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

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

Proceedings
OF THE
Wesley Historical Society
Editor: REV. JOHN C. BOWMER, M.A., B.D., Ph.D.

Volume XL **June 1976**

CHARLES WESLEY AND THE AMERICAN WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

THAT John Wesley founded Methodism in the eighteenth century by the power of his preaching and the genius of his organizing ability is well known. And at least a few of the seven thousand hymns written by his younger brother, Charles, are familiar to many people. But that Charles also produced a large number of virulent poems on eighteenth-century British politics and the American War of Independence is not common knowledge at all. Yet, like many other writers at the time whose politics were decidedly Tory, Charles Wesley joined in the furious attack on the Whig politicians who were regarded as enemies of George III and thus inevitably opposed to the King's policies towards the American colonists. The literary merit of Wesley's political poems is not great, but the sentiments expressed in these poems, or "hymns" as he called them, do throw light on a facet of his character which has not previously received much critical attention.

The sources of the poems

There are two major sources of Charles Wesley's opinions on the American War of Independence and British politics at the time. The first is an unpublished manuscript note-book which represents a fair copy of various drafts written on loose sheets of paper; the second is a long narrative poem entitled "The American War under the Conduct of S[i]r W[illiam] H[owe]", extant in two manuscripts having minor textual differences. "The American War . . ." has now appeared in print.[1]

The note-book, which is listed in Sharp's *Catalogue of Wesleyana*,[2]

[1] See "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", ed. Donald Baker (M.A. thesis, University of Birmingham, 1959). Articles based on this edition have appeared in *Proceedings*, xxxiv, pp. 159-64, and xxxv, pp. 5-9; also in *Methodist History* (USA), October 1966. See also *The American War*, ed. with introduction and notes by Donald Baker (The Keepsake Press, London, 1975).

[2] J. A. Sharp: *A Catalogue of Wesleyana* (Methodist Publishing House, 1921). The note-book has also been listed by Dr. Frank Baker as "Manuscript Patriotism" No. 112, and in the Methodist Archives as C.27.

is entitled "Hymns and Verses on Modern Patriotism, and the American Rebellion and Independancy [sic] etc. Miscellaneous Poems", and is written in Charles Wesley's hand, but has been worked over at some time by his daughter Sarah, better known as Sally, who states in her own handwriting on the first fly-leaf: "Revised by his Daughter Sarah Wesley / 1824". It is apparently Sally who has carried out the two most drastic pieces of "revision"—firstly, by pasting a blank sheet of paper over three poems on page 108 concerning Charles James Fox, and secondly, by cutting out eleven pages in the small group of "Miscellaneous Poems" which Wesley bound in with the main body of the note-book. Some of the missing poems very probably deal with Charles Wesley's answer to the critics of the music recitals that were held at his London home;[3] others may refer to the strained relationship between Charles and his younger son, Samuel, when the latter's allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church was announced in 1784.[4] If it is Sally who removed these poems, the reason may be that she did not wish the personal criticism of her father or the family quarrel to be permanently preserved in verse, and thus, on either her own initiative or Samuel's, removed these eleven pages.[5]

Her elder brother, Charles, was a frequent visitor to the Prince Regent, and taught music to Princess Charlotte; this attachment to the Court continued when George IV ascended the throne, but it need not be inferred that Sally altered her father's poems in those places where George IV, then Prince of Wales, was cast in a poor light. It is not likely, I think, that her brother had this much influence over his sister—who, in fact, had much more control over *him*. "She had," says Thomas Jackson, "considerable power over the mind of her faithful brother Charles."[6]

Sally's textual alterations probably derive from a reverence for the King that was certainly as great as that of her father for George III. Thus, when reading her father's statements about the Prince of Wales, who had openly associated himself with the Opposition, she might have felt bound to alter them in 1824, now that the Prince had become King. This seems to be the reason for the alteration in "American Independancy", part II, where Sally has changed her father's

[3] Charles Wesley was criticized for holding concerts of secular music on the Sabbath. Two poems in the "Miscellaneous" section, which were not cut out with the other poems, are a defence of these recitals.

[4] At the top of page 23 of the "Miscellaneous" section in the note-book there is the following couplet, which seems to be the end of a poem dealing with the strained relationship between father and son occasioned by Samuel's confession of Roman Catholicism:

But now, we fear, he wou'd much rather
Pluck out the eyes of his old Father.

[5] Dr. Frank Baker believes he has succeeded in tracing the poems which have been torn out, and has published them, together with others from the "Miscellaneous" section, in *Representative Verse of Charles Wesley*.

[6] T. Jackson: *Memoirs of the Rev. Charles Wesley, M.A.* (John Mason, London, 1848), p. 406.

Your country sold by his [George III's] own sons . . .

to

Your country sold by Briton's sons . . .[7]

Whether Sally revised the note-book with a view to preparing it for publication is uncertain. In actual fact, except for "The American War", Charles Wesley's political poems have never been published, apart from eight poems—Nos. 1, 10 (Part II), 13 (Part II), 23, 24, 25, 26, 30—which are printed in Osborn's *Poetical Works of John and Charles Wesley*, viii (1876). Five of these eight had previously appeared in *The Arminian Magazine*—one in 1780, one in 1781, and the remaining three in 1782.[8] More recently, Dr. Frank Baker has reproduced in his *Representative Verse of Charles Wesley* seven poems from the main section of the note-book and several examples on various topics from the "Miscellaneous" section.

Also extant are some loose manuscript sheets of roughly half the poems. These manuscripts almost certainly represent the original drafts, since the first page of some of them has the letter T written at the top in Charles Wesley's hand to indicate that the poem had been transcribed. It was Charles's practice to revise his work continually, and of one poem in the note-book—No. 40—there are two loose manuscripts in existence. In the note-book itself, he has made a few alterations to various poems, though these are not of great significance.

The long narrative poem, "The American War", is mainly complementary to the theme of the note-book poems. In 1780, John Wesley had published, under the main title of *Political Extracts*,[9] various passages from the work of Joseph Galloway, a delegate from Pennsylvania to the First Continental Congress. Galloway seems to have been strongly pro-British, but, for reasons I shall refer to later, violently opposed to the British army commander, Sir William Howe. John Wesley's *Political Extracts* ran through five editions in 1780—a fact which testifies to its popularity. From possible references in the poem to historical events and from similarities in phraseology to Galloway's pamphlets,[10] it seems likely that "The American War" represents Charles Wesley's somewhat pedestrian versification of these curious but interesting essays in political pamphleteering.

The sheer length of "The American War" may have precluded it from incorporation in the note-book, since Charles usually published

[7] op. cit., No. 48, Part II, l. 9 (p. 104).

[8] Six poems from the "Miscellaneous" section also have been published in the *Poetical Works*.

[9] Joseph Galloway: "Reflections on the Rise and Progress of the American Rebellion"; "An Account of the Rise and Progress of the American War"; "A Reply to the Observations of Lieut. Gen. Sir William Howe"; "A Letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord Vincent H[ow]e on his Naval Conduct of the American War".

[10] All these pamphlets were condensed by John Wesley and published under the main title of *Political Extracts*. I have worked over the fifth edition of 1780, and Sharp gives the date of the first edition also as 1780, so the work must have been extremely popular.

his long poems separately from his collections of occasional hymns and poems—as, for example, "The Protestant Association" and his "Advice to the City", where, although both poems deal with the Gordon Riots in June 1780, they were not included in the little volume he published entitled *Hymns written in the Time of Tumult, 1780.*

The primary source, then, for the text of "Hymns and Verses on Modern Patriotism and the American Rebellion . . ." is an octavo note-book, quarter-bound in calf, with marble paper boards. The poems are all written in Charles Wesley's hand on watermarked laid paper, and it appears, from considerations discussed later, that he was following his usual practice of writing fair copies on loose sheets, which were later bound together.

The inside cover of the note-book bears the inscription, in Charles Wesley's hand: "Hymns & Verses / on Modern Patriotism, & the American / Rebellion and Independancy [sic] &c. / Miscellaneous Poems". Beneath this in another hand is written: "Conference Office No. 9". I do not think there is any doubt that this is the hand of the Rev. Dr. F. J. Jobson, who was the Wesleyan Book Steward from 1864 to 1879. One of Dr. Jobson's letters is headed "Wesleyan Conference Office", and the handwriting is identical with that for the words "Conference Office" in Wesley's note-book. Moreover, it would have been one of Jobson's duties as book steward to take charge of manuscripts, so that "Conference Office No. 9" is almost certainly his catalogue number for the note-book.

The first fly-leaf has, in Wesley's daughter's hand: "Revised by his Daughter Sarah Wesley / 1824". On the reverse of this leaf appears a circular stamp: "Conference Office Library No. 9". On the second fly-leaf is written, in Wesley's hand: "Patriots, Indep., Americans." Then follow three blank sheets, and the first series of page-numbering begins.

There are, in effect, four sections to the note-book, each section being introduced by a title. The first section runs from page 1 to page 43, and is headed at the top of page 1: "Hymns and Verses / On Modern Patriotism, and the American / Rebellion & Independancy [sic] &c." "Modern" has been inserted at a later date in Wesley's hand, presumably to agree with the heading of the second section, beginning on page 45, where the title reads: "Verses and Hymns / on Modern Patriotism, and / the American Rebellion". "Independancy" has also been added, thus making it necessary to amend the original title, for he had written ". . . Rebellion &c.", and had to turn &c. into & by deleting the c. From a comparison of the ink and penmanship of the emendations, it appears as if they were made at the same time.

It seems likely that the heading on page 1 is intended to be a general title for the whole note-book, and that Charles Wesley began making his fair copy before Independence was acknowledged in the

Preliminary Articles of Peace, which were signed on 30th November 1782. Thus, on deciding to write a new series of poems on American Independence and to include it in the note-book collection, he found it necessary to add "Independancy &c." to the first heading or general title on page 1. The first section is composed entirely of poems in hymn-metres; but section two, which runs from page 45 to page 125, and which is headed "Verses and Hymns / on Modern Patriotism, and / the American Rebellion", has poems in both hymn-metres and octosyllabic couplets.

Following the end of the first series of numbered pages are four unnumbered ones. The first has the title "Modern Patriots" and the instruction at the top right-hand corner, in Charles's hand: "inserted p. 45". The three poems, "Modern Patriots", "The Prophecy of Sir Edward Newlite", and the untitled lines on Fox, which make up these four pages, would obviously fit on thematic grounds at page 43, the reverse of which is blank, and where "Modern Patriotism" would be a logical title for the first poem under the heading of section two of the note-book. There is no numbered page 44, so that it seems that there has been an error in the binding of the loose sheets, and that Wesley's instructions were not carried out.

The third section of the note-book is formed of the four parts of one poem, which is headed "The Testimony / of the American Loyalists / 1782". The poem begins a new series of page-numbers, which runs from page 1 to page 12, the figures on pages 10 and 11 having been omitted in error.

The final section is headed "Miscellaneous Poems / July 1st. 1785". The date presumably refers to the time when the fair copy was either made or begun, and Charles Wesley's decision to include this section with the poems on America caused him to add "Miscellaneous Poems" to the title on the inside front cover of the note-book. The pages in this fourth section are numbered from 1 to 38; the removal of eleven of these pages has already been mentioned. The poems which remain are on various topics that lie outside the scope of this introduction. Although seven of these poems are on a political theme, they deal with events much earlier than the period covered by the American War, and it seems reasonable to suppose that Charles himself did not intend these early political poems to be read with those of the main body of the note-book, otherwise he would no doubt have made some note for their insertion at a relevant point in the preceding sections.

Two curious poems, which, according to Wesley's own heading, were written beneath a picture of Richard Swanwick, an American Loyalist, appear in the "Miscellaneous" section. If Wesley's title is to be believed, the note-book version represents a transcription of the verses written on the portrait; but of this portrait, painted by John Russell (1745-1806), there is no trace.[11] These two poems both

[11] John Russell was affected at an early age by the Methodist preaching, and was "converted", as his diary records. He engaged in considerable preaching

deal with the character of Swanwick, who is also mentioned in poem No. 45 in section two of the note-book.

That the fair copies of the poems to be included in the note-book were first written on loose sheets and later bound together is clear when the following points are considered. There are several instances where insertions have been made after the pages had been numbered: at the end of page 92, for example, the catch-word "Written" is not picked up on either of the following pages, which are numbered (89) and (90). Page 92 has "89" written on the top right-hand corner, as if to indicate that this was to be the place of its insertion. The same interruption in the pagination occurs at page 72, where another insertion has been made. The one curious example of a wrongly-placed insertion has been mentioned above, and it may be that Charles Wesley wrote the note "inserted p. 45" some time after the poem, "Modern Patriots", was written. This is uncertain, as nothing can be deduced from the form of the script.

That Charles ever intended to publish the contents of the note-book in their entirety seems to me unlikely. The "Miscellaneous" section is obviously a later addition, destroying the unity of theme maintained in the main body of the work. It is interesting to note that towards the end of February 1780 the poet William Cowper had contemplated and even embarked upon a poem similar in theme to that in the first three sections of Charles's note-book. Cowper wrote to his friend William Unwin a letter which contained the following passage:

> When I wrote last I was a little inclined to send you a copy of verses entitled, "The Modern Patriot", but was not quite pleased with a line or two, which I found difficult to mend. At night I read Mr. Burke's speech in the newspapers, and was so well pleased with his proposals for a reformation, and with the temper in which he made them, that I began to think better of his cause, and burnt my verses.[12]

Burke certainly did not have this effect on Charles Wesley, but it would have been intriguing to compare Cowper's verses with those of the "poet of Methodism".

The themes of the poems

It seems very likely that Charles Wesley's information about the American War of Independence was drawn from his brother's reproduction of Joseph Galloway's works, to which reference has already been made, and also from Sir William Howe's defence of the British Army's campaigns which he gave before the House of Commons in April 1779. I think it is fairly certain that all of Charles's poems on the American War date from the latter part of that year

activity himself, endeavouring to convert as well as paint his sitters. He painted Whitefield in 1770, Charles Wesley in 1771, and John Wesley in 1773. The portraits of Whitefield and John Wesley have both been lost, and it is possible that the painting of Swanwick has disappeared along with them, since inquiries I have made on both sides of the Atlantic have revealed no trace of it.

[12] G. O. Trevelyan: *The American Revolution* (1905), iii, p. 273.

onwards—a deduction made partly from his own dated poems and partly from internal evidence in the poems themselves. Thus it can be said that Charles Wesley seems to have become interested in the question of American independence some four or five years after hostilities had actually broken out. We must briefly sketch in the events of these years, and attempt some explanation for their having happened at all.

On 3rd September 1783 the final draft of the treaty between Britain and the thirteen colonies in America was signed, thus ending a war which both sides had become too exhausted to fight. After a long and painful period of misunderstanding and diplomatic failure, war had broken out, and had proved to be a conflict fraught with incongruous situations between the opposing sides—situations that alternated between hatred and amity.

The war itself was primarily due to a political theory which George III refused to recognize as outdated, although to many Englishmen, including Charles Wesley, this refusal was based on a very solid theological doctrine of kingship.[13] In many ways the war in America was a struggle for principles similar to those at issue in the English Civil War of the preceding century. The American Revolution may have had fiscal manifestations, but its temper and inspiration were religious. It is a significant fact, which certainly did not escape the notice of the British Government, that many of the colonists were men who had found life impossible under an arbitrary political or religious authority, and in America had established a tradition of religious freedom. For example, Macrabie, brother-in-law to Philip Francis, remarked: "The Presbyterians should not be allowed to become too great. They are of republican principles. The Bostonians are Presbyterians."[14] In fact, the established church in Boston was Congregationalist, but the system of church government in the two denominations is not dissimilar. "The established church" to most Englishmen could, however, mean only one thing—the Church of England with its doctrine of apostolic episcopacy.

There seems little doubt that party politics in Britain and the Revolution in America were largely religious in inspiration. "Party strife in English politics," says E. R. Taylor, "has been conditioned by a peculiarly English division—that between Church and Dissent."[15] Dissent, whether of the Presbyterian or Congregationalist variety, to Charles Wesley and other Tories suggested some form of democracy, of social equality, and government by consent. The Civil War was largely the practical expression of religious beliefs in the individual conscience or "the inner light", which explains Charles Wesley's hatred of "Cromwell and the good old cause", to use a phrase from one of his own poems.

[13] Charles Wesley wrote several collections of verse on national events, which he usually viewed as divine punishments or rewards, the tone of the poems being strongly apocalyptic.

[14] Trevelyan, op. cit., iii, p. 298.

[15] E. R. Taylor: *Methodism and Politics* (1935), p. 5.

No doubt Charles Wesley could see, as did many others of similar doctrinal persuasion, amongst whom we must include Samuel Johnson, that the Puritan theology, mainly Calvinistic in tenor, stood for the emphasis of the individual and set him in the immediate presence of God. The Bible and the individual interpretation of it became the source of authority in place of the Church; but John and Charles Wesley, brought up in an atmosphere of high church doctrine, could have little to do with a system of belief that set the value of an institutionalized church with its rigid hierarchy so low. In spite of this, however, both the Wesleys retained a measure of Puritanism in their thinking, with their emphasis on individual experience. When this experience was carried over into the realm of politics, the brothers seemed to boggle. As H. B. Workman has pointed out,

> To some extent . . . the antipathy to the doctrine [of individual experience] was political. The staunch Toryism of the age felt that there was a danger to the Constitution in the presumption of ignorant underlings to a knowledge denied to their betters.[16]

In America, the Presbyterian form of church government was obviously the model on which the colonies were attempting to base themselves; and where the Presbyterian population was large, it appeared quite clear to the British Tories that Oliver Cromwell's ghost had arisen, and that the horrors of civil war would be re-enacted. The parallel between Cromwell's Commonwealth and the proposed independent American colonies was being continually drawn by contemporary writers, and the attitudes expressed by Charles Wesley in the "Hymns on Patriotism" were echoed many times by contributors to the daily press.

It is not surprising that the political reformers and Nonconformity were so closely linked in thought. The differences in outlook between the Anglican Tory and the nonconformist "Patriot"—as the Whig sympathizers with the Americans were often ironically termed—were religious differences which sprang from essential divergences of religious opinion. In the words of Professor Herbert Butterfield,

> The Church of England and the body of Dissenters had come to represent remarkably differing types of mentality and outlook. The cleavage was widened by the educational cleavage which separated schools like Eton and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge from the dissenting academies.[17]

The controversial reformers were often men who had little or no contact with the world of tradition represented by the Tories and the Anglican Church. They were men who believed in "common sense", and, influenced greatly by the French *philosophes*, they were intent on applying it to the government of the country.

In America, Nonconformity was an integral part of the revolutionary cause; and in Britain, localized opposition to the Government

[16] See *A New History of Methodism* (ed. Townsend, Workman and Eayrs) (1909), i, p. 20.

[17] H. Butterfield: *George III, Lord North and the People* (1949), pp. 182 ff.

was often in the hands of nonconformists. In December 1779, a correspondent to the *Public Advertiser* drew a clear and direct parallel between the political associations in America and Britain:

> The Associations in America . . . have set an example before Freemen how to act when oppressed. This example has been followed by Ireland . . . When James II was driven into Exile it was by a National Association . . . Association becomes the duty of all.[18]

Charles Wesley was naturally horrified with the state of affairs in which the established Church, its bishops and its political manifestations are under attack:

> Religion pure is chas'd away,
> General ungodliness succeeds
> And treason walks in open day,
> And unprovok'd rebellion spreads . . .[19]

He constantly refers to Cromwell and the Commonwealth in hymns written during this period:

> *In solemn League* with death and hell
> The saints against their King conspir'd
> With passions fierce, fanatic zeal
> With avarice and ambition fir'd
> O'erturn'd the government and laws
> The Parent State and Church subdued,
> And *sought the Lord* in Satan's cause,
> And Wash'd their hands in Royal blood.[20]

From his own point of view, Charles's hatred of the Commonwealth was quite justified. He rightly associated the régime with republicanism, and often referred to it under the popular term "the good old cause":

> The horror of the good old cause,
> The hate of Kings and Church and laws
> Thou wilt, O God, expel . . .[21]

In his own note to the line, he equates "the good old cause" with "the solemn league and covenant" signed in Edinburgh in 1643 for the express purpose of imposing a Presbyterian church and a new form of government inspired by Presbyterianism in England.[22]

In a penetrating essay, Professor E. Gordon Rupp has clearly shown that the key to John Wesley's politics is in the epistles of St.

[18] *Public Advertiser*, 4th December 1779.
[19] op. cit., No. 6, Part II, ll. 17-20 (p. 12).
[20] ibid., Part I, ll. 17-24 (p. 11).
[21] ibid., No. 10, Part I, ll. 67-9 (p. 22).
[22] The Solemn League was signed in 1643 in Edinburgh. The Scots wished to lead England to "the reformation of religion in the Church of England according to the example of the best reformed churches"; in other words, according to Presbyterianism. The Covenant was sworn by the House of Commons on 25th November 1643. In the Committee of Correspondence in Boston there originated a "Solemn League and Covenant", which bound all covenanters in Massachusetts to suspend communication and intercourse with Great Britain until "the Intolerable Acts" were repealed. Charles Wesley therefore quite rightly associated the Solemn League or "good old cause" with republicanism.

Paul. I think it also justifiable to include Charles in this respect, for Professor Rupp's remarks seem equally applicable to both the Wesleys:

> The fundament is in the Epistles of St. Paul, in the balanced duties of husband and wife, parents and children, master and slave, citizens and magistrates (Colossians iii. 18-iv. 1; Ephesians vi. 1-9; Romans xiii. 1-9). This doctrine in the first place is a theological, not a political or social doctrine of a hierarchy of balanced duties, and persists in almost every classic treatment of the theme . . . [i.e.] The High Church doctrine of Divine Right, Passive Obedience, and Non-Resistance . . .[23]

Upon this principle Charles Wesley takes his stand, and his poetical comments on the politics of this period must be interpreted with the principle of Christian obedience as opposed to the doctrine of the rights of man clearly in mind. To Charles Wesley, the Christian had responsibilities of obedience before he had rights of individual judgement. Anything which savoured of the latter, as events in America and the Opposition's support for them in Britain seemed to do, was to be suppressed as symptomatic of theological anarchy. Failure to obey could only lead to apostasy and chaos. We may sum up this argument in the words of the French historian Halévy: "The High Churchmen were Tories who supported the prerogative and denounced rebellion as sinful."[24]

Edmund Burke had warned the House of Commons that the enemies of episcopacy in America were not feeble folk. The central colonies had many Huguenot families, whilst along the western frontier lived Irish Presbyterians of Scottish descent. More numerous than these were the descendants of the old English Puritans who had equal cause to distrust bishops.

> Dislike and dread of Episcopacy intensified American opposition to the fiscal policy of Parliament; and the Non-importation Agreement, in all but the unanimous view of its promoters, held good against Bishops as well as against all other British products.[25]

Thus Charles Wesley sees the Revolution not only as political but as theological anarchy—an anarchy too closely resembling "Cromwell and his desperate crew"[26] to allow a high church Englishman to be complacent.

DONALD BAKER.

(To be continued)

[Mr. Donald S. Baker, M.A., M.Phil., Dip.Ed. is Principal Lecturer in English at Weymouth College of Education.]

[It is appropriate that we publish this article in this year of grace 1976, when the American people are celebrating the bicentenary of the Declaration of Independence.—EDITOR.]

[23] E. G. Rupp: "John Wesley's Toryism and our present Discontents", article in *The Presbyter*, November 1945.
[24] E. Halévy: *England in 1815* (1924), p. 391.
[25] Trevelyan, op. cit., iii, p. 299.
[26] "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", No. 10, l. 25 (p. 20).

TENSIONS IN PRIMITIVE METHODISM IN THE EIGHTEEN-SEVENTIES

And the Origins of the Christian Lay Churches in the North-East

(Continued from page 101)

A MOVE to divide the Sunderland circuit was set on foot at least as early as March 1875 by the ministers and the Tatham Street society. Their intentions, presumably, were to carve out a circuit, based on the new chapel, which could develop in freedom its own identity and mode of working. Later developments proved that this plan had connexional approval, and it must have been seen by its promoters, locally and connexionally, as an opportunity to give a new image to Primitive Methodism in Sunderland. The March 1875 Quarterly Meeting rejected the plan decisively by a vote of 69 to 19. By December 1875, however, the majority against it was cut to 4, and by that time an appeal had been made by the supporters of division to the PM General Committee (a standing committee meeting weekly in London) for a decision on the question. A delegation from the Committee consisting of two ministers, who were, I believe, the President and the Secretary of the Conference, arrived in Sunderland in January 1876. They met a party of some ninety circuit officials, 62 of whom expressed themselves opposed to division. The deputation then returned to London. Before the Committee's decision was conveyed to the circuit officially, news reached Sunderland that it had decided in favour of division—and this was in fact confirmed by a letter dated 21st January 1876.[24]

This decision was admittedly strange, and indeed unconstitutional. The Flag Lane circuit was in debt, and a majority of the officials and of the members of the Quarterly Meeting had stated quite unequivocally that in their view division would be against the interests of the circuit. The connexional rules forbade the division of a circuit where these two specific disqualifications were in operation.[25] Yet the Committee chose to set those rulings aside. The basis for their doing so was that, despite the majority against division, a "large and influential minority" wanted it; and moreover the Committee believed that a division would in fact promote peace and prosperity in the circuit, since "so many of the brethren are separated from each other in feeling and judgement on this and other important subjects."[26]

[24] The Circuit Committee minutes and the correspondence in the *Sunderland Daily Echo*, 17th to 24th January 1876, are the main sources for this sequence of events. The minutes contain the text of the letter, which is also found in Minute 283 of the General Committee Minutes for the connexional year 1875-6.

[25] *Consolidated Minutes* (1861), p. 33.

[26] The words are those of Charles Smith, secretary to the General Committee, in his letter of 21st January 1876.

It is possible to see some justification for the Committee deciding as they did. To begin with, their sympathies were on the ministerial side, and they could see the long-term advantages to Sunderland of a new circuit with a modern approach. Moreover, they appear to have lost patience with a particular element among the lay leadership —no doubt because in this and other affairs they had found them difficult and contentious. Indeed, the implication seems to be (and Kendall appears to mean this in his paragraph on the affair) that despite the lay leaders having mustered—some said "whipped in"—a large opposition to meet the delegation in January, they were nevertheless regarded as not representative of the true wishes and best interests of the circuit as a whole. This may have been true. Yet, whatever the Committee's intention, their decision to overrule the majorities both in the Quarterly Meeting and in the meeting of circuit officials meant that justice was not seen to be done. There was a predictable reaction, as the heightened tone of letters to the press reveals:

> A more tyrannically despotic act never proceeded from any church meeting. . . .
>
> Shall we suffer the priests to eat out the very heart of the connexion? . . . Can we sit down tamely under an act of arbitrary despotism? Shall the character of our connexion be changed by a number of priests and their miserable weaklings?[27]

On 5th February 1876, at a special meeting of circuit officials held at Flag Lane, J. F. Drinkwater and Myers Wayman proposed a resolution which expressed the conviction that "should there be a division there will be such an exodus as to make division unnecessary".[28] A fortnight earlier Edward Rutter had stated in a letter to the *Echo*:

> I think it is high time that the laymen of the Primitive Methodist Connexion were astir and looked about for help somewhere else. It seems obvious that the lay element has no place in the estimation of these gentlemen.

The ground was being prepared for that "exodus" which, a year later, was to lead to the foundation of the Lay Churches. The fact that there was a year's delay was because the matter was referred first to the District Meeting and then to the Conference, meeting in Newcastle in June 1876, and thence delegated to a special Conference committee, which finally enforced the division in February 1877 despite a further urgent request not to do so by a majority of the Quarterly Meeting of December 1876, on the grounds that a division would be "injurious both to the spiritual and numerical prosperity of the station".[29] It is apparent that the connexional authorities were in no mood to relent on the division issue; indeed, the overwhelmingly ministerial composition of the committee seemed almost

[27] *Sunderland Daily Echo*, 17th and 21st January 1876.
[28] Circuit Committee Minutes.
[29] Circuit Quarterly Meeting Minutes.

designed to provoke the opposition.[80] This fact was seized upon eagerly by those indefatigable correspondents to the Sunderland newspapers. For example:

> All confidence is at an end . . . This division has been effected by a Conference clique . . . infatuated by a love of power . . . characteristic of the whole priestly hierarchy; they seek not the chief good but little circuits and large salaries . . . They plunge into the secular affairs of the church and make everything subservient to their own aggrandisement. If Primitive Methodism is to be maintained in its original simplicity and power, the lay preachers must organise themselves throughout the connection, and by means of associations of this kind they may be able to arrest the progress of priestly power. It is however too late to attempt to heal the breach in Sunderland: two thirds of the local preachers have declared their intention to sever their connection with Primitive Methodism so that they may pursue their beneficent labours free from the trammels of ecclesiasticism.[81]

It may seem hard to believe that such phrases could ever be used to describe Primitive Methodism. Yet the strident tone of this anonymous letter should not deceive us into thinking that opposition to division was the preserve of an extremist fringe among the circuit's laity. There were trouble-makers in the circuit, no doubt, and when the secession came their departure was regarded as no great loss. But the seceders included among their number some of the most senior, respected and well-to-do men. The circuit was perhaps most hurt by the resignation of the highly-respected circuit steward Thomas Gibson, who had been a wise, able and generous leader. Despite all attempts to dissuade him, he refused resolutely "to continue in membership because of the way in which the Conference Committee divided the circuit although repeatedly told that it would injure the circuit".[82] However, he was, in Robert Clemitson's words, "too shrewd and regardful of the regular ministry to join the Lay Church", and he joined the Wesleyans.[83] There cannot be many instances in Methodist history of a layman leaving Primitive Methodism for alleged reasons of ministerial autocracy and opting for the Wesleyans instead!

There were others who, like Thomas Gibson, did not join the Lay Churches, and some drifted away from organized religion altogether. But the greater part threw in their lot with those who were prepared to organize societies on Lay Church principles. Within a matter of days after the Conference committee's decision of 13th February 1877, eighteen of the seceding local preachers, with obvious preparation, published a stylishly-printed plan for the Sunderland Circuit of Christian Lay Churches, with the first services arranged for the

[80] The members were: J. Dickenson, R. Smith, R. Fenwick, G. Charlton, G. Lamb, J. Macpherson, J. Atkinson, W. Stewart, C. C. McKechnie, T. Dearlove, T. Smith, T. Southron, H. Phillips and S. Antliff. Charlton and Stewart were the only laymen—both were Tynesiders.

[81] *Sunderland Daily Echo*, 16th February 1877.

[82] Circuit Quarterly Meeting Minutes, March 1877.

[83] PM *Magazine*, 1886, p. 87.

Sunday immediately following—18th February. The meeting-places included a public lecture-hall, workmen's halls, and colliery rooms. Some sentences from the Address printed on the plan state the principles of the seceders:

> We would not have it supposed that in leaving that Connexion with which many of us have been identified since childhood, we have changed our religious views. All that was dear to us in respect of doctrine, or cherished association, is dear to us still. But Primitive Methodism, in regard to its polity and the relationship subsisting between its paid ministers and the Lay Agency and Members, is no longer what it once was . . . We have resolved to return to the primitive usages laid down in the New Testament, believing that a hired ministry is by no means essential . . . We are resolved to disdain allegiance to a system which is subversive of Christian liberty and destructive to that holy bond of brotherhood which is declared in scripture to be the test of union with Christ.

The plan is headed by that text from Romans xii which in 1860 John Petty had quoted to signify one of the principal characteristics of true Primitive Methodism: "Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate." As their developments showed, the Lay Churches aimed to be true to that same precept, and their chapels, the first of which was erected in James William Street in the east end of Sunderland in 1878, were all in working-class areas in the town or in the colliery villages round about. It would be a mistake, however, to interpret the secession in over-simplified class terms, since many of its leaders were not working-class themselves. The principal men involved included a shipbuilder (D. A. Douglass), the proprietor of a private academy (E. Rutter), a cabinet-maker and undertaker (M. Wayman), an insurance agent (J. F. Drinkwater, who was apparently the chief propagator of the lay church idea, and at whose house the leading seceders met on 15th February to forge their plans), and two prosperous coal-exporters (T. Shields and William Branfoot).[34] It is not the least of the ironies of the whole episode that the last-named was the son of the pioneer PM missionary who came to the town in 1821. At the time of the secession William Branfoot was 52 years of age, and we should not underestimate the sacrifice involved in breaking his lifelong ties with his mother church and shouldering the very real financial and personal demands which came to him as a pillar of the new lay movement.[35]

A correspondent to the *Sunderland Daily Echo* of 2nd March 1877 cast doubts upon the organizing ability of the seceders, who in his view seemed better suited to destruction than construction. He did them an injustice. Having crossed their Rubicon, they applied themselves to building up their Lay Churches with devotion and evangelical zeal. By what exact processes their cause was propagated I am not clear, but by 1886 they had in their Sunderland circuit eight chapels and seven other preaching-places, 793 members,

[34] Information based on Sunderland directories.
[35] See Vickers, op. cit., p. 191.

1,625 Sunday-school scholars, and 289 teachers.[36] Moreover by that date the movement had spread from Sunderland to other north-eastern centres, and the Sunderland seceders were playing a leading role in the affairs of the Northern Counties Federation of Lay Churches.

There is not space to pursue further the Lay Church side of the aftermath of the secession. Let us, in conclusion, consider its significance for Primitive Methodism. There is no doubt that the Conference committee's decision was, in the short term at least, a disaster. Two societies were decimated completely by the secession; Flag Lane was reduced to 39 members, and the days of the historic old chapel were numbered.[37] The total losses to the circuit were thought to be at least 330, all from Sunderland I (Flag Lane) circuit. The new Tatham Street circuit was not affected. Such was the financial plight of the old circuit that the ministers could not be paid their full salaries for over a year, and in 1878 the circuit was obliged to request a student straight from the Institute as second minister at a salary of £15 a quarter instead of the customary married man at something near twice that amount.[38]

Thomas Southron, the superintendent (who was to become President of the Conference in 1882) was virtually denuded of all his circuit officials, and the Circuit Committee minutes make sorry reading for a few months. For example, the entry for 22nd May 1877 reads:

> Present: T. Southron.
> [Resolved:] That T. Southron do the best he can with any business in the circuit as nobody but himself is present at this meeting.

The old circuit certainly passed through the Valley of Humiliation during these years. However, within less than a decade there was a genuine recovery. By 1886 the combined membership of the two circuits in the town was 321 more than the figure for the undivided circuit in 1876.[39] Both circuits benefited in this growth, and this fact would appear to justify the decisions taken by the General Committee and the Conference committee, upholding the wishes of those who wanted the division of the circuit despite the fact that they could not muster a majority in the Quarterly Meeting. Yet, was the immediate cost too great? Could the secession have been avoided by postponing a decision and attempting to effect a reconciliation? One would like to think that it could; but the committees, with a full knowledge of the situation not available to us, obviously believed that matters had reached such a pitch that division was the better course, even if it meant braving the dire consequences which the opposition had warned would follow. There may even have been

[36] PM *Magazine*, 1886, p. 87.
[37] Within a few years it was closed and the society re-established in the Institute building after it had ceased to be used for ministerial training in 1883. The Flag Lane chapel was sold to the Church of England as a chapel-of-ease to Sunderland parish church.
[38] "Circuit Accounts of Monies and Members".
[39] PM *Magazine*, 1886, p. 87.

the thought in some minds that a secession was a desperate remedy worth risking in order to ensure the health of the circuit by the removal of a particularly difficult element whose motivation was, as someone at the time claimed, "wounded pride and disappointed ambition".[40] If so, they cannot surely have foreseen how large a number actually would secede.

Moreover, personal factors apart, there were deep convictions on either side which made conciliation very difficult. The issues were caught up in that general crisis of identity within Primitive Methodism as it passed out of its early, fervent, expansionist phase. The seceders, and those whose point of view they voiced, looked back to a simpler age in an endeavour to preserve what they believed was the original purity of Primitive Methodism. Against them was ranged the party which believed that new situations called for new responses, and who were prepared for Primitive Methodism to develop in ways which were not entirely in keeping with its original character as a largely proletarian revivalist movement. The supporters of this position wished to retain an evangelical emphasis—souls must still be saved—but they conceived the strategy of evangelism in broader and more complex terms than revivalist missions to the working class, though these still had relevance in particular situations. The modernizing party wanted a Primitive Methodism which was both evangelical *and* ecclesiastical, popular *and* cultured.

There was an inevitable tension in this desire to have the best of both worlds, and this tension was acutely felt in relation to the role of the ministry. The classical pattern of a PM minister was a poorly-paid, self-sacrificial, full-time evangelist who itinerated both *between* and *within* circuits, which were often of considerable extent. (John Petty's biographer describes a typical week's round in the old Sunderland circuit in the early 1830s which involved walking from Sunderland to Hartlepool on a Saturday and, after preaching there on Sunday, walking back by stages throughout the ensuing week.[41] At each place en route at which the preacher called there was a round of duties—sermons, class meetings, home visiting, and so on.) The anticipated result of all this labour was that the circuit would prosper. A quarter without an increase, or showing a decrease, was a matter both for sorrow and explanation. As the PM circuit schedules show, exceptional circumstances—strikes, emigration, etc.—often were the cause of decline, and the ministers were therefore "exonerated".[42] But the implication is clear: in normal times a minister justified his keep by adding to the numbers of those saved. "By their fruits shall ye know them."

The minister's full-time engagement in the work of evangelism

[40] *Sunderland Daily Echo*, 2nd March 1877.

[41] Macpherson, op. cit., p. 199.

[42] The Circuit Reports of the Westgate (Weardale) PM circuit, 1836-1932, are very instructive in this connexion. (Durham County Record Office, reference M/We 93.)

was what marked him out as different from the laity. In other respects the distinction is hard to discern. His standard of living (unless he enjoyed private means) was that of the working class, he enjoyed no prestige or status other than that of a preacher of the Gospel, and there was no administrative or pastoral function which a layman could not, in theory and practice, discharge as well as a minister.[43] In the early and middle decades of the nineteenth century the roles of ministers and lay leaders were, in practice, fairly well distinguished from each other. The ministers devoted themselves to travelling and preaching in their far-flung stations, never in one place for long, whilst the laity bore the heat and burden of circuit- and society-leadership. This fraternal division of duties between laity and ministry was well suited to the expansionist period of Primitive Methodism, but as the movement matured in the later decades of the century its connexional emphasis moved towards consolidation and concentration. One feature of this, as we have already seen, was a drastic reduction in the average size of circuits, which was itself an outward manifestation of a more fundamental shift of policy affecting the deployment and role of the ministry. Working in a more narrowly-defined area, the minister became closely involved in the day-to-day life of a relatively small number of societies as pastor and administrator, and his frequent appearance in the same pulpits obliged him, if he were conscientious, to have recourse to his books more often for his necessary mental enrichment. It was natural too that he should become caught up in chapel-building and other schemes intended to improve the civic image of the Primitive Methodists and to provide a more decorous context for their worship and fellowship. In these and other ways the minister became the focal point of changes which were occurring throughout the connexion.

These changes might be seen on the one hand to be leading Primitive Methodism away from the poorer classes, but on the other they may be seen as an endeavour to keep company with the working-class members of their movement on their path towards respectability. It is probably true that most members accepted the changes, and were willing, too, to support their ministers in their changing role. It was inevitable, however, that some traditionalists should view these developments with concern, and even see them as a betrayal of the pioneers of the movement; inevitable too that they should query the justification of a salaried minister who was not engaged primarily in aggressive evangelism, and the acceptability of a connexional authority which supported and encouraged the developments in question.

These tensions were not new to Methodism as a whole. In most respects they were the same as those which had afflicted Wesleyanism two or three generations earlier. The issues which troubled the

[43] R. Currie: *Methodism Divided* (1968), p. 168, quoting J. R. Gregory: *A History of Methodism* (1911), i, p. 230.

Wesleyans in the 1820s and 1830s foreshadowed in a quite remarkable way those within Primitive Methodism in the 1870s, though on the face of it one might have expected the PMs to avoid the problems experienced by the "old body". Within both connexions, once they had attained maturity, one sees a minority reacting against tendencies which were felt by them to be changing the essential character of Methodism as they had known it, or wanted it to be—tendencies towards a more centralized and disciplined church structure, towards the growing authority of Conference over local affairs, towards a more refined and less evangelical ministry exercising its duties in smaller circuits, and towards more dignity in chapel-design and worship. Those who opposed these tendencies—and especially those who went to the length of seceding because of them—were opting for a looser and freer type of religious organization which allowed a high degree of local autonomy, one which was lay- rather than ministerially-dominated, preferred evangelism to consolidation, and was popular rather than dignified in its worship. These were the aims of the seceders from Wesleyanism in the 1820s and 1830s and from Primitive Methodism in the 1870s.[44]

It would be interesting to pursue these comparisons, and to examine also the social and political contexts in each case, but there is not space here for that. And despite the common elements which have been noted, there were some important differences. Firstly, the PM troubles were, as far as I am aware, largely confined to the North-East, though it may be that research in other areas would reveal other examples of tension, if not of actual secession. Secondly, the Wesleyan seceders all retained a professional ministry. This was true even of the Protestant Methodist secession, which perhaps bears closest resemblance to the Lay Church secession: it was an entirely lay revolt, and had led to accusations by the dissentients that "the people were 'priest-ridden' and that the Preachers were 'lording it over God's heritage'".[45] Yet the Protestant Methodists retained itinerants, though admittedly giving them a humble status. Why did the seceders from Primitive Methodism in the Sunderland circuit opt for the "non-hired ministry"? The major reason would seem to be that whilst Wesleyanism had developed a high view of the pastoral office, the PM doctrine of the ministry, as revealed in connexional practice, was so low that it was not illogical for the Sunderland seceders to take the ultimate step and do away altogether with paid professional ministers, transferring their functions entirely to the appropriate lay members of each congregation.

It was because the Primitive Methodist seceders started from a doctrine of the ministry which was already more radical than that of the Wesleyans that they were led on to a correspondingly more radical solution, which they found in the concept of the lay church.

[44] See J. C. Bowmer: *Pastor and People* (1975) for a fine analysis of the Wesleyan position in the sixty years after John Wesley's death.
[45] ibid., pp. 115-17, 135.

In this respect it is instructive to recall that Independent Methodism, with its lay ministry, had taken root in the North-East, including Sunderland, in 1819, and appears to have lasted to around 1830, when (I suspect) it was absorbed into Primitive Methodism. It may be that its ideal of a lay ministry had never been entirely forgotten, but had endured in a subterranean way below the normal levels of circuit life until the circumstances were once again ripe for its re-emergence nearly half-a-century later.

* * *

The events of the years 1873 to 1877 in Sunderland Primitive Methodism do not make particularly happy reading. Drama there was in plenty. And one may therefore overlook the fact that, despite all the tension and the final parting of the ways, the steady work of the circuit continued among those who, as H. B. Kendall reminds us, were its real strength—"those sequestered souls in the various societies who quietly did their duty and gave stability to the cause".[46] Without them there could have been no recovery.

GEOFFREY E. MILBURN.

[46] Kendall, op. cit., ii, p. 205.

Main sources and abbreviated references

I—DOCUMENTARY AND OTHER UNPUBLISHED SOURCES

(a) Sunderland Primitive Methodist Circuit Records deposited at the Durham County Record Office:

Flag Lane Chapel Leaders' Meeting Minutes, 1854-78 (Catalogue reference M/SuS 112)
Flag Lane Chapel Sunday School Minutes, 1872-6 (M/SuS 115)
Circuit Committee Minutes, 1869-91 (M/SuS 82/2)
Circuit Accounts of Monies and Members, 1848-1914 (M/SuS 83)
Circuit Quarterly Meeting Minutes from 1857 (M/SuS 76).

(b) Records deposited at the Methodist Archives and Research Centre:

Ministerial Candidates Committee Minute Book (being the minutes of the Sunderland PM Theological Institution, 1865-84)
Primitive Methodist General Committee Minutes, volume for 1873-7.

(c) Journals:

The journal of the Rev. William Gelley covering the years from 1864 to 1875. [I am grateful to Mr. W. O. Gelley for access to this manuscript.]

(d) Circuit Plans (originals or photo copies in the author's possession):

Sunderland PM Circuit Plan, January to March 1877
Sunderland I PM Circuit Plan, October to December 1878
Christian Lay Churches Plan, Sunderland Circuit, February to May 1877
Christian Lay Churches Plan, Darlington Circuit, November 1884 to February 1885
Free Gospel Ministers' Plan, Westmorland and Durham Circuit, January to April 1876.

[I am grateful to Mr. J. Edwards of Sunderland and to the late Mr. A. Dalby of Colne, for access to the third and the last of the plans listed.]

II—PUBLISHED WORKS

(a) Books:

H. B. Kendall: *The Origin and History of the Primitive Methodist Church* (two volumes) (no date, but c. 1905-10); *History of the Primitive Methodist Connexion* (no date, but c. 1888); *History of the Primitive Methodist Church* (1919)

J. Petty: *History of the Primitive Methodist Connexion* (1860); also a new edition, revised and enlarged by J. Macpherson (1880)

W. M. Patterson: *Northern Primitive Methodism* (1909)

J. Vickers: *History of Independent Methodism* (1920)

E. Embleton: *Reminiscences* (1945)

Consolidated Minutes of the PM Connexion (1861)

P. J. Parrott: *A Digest of the History, Polity and Doctrines of the Primitive Methodists* (1866)

Diamond Jubilee booklet, Shildon Independent Methodist Church (1930).

(b) Articles:

R. Clemitson: "Primitive Methodism in Sunderland", in *Primitive Methodist Magazine*, 1886, pp. 19-23, 85-7.

(c) Newspapers (on microfilm in the Sunderland Central Library):

Sunderland Times for the years 1873 to 1876

Sunderland Daily Echo for the years 1876 and 1877.

(d) Directories:

Ward's Directories for Newcastle, Gateshead and Sunderland, 1873-4, 1877-8, 1879-80, 1885-6

Kelly's Directory for Sunderland, 1886.

THE ANNUAL LECTURE

in connexion with the Preston Conference, 1976,

WILL BE DELIVERED IN THE

Central Methodist Church, Hargreaves Street, Burnley,

On Monday, 28th June, at 7-30 p.m.,

BY

Dr. DAVID A. GOWLAND, B.A.

Subject: "SAMUEL WARREN AND THE METHODIST REFORMERS OF LANCASHIRE".

The chair will be taken by MR. E. ALAN ROSE, B.A.

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

Mr. and Mrs. Rowland C. Swift kindly invite members of the Society to **Tea** in the schoolroom at **4-30 p.m.** It is desirable that all those who intend to be present at the Tea should send their names to the Rev. J. D. Wood, 26, Rosehill Road, Burnley, Lancs (Tel. 0282 24663) not later than Saturday, 26th June.

To reach Burnley *by car*, take the A59 from Preston. After approximately 3 miles turn left (at Salmesbury traffic signals) to Whalley, and from there follow the Padiham and Burnley signs. At Burnley town centre turn right at traffic signals by Woolworths (Hammerton Street). Hargreaves Street is first left in Hammerton Street, and there are three car parks nearby. *Buses* leave Preston bus station (behind the Conference hall) for Burnley at frequent intervals, and the chapel is five minutes walk from Burnley bus station. *Trains* are less convenient.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF METHODIST HISTORICAL LITERATURE, 1974

[It is hoped that a bibliography on these lines will be an annual feature published in our June issue.—EDITOR.]

THIS list covers theses, books, pamphlets and articles which appeared in 1974 and which made a significant contribution to the study of British Methodism. The emphasis has been on national and regional developments, and only the more substantial of individual chapel histories have been included.

Notification of major omissions and offers of help with future bibliographies should be sent to the author at Wadham College, Oxford, OX1 3PN. Those who have recently completed research degrees are particularly requested to supply details of their dissertations.

The assistance of the following in the compilation of this year's report is gratefully acknowledged: Messrs. David A. Barton, Alan N. Cass, Geoffrey E. Milburn, E. Alan Rose, Roger F. S. Thorne, John A. Vickers, and Dr. John D. Walsh.

K. J. ALLISON (ed.): *A history of the County of York: East Riding*, II (London, pp. 365).

ANON.: "A Salford Mission in 1894", *Journal of the Lancashire and Cheshire Branch of the Wesley Historical Society*, II, pp. 166-7.

M. K. ASHBY, *Joseph Ashby of Tysoe, 1859-1919*, new impression with introduction by E. P. Thompson (London, pp. 303).

M. K. ASHBY: *The changing English village: A history of Bledington, Gloucestershire, in its setting, 1066-1914* (Kineton, pp. 425).

F. BAKER: "The real John Wesley", *Methodist History*, XII, No. 4, pp. 183-97.

A. M. BANKS: "Diary of a Birmingham Methodist", *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XXXIX, pp. 97-103, 145-8.

E. BARRETT: *Finchley Methodist Church, 1874-1974* (London, pp. 29).

J. L. BAXTER: "The Great Yorkshire Revival, 1792-6: A study of mass revival among the Methodists", in M. HILL (ed.): *A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain*, VII (London, pp. 46-76).

J. D. BEALS: "John Wesley's concept of the Church", *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, IX, pp. 28-37.

J. M. BELLAMY and J. SAVILLE (eds.): *Dictionary of Labour Biography*, II (London, pp. 454).

J. H. BETTEY: "Bishop Secker's Diocesan Survey", *Dorset Natural History and Archæological Society Proceedings*, XCV, pp. 74-5.

B. J. BIGGS: "Nonconformist Records and their uses", *Bulletin of Local History: East Midlands Region*, No. 9, pp. 14-26.

L. BILLINGTON: "The Churches of Christ in Britain: A study in 19th century Sectarianism", *Journal of Religious History*, VIII, pp. 21-48.

T. J. BLACKWELL: "The history of a working-class Methodist chapel", *Working Papers in Cultural Studies*, V (Birmingham), pp. 65-83.

J. C. BOWMER: "Ordination in Wesleyan Methodism, 1791-1850", *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XXXIX, pp. 121-7.

J. C. BOWMER (ed.): "An unpublished Wesley letter", ibid., XXXIX, p. 144.

J. C. BOWMER: "The Ordination Service in Wesleyan Methodism, 1791-1850", ibid., XXXIX, pp. 153-7.

J. C. BOWMER: "The Minutes of Conference", ibid., XXXIX, pp. 187-8.

J. C. BOWMER: "Alexander Mather", *Journal of the Scottish Branch of the Wesley Historical Society*, No. 3, pp. 3-8.

J. C. BOWMER and J. A. VICKERS: "Academic Theses on Methodist History", *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XXXIX, pp. 184-5.

G. T. BRAKE: *Drink: Ups and downs of Methodist attitudes to Temperance* (London, pp. 151).

A. BROCKETT: "The Nonconformists", *The Devon Historian*, No. 9, pp. 9-13.

J. BURNETT: *Useful Toil: Autobiographies of working people from the 1820s to the 1920s* (London, pp. 364).

D. BUTLER and D. STOKES: *Political change in Britain: the evolution of electoral choice* (2nd edn., London, pp. 500).

W. R. CANNON: "Methodism in a philosophy of history", *Methodist History*, XII, No. 4, pp. 27-43.

A. P. CHAMPLEY (ed.): "Primitive Methodism in Haltwhistle, 1822-1860", *Wesley Historical Society North-East Branch Bulletin*, No. 22, pp. 19-22.

S. D. CHAPMAN: *Jesse Boot of Boots the Chemists* (London, pp. 288).

F. L. CROSS and E. A. LIVINGSTONE (eds.): *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (2nd edn., London, pp. 1518).

F. H. CUMBERS: "John Wesley—Publisher", *Wesley Historical Society East Anglia Branch Bulletin*, No. 31, pp. 3-6.

G. J. DAVIES: "John Wesly, *c.* 1636-1670", *Notes and Queries for Somerset and Dorset*, XXX, pp. 55-60; subsequently reprinted in *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XL, pp. 80-4.

W. R. DAVIES: *Spirit Baptism and Spiritual Gifts in Early Methodism* (Thelwall, pp. 14).

S. DAVIS: "Close-up on Southey", *Methodist Recorder*, 21st November 1974.

D. C. DEWS: "The Ecclesiastical Returns, 1851: A study of Methodist attendances in Leeds", *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XXXIX, pp. 112-16.

M. DRABBLE: *Arnold Bennett: A biography* (London, pp. 397).

J. P. D. DUNBABIN: *Rural Discontent in 19th century Britain* (London, pp. 320).

R. W. DUNNING (ed.): *A History of the County of Somerset*, III (London, pp. 293).

G. T. EDDY: "A Methodist Minister's Journal, 1837-1857", *Wesley Historical Society East Anglia Branch Bulletin*, No. 32, pp. 4-8.

M. L. EDWARDS: "The Reluctant Lover: John Wesley as suitor", *Methodist History*, XII, No. 2, pp. 46-62.

M. L. EDWARDS: "Aldersgate and the Year of Evangelism", *Methodist Recorder*, 23rd May 1974.

M. L. EDWARDS: *The Wesleys in Bristol* (Manchester, pp. 20).

E. EVANS: *Howel Harris, Evangelist, 1714-1773* (Cardiff, pp. 78).

J. EYRE (ed.): *Extracts from the Diary of Jeremiah Gilbert (1789-1852)* (Chesterfield, pp. 12).

C. D. FIELD: "Methodism in Metropolitan London, 1850-1920: A social and sociological study" (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, pp. 401).

J. M. Fletcher: "The Beginnings of Methodism in Wednesbury", *Black-countryman*, VII, No. 1, pp. 7-11.

R. FLETCHER: *The Akenham Burial Case* (London, pp. 280).

M. W. FLINN and T. C. SMOUT (eds.): *Essays in Social History* (Oxford, pp. 289).

J. O. FOSTER: *Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution: Early industrial capitalism in three English towns* (London, pp. 346).

K. B. GARLICK: "The Wesleyan Theological Institution: Hoxton and Abney House, 1834-42", *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XXXIX, pp. 104-12.

K. B. GARLICK: "Wesleyan Theological Institution Governors", ibid., XXXIX, p. 183.

P. GASKINS: *Methodism in Hutton Roof* (Carnforth, pp. 26).

E. D. GRAHAM: "The Life and Times of Lady Glenorchy", *Journal of the Scottish Branch of the Wesley Historical Society*, No. 3, pp. 15-20; No. 4, pp. 13-17.

G. D. HALL: "Congregationalists, Methodists and Lancashire Nonconformity during the years 1790-1907" (Liverpool M.A. thesis, pp. 167).

D. G. HANSON: *Within these Walls: A century of Methodism in Formby* (Formby, pp. 102).

N. B. HARMON: "John Wesley's *Sunday Service* and its American revisions", *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XXXIX, pp. 137-44.

N. B. HARMON (ed.): *The Encyclopedia of World Methodism*, I and II (Lake Junaluska, pp. 2816).

J. W. HARRIS: *Concern for each inner city*, Home Mission Division, Occasional Papers, No. 24 (London, pp. 33).

R. P. HEITZENRATER: "The Oxford Diaries and the first rise of Methodism", *Methodist History*, XII, No. 4, pp. 110-35.

T. W. HEYCK: "Home Rule, Radicalism and the Liberal Party, 1886-1895", *Journal of British Studies*, XIII, No. 2, pp. 66-91.

P. L. R. HORN (ed.): *Agricultural Trade Unionism in Oxfordshire, 1872-81*, Oxfordshire Record Society, XLVIII (Oxford, pp. 144).

L. HORSTMANN: "A Birthday Portrait of J. Scott Lidgett", *Methodist Recorder*, 8th August 1974.

A. J. HUNT: "James Way—Missionary to Australia", *Proceedings of the Plymouth and Exeter Branch of the Wesley Historical Society*, III, No. 1, pp. 5-13.

L. O. HYNSON: "Social concerns of Wesley: Theological foundations", *Christian Scholar's Review*, IV, pp. 36-42.

E. JONES: "Methodist Conference 200 years ago", *Methodist Recorder*, 15th August 1974.

T. KALLSTAD: *John Wesley and the Bible: A psychological study* (Uppsala, pp. 356).

T. M. KEMNITZ and F. JACQUES: "J. R. Stephens and the Chartist Movement", *International Review of Social History*, XIX, pp. 211-27.

J. H. S. KENT: "Methodism and Revolution", *Methodist History*, XII, No. 4, pp. 136-44.

S. E. KOSS: "1906: Revival and Revivalism", in A. J. A. MORRIS (ed.): *Edwardian Radicalism, 1900-1914* (London), pp. 75-96.

S. E. KOSS: "Lloyd George and Nonconformity: The last rally", *English Historical Review*, LXXXIX, pp. 77-108.

G. E. LAWRENCE: *Kindling the flame: 150 years of Methodism in the Forest of Dean, 1824-1974* (Pillowell, pp. 59).

W. LEARY: "Methodists under fire", *The Epworth Witness and Journal of the Lincolnshire Methodist History Society*, II, pp. 122-6.

W. LEMMON: *The story of an Addingham school, 1874-1974* (Addingham, pp. 12).

G. LEWY: *Religion and Revolution* (New York, pp. 694).

R. LOWERY: "The Wesleyan Theological Institution, Hoxton: A further study", *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XXXIX, pp. 128-36.

N. J. L. LYONS: "John Wesley and Lincolnshire: A reassessment", *The Epworth Witness and Journal of the Lincolnshire Methodist History Society*, II, pp. 103-7.

C. C. MCFEE: *Colby (Isle of Man) Methodism and its Buildings* (Colby, pp. 28).

A. A. MACLAREN: *Religion and Social Class: The Disruption years in Aberdeen* (London, pp. 268).

D. H. MCLEOD: *Class and Religion in the late Victorian city* (London, pp. 360).
M. MACOURT: "The nature of Religion in Ireland", in M. HILL (ed.): *A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain*, VII (London), pp. 26-45.
A. MARRIN: *The Last Crusade: The Church of England in the First World War* (Durham (North Carolina), pp. 303).
D. MARSHALL: *18th century England* (2nd edn., London, pp. 553).
R. H. MARTIN: "The pan-evangelical impulse in Britain, 1795-1830: with special reference to four London societies" (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, pp. 412).
METHODIST ARCHIVES COMMITTEE: "Oral History: The use of recorded material in Methodist historical study" (London, pp. 5).
METHODIST HOMES FOR THE AGED: *Homing* (2nd edn., pp. 73).
G. E. MILBURN: "The Dawsons: A North-Eastern Primitive Methodist family", *Wesley Historical Society North-East Branch Bulletin*, No. 21, pp. 13-20.
G. E. MILBURN: "The Census of Worship of 1851", *Durham County Local History Society Bulletin*, No. 17, pp. 3-20.
R. S. MOORE: *Pit-men, Preachers and Politics: The effects of Methodism in a Durham mining community* (Cambridge, pp. 292).
M. A. NOLL: "Romanticism and the Hymns of Charles Wesley", *The Evangelical Quarterly*, XLVI, pp. 195-223.
A. C. OUTLER: "Evangelism in the Wesleyan spirit", *Andover Newton Quarterly*, January 1974, pp. 212-24; copied in *Methodist Recorder*, 14th and 21st February 1974.
A. C. OUTLER: "John Wesley as Theologian: Then and Now", *Methodist History*, XII, No. 4, pp. 63-82.
G. PARKINSON: "Fall of a Methodist", *New Society*, 3rd January 1974.
N. PEVSNER and E. RADCLIFFE: *The Buildings of England: Suffolk* (2nd edn., London, pp. 555).
J. C. C. PROBERT: "Leaders' seats in Methodist chapels", *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XXXIX, p. 152.
W. T. R. PRYCE: "The 1851 Census of Religious Worship: An introduction to the unpublished schedules for Denbighshire", *Denbighshire Historical Society Transactions*, XXIII, pp. 147-92.
G. M. ROBERTS (ed.): "The Trevecka Letters (Nos. 644-691)", *Journal of the Historical Society of the Presbyterian Church of Wales*, LIX, special number, pp. 32.
S. J. ROGAL: "John Wesley's daily routine", *Methodist History*, XIII, No. 1, pp. 41-50.
E. A. ROSE: "Sarah Kilham and Hannah Kilham", *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XXXIX, pp. 185-6.
G. ROWELL: *Hell and the Victorians: A study of the 19th century theological controversies concerning eternal punishment and the future life* (Oxford, pp. 242).
E. R. ROYLE: *Victorian Infidels: The origins of the British Secularist Movement, 1791-1866* (Manchester, pp. 357).
W. D. RUBINSTEIN: "British Millionaires, 1809-1949", *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, XLVII, pp. 202-23.
D. H. RYAN: "Methodism on the Mantelpiece: The story of Methodist pottery", *Journal of the Lancashire and Cheshire Branch of the Wesley Historical Society*, II, pp. 181-4.
A. B. SACKETT: "John Wesley's preferment to St. Daniel's Church, near Pembroke", *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XXXIX, pp. 158-65.
S. SAMONELIAN: *Le Reveil Méthodiste* (Nîmes, pp. 105).
W. F. SEALS: *Methodism in the Otley circuit, 1744-1974* (Menston, pp. 37).

A. SEAMAN (ed.): "The notebooks of Jacob Rowell", *Wesley Historical Society North-East Branch Bulletin*, No. 21, pp. 9-12.

I. SELLERS: "Anglicans, Methodists and Swedenborgians: Their early interrelationships in Liverpool", *Journal of the Lancashire and Cheshire Branch of the Wesley Historical Society*, II, pp. 169-75.

B. SEMMEL: *The Methodist Revolution* (London, pp. 273).

T. SHAW: "Cornish manuscripts at the New Room, Bristol", *Journal of the Cornish Methodist Historical Association*, IV, pp. 138-41.

T. SHAW: "Maldwyn Edwards, 1903-74", *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XXXIX, pp. 166-7.

J. SHERWOOD and N. PEVSNER: *The buildings of England: Oxfordshire* (London, pp. 936).

N. P. SIL: "Influence of Methodism on the English working class, 1740-1819", *The Quarterly Review of Historical Studies*, XIV, pp. 19-34.

M. SIMON (ed.): *Aspects de l'Anglicanisme* (Paris, pp. 244).

J. H. TEMPLE: *The Mighty Oak: The story of the Devon and Dorset Mission* (Lyme Regis, pp. 37).

M. I. THOMIS: *The Town Labourer and the Industrial Revolution* (London, pp. 247).

D. M. THOMPSON: "The Liberation Society, 1844-1868", in P. HOLLIS (ed.): *Pressure from Without in early Victorian England* (London), pp. 210-38.

K. TRICKETT: "Charles Wesley's Hymns reconsidered", *Methodist Recorder*, 2nd May 1974.

J. M. TURNER: "Methodism, Revolution and Social Change", *Wesley Historical Society West Midlands Branch Bulletin*, II, pp. 71-8.

C. W. TYRRELL: "Methodist Vans: Gospel heralds to the Villages", *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XXXIX, pp. 170-6.

A. F. WALLS: "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers: Some early interactions of Scottish and English Methodism", *Journal of the Scottish Branch of the Wesley Historical Society*, No. 3, pp. 8-14; No. 4, pp. 2-13.

J. D. WALSH: "Methodism and the Mob in the 18th century", *Wesley Historical Society West Midlands Branch Bulletin*, II, pp. 70-1.

F. B. WESTBROOK: "A former Methodist hymn-book", *Methodist Recorder*, 7th November 1974.

CLIVE D. FIELD.

[Dr. Clive D. Field, M.A., Cert.Ed. is Social Science Research Council Fellow at Wadham College in the University of Oxford.]

It is another "sign of the times" that this year there is no Conference "Handbook" in the usual form. Instead, the familiar contents of such a handbook have appeared as a supplement to the *Methodist Recorder* of 8th April. So far as historical items are concerned, there seems to be no loss. In fact, compared with the amount of space devoted to local history in some recent Conference handbooks, this year's allocation is quite generous. There is a nicely-illustrated article on "Methodism in Preston, 1860", and a short inset on Methodist beginnings in Bolton. Preston is now, of course, the "Martha Thompson" town of Methodism, and it is appropriate that Conference should meet there this year when we are seeing a professional performance of *Ride! Ride!* We are pleased to notice the Wesley Historical Society medallion displayed on page xii in connexion with the Exhibition of Lancashire Methodism which is held in the Great Hall of the Harris Building. Copies of the *Methodist Recorder* containing the Conference supplement may be obtained from the *Recorder* office, 176, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4A 2EP, price 8p. plus 9p. postage.

BOOK NOTICES

Religion and Society in Industrial England: Church, Chapel and Social Change, 1740-1914, by A. D. Gilbert. (Longmans: pp. ix. 251, £3 50p.)

If Owen Chadwick's *Victorian Church* was the last great traditional church history, W. R. Ward's *Religion and Society in England, 1790-1850* marked a new style, asking sociological questions whilst assuming the data the older histories provided. Dr. Gilbert's book is of this type —an attempt at a social history of English religion in its institutional and functional aspects from 1740 to 1914. The basic thesis is that the "Church–Chapel" conflict is the key to the understanding of the social and political changes of this period. The author makes valuable use of the quantitative methods pioneered by Robert Currie, showing that Methodism achieved its greatest strength relative to population growth by 1840, with fairly consistent relative decline since, whilst the Church of England grew stronger in the later Victorian age along with Roman Catholicism. This seems irrefutable. Dr. Gilbert uses Harold Perkin's concept of a "dependency system" to show how the older Anglican pattern of social control broke down. In the period of early industrialization, Nonconformity (this is a summary of the research of D. Thompson, J. Gay, B. Greaves, A. Everitt *et al*) grew in the areas where the parish system could not keep pace with population growth, especially the "open village". The function of Nonconformity was to provide religious and social fulfilment of the artisan's search for meaning. These were the groups who could escape the "dependency system". Methodism thus echoes the aspiration rather than the despair (cf. E. P. Thompson) of the working classes.

The institutional and religious renewal of the Church of England is interpreted as coming to terms with a market system of religious pluralism and competition. If nonconformist "sects" tend to become "denominations" compromising with society, so the "Church" *also* becomes a "denomination"—one among several. The "Church–Chapel" clash is then a struggle for power and equality between increasingly similar groups in social composition. Manifest vitality cloaks latent secularization. As the Victorian age comes to an end, Nonconformity grows by "socialization"—educating another generation, rather than evangelism, save for "revivals" coinciding with political agitation, as in 1902-6. The Forward Movement is ignored.

This important book will be widely read, especially by students. Much of its argument is clearly valid, but several questions need asking:

1. Is *Anglican* Evangelicanism clearly interpreted? There may have been more rapport here with Nonconformity than Dr. Gilbert shows.
2. Are older systems of itinerantcy somewhat romanticized when compared with the later Wesleyan style of ministry? *Could* the older patterns have continued? *How?*
3. Does not the use of non-parochial registers in respect of Methodism need especial care due to the recurrent habit even after 1836 of seeking "rites of passage" at the parish church? Anglican Easter communicant figures are also ambiguous due to *liturgical* changes.
4. Was Methodism ever a "sect" in Troeltsch's or Yinger's classification? Were dissenting groups really totalitarian? Was Nonconformity as homogeneous as Dr. Gilbert suggests?
5. Is the Wilson–Currie thesis on ecumenism to be accepted without rigorous criticism?

On minor points, there is confusion over the 1902 Education Act (p. 195); Independence should be Independency (p. 15); E. R. Bebb is E. D. Bebb (pp. 15, 209); and Wesleyan should be "Wesley" (p. 212). One could wish that the new race of sociological historians might write better English: then we should be spared "conversionist activity" (evangelism?) and "dimensions of associational religiosity" (attending public worship?)!

J. MUNSEY TURNER.

Everywhere Spoken Against: Dissent in the Victorian Novel, by Valentine Cunningham. (Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press, pp. xvi. 312, £7 50p.)

This is a book which I have thoroughly enjoyed, partly because I felt all along that the author knew his subjects, viz. both Victorian Dissent and Victorian Literature. He quotes freely from our *Proceedings*, which is enough to inspire confidence from the start! He is also familiar with the byways of Methodism, as is evidenced by the minor secessions mentioned on page 26.

The title, significantly enough, is taken from the text—Acts xxviii. 22—which appeared on the first Primitive Methodist class ticket in May 1811. Before dealing with individual novelists, Mr. Cunningham devotes four very useful chapters, packed with information and well documented, on the varieties, places and politics of Dissent, with an opening chapter on what he has called "Openness versus Illiberalism" in the novel. This seems to indicate, in a general way, the attitude of the Victorian novelists to contemporary Dissent. He concludes that, apart from George Eliot,

> there is an almost general failure in compassion, sympathy and tolerance, an absence of the openness that constitutes true greatness in the novel. Chapel life in the novel is usually presented as being so life-denying, so uniformly dreary, and the members are so unattractive, the preachers so grotesque, that it is difficult on such a showing to see why people bothered to belong. (p. 9)

But the truth is that "where the outsider like Dickens sees only repressive narrowness and gloom, insiders insist on the happiness and joy". (p. 10)

Then we come to a detailed study of the more famous Victorian novelists—the Brontës, Mrs. Gaskell, George Eliot, Charles Dickens, Mrs. Oliphant, and Mark Rutherford (William Hale White). Each is given a full and careful analysis which makes fascinating and rewarding reading. The final chapter, "The Sense of an Ending", points out the strange fact that whilst "the novelists assumed too readily that because *their* account had been closed, Christianity itself was bankrupt", Dissent lived on. Symbolically, says Cunningham (and this is his final sentence),

> Dissent belongs to the age of the telegraph, to the era of Smiles's *Lives of the Engineers* (1874) and of
>
> . . . the march of mind—
> The steamship, and the railway,
> And the thoughts that shape mankind.
>
> Intrusively, but emphatically, Nonconformity insists on its survival, despite the author. (pp. 285-6)

Well said! (The author referred to is Thomas Hardy.)

There is an Appendix reproducing Charlotte Brontë's parody of the Methodist magazine, some Bibliographical Notes, and an excellent Index. The book is printed in small but very clear type—so for quantity, as well as quality, it is good value for money.

JOHN C. BOWMER.

Methodist Union Catalogue: Pre-1976 Imprints, Volume I, A - Bj, edited by Kenneth E. Rowe. (The Scarecrow Press, Inc., P.O. Box 656, 52, Liberty Street, Metuchen, New Jersey, 08840, USA: pp. xvi. 422, $22.50.)

This is the first volume of a reference work which is likely to run to many volumes. It consists of a list of the catalogued holdings of more than two hundred libraries in America, Canada, Great Britain and several other European countries. It is undoubtedly the most comprehensive bibliography of books about Methodism or by Methodists ever compiled, and will prove a most useful tool in the hands of Methodist scholars.

JOHN C. BOWMER.

The 24-page typescript report of the Selly Oak Conference organized by the World Methodist Historical Society (British Section) in July 1975 contains a summary of the main contributions and discussions: "The Planting of Methodism" (John D. Walsh), "The Planting of Methodism in the West Riding" (Charles Wallace), "The Period of Separation" (Barrie S. Trinder), "Clan Feeling and Great-aunts" (Clyde Binfield), "Provision for Ministerial Training" (Kenneth B. Garlick), "Evangelism, Methodism and reforming movements in the late 18th and early 19th centuries" (Roger T. Anstey), "Evangelicalism, Methodism and popular religion among the working classes of early Victorian Birmingham" (Geoffrey Robson), "Smaller Methodist Denominations" (E. Alan Rose), "A Local History approach to Denominational History" (Roger F. S. Thorne), "Twentieth-century Methodism" (John A. Vickers), "Oral History" (Clive D. Field), "Victorian Afterglow: Memories of the early part of the present century" (E. Ralph Bates). A limited number of copies, at 51p. post free, are available from Mr. John A. Vickers, 87, Marshall Avenue, Bognor Regis, Sussex.

We have received and gratefully acknowledge the following periodicals, some of which come to us on a reciprocal basis with copies of our own *Proceedings*.

The Journal of the Historical Society of the Presbyterian Church of Wales, October 1975 and March 1976.
The Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society, April 1976.
The Baptist Quarterly, April 1976.
Cirplan, Lent 1976.
Methodist History, April 1976.

NOTES AND QUERIES

1287. INFORMATION WANTED ABOUT JAMES CAUGHEY.

DR. R. J. CARWARDINE, of the Department of History, University of Sheffield, Western Bank, Sheffield, S10 2TN, writes:

I am trying to trace letters or other manuscript material relating to the Rev. James Caughey (*c.* 1810-91), the American Methodist Revivalist who conducted revival meeting in various branches of British Methodism during 1841-7, 1857-9, 1860-2 and 1863-7. I should be grateful if readers with any information or suggestions would write to me at the above address. Incidentally, an oil painting of Caughey appears to have been at the turn of the century in the possession of "R. Brewin, 2, Banks Terrace, Appleby, England". Help in tracing this painting would be welcomed.