in the capacity of Wesley’s secretary or was his expertise in law put to good use? Coke’s name appears in the Deed, following that of Charles Wesley, as “Thomas Coke, of the City of London, Doctor of Civil Law; ...”.

A very interesting letter from the Keeper of the Archives, Oxford, elucidates the use of D.C.L., an English phrase:

Yet it is used in a large number of Latin documents in the phrase “ad gradum D.C.L.” I have never once come across the Latin equivalent J.C.D. (Juris Civilis Doctor). Since the D.C.L. represents an English phrase, those who wrote in Latin frequently Latinised it as LL.D. (Legum Doctor) and the use of L.L.D. spread from Latin title-pages to the title pages of English works. Thus the use of L.L.D. while not strictly correct, became common and is not to be regarded as an abuse.

Coke frequently used the letters LL.D. It seems that Oxford was forbidden, by parliamentary statute, to grant a degree in Canon Law. Cambridge was allowed to do so—hence references to “the double doctorate”.

The doctorate was Coke’s hallmark. John Wesley employed it:

I have this day set apart as a Superintendent ... Thomas Coke, Doctor of Civil Law, a Presbyter of the Church of England, and a man ... well qualified ... And Coke, in turn, when ordaining Francis Asbury, began: “I, Thomas Coke, Doctor of Civil Law, late of Jesus College, in the University of Oxford ...”.

17 See Thomas Coke: *An Address to the Methodist Societies in Great Britain and Ireland on the Settlement of the Preaching Houses* (Edinburgh, 1790).
18 “An Attested Copy of the Rev. John Wesley’s Declaration and Establishment ... Dated London, the 28th of February, MDCCLXXXIV.” (Copy in the Methodist Archives, Manchester.)
19 See the F. Deaville Walker papers in the Methodist Missionary Society Archives, London.
20 See *Proceedings*, xi, pp. 94, 144. See also Vickers, op. cit., pp. 29-30.
21 Coke’s certificate (the original) is in the Methodist Missionary Society Archives, London.
22 Quoted in Etheridge, op. cit., p. 144.
How much Civil Law—or Canon Law—did Thomas Coke know and use? Here we must leave the query, but in the hope that full disclosure will come with continued investigation.

W. Thomas Smith.

[Dr. Warren Thomas Smith is Assistant Professor of Church History at the Interdenominational Theological Centre, Atlanta, Georgia, USA.]

THE ANNUAL MEETING AND LECTURE

Attendances at the Tea, Annual Meeting and Lecture were all "up" at Ilkley on Monday, 26th June. The church was comfortably full for the lecture in the evening—an indication perhaps of the attractive power of a local theme and a local lecturer. Following a well-prepared and attractively-presented buffet tea, Mr. Martin Hunt of Cardiff expressed the thanks of those present to the ladies of the church who had prepared the meal on behalf of our esteemed Treasurer and his wife—Mr. and Mrs. Rowland C. Swift of Danehill, West Sussex.

Business Meeting

Our President, Dr. John C. Bowmer, took the chair, and 31 members and friends were present from many parts of Great Britain. After the opening devotions there followed the customary reading over of the names of members who had died since the last Annual Meeting—23 in all, an unusually large number—and there were many tributes to their lives and work before the meeting stood in an act of affectionate remembrance.

Felicitations were expressed to the President and the Vice-President of the Conference, who are both members of the Wesley Historical Society, and to Mr. William Leary, our Exhibitions Secretary, who has now been appointed Connexional Archivist. Our thanks were also to be conveyed to Mr. F. J. Hammond, who has served as Honorary Auditor for the past ten years, and whose partner in business, Mr. A. C. Sargent, now succeeds him. (All the other officers were thanked and re-appointed.)

The Rev. Kenneth Garlick as Librarian reported on the final stages of the removal of the Society's Library from the basement of Epworth House where it had been stored to Southlands College, Wimbledon, where it will be fully catalogued and at the service of our members.

It was reported on behalf of our Treasurer—Registrar that the Society's assets now amount to £2,227 34p., of which £1,064 70p. represents advance subscriptions. Acting upon the advice of the Executive Committee, the meeting agreed to realistic increases in membership fees and advertisement rates, and also to the registration of the Society with the Charity Commission in the belief that this will bring certain advantages to the Society in the future.

The Annual Lecture

The Rev. W. Russell Shearer presided over the lecture, and introduced Miss Joanna Dawson, who then addressed a large and attentive audience on "Methodism at the grass-roots within the Great Haworth Round, 1738-91". Miss Dawson, who is a member of our Society and a well-known local historian, spoke authoritatively and with an apparent zest for her subject that carried all her hearers with her. The image of the Brontës, and even of their Methodist aunt, had been temporarily eclipsed by a vision of John Wesley, his helpers and his disciples within the Great Haworth Round.

Thomas Shaw.
WESLEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Financial Statement, 1st January to 31st December 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings and Printing</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial, Editorial and Registrar's Expenses</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer's Honorarium</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications — S. E. Keeble and John Wesley and Methodism (reprint)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Social Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of Income over Expenditure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{£919 30} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions in advance br't forward from previous year—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary Members</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Members</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received during year</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Unexpired Subscriptions (see Balance Sheet)</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings (back nos.) sold</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Branch</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Stock Dividend</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Lecture Collect'n</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications sold</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Interest</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{£919 30} \]

Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unexpired Subscriptions—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary Members (say)</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Members (77)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Funds b/fwd.</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Excess of Income over Expenditure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{£2,227 34} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash in hand—Treasurer</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Stock (at cost)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Market Value £83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Savings Bank</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland Bank Deposit A/c</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Savings Bank (Investment A/c)</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan to World Methodist Historical Society</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library, Publications Stocks,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing Cabinet, etc. unvalued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{£2,227 34} \]

26th June 1978.

AUDITOR'S CERTIFICATE

I have examined the Income and Expenditure Account and the Balance Sheet with the books and records of the Society. No account has been taken of subscriptions in arrears at 31st December 1977, whether or not recovered since, but any arrears from previous years received during 1977 are included in Subscription Income. Subject to the foregoing, in my view the Balance Sheet and Account show a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Society as at 31st December 1977, and of the excess of Income over Expenditure for the year ended on that date.

(Signed)

High Beech,
Long Park Close,
Chesham Bois,
Amersham, Bucks.
THE 1851 RELIGIOUS CENSUS
A Select Bibliography of materials relating to
England and Wales

DURING the last quarter of a century, scholars have become increas­
ingly aware of the importance of the 1851 Ecclesiastical Census as a
source for the study of institutional and popular religion in nineteenth­
century Britain. The present guide, made possible by generous financial
support from the Social Science Research Council, is designed to encou­
rage and facilitate this development.

Readers are advised that, in the selection of references, special consider­
ation has been given to works using, in some degree or other, the manu­
script enumeration schedules at the Public Record Office (H.O. 129). Items
which rely entirely upon the printed report (Parliamentary Papers, 1852-3, LXXXIX)—rarely included except in the “General” section—are marked with an asterisk.

It is hoped to compile supplements to this bibliography at occasional
intervals, and notification of errors and major omissions, as well as of sig­
nificant additions to the literature, would be appreciated. Any corres­
pondence should be addressed to the author at the John Rylands University
Library of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PP.

GENERAL

1 R. W. AMBLER: “The 1851 Census of Religious Worship”, Local


*5 A. M. EVERITT: The pattern of Rural Dissent: the Nineteenth Century (University of Leicester, Department of English Local History, Occasional Papers, 2nd Series, No. 4, Leicester, 1972).


*12 J. A. LESOURD: “Les Catholiques dans la societe anglaise, 1765-1865: évolution numérique, répartition géographique, structure sociale,


J. C. C. Probert: The Sociology of Cornish Methodism to the present day (Cornish Methodist Historical Association, Occasional Publications, No. 17, Redruth, 1971).


cf. No. 4.
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---

Clive D. Field.

We gratefully acknowledge having received the following periodicals, some of which come to us on a reciprocal basis with these *Proceedings*.

*The Local Historian*, Vol. 13, No. 3.


---

**MORE LOCAL HISTORIES**

Handbooks and brochures from all parts of the Connexion continue to reach us, and for these we are grateful. The following are some of those which have recently come to hand. We give the prices where these are stated thereon.

*The Colliery Chapel*—centenary brochure of Rhosddu Methodist church, Wrexham (pp. 12): copies, price 35p., from Mr. F. D. Fisher, 5, Edinburgh Road, Wrexham, Clwyd, LL11 2RG.

Grainger's Lane, Cradley Heath, 150th anniversary souvenir guide (pp. 56): copies, price £1, from Mr. Malcolm Guest, 199, Manor Way, Halesowen, West Midlands.

Bamber Bridge centenary handbook (pp. 34): copies from the Rev. John M. Hibberts, 63, Brownedge Lane, Bamber Bridge, Preston, Lanes, PR5 6TA.

*The Light still shines*—centenary brochure of King Cross Methodist church, Halifax (pp. 16), by Eveline Chapman: copies from the Rev. Marcus A. Pattern, 37, Rothwell Road, Halifax, West Yorks, HX1 2HA.

*Over Two Centuries of Methodism in Robin Hood's Bay, 1747-1978* (pp. 32), by John Marsland: copies, price 50p., from the author at Montrose, Wesley Road, Robin Hood's Bay, Whitby, North Yorks, YO22 4RW.

*Chapels in the Selby Circuit* (pp. 26), by C. R. Moody: copies, price 20p., from the author at Lynton, Doncaster Road, Brayton, Selby, North Yorks, Y08 9HD.

*The Origins of Methodism in Eastbourne* (pp. 10), by the Rev. Dr. D. Dunn Wilson: copies, price 50p., from the author at Central Methodist Church, Langney Road, Eastbourne, Sussex, BN21 3EU.

---

An Introduction to the Methodist Church in Europe (pp. 38) has been written by the Rev. Dr. W. Peter Stephens, who is the secretary of the European Relations Committee of the Methodist Church. Copies (no price stated) may be obtained from Dr. Stephens at Wesley College, Bristol, BS10 7QD.
A NOTABLE CENTENARY

It has never been our policy in these pages, even were it possible, to mark all the centenaries in Methodism as they come along, but occasionally we find one which ought not to pass without comment. Such a one has recently gone by with the Conference of 1978, for it was just one hundred years ago—in 1878—that laymen first took their seats in the Wesleyan Conference. This may not seem to be outstanding in itself—in fact it may be dismissed by many as just another step in the democratization of Wesleyanism in an age when representation of the people was a live issue. To others it may come as a surprise that as late as 1878 laymen were not represented in a Methodist Conference. Our reason for drawing attention to this centenary is that it was not merely the democratization of an all-ministerial assembly, but it involved a basic shift in the Wesleyan conception of the Conference itself. If this change were considered simply as an historical event, we would endeavour to trace the steps by which it was made from its first being mooted, through the debates in Conference and the literature which it generated until the vote was taken in 1877. This would be a worthy exercise for anyone with access to contemporary newspapers, magazines and pamphlets, of which there is a plentiful supply in the Methodist Archives. We are concerned here, however, not so much with the history and politics of the change as with the significance of it as far as the Wesleyan Conference is concerned. So let us begin with John Wesley’s first Conference of 1744.

Wesley’s Methodism was essentially “episcopal” in the sense that “episcopé”, “oversight” or “watchfulness” (call it what you will) was exercised at every level of the administration: class leaders over members, itinerants over class leaders, and Wesley over the whole. Wesley’s definition of the office of a minister was “to watch over souls committed to his charge”. While Wesley lived, he was the supreme episcopos of the connexion. When he died, he had no personal successor. His successor was—the Conference. “The Conference,” said Jabez Bunting, “is the living Wesley.” It was the corporate episcopos, and to it were assigned the duties, previously exercised by Wesley, of admitting, ordaining, if necessary dismissing, and stationing the ministers, administering discipline, and regulating doctrine. It was the pastor pastorum.

This goes far towards explaining why the Wesleyan Conference was an all-ministerial body. It was an assembly of pastors acting in Pastoral Session, and as such it was the supreme embodiment of the Wesleyan doctrine of the Pastoral Office. No history of Methodism in the first half of the nineteenth century can be written with any degree of accuracy which ignores this doctrine. The whole temper and organization—and also the woes and divisions—of the movement can be understood only in the light of its conception of

1 Minutes (1862 edn.), p. 23.
the ministry. It was the doctrine of the Pastoral Office that sustained the all-ministerial Conference until 1878. Then came the change, and we must now ask: "Why did it come about when it did?". There were many factors.

1. The climate of the age was against a governing body in which the rank and file of the people were not represented. "No taxation without representation!" was not a far-off cry. The Wesleyans, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, were maintaining a system of government which was more autocratic than that of the State. After the expulsion of Everett, Dunn and Griffith in 1849, *The Times* likened the Wesleyan Conference to the Star Chamber, though it confessed that "of the usual features of the Conference we know next to nothing" (slender grounds on which to criticize!). Bunting's reply was:

You forget that we are a religious and not a secular body. We guard against those terms and usages which would assimilate us to the House of Commons or any other secular assembly.

But Bunting was swimming against the tide—a tide which eventually proved too strong for the Wesleyans to resist.

2. Ever since the death of Wesley, his followers had had to contend with internal pressures to achieve lay representation in connexional courts. More than once these pressures had erupted with increasing distress to the parent body—in 1796 (the Kilhamite revolt), 1827 (the Leeds Organ affair), 1834 (the Warrenite secession), and, most serious of all, the Fly Sheets agitation of the 1840s.

3. The Wesleyans would have been reluctant to admit that the other Methodist bodies, with lay representatives on their Conferences and committees, had any influence upon them, but undoubtedly their very presence was not without telling side effects, if only in the way of encouragement to those Wesleyans who wished for lay representation in their own courts, but rather than separate or join the Free Methodists, preferred to work for reform from within.

4. The Wesleyans clung to their high doctrine of the Pastoral Office as expounded by Alfred Barrett, John Beecham and others, but it was too imposing a structure for the system to carry. As I have written in *Pastor and People*:

Authoritarian systems like the Roman Catholic Church may be able to survive independently of changing social forms, but for comparatively young and voluntary systems like Methodism, this was virtually impossible. The Methodists had behind them less than half a century in which to work out a viable relationship between pastor and people, between the rulers and the ruled—and the time was too short, internal and external pressures too great.

---

2 *An Essay on the Pastoral Office* (1839); *Catholic and Evangelical Principles* (1843); *The Ministry and Polity of the Christian Church* (1854).
5 p. 256.
Looking back upon the scene after a hundred years, we might conclude, with some degree of consolation, that lay representation was inevitable; but, like every act of reformation, it had its losses and its gains. On the debit side, it signified the demise of the high Wesleyan doctrine of the Pastoral Office (though it has survived, in a way, in the present Ministerial Session of Conference). On the credit side, we must write the growing confidence and co-operation between pastor and people, working together for the Kingdom of God and the well-being of the People called Methodists.

JOHN C. BOWMER.

JOHN WESLEY IN THE EAST MIDLANDS

WESLEY'S Journal contains many interesting comments on England in the eighteenth century. His travelling on horseback and by coach led him to remark about the state of the roads; his frequent preaching out-of-doors made him acutely aware of the weather. Some scholars have used his Journal to describe Scotland1 and Ireland.2 In this article we shall consider the East Midlands as regards (a) climate and weather and (b) human geography.

Climate and weather

The problem is that although the latter part of the eighteenth century comes indeed within the period of instrument records, there was considerable chaos in the matter of units. Between this difficulty and the details of site and exposure, there was a good deal of trouble in making use of old records for any period before 1860.3 Before about 1800 all early instrument records must be treated with utmost care. The variety of errors to which meteorological observations are liable when made with doubtful instruments by pioneer enthusiasts in questionable exposures is considerable.4 Wesley's comments were all based on personal observation, without the benefit of instruments.

The findings of experts like Lamb and Manley will be used here, and an attempt will be made to see how far the observations and comments of Wesley agree with the scientists of our own generation. Certainly there was a prevalence of cold winters in the latter part of the eighteenth century, and from 1740 onwards groups of generally warm summers occurred, especially about the period 1772 to 1783.6

On Friday, 13th July 1770, when Wesley was at Epworth, he records that he was "broiling in the sun"; on Wednesday, 1st August,

5 ibid., p. 279.
nearly three weeks later, he was in Northampton, and it was still extremely hot. On Sunday, 17th July 1774, he was preaching at Misterton; the sun was shining in his face and was a little troublesome at first, but was soon covered with clouds. On Saturday, 17th July 1779, he preached at noon in Castle Donington, but in the open air, for there was "no enduring the house". Shortly afterwards he was persuaded to preach in Nottingham in the house which was "as hot as an oven".

On Thursday, 29th June 1780, Wesley was at Worksop, and preached "without the least shelter from the scorching sun". A little later he records that at Sheffield the heat was "scarcely supportable".

It is true that these records are fragmentary, and lack scientific precision, but they are in accord with current findings on temperature in the 1770s and early 1780s.

It is likely that Wesley's comments on winter weather are biased because of the time he spent in the open air; but he does make many references to the severe wintry weather which are in harmony with present-day views on the weather in the latter part of the eighteenth century. On Wednesday, 20th February 1745, Wesley records that water and snow had "lately fallen" on the road from Doncaster to Sykehouse, and on Friday of that week that there was "much snow about Boroughbridge".

Twelve months later (Thursday, 20th February 1746), he was travelling from Birmingham to Aldridge Heath, and the rain changed into snow, and "crusted us over from head to foot in less than an hour's time". All the roads to Stafford were covered with snow; and a man of whom he inquired the way told him "... it snows so that you cannot see before you."

Again the next year—on Thursday, 19th February 1747—Wesley was travelling from Grantham to Epworth, and at Haxey Carr "the ice which covered the dykes, and great part of the common, would not bear, nor readily break". On Wednesday, 18th April 1759, he writes that rain had started on the previous Sunday (Easter Day); he was setting out for Selby from Epworth. At Selby the late flood had carried away the bank over which he was to ride, and left a great hole in its place. On Tuesday, 25th March 1766, he was travelling from Derby to Sheffield through several heavy showers of snow; two days later he was describing a cold ride over the snowy mountains of the High Peak; and riding back over this route he met several storms. He was at Epworth on Thursday, 24th April of the same year, and he records heavy rain. On Sunday, 20th March 1768, he was on West Bromwich Heath, when the north wind "cut like a razor".

Nearly a year later—on Thursday, 16th February 1769—Wesley was travelling to Yarmouth, where it rained all day. A few days later—on Friday, 24th February—he was riding to Braintree during
a sharp frost. On Saturday, 28th July 1770, he was at Castle Donington: hay-making had emptied the town, and there was a violent shower. By Thursday, 8th November that year, he could record that the rain was driven upon him by a furious wind, and made travelling to Lakenheath (Suffolk) very difficult. On Thursday, 16th January 1772, he set out for Luton: snow was lying deep on the ground. On Tuesday, 24th October 1775, he was travelling from Epworth to Whittlebury when a violent storm came on which soon drenched him from head to foot.

On Sunday, 4th July 1779, Wesley was at Louth, and the rain drove him into the house. Later on in the same month—Wednesday, 21st July—heavy rain prevented him from preaching in the park.

Again, too much must not be read into these comments; but winters do seem to have had snow more frequently than at present. It certainly seems to “tie in” with the dampness and snow one would expect from a “Little Ice Age”—the name which scientists have given to the period 1550 to 1850.6

There is a reference to an interesting meteorological phenomenon: on Tuesday, 24th October 1769, Wesley was at Northampton when there was such an aurora borealis as he had never seen before: “the colours, both the white, the flame-colour, and the scarlet, were so exceeding strong and beautiful.” It must have been a rare occurrence, since it frightened people into good resolutions!

Comments on contemporary human geography

These are fragmentary, and it is difficult to deduce much from them. Wesley describes Grimsby in April 1766 as reminding him of Purrysburg in Georgia (North America). It had been “one of the largest towns in the county”, but was then “no bigger than a middling village, containing a small number of half-starved inhabitants, without any trade, either foreign or domestic.” Apparently silting destroyed a port trade which had flourished in the Middle Ages. The town was re-invigorated when the railway entered in 1848 and when the first dock was finished in 1854.7

Wesley has a short comment on Epworth: in June 1782 there were four factories there for spinning and weaving, where large numbers of young women, boys and girls were employed.

Other parts of the Journal (e.g. his visits to Ireland) are a gift to the historical geographer,8 but from the scattered references I have quoted I have simply been able to verify existing knowledge.

Peter S. Richards.

[Mr. Peter S. Richards, M.A., M.Phil., Dip.Ed., F.R.G.S. is Vice-Principal and Head of the Department of Liberal Studies and Commerce at the Wallasey College of Further Education.]

6 Lamb, op. cit., p. 10.
8 Personal communication from Professor T. W. Freeman of the University of Manchester.
BOOK NOTICES


The first thing to say about this second and rather belated volume of A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain is that it is not really a history of the Methodist Church in Great Britain! At least, it is not in the form that one would expect a definitive history to take. It does not follow the pattern of, say, Smith's History of Wesleyan Methodism or, more recently, Michael Watts's The Dissenters (reviewed in this issue on pages 190-1). More correctly, it is, like its predecessor, a "series of essays" on the history of Methodism in Great Britain—and that, we suggest, would have been a more appropriate title. The editors' preface, in fact, admits that this volume "consists of substantial essays on features of Methodism in Great Britain . . ." (p. 7). The problem for the reviewer is to decide whether to treat it in terms of its title or its contents. In terms of its title, it fails of its objective; as a series of essays (though the selection of topics would not be everyone's choice), it serves us well.

There are seven essays in all. The titles are enough to indicate the scope of their subject-matter, and the names of the authors sufficient to guarantee a high level of scholarship:

I. "Church and Society in the first half of the nineteenth century", by W. R. Ward.
IV. "Ordination", by A. Raymond George.
V. "The Mid-nineteenth-century Background", by T. E. Jessop.
VI. "The Wesleyan Methodists to 1849", by John H. S. Kent.
VII. "The rise of other Methodist traditions", by John T. Wilkinson.

Thus, taking the book as a whole, we get a general picture, without great detail, of the People called Methodists, living their "disciplined, simple, pious lives, removed from worldly pleasures and centred on home, chapel and business" (p. 110), yet contending with internal and external pressures which, in one way and another, transformed Mr. Wesley's federation of societies into a church to be reckoned with in the land. The "Halevy myth" is adequately dealt with, and Jabez Bunting—at last—given a true evaluation. One would wish to read more about the Wesleyan doctrine of the Pastoral Office, for it went a long way towards shaping the economy and discipline (and also the bitterness and tears) of nineteenth-century Methodism. It is significant that neither "Pastoral Office" nor "Alfred Barrett" appears in the index!

Now from contents to comment:

1. Our main criticism of the work concerns background, of which there is at once too much and too little. Of general background there is too much—85 pages on Church and Society and 51 on mid-nineteenth century, making a total of 136 out of 329. We certainly ought to know the context in which Methodism "lived and moved and had its being"—the sort of world in which the Methodists worked out their salvation—the cultural, social and ecclesiastical climate of the day, but in a book which purports to be a history of the movement, this information could have been contained in an introductory chapter of reasonable length. On the other
hand, we feel sure that, not infrequently, readers would wish for more information on important subjects which receive only passing mention—for example, the Lichfield case (pp. 283, 217) or Lord Sidmouth’s Bill (p. 216).

2. In a discussion of the secessions from Wesleyan Methodism, from Kilham to the Fly Sheets, one would like to see some evidence that an attempt has been made to understand the Wesleyan point of view. It is so easy to rely upon accounts which have been written by historians with a sympathy towards the reformers and an antipathy for the Wesleyans. Not to be ignored are those informative articles which appeared anonymously (but are now known to have been from the pen of Dr. J. S. Simon) in the London Quarterly Review between 1884 and 1898, or the files of the Wesleyan newspapers and magazines. Furthermore, for the claim to be a history of Methodism to be justified, much more needs to be said about the minor secessions (e.g. the Tent Methodists, the Band Room Methodists, the Church Methodists) which, by their presence and protests, were not without effect upon the moods and temper of the parent body. If it is “not inconsistent with modesty” (to use Wesley’s well-known phrase), the present reviewer would refer readers to his book Pastor and People (reviewed in these Proceedings, xl, pp. 120 ff.) for a detailed consideration of many of the points raised here.

3. On pages 280 and 283 (and in volume 1, page 283, referred to in a footnote) there appears to be some confusion about the events at Bristol in 1792 and 1794. In 1792 the trouble arose at the opening of Portland Street chapel when Samuel Bradburn and Thomas Roberts appeared in gowns and read the liturgy in surplices. This led to protests from the incumbent of the parish (the Rev. William Embury) and the trustees of the “old room”. It was in 1794, during the sittings of the Conference, that Henry Moore administered the Sacrament at Portland Street, as a result of which the trustees of the “old room” debarred him from “their” pulpit and the people responded with a mass walk-out. (See George Smith: History of Wesleyan Methodism, ii, pp. 21 f., 26 f.)

4. In several places, some editorial cross-referencing would have been helpful—for example, on the Anglican Evangelicals on pages 174 and 217, and on the Oxford Movement on pages 191 and 218 ff. In a volume like this, the crucial subjects are bound to be touched upon by more than one contributor.

5. Two minor points: On page 28, it is misleading to refer to the anti-separatists in 1791 as the “Church Methodists”. Doubtless the title did fit, but it is now applied to a small sect which sprang up in 1823 under a certain Mark Robinson in the East Riding of Yorkshire. The anti-separatists are usually referred to as the “Old Planners”, for they believed they were preserving the “old plan” of Methodism as a society within the Church of England. On pages 276 ff., one wonders why the 1812 edition of the Minutes is preferred to the definitive edition of 1862.

One final comment: There is still a vast storehouse of source-material at the Methodist Archives and Research Centre, in the form of thousands of contemporary pamphlets and newspapers, and until these are thoroughly studied the history of the Methodist Church in Great Britain has yet to be written.

The book is well produced and a pleasure to handle. The large print is much more “easy on the eye” than that of its predecessor, and the price for such a scholarly work is not unreasonable. We look forward to volume three, hoping that it will not be long delayed. JOHN C. BOWMER.

Who would ever have thought that the humble songs of Dissent and Methodism could receive serious and appreciative attention from a distinguished secular critic and poet?—and in the Clark Lectures too! Professor Davie certainly acknowledges a debt of insight inherited from his Baptist origins; but essentially he approaches his subject as a literary critic, even though one unusually aware of the theological tradition which informs it. (Readers, by the way, should not neglect the notes at the end of the book which expand the theological observations in the main text.)

The argument is that early eighteenth-century Dissent (especially as represented by Isaac Watts) possessed a definite and respectable culture of its own, informed by a "Calvinist aesthetic" of "classical" quality, characterized by "simplicity, sobriety and measure". Watts's achievement was to produce a kind of "tribal lay", pitched to the level of the congregation, yet also "accommodated" to the secular enlightenment and civility of the prevailing culture. To a lesser degree the Wesleys achieved something of the same cultural compromise. Unfortunately, in the delicate process of "simplification and intensification" which they found necessary to convey a body of "difficult but momentous truths" to a popular audience, they simplified and intensified too much, thus endangering the very truths they were trying to convey. The Unitarians and the post-Wesley Evangelicals are, however, the real villains for Professor Davie. The Unitarians may have helped to foster the political fortunes of Dissent, but political vigour is not necessarily the same as cultural vigour. The price paid for Unitarian achievements in politics (and in some respects in intellectual life) was theological heterodoxy; and this association was for Evangelicals too heavy a price to pay for culture. It encouraged Evangelical distaste for culture, and aggravated their tendency to reduce their intellectual and literary level to that of their popular following. Mark Rutherford is, for Professor Davie, the last belated example of the survival of some of the old Dissenting cultural virtues.

This book has the great merit of taking seriously the cultural aspects of Dissent and Methodism as one neglected clue to understanding their characteristics and historical significance, whilst at the same time recognizing how theological principles informed that culture and gave it special force. Suggestive hints are offered towards a revaluation of pre-Evangelical eighteenth-century religion and of the rise of Unitarianism. The criticism of Unitarianism and of Matthew Arnold's famous sneers at Nonconformist philistinism will not please everyone, and here a certain bias against radicals in politics and theology may be detected. Readers may care to note that in his Purity of Diction in English Verse (1952) Professor Davie provided a fuller literary context for the virtues he finds in the Dissenting tradition, including an analysis of Charles Wesley's hymns. He now seems to have more reservations about them, and one would welcome a similar analysis of Isaac Watts's achievement.

Michael Watts's book is more comprehensive in its coverage and at the same time more detailed in its treatment. It is, in fact, a much-needed synthesis of modern work on the history of Dissent—the first for sixty years, and a vast improvement on its predecessors, which so often seem to tell us more about nineteenth-century ambitions and prejudices than about the
earlier history they purport to be describing. This first volume offers a broadly chronological survey from the sixteenth century to the French Revolution, together with a more analytical account of the numerical and social aspects of Dissent and its congregational life in the early eighteenth century. A similar analysis for the period of the Evangelical Revival is reserved for a second volume, so that the account of Methodism, for example, though excellent as far as it goes, remains to be completed later.

Mr. Watts has performed a difficult task in an exemplary manner: his power of minute analysis and portrayal of individual cases is as impressive as his capacity for charting the larger and more impersonal processes of historical change. He achieves (what is now so important in religious history) a realistic appreciation of the economic, social and political forces which condition religious life, whilst convincingly insisting on the importance of the spiritual and theological aspirations which created the special Dissenting way of life. Much of the best modern research on his subject has been concentrated on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and this is digested and expounded in an admirably sensible and balanced manner. For the eighteenth century there is less satisfactory modern material available, and, as noted, some topics are reserved for the second volume. One noteworthy achievement here is the most precise account yet to appear of the social composition and numerical strength of Dissent by about the 1730s.

On Methodism Mr. Watts asks some much-needed questions about origins, and gives some helpful answers in terms both of social and psychological factors and of the background of High Church and "Puritan" piety and morality. His discussion of these matters would have benefited from Dr. Walsh's most recent work, but the fact is that fundamental research on the origins of the Revival is as yet insufficiently advanced for a satisfactory synthesis to be attempted. Mr. Watts makes good use of the "lives" of the preachers, and so avoids the old habit of characterizing the Revival simply in terms of its clerical leaders, but the possibilities of exploring the ordinary rank-and-file membership are not much exploited. Due weight is also given to the impact of the Revival on the "old Dissent", and to the rise of Unitarianism. At £15 for over 500 pages the book is still a bargain investment for a work which deserves to be standard on its subject for a good many years to come, and one hopes the sequel will speedily become available. HENRY D. RACK.

NOTES AND QUERIES

1315. "O HAPPY DAY".

With reference to Note 1311, it comes as a surprise to realize that until the lifetime of many still alive, these words appeared in many Methodist hymn-books as a straightforward LM hymn, i.e. without the familiar tune and chorus. It is set to Samson in the 1904 MHB (Wesleyan and New Connexion), and to Melcombe in the 1889 UMFC book, which continued to be used in that section of the United Methodist Church until the appearance of the present Methodist Hymn-Book in 1933. The PM book (which might have been expected to contain the lively version) set the words to Truro, and their Sunday-school hymn-book retained this setting, with an alternative (somewhat typically PM) tune, Dryden—but still no chorus. In 1895 they published a PM Mission Hymnal, which included verses and chorus set to another tune—Sunbeam.

The one standard Methodist hymn-book to include the familiar tune was the Bible Christian book of 1888 (No. 950), which continued in use until
But whilst it otherwise had to wait until 1933 for official recognition (so to speak) in Methodism, the Wesleyans had taken cognizance of it in a series of "mission" hymnals—*Hymns and Songs for Mission Services* (1887), *The General Hymnary* (1890), and *The People's Hymnary* (n.d., but after 1890), all of which have the popular tune, though the chorus lacks the opening lines, and begins "He taught me how to watch and pray". In this form it appears in the *Methodist School Hymnal* (Wesleyan and UM) (c. 1913). I myself, though brought up on the latter book and the UMFC book of 1889, cannot remember hearing this hymn sung in any other form than that now invariably used, and this may well be so with users of other books.

The earliest European Methodist hymn-book in which I have traced *Happy Day* is, curiously, the German *Zionspsalter* of 1876, where the full tune and chorus appear; and the words of verses and chorus are retained in their far more "German" book of 1926, but with a new German tune.

Mr. Edward Jones's suggestion that the chorus (and presumably familiar tune) is of American camp-meeting origin would appear to be well founded. Apart from the fact that, as he says, the tune appears first in the *Wesleyan Sacred Harp* of 1855 (an American collection), it is also found in the first edition of *Sankey* (n.d., c. 1874), No. 65; and, what is significant, the German Methodist Church, which, as noted, included the hymn in its 1876 book, is of American origin. These facts would appear to clinch the matter.

1316. HYMN 744 AND ITS CHORUS.

It would seem to be taken for granted that the lines now affixed as a refrain to Doddridge's hymn, by whomever written, were intended for this hymn and no other. But is this so? In the *Primitive Methodist Sunday School Union Hymn Book* (words 1879, music added 1882), there appears at No. 91 a hymn, set to *Happy Day*, whose first verse runs:

I'm glad I ever saw the day
When first I learn'd to sing and pray;
'Tis glory's foretaste makes me sing,
And praise my Saviour and my King.

Then follows the chorus, "Happy day!...", printed as now except for "took" instead of "washed". No author's name is given, but similarity of style strongly suggests that verses and chorus were penned by the same hand. At No. 92 (on the opposite page in the tune-book) is the hymn "O happy day that fixed my choice", set to *Winchester New*. Obviously Tune 91 would be an attractive alternative setting for Hymn 92, and one imagines that quite possibly the compilers of the book had this in mind.

Dr. Ellingworth draws attention to the second half of the fourth verse of "O happy day"; and the original lines he quotes, or variants of them, appear in many collections still. The earliest use of the lines

Nor ever from thy Lord depart,

With Him of every good possess'd

that I can find is in the *Primitive Methodist Hymn Book* of 1854, edited by John Flesher, the PM Book Steward of the day. Flesher was an unrepentant amender of other people's hymns, who patently ignored John Wesley's 1780 caveat in this regard, but if he was responsible for this particular change, one feels that he is for once to be commended!

ALFRED A. TABERER.