

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

Proceedings

OF THE

Wesley Historical Society

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

Volume XL

October 1976

MARY WESLEY'S MARRIAGE

OF all the girls in the Epworth rectory, Mary Wesley was perhaps the least likely candidate for betrothal. Her attractive countenance may, in part, have eclipsed the deformities of her body, twisted from early childhood. But the protective attitude of her parents, who had a penchant for interfering in the romantic entanglements of their children, seemed to seal Mary's rather dismal fate as a permanent resident at home. The intrigue surrounding her eventual marriage to John Whitelamb and the tragedy of her sudden death are heightened by this predicament. The reaction of her family to these events bespeaks the tensions within the ageing rector's household. We are given a glimpse of this drama through the private diaries and correspondence of John Wesley, who saw his role in this affair not only as a long-time confidant of his sisters but also as an agent of God's providence, with a responsibility to discern the truth and promote appropriate action.

Little is known of Mary Wesley—called "Molly" by the family. The occasional biographical notice of her perpetuates the rather misleading observation that Molly's exquisite face and amiable temper made her "the delight and favourite of the whole Wesley family". This conclusion is derived largely from Hetty Wesley's elegy for her sister, and is the result of trying to harden literary flourish into historical fact.¹ Molly does seem to have borne her crippling deformity and hardship with some measure of forbearance—brother Charles could refer to her lovingly as a "patient grizzle".² But her condition did weigh heavily on her mind at times, as is seen in the two surviving productions of her pen. To her youngest brother she wrote: "I have lived in a state of affliction ever since I was born,

¹ Molly alone came to sister Hetty's defence in 1725 during a dispute with Samuel over a suitor, and the resulting friendship between the sisters finds embellishment in much of Hetty's poetry, including "To the Memory of Mrs. Mary Whitelamb", published in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, xxxvi (1736), p. 740.

² Letter from Charles to John Wesley, 5th January 1728/9. Holographs of all letters herein quoted are contained in the Methodist Archives, London, unless otherwise noted.

being the ridicule of mankind and the reproach of my family."³ She was nearly thirty years old at the time, and at least momentarily tired of being "the jest of the family", as we see also in a letter she wrote to brother John on the same day. Decrying her condition with a plaintive flair that magnified her pique towards John for not writing to her, she asks:

But why should I wonder at any indifference shown to such a despicable person as myself, seeing I'm conscious there is nothing in my composition that merits esteem. Were I indeed like Edwin,

Edwin, I ween, a gentle youth
Endow'd with virtue, sense, and truth
Tho' badly shap'd he been—⁴

I might be so vain as to hope to be taken notice of; but as I only sympathize with his body, t'would be injustice for me to desire an equal share of respect with one adorned with all the beauties of body and mind. I should be glad to find that miracle of nature, a friend.

She was, of course, not entirely without friends. But by this time three of her sisters were married (Sukey, Nancy, and Hetty), and two others (Patty and Emily) had already seen their first suitors spurned by their father. Her youngest sister (Kezzy) was not yet seventeen. Emily and Kezzy were soon to be living in Lincoln, leaving only Molly and Patty at home—the latter bemoaning her shared fate by observing to brother John, in a letter dated 7th February 1726/7, that at least "if sister Molly stays long at home it will be because she *can't* get away".

But companionship was not long in coming for Molly. In 1727, John Whitelamb joined the Wesley household to help Samuel with the production of his *Dissertationes in librum Jobi*. Molly Wesley had helped the rector in this enterprise (along with brother Charles) until John Romley became curate of Epworth in 1726. Romley, also a teacher of the charity school in Wroot, assumed the copying labours for about a year, and then recommended Whitelamb, his former student, for the task.

The picture is often drawn of the poor teenage Whitelamb being taken under wing by the benevolent rector, who not only provided for his material wants, but also gave the appreciative lad both the grounding for—and the opportunity of—an Oxford education. This view bears modification, as the young man's own pen informs us.⁵ Johnny was at first "extremely glad" to live with "so pious a family", but his four years in the Epworth rectory were marked by increasing tensions and uneasiness. He left his work more than once, claiming that he was being branded as "the most odious of all characters, . . . deprecated and reviled by every common servant".

³ Letter from Mary to Charles Wesley, 20th January 1726/7 (quoted in G. J. Stevenson: *Memorials of the Wesley Family* (1876), p. 289).

⁴ Quoted from Thomas Parnell, "A Fairy Tale", the story of Edwin of the Green, who miraculously lost the "bunch" on his back by the virtuous exercise of courage, sense, and truth.

⁵ Quotations in the two following paragraphs are from his letter to Susanna Wesley, dated 1730.

On one occasion of truancy in 1730, he wrote to Susanna, listing the disadvantages under which he was working: the likelihood of no recompense or "future advantage", it not being in Mr. Wesley's power to provide such; the constant struggling with Samuel's temper and his "satirical wit"; the "poor and wretched condition" to which he had been reduced for want of clothes, exposing him to universal contempt and bringing grief to his own mother; and—the worst of all, in his mind—that "my master has learned me nothing". The rebel assistant claimed, in this last respect, that his time in the rector's study was "entirely lost". He told Susanna: "I'm sure I could in one month of thrashing, if I'd had books, learnt more than I did all that time."

Nevertheless, Whitelamb again returned to the rectory to resume his "flail", as he called it, even though he had "great reason to believe that scarce any in the family could endure me". He particularly felt that Susanna's antipathy towards him was the result of her having received information "second-hand . . . and with quite different colours". But not every Wesley was hostile to the young Whitelamb. Molly was quite happy for the opportunity to work once again on her father's project, and placed her helping hand at Whitelamb's disposal. Neither her crippled body nor the fact that Johnny was more than ten years her junior kept Molly from approaching these labours with apparent zeal. She left it to her sister Patty to explain (perhaps with tongue in cheek) to her brothers at Oxford that Molly was so busy working for Johnny Whitelamb she was not sure she could find time to write.⁶

This arrangement came to an end in April 1731, when Whitelamb again left Epworth, this time to enter Lincoln College, Oxford. Samuel Wesley proposed to pay his son John for tutoring the boy from Wroot, and may even have offered some limited assistance with the young man's expenses at college. But Whitelamb soon found that he had not escaped hardship and want by taking leave of Epworth. At Charles Wesley's urging, he sent to the rector on 30th June 1731 a report of his condition after his first ten weeks at school:

I stint myself to just about the sixth part of what those that spend the least in the College generally battle, which is . . . about three half-pence per day, and I thank God I live very well.

A brief postscript sent his "humble service to Madame Wesley and Miss Molly", to which Susanna responded in her next letter to Charles: "Remember my love to poor starving Johnny."⁷

Fond wishes did not provide for Whitelamb's needs, however, and his tutor soon found it necessary to canvass his brothers and friends for money to help the poor student. Samuel Wesley, jun. grudgingly consented to help buy Whitelamb a gown that first winter if Johnny would consider the twenty-shilling donation "in part of alleviation

⁶ Letter from Martha (Patty) to John Wesley, 30th March 1731.

⁷ Letter dated 12th July 1731; often misquoted as "starveling Johnny".

of my father's hard bargain with him", as he said in his letter to John Wesley on 11th December. The rector himself continued to do what he could for Whitelamb, although he found it increasingly difficult to send funds to Oxford. During the winter of 1732, Samuel enclosed something for Whitelamb in a letter that Kezzy was sending to her brother John, "to save poor Johnny [postal] charge", adding, "I hope this severe weather has not quite starved him."⁸

In spite of persistent economic difficulties and some academic inadequacies, Whitelamb's career at Lincoln College began with promise of success. Although, as he told the rector in a letter dated 30th June 1731, Johnny felt "extremely backward" in the study of the classics, his tutor sent home an encouraging report of his progress:

If he goes on as he has begun, I dare take upon me to say that, by the time he has been here four or five years, there will not be such an one of his standing in Lincoln College, perhaps not in the University of Oxford.⁹

Wesley told the young servitor early in the summer of 1731 that a scholarship might possibly be procured for him. And although he was indeed elected a scholar of Lincoln College on 30th July 1731, Whitelamb was not destined to stay at the University long enough to test fully his tutor's forecast of success.

After two years of rather conventional study at Oxford, several developments combined to bring Whitelamb's days as a student to a premature end. His fondness for Molly Wesley, nurtured by their months of common employ in Samuel's study (and perhaps even intensified by the subsequent period of separation), blossomed in the summer of 1733, when Johnny promised himself to her in what was known as a pre-engagement. And then, returning to Oxford, Whitelamb began to develop a closer alliance with the Wesley brothers. Even though from his first days at Lincoln College he had expressed an admiration for the life of sincere piety exhibited by John Wesley and his small company of "Methodists", Whitelamb had not directly associated with the group. As the autumn of 1733 approached, however, Wesley convinced Whitelamb to part with his usual company of friends at the University, whereupon Johnny "promised to leave his Society",¹⁰ and began to meet instead with Wesley and his friends. In mid-August the promising young student adopted several aspects of the Wesleyan manner of holy living, and started visiting his tutor's room every Sunday, Wednesday and Friday evening for religious study and prayer with the Wesley brothers and John Gambold. Occasionally they were joined by William Smith, another of Wesley's students who was trying to live by "method and rule".

It was Smith who told Wesley on 14th September 1733 that Whitelamb was courting a young woman at Medley, despite his

⁸ Samuel Wesley's postscript to Kezia's letter to John Wesley, 20th January 1732.

⁹ John Wesley's *Letters*, i, p. 85.

¹⁰ This and subsequent quotations, unless noted otherwise, are taken from John Wesley's MS. diaries, Methodist Archives, London.

promises to Molly. Almost immediately the concerned tutor (and brother of the bride-to-be) began a thorough inquiry into the matter. The very next morning, Wesley set out in a flurry of activity, first visiting Mrs. Etty to "talk of John Whitelamb's mistress at Medley", then stopping by to see Mr. Hawkins of Medley, with whom he had a "nice talk of John Whitelamb". After lunch he visited Mr. Etty in the Castle prison, with whom he also had a "nice talk"; and before dinner, he talked with another of his students, Matthew Robinson, about the Whitelamb affair. He soon discovered that Robinson was a central figure in the whole story, playing a role which Susanna Wesley later described as being Whitelamb's "pimp".¹¹

The following day, Sunday the 16th, Wesley again spoke with Robinson, then went to the Castle prison to preach and administer the Sacrament. After the service he was able to continue his investigation by talking at length with Sally Lumley, a prisoner who had refused to speak with him the previous evening. On Monday, he set out for Medley with his brother Charles and another Methodist student, Westley Hall, who had just returned to college. When they arrived at their destination, Betty (the object of young Whitelamb's questionable attentions) was not at home. And when she did arrive, fifteen minutes later, she "ran out" immediately upon seeing Wesley and his friends.

Back at Oxford the following morning, Tuesday the 18th, Wesley sat in his room with John Whitelamb, and talked for nearly an hour "of Betty and sister Molly". This appears to be the first confrontation between the tutor and the student on this matter, and Wesley no doubt asked for straight answers, and gave some timely advice. We have no record of that conversation, but we do have an idea of some of the thoughts that were in Wesley's mind during this period, for he was in the midst of writing a sermon on "The Love of God". He may even have had Whitelamb in the back of his mind when he wrote:

Indeed many loves may consist in the same heart . . . , but two ultimate loves are as flat a contradiction as two firsts, or two lasts.¹²

They may also in that conference have discussed Whitelamb's plans for taking deacon's orders the following week-end. In any case, after having opened up the whole matter fully with Whitelamb, Wesley set out for Medley, where he again talked with Mr. Hawkins. After half an hour, Betty appeared upon the scene, and this time "confirmed all", as Wesley noted in his diary. Satisfied that he had the whole story, the Oxford don headed back to his rooms to

¹¹ See Susanna's letter to John Wesley, 1st January 1733/4, quoted later in this article. Robinson had written an essay "against the Methodists" in August 1733, which John Wesley had read just an hour before convincing Whitelamb that he should leave the company of his former friends. Robinson may have been part of that "Society".

¹² Quotation taken from Charles Wesley's copy of this sermon, in his MS. sermon-book, Methodist Archives, London.

begin packing for a journey to Epworth. After a final conversation with Whitelamb and several other friends the next morning, Wesley set out on horseback for the North.

For several years John's unmarried sisters had looked upon him as a trusted friend and confidential adviser. In their pursuit of virtue and happiness, they responded to his guidance with an openness that was generally appreciative, although not beyond an occasional sisterly retort.¹³ This particular visit to the rectory was to be a strenuous test of his counselling capabilities.

Wesley arrived at Epworth on Friday evening, 21st September, only to discover that his sisters were visiting at Haxey. When they returned home the following day, John did not go immediately to Molly with his story about Whitelamb, but rather spent the evening revealing the problem ("told all") to his youngest sister, Kezzy, and asking for her advice in the matter. On Sunday morning, John preached for his father, waiting until early Monday morning to break the news to sister Molly "of John Whitelamb's mistress". With measured relief, he then could enter a brief note in his diary: "Told all to Sister Molly. She quite resigned. *Vortat Bene!*"¹⁴

Wesley felt very strongly that the advice and counsel of friends constituted an essential element in one's attempt to discern the direction of God's will. He himself always consulted friends for advice before making major decisions, and during this same trip was seeking counsel from several acquaintances concerning Samuel's desire that he should accept the Epworth living. His principle on this point could be stated concisely:

that a man had no other way of knowing God's will, but by consulting his own reason, and his friends, and by the order of God's providence.¹⁵

And in this regard, by having "opened to sister Molly" (his way of saying that he had laid his heart and mind open to her), he had now discharged his responsibility towards her as a friend: the final decision was now hers.

Wesley stayed at Epworth until after he had preached again the following Sunday, noting in his diary several occasions during the week when he had "religious talk" with his sisters. At one point, he convinced sister Kezzy of "vanity"—a fault which he had pointed out in Whitelamb just a few weeks before. Then, after a week of muddy travel, he began another round of conversations with his friends back at Oxford, talking "of Whitelamb" with his brother Charles after Sunday dinner, and with Matthew Robinson later that

¹³ Their letters frequently contained sentiments similar to those of Emily in a letter written on 4th September 1733: "You are one of those few whose good opinion I would possess, if possible." And yet, John had noted three weeks earlier receiving an "angry letter from sister Emily for advising her".

¹⁴ "It turned out well!"

¹⁵ Advice given to Benjamin Ingham, quoted in Ingham's account of his decision to accompany the Wesleys to Georgia. (Tyerman: *The Oxford Methodists* (New York, 1873), p. 65.)

afternoon. On Monday morning, 8th October, the two Wesley brothers talked with Whitelamb for an hour, apparently giving some final advice to the young man before he set out for Epworth to act as Samuel Wesley's curate.¹⁶ Whitelamb's tutor then went to the bursar to clear up his student's account, wrote letters to Susanna, Emily, Kezzy, and Molly, and then had one last talk with Johnny, giving him the letters and 10s. 6d. for the trip to Epworth.

The subsequent events and the reactions of the Wesley family can perhaps best be portrayed by quoting portions of three letters which have not hitherto been published. From these we discover that the marriage of Molly to John Whitelamb did not occur "with the high approbation of all the family", as is often stated. The first corrective to this view is found in Susanna Wesley's reaction to this whole episode in a letter to her son John on 1st January 1733/4:

I was highly pleased with receiving a letter from you last Sunday, for I have long wanted to write to you, but knew not whether you were at London or Oxford. My principal business with you was about Whitelamb, to reprimand your too great caution in not informing me what his moral character is, and about his intrigue at Medley. Had you let me know of the looseness of his principles and his disreputable practices, I should never have forwarded his going into Orders, neither would I have suffered him to renew his addresses to Molly, after such a notorious violation of his promises to her. Indeed when he came hither first, he was so full of his new Doxy that he could not forbear telling Molly and Kezzy of his amour, which the former informed me of; and I discoursed him about it, and would have convinced him, that it was sinful, and dishonourable for him to court another woman when he was pre-engaged. He was not much moved with what I could say. So I told him plainly, he should presently renounce one or the other, and that if he did not presently write to Robinson (who is his pimp) and tell him that he would never more have any conversation with his doll at Medley, I would immediately send Molly away, where he should never see her more; though with all, I advised him rather to take his Betty than your sister, for I thought her a much fitter wife for him. Besides, I was extremely unwilling Molly should ever marry at all. But Molly, who was fond of him to the last degree, was of another mind, and persuaded him to write to Robinson and show me the letter. I did not much approve it, because he seemed to justify those vile practices which I thought he ought to have condemned. Yet to satisfy her importunity I permitted them to go on. Whitelamb wrote to ask your father leave to marry his daughter, which Mr. Wesley gave him, and on St. Thomas's Day married they were at Epworth by Mr. Horberry; full sore against my will, but my consent was never asked, and your father, brother Wesley, &c., being for the match, I said nothing against it to them, only laboured what I could to dissuade Molly from it. But the flesh and the devil were too hard for me. I could not prevail. Yet with God nothing is impossible, and though this unequal marriage has to me a terrible aspect,

¹⁶ The rector of Epworth was going to London for five months to work on final details of publishing his *Job*. Whitelamb had subscribed to the Thirty-nine Articles on Friday, 21st September (just two days after John had left Oxford for Epworth), and along with John Gambold had been ordained by Bishop Potter in Christ Church Cathedral on the 23rd.

'tis possible for God to bring good out of this great evil; or otherwise, He can take me away from the evil to come. Still Jacky I have somewhat more to tell you, but dare not write, only this. Pray let Robinson (your pupil) know, that Whitelamb is married. Let him know I was against the match; give my service to him, and tell him from me, I am as good as my word. I daily pray for him, and beg of him, if he have the least regard for his soul, or have yet any remaining sense of religion in his mind, to shake off all acquaintance with the profane and irregular; for it is the Free Thinker, and the Sensualist, not the despised Methodist, which will be ashamed, and confounded when summoned to appear before the face of that Almighty Judge, whose Godhead they have blasphemed, and whose offered mercy they have despised and ludicrously rejected.

Before John had composed an appropriate response to this epistle, he received a further reprimand, this time from sister Kezzy, who likewise felt that she had been misled by her brother in the whole matter, and had not really been "told all". She warms up to her argument with some characteristic sarcasm:

I am not surprised your affection should be cooler towards me than formerly. 'Tis next to a miracle it lasted so long, since nothing but the good qualities of the person beloved can be a foundation for a love of judgment and discretion. This indifference, therefore, proceeds from the unwise choice you made of a friend. "Among unequals what society can sort, what harmony, or true delight?"¹⁷ Sister Molly was married the 21st of December. There were no preparations for the wedding. We have not the common lot of mankind, "The Voice of the Bridegroom, and the Voice of the Bride",¹⁸ not so much as the first day. Our rejoicing is always turned into mourning, because we cannot meet with an honest man. You had no reason to be displeased at my telling sister Patty of Mr. Whitelamb's affair; certainly I was under no obligation to secrecy, when he spoke of it himself, to me and all the Family, Mr. H., Mr. R., etc; and not only spoke, but boasted of it as a laudable action. I used all the little rhetoric I was mistress of, to dissuade her from marrying, but it was all in vain. So I advised her (if she would marry) to do so as soon as possible, for I perceived his affection grew cooler to sister Molly every day. But sure you had acted more like a friend to me, if you had told me he was an immoral man, not only in this instance. For in this, he is only like his neighbours; "They cannot Love where they are Beloved". But he has very little sense of religion according to our notions. I thought he had been a friend to the family, and an honest man in the main (but he proves neither), for which reason I trusted him farther than I should have done if I had known him. "For he that Fears no God can Love no Friend."¹⁹ I desire you will let Betty know immediately he is married, which will prevent their keeping a correspondence. I am afraid neither his love to my sister nor his religion will keep him from [it], if she has not the prudence to decline it. I do not tell you this to expose the man, but because I believe you may do him good by writing, if he be not entirely given over to a reprobate mind.

¹⁷ Quoted from John Milton: *Paradise Lost*, Book VIII, l. 383.

¹⁸ Jeremiah vii. 34; xvi. 9; xxv. 10; xxxiii. 11.

¹⁹ Quoted from Torquato Tasso: *Godfrey of Bulloigne; or the Recovery of Jerusalem*, Book IV, l. 65.

One last barb is flung out in a postscript :

Pray send me word immediately [that] Mr. Whitelamb's Doxy is disposed of. I think Mr. Robinson seems to be worthy of her ; you shall marry her to him.²⁰

John apparently did not feel compelled to write a hasty reply to these jabbing criticisms. A full four weeks after his mother had written, he prepared a concise response to her reprimands. His letter, of the 28th January, begins with the following carefully-drawn and somewhat evasive paragraph—his only observation on the matter :

Dear Mother,

As soon as I had informed myself fully of the intrigue at Medley, I determined to inform my sister Molly of the whole, and then leave it wholly with her either to keep it secret or to reveal it to whom she pleased. I have a good hope that the measures she has taken will be the means of saving a soul from death. Poor Mr. Robinson seemed concerned just at the time when I read him what you said, but the time of his laying it to heart is not yet come. I am more and more convinced that few men are satisfied of practical truths by disputing about them, though there still seems to be no doubt. But every man may and ought to ask a reason for the advice we give him, and to remonstrate in a humble and diffident way if that reason does not appear conclusive ; because the director may possibly be wrong, though not so possibly as the directed.²¹

Thus the wedding was put behind, but that was not the last trial for this unfortunate couple. The circumstances surrounding the marriage seem to have further aggravated John Whitelamb's long-standing differences with some members of the Wesley family. Emily hinted to her brother John in February 1734 that there was much to say about Whitelamb, but said no more. In March, Molly herself wrote a letter to her brother at Oxford, who noted in his diary, "Hope for John Whitelamb". Susanna also seems to have had continuing differences with her new son-in-law, although on some points, in religion at least, according to a letter she wrote to John on 30th March 1734, she may have won him over to her view. But Whitelamb continued to harbour a deep animosity towards Kezzy Wesley, who had so strongly opposed his marriage. Whilst outwardly civil towards her, Johnny had a "perfect aversion to her", and tried to break off her budding romance with Westley Hall by writing secret letters to him full of "bitter invective against her".²² Kezzy, not yet suspecting the full scope of Johnny's hatred, told brother John in a letter dated 3rd July 1734 :

Mr. Whitelamb and I grow more indifferent than ever, nor can I think

²⁰ Wesley had in fact found Betty in Robinson's rooms at Lincoln College in November 1733, after Whitelamb had left for Epworth. His relieved note in the diary at that point was "*Ego in portu!* [I am now safe!]"

²¹ I express appreciation to the Rev. E. Ralph Bates for calling this manuscript to my attention and allowing it to be used here.

²² See John Wesley's MS. account of the Westley Hall affair (Methodist Archives, London), p. 6 f.

what way I must take to reconcile us. He will scarce speak if we meet. I would not choose to live like enemies, but if he will, I can't help it;

Forgiveness to the injur'd does belong,
He never pardons that commits the wrong.²⁸

During John Wesley's usual late-summer visit to Epworth that year, his diary reveals nothing about Molly and her husband. Everyone was caught up in yet another romance—Benjamin Ingham, also an Oxford Methodist, was visiting the Wesleys, and had fallen in love with sister Patty.

Within a month, however, Molly was back in the centre of attention. A sudden deterioration in Samuel Wesley's health had brought John home again in October to help with the work of the parish (which the rector was still trying to get him to accept). John had been at Epworth only three days when Whitelamb came from Wroot bringing the news that Molly was "in labour" with their first child. During the following two weeks, John Wesley travelled to Wroot nearly every day to visit his sister as she suffered through a long and difficult period of travail. Finally, on Monday, 28th October, Molly was "delivered by Mr. Harper", the child apparently being either dead or dying.

The remaining three days of his stay at Epworth were not happy ones for John. He continued to "hedge" about taking his father's living, and his sisters were not very receptive to the advice he was giving them regarding celibacy and suitors. On the last day of October, not having seen Molly since the day of her delivery, the Fellow of Lincoln set out at 7-15 in the morning to return to his collegiate responsibilities, noting in his diary that his sisters were "very cold". Molly died that very afternoon. The news did not reach John Wesley until he was back at Oxford. The marriage which had begun amid conflict and intrigue had ended in tragedy—the wife and child sharing a grave, the husband almost inconsolable at his loss.

John Wesley was to return to Epworth rectory as his home only one more time, responding to his sister Emily's warning in March 1735 that if he wanted to see his father alive he must come at once. As the Wesley brothers trudged northwards, John took with him a funeral sermon that he had written "for Molly". There is no way at present to know what he wrote in memory of his sister, but if some day the manuscript should come to light we should probably discover yet another exposition of God's action in the lives of mankind. And given the common propensity to see God's providence as retributive, it is likely that many may have drawn some rather plain connexions between the "intrigue at Medley" and the tragedies of the Whitelamb marriage.

Apparently the Wesley family never fully forgave John Whitelamb for his frivolities as an Oxford student. Eight years after these

²⁸ The quotation is from John Dryden: *The Conquest of Granada*, II, i.

events, Whitelamb was still bemoaning his separation from the Wesleys, recalling that it all stemmed from "a heat of youthful blood, and want of experience in the world", by which he had been "betrayed into very great follies".²⁴ And no small part of this alienation was caused by his once again embracing the deistic inclinations that Susanna had so strongly criticized in 1734. The whole episode is a sad chapter in the Wesley family story, the most telling comment being John Wesley's own postscript to these events. Upon hearing of John Whitelamb's death in 1769, Wesley wrote: "Oh, why did he not die forty years ago, while he knew in whom he had believed!"²⁵

RICHARD P. HEITZENRATER.

[Dr. Richard P. Heitzenrater is Associate Professor of History and Religion at Centre College, Danville, Kentucky, USA. He is also Assistant to the Editor-in-chief (Dr. Frank Baker) of the Oxford Edition of Wesley's *Works*.]

²⁴ In a letter to Charles Wesley, dated 2nd September 1742, and published in the *Arminian Magazine*, 1778, p. 186.

²⁵ Letter from John Wesley to "Mrs. Woodhouse, At Mr. Hutton's, Epworth . . .", 4th October 1769 (*Letters*, v, p. 151). [In the same letter he inquires, rather belatedly, as to the circumstances of Whitelamb's death.—EDITOR.]

THE ANNUAL MEETING AND LECTURE

THE Annual Meeting, Tea and Lecture were held at Burnley on 28th June. A representative company gathered, though members of Conference did not find Burnley easily accessible. At the tea-table Mr. C. F. Stell of the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England) expressed the thanks of those present to their invisible host and hostess, Mr. and Mrs. R. C. Swift.

Business Meeting

Professor John Lawson presided at the Annual Meeting, at which encouraging reports were received, verbally and by letter, from our local branches. A new appointment made this year was that of the Rev. K. B. Garlick to the office of Librarian in succession to Dr. Bowmer.

The General Secretary outlined the rapidly-changing situation at City Road and the Executive Committee's provisional recommendation that the Society's Library should be moved to Southlands College of Education. After some discussion, it was agreed that the Library should be re-housed at Southlands providing an agreement was reached safeguarding the proprietary rights of the Society in its Library and the continuance of the facilities at present enjoyed by our members.

Accounts presented to the meeting are summarized on the next page.

The Annual Lecture

It was one of the warmest evenings of the hot summer when Dr. David Gowland lectured to us on "Samuel Warren and the Methodist Reformers of Lancashire", with Mr. Alan Rose presiding—both appearing in shirt-sleeves. Dr. Gowland was the master of his subject, which he presented with touches of lively humour. We look forward to the eventual publication of this lecture.

THOMAS SHAW.

WESLEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Financial Statement, 1st January to 31st December 1975

EXPENDITURE.		£	p.	INCOME.		£	p.
<i>Proceedings</i> and Printing		568	87	Subscriptions in advance br't forward from previous year—			
Insurance		10	0	Ordinary Members	504	80	
Secretarial, Editorial and Registrar's Expenses		55	53	Life Members	325	50	
Publications		154	0	Received during year	807	48	
Sundry Expenses		2	50				
Excess of Income over Ex- penditure		104	10				
						1,637	78
				<i>Less</i> Unexpired Subscrip- tions (see Balance Sheet)		999	20
						638	58
				<i>Proceedings</i> (back nos.) sold		28	90
				Advertisements	20	75	
				Irish Branch	54	0	
				War Stock Dividend	7	68	
				Conference Lecture (2 years)	11	55	
				Publications sold	62	77	
				Bank Interest	70	77	
						£895	0
						£895	0

Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1975

LIABILITIES.		£	p.	ASSETS.		£	p.
Unexpired Subscriptions—				Cash in hand—Treasurer	157	48	
Ordinary Members	691	20		Registrar	7	4	
Life Members (70) (say)	308	0		War Stock (at cost)	225	0	
				(Market Value £55)			
				Trustee Savings Bank	901	93	
Accumulated Funds b/fwd.	999	20		Midland Bank Deposit A/c	644	74	
				Library, Publications Stocks, Filing Cabinet, etc. unvalued			
<i>Add</i> Excess of Income over Expenditure	1,832	9					
						£1,936	19
						£1,936	19

(Signed)

ROWLAND C. SWIFT, *Treasurer.*

28th June 1976.

AUDITOR'S CERTIFICATE

I have examined the Income and Expenditure Account and Balance Sheet with the books and records of the Society. The further improvement in subscription income again appears to reflect the recovery of some arrears, but still to leave a substantial amount of unpaid subscriptions outstanding. No account has been taken of such arrears, whether paid since the end of 1975 or still not recovered. 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 1975, and of the excess of Income over Expenditure for the year ended on that date.

(Signed)

F. J. HAMMOND, F.C.A., *Auditor.*

High Beech,
Long Park Close,
Chesham Bois,
Amersham, Bucks.

CHARLES WESLEY AND THE AMERICAN WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

(Continued from page 134)

IT is difficult for us to sympathize with the obviously wrong-headed approach of the administration under Lord North towards the American colonies, even though North himself was, for most of the time, carrying out the King's instructions with great reluctance. The colonists, according to the Tories, were not Americans, but Britons living beyond the seas—a view which showed a complete unawareness of the composition of the colonial population, one-third of which was non-English. Thus it is not surprising that these people cared little for the historic traditions of a country they had never seen. Moreover, many of those who had undoubted English origins had grown away from the mother country in thought.²⁷

We may draw obvious parallels between the American Revolution and the events of the present century—particularly of the past twenty years, when Britain has realized the existence of the changed political and social situation in Asia and Africa, and by this realization has transformed, albeit imperfectly, an empire into a commonwealth. The comparison becomes even more interesting when we note that at the beginning of the verbal war between Britain and the American colonies, a delegate from Pennsylvania to the first Continental Congress, Joseph Galloway, recommended a kind of dominion status for America. It was Galloway who later became an ardent loyalist and British spy, and who so impressed John Wesley when they met in November 1779.²⁸

Charles Wesley was equally impressed with Galloway's pamphlets on the conduct of the American war, and many of his adverse comments on Sir William Howe can be traced to the vitriolic writings with which the exiled loyalist employed himself during his enforced stay in Britain. Galloway never seems to have forgotten that during the whole of the British occupation of Philadelphia and while he was living next door to Howe, the General called only once.²⁹ Whatever may be the reasons for Galloway's comments on Howe, his picture of the British general in the pamphlets—parts of which John Wesley thought worth collecting in his volume of *Extracts*—is grossly exaggerated and unfair. In Galloway's *Letters to a Nobleman on the Conduct of the War in the Middle Colonies*, Sir William Howe is depicted as a voluptuary, gambler, and drawing-room soldier. Charles could not refrain from using such gifts of valuable ammunition as this against Howe, of whom he had already formed

²⁷ William A. Hamm: *From Colony to World Power*.

²⁸ *Journal*, vi, p. 261; cf. Woodward: *A New American History*, p. 125: "His [Galloway's] proposal ought to have a place among the documents of history."

²⁹ Claude Halstead Van Tyne: *The Loyalists in the American Revolution* (New York, 1929), p. 246.

an adverse opinion since they were of opposing political parties. The direct source of the long narrative poem "The American War" is almost certainly John Wesley's *Political Extracts* from Galloway. There are many echoes of Galloway's phraseology in this long poem, as indeed in the "Hymns on Patriotism . . ." as a whole.

It also seems probable that it was Galloway who supplied Charles Wesley with material for his comments on the plight of the loyalists—a theme to which he returns again and again in "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", as we shall see.

In spite of Galloway's uncompromising attitude in criticizing the British Government's conduct of the war in general and the British generals' characters in particular, his proposal regarding dominion status for America was ingenious, and had it been accepted, or had the British Government been more discerning, the American colonies might very well have been "founder members" of the British commonwealth. It is certainly true that the colonies themselves in the early stages of the dispute were not considering rebellion, and Congress was merely called to take various collective measures for the recovery of their rights and liberties, which they held to have been violated by a series of unpopular acts of the British Government. These acts culminated in a number of repressive measures directed against Massachusetts, but were interpreted as implying threats against all the colonies.

The course of events leading up to the engagement between the American "Minute-men" and the British troops on Lexington Green in April 1775 is a catalogue of misunderstanding and obstinate refusal on the part of the King and his administration to countenance any concessions to the colonists. And, as so often happens in such affairs, the irritations the Americans felt at being subject to those who knew little of their country or their cause eventually reached insufferable proportions. Who actually fired the first shot at Lexington is unknown, but, to all intents and purposes, this incident marked the beginning of formal hostilities, and, as Emerson later wrote,

Here once the embattled farmers stood
And fired the shot heard round the world.

The following year, Congress passed the resolution that

these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States . . . and all connection between them and the State of Great Britain is, and of right ought to be, totally dissolved.

The way was now clear for the Declaration of Independence on 4th July 1776.

The Declaration itself is based largely on the work of Locke, Rousseau and Milton, and in Britain the document was criticized on the ground of plagiarism. It falls into two parts, the first expressing a theory of government which argued that it was legitimate in natural law for the colonies to separate themselves from Britain at any time desirable to them; the second part gave a list of specific

acts on the part of the King which made it necessary in the colonies' interests that they should do so. Undoubtedly, the King's obstinacy was one of the main causes of the war.⁸⁰

Charles Wesley does not mention the Declaration of Independence even in "The American War"—his account there beginning with the New York campaign of Sir William Howe. But since Wesley was relying almost exclusively on Galloway's account, which also omits any mention of the Declaration, it is perhaps not surprising that he makes no reference to it. Moreover, it is quite possible that the Declaration was not taken very seriously in Britain. Its long list of grievances stated nothing new, and, from the British point of view, the proposal that a group of rather disreputable colonists should cut themselves off from "the parent state" was not only impossible but ridiculous.

Throughout the war in America, Charles Wesley's attitude towards the colonists was far more rigid than that of his brother, who showed, at least at the beginning of the controversy, a marked degree of tolerance and understanding. John Wesley's famous letter to Lord North is written in quite a different spirit from that of Charles's bigoted Toryism which informs the political poems. Compare, for example, the first poem in the "Hymns on Patriotism . . ." with the moderation of John's letter. The poem begins:

Why do the Christen'd heathen rage,
And furiously their powers engage
Against the Lord most High?⁸¹

And John writes:

I do not intend to enter upon the question whether the Americans are in the right or in the wrong. Here all my prejudices are against the Americans; for I am an High Churchman, the son of an High Churchman, bred up from my childhood in the highest notions of passive obedience and non-resistance. And yet, in spite of all my long-rooted prejudices, I cannot avoid thinking, if I think at all, these, an oppressed people, asked for nothing more than their legal rights, and that in the most modest and inoffensive manner that the nature of the thing would allow.⁸²

Charles was also "the son of an High Churchman", and it may be that his belief in a high church doctrine of kingship and the proper relationship that ought to prevail between the mother country and her territorial offspring across the Atlantic is responsible for the atmosphere of amazement and horror in the poems on American Independence. One has the feeling that, when writing in 1779, he is completely baffled by events in America, simply because they are beyond the range of human possibility. The American colonists, therefore, are to him no longer responsible human beings, but savage and barbarous children who have not learned to submit to parental authority. Thus he writes:

⁸⁰ Trevelyan, *op. cit.*, iii, p. 164.

⁸¹ "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", No. 1, ll. 1-3 (p. 2).

⁸² *Journal*, viii, p. 325.

Ye vipers who your Parent tear,
With evil all our good requite . . .⁸⁸

And the American cause seems to be associated with the rule of Antichrist in the following lines :

Justice hath given the Rebels up,
Their own inventions to pursue,
Curst with their Luciferian hope
Suffer'd to found their Empire new.
Their aim original t' attain,
And Satan's Demagogues to reign.⁸⁴

The British people were not really alarmed by the war in America until Burgoyne's defeat at Saratoga in October 1777—an event which awakened Britain to the seriousness of the situation. By that time, however, General Sir William Howe was already embarked on a campaign, defending the strategy of which gave Lord North so much trouble in the House of Commons and provided Charles Wesley with so much material for poetical comment.

Charles deals with the campaigns of Sir William Howe in considerable detail in "The American War", and there are numerous references to Howe and other British commanders in the "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", though it is obvious that his main purpose is not to give a straightforward narrative, but to reveal what seemed to him and others of like political persuasion the equivocal and even traitorous conduct of the British commander-in-chief.

The ineffective campaigns against the colonists were popularly attributed by the Tory faction in Britain and the Loyalists in America to Howe's dilatory leadership—the result, it was supposed, of his Whig sympathies. It was Howe's apparent failure to press home any military advantage that prompted Charles to sub-title "The American War" with a quotation from Virgil referring to Quintus Fabius Maximus, who dogged Hannibal's army without risking a decisive battle. It is a sarcastic comparison, for translation of the whole line reads: "You are the famous Maximus who alone restores our fortunes by delay." However distorted Galloway's portrait of Howe as a voluptuary, gambler, and drawing-room soldier, the tactics of the British *cunctator* invited criticism, and when he had to defend himself before the House of Commons in 1779, his defence was not wholly convincing. Perhaps, therefore, Charles Wesley did have some justification for suspecting the motives and methods of Sir William Howe.

One example of Howe's enigmatic behaviour can be seen in the way in which he conducted his campaign in the latter part of 1776. Howe's army, commanded in the field by Lord Charles Cornwallis, had pursued the Americans across New Jersey and over the Delaware into Pennsylvania, the last American rearguard crossing the river as the British advance parties came into sight. Philadelphia

⁸⁸ "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", No. 9, ll. 25-6 (p. 18).

⁸⁴ *ibid.*, No. 40, ll. 25-30 (p. 83).

now lay directly in the line of the British troops. The city was virtually defenceless, and Congress hurriedly departed for Baltimore. At this juncture, Howe came to the curious decision that the campaign for 1776 was over, and returned to New York, deferring capture of Philadelphia until the following year. Wesley sums up these events in 1776 in the following lines :

. . . Resistless on their armies fell,
And stormed their Forts impregnable,
Scatter'd their fugitive remains,
(But not pursued them) on the Plains :
With ease their Provinces he took,
Their Provinces with ease forsook,
As if he took them but in play,
And threw them wantonly away.⁸⁶

Although Wesley's comments on Howe's conduct are all second-hand and distinctly biased, he is probably correct when he claims that Howe, who had one eye on the policy of his own party, which was openly opposed to the war, never intended to cross the Delaware and force home his undoubted advantage. As Wesley puts it,

The Knight intending no such thing
As making absolute the King
And by a short, decisive Action
Stopping the mouth of his own Faction . . .⁸⁶

But if in Howe's view the campaign of 1776 was over, Washington had other ideas. In order to forestall any move Howe might make, the American commander crossed the frozen Delaware, and at Trenton surprised the Hessian mercenaries, who surrendered within forty-five minutes. Charles describes the scene in somewhat undistinguished lines :

He [Washington] seized the moment of success
The unsuspecting troops t' oppress,
The river cross'd his glory bent on
And took them napping all at Trenton.⁸⁷

Howe cannot be blamed for allowing Washington to surprise the garrison at Trenton, although he may have underestimated the audacity of the American commander and the capacity of the Hessians to enjoy their Christmas festivities to the full ; but he can be held at least partly responsible for the conduct of the Hessians in general. It is true that they could not be trusted to respect the property of the inhabitants. Howe claimed that he did all in his power to prevent the devastation and plundering of the countryside during the winter of 1776-7, but according to the Hon. Thomas Jones, one of the royal judges in the supreme court of New York Province, who was an ardent loyalist, he was slow to punish the excesses of his troops. Charles Wesley therefore had some justification for his versified comments on the troops' behaviour when they took possession of Princeton and gutted the library :

⁸⁶ " The American War ", ll. 9-16.

⁸⁷ *ibid.*, ll. 156-9.

⁸⁶ *ibid.*, ll. 126-9.

He lets his valiant soldiers loose
 To rob, and plunder, and abuse,
 Whose mercy no distinction knows
 Of age or sex, of friends or foes . . .³⁸

On the other hand, the American army was not, as the British Government led the country to believe,

. . . a despicable Host
 Who nothing had whereof to boast,
 Undisciplin'd, half-arm'd, half fed,
 To labor, not to battle bred,
 Drag'd from their shops, or from the plow
 To face th' unconquerable How [sic] . . .³⁹

Perhaps the "despicable Host" was more used to "labor", but it had also given an extremely good account of itself in battle, as Howe knew far better than Charles Wesley or the Secretary for the Colonies, Lord George Germaine.

In 1777 occurred the disaster of Burgoyne's surrender at Saratoga—an event which inspired Wesley to pour his poetical scorn and fury on Howe. Germaine had refused Howe's requests for reinforcements and caused him to reduce his projected campaigns one by one until he decided to proceed with the attack on Pennsylvania only. In the meantime, Burgoyne was following the route from Canada opened up in the previous year by General Carleton, who according to Wesley was

. . . an honest man
 Who truth and righteousness approves,
 And more than gold his country loves.⁴⁰

With some impetuosity and over-confidence after his success at Ticonderoga, Burgoyne struck across wild territory where over forty bridges had been destroyed by the retreating Americans. When Burgoyne reached Fort Edward in July 1777, his stores were almost exhausted, and he did not dare to cross the Hudson River and make for Albany, where Howe was supposed to meet him. But in the same month Howe had sailed for the Chesapeake, bent on conquering Pennsylvania. Wesley attributes these tactics to implied jealousy and outright treachery:

Ask Will, why he refus'd to join
 And save the resolute Burgoyne
 Marching (his rival to betray)
 Their thousand miles another way? . . .⁴¹

In "The American War", Charles indirectly accuses Howe of treason in disobeying the King's instruction:

Commanded by his King to join
 The brave, unfortunate Burgoyne . . .
 He flies impatient of delay,
 But turns and flies another way.⁴²

³⁸ *ibid.*, ll. 75-8.

³⁹ *ibid.*, ll. 182-7.

⁴⁰ "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", No. 25, ll. 40-2 (p. 51).

⁴¹ *ibid.*, No. 48, ll. 23-6 (p. 102).

⁴² "The American War", ll. 305-10.

Charles Wesley's account merely reflects the Administration's version of what happened at Saratoga—an explanation which certainly does not fit the facts. Carleton, whose dislike of Germaine was reciprocated, wrote in November :

This unfortunate event, it is to be hoped, will, in future, prevent ministers from pretending to direct operations of war, at 3,000 miles distance . . .⁴³

Howe also claimed that he was acting with Germaine's and the King's approval, and that Burgoyne knew he could not expect any assistance from the southern army. Charles, linking Lord Howe, the naval commander, with his brother, imagines the Whigs in Britain saying :

" Their Rivals, not the Noble Pair,
 " Prolong'd the dire destructive war ;
 " The *ministers*, Burgoigne [sic] betray'd,
 " And captives all his army made . . ."⁴⁴

It is true that many Whig ballads expressed exultation over the disaster—a sentiment which lent support to those who believed that the war was in the hands of generals whose sympathies lay with the rebellious colonists. But it is unfair to suggest that Howe deliberately left Burgoyne to his fate, as letters between Howe and Germaine clearly show. The inefficiency of the administration needed a scapegoat, and the commander-in-chief was the obvious choice.

Howe's desultory prosecution of the war was traced to two sources by his opponents. Firstly it was said that, as a member of the Opposition, he disliked pursuing a policy with which his party was in violent disagreement and which, if successful, would bring it into disrepute, and there are at least some grounds for believing this explanation. Samuel Kirk of Nottingham, one of Howe's constituents, wrote to the General, charging him with "a breach of promise in accepting of a command of the forces about to be sent to America for suppressing the rebellion".⁴⁵ The letter continues: "I do not wish you may fail, as many do, but I cannot say I wish success to the undertaking."⁴⁶ Charles Wesley refers to this and other letters in a note added in the margin of "The American War", where he remarks on the political aspect :

Unless for patriotic reason
 He meant to lose the fighting season
 And confidential friends content
 With the disastrous war's event.⁴⁷

The second source of Howe's conduct sprang, it was said, from his fear of losing his appointments if the war were over quickly.

⁴³ Letter from Sir Guy Carleton to Lord George Germaine, 22nd October 1777 (quoted by Belcher : *The First American Civil War*, ii, p. 339).

⁴⁴ "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", No. 32, Part I, ll. 42-5 (p. 65).

⁴⁵ *Political Extracts*, Appendix, p. 99: letter from Samuel Kirk to Sir William Howe, 10th February 1775 (quoted in "An Extract from a Reply to the Observations of Lieut. Gen. Sir William Howe on a pamphlet Entitled 'Letters to a Nobleman'").
⁴⁶ *ibid.* ⁴⁷ "The American War", ll. 349-52.

With this view Charles Wesley agrees, but he was probably following the lead of his brother, who by his editorial comment in the *Extracts* dissociated himself from Galloway's point "that there are those who imagine the war was procrastinated for lucrative views. But from this charge I acquit the General."⁴⁸ It seems more reasonable to believe Galloway here, since this is one of the very few occasions when he is prepared to concede a point to Howe. Charles sums up what he claims to be the mercenary and political explanations of Howe's conduct thus:

If Congress is destroy'd, my friend,
The war and my appointments end
And the war's fortunate conclusion
Brings my own Party to confusion . . .⁴⁹

Perhaps the simplest explanation of Howe's controversial conduct of the war is that he was the instrument of a bifocal foreign policy. He was a professional soldier, whose duty it was to carry out the instructions of his government; but in this instance his government did not have the unanimous support of the House of Commons, and as a member of the opposition party he had naturally a great sympathy with the American cause. Consequently he was continually hoping that a show of force and limited military action would result in the Americans calling off the struggle. In any case, the whole miserable affair in America was conducted in a half-hearted way from beginning to end by all except the King and his close supporters, among whom for theologico-political reasons was Charles Wesley, whose comments on the Howe controversy form such a large portion of the "Hymns on Patriotism . . ." and "The American War".

Charles's comments on the naval aspect of the war are based mainly on his brother's *Extracts* from Galloway's "Letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord Vincent Ho[w]e on his Naval Conduct of the American War". These comments bear little relation to the actual facts, which were truly appalling. That there was a British fleet to put to sea at all represented an act of faith in rotting timbers on the part of the ships' commanders. But Wesley's views were coloured by his belief that both the Howes were conducting their respective campaigns somewhat reluctantly. He comments on the naval commander thus:

Or let his warlike Brother own
What with his fleet he *might* have done,
Block'd all their harbours up, and seiz'd,
Or burst their ships, whene'er he pleased,
Their ragamuffin host compel'd
Their Chief without a shot to yield,
Reduc'd to desperate condition
And starv'd into intire submission.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ *Political Extracts*, p. 82, where John Wesley's note reads: "The Editor of this Extract cannot agree. He fears, the enjoying his immense Appointment was the motive of his Delays."

⁴⁹ "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", No. 44, ll. 23-6 (p. 94).

⁵⁰ *ibid.*, No. 28, ll. 15-22 (p. 102).

Undoubtedly this was the ideal policy to follow, but where to get the instruments of that policy Charles does not say. Lord Sandwich did not know either, but army and navy commanders merely carried out their government's orders in Charles's opinion; they did not question the practicability of those orders.

Certainly, the arrival of the French fleet under d'Estaing had upset the balance of sea-power and allowed the American privateers free movement, thus endangering Britain's lines of communication. And in Europe, by preparing to invade Britain, France was hoping to achieve her own purpose—a purpose which had nothing to do with helping aggrieved colonists. Britain's safety depended on her ability to control the Channel seas, but with the home fleet in a miserable condition, this was extremely doubtful. During the year 1779, by tremendous efforts, twenty-four ships of the line in various states of seaworthiness were assembled to hold the Channel. Soldiers were pressed into naval service, and of this strange assemblage of men and materials Admiral Augustus Keppel, a Whig who like the Howe brothers made no secret of his disapproval of the American war, was put in command. In July he attacked the French fleet off Ushant, but his ships, ill-equipped and ill-manned, were unable to bring the French to a major engagement.

Subsequently, resignations of officers were so numerous that Sandwich was forced to bring ageing and retired officers back into service. Thus did Britain face the anticipated French invasion, and when, in August 1779, a French fleet appeared off Plymouth, if disease and lack of co-ordination between the naval commanders had not super-vened, the port would certainly have fallen. Without doubt the year 1779 represented as serious a crisis as had ever existed in Britain's history. John Wesley, writing to Samuel Bradburn, stated:

It is the judgement of many that, since the time of the Invincible Armada, Great Britain and Ireland were never in such danger from foreign enemies as they are at this day. Humanly speaking, we are not able to contend with them either by sea or land. . . .⁵¹

In a poem written at the time, Charles Wesley strikes a characteristic note of pessimism and alarm:

The national calamity
 With stony eyes can Britons see,
 With stupid carelessness? . . .
 Numberless hosts and fleets combin'd,
 Rebellious Sects and aliens join'd,
 With dire malicious joy
 Our navies and our trade to seize,
 Our church and government t' oppress,
 Our country to destroy.⁵²

While these events were taking place in Europe, the centres of battle in America had shifted to the Carolinas. Howe had been replaced as commander-in-chief by Sir Henry Clinton—though, for

⁵¹ *Letters*, vi, p. 348.

⁵² "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", No. 4, ll. 1-3, 7-12 (p. 7).

Charles, this merely represented a continuance of Howe's equivocal policy :

True followers of the gallant H [owe] s,
The cause of rebels they espouse,
And vow to leave them free. . . .⁵³

He was still convinced that, even though Howe had sailed for home, his successor was just as self-seeking as Howe himself :

With all his spoils the Hero sails !
Yet private still alas prevails
Above the public good . . .⁵⁴

and even when Clinton had successfully and very creditably taken the city of Charleston, could give him only grudging praise :

But did he not at last awake,
And force the noble powers to quake
While on their troops he flew ?
He beat their troops, he took their town,
And sated with immense renown
Back to his fort withdrew.⁵⁵

With the fall of the city, the whole of South Carolina sought terms with Clinton, who tried by leniency to win the population to his side and ensure allegiance to the British crown.

Clinton, however, thought it necessary to return to New York in order to keep Washington in check, and this seems to be the reference in the last line of the stanza quoted here. The effect of Clinton's departure was soon apparent in the changed method of administration in the captured town. Lord Cornwallis did not carry out Clinton's instructions for establishing a board of police and did not revive civil government ; in fact a number of rebels were hanged on Cornwallis's orders.⁵⁶ Moreover throughout the province Clinton's policy failed to meet with success simply because the loyalists, who had suffered for so long under patriot rule, began to avenge themselves on their former rulers, so that very soon a minor civil war developed.

In spite of the unrest in South Carolina, Cornwallis contemplated further conquests, and decided to attack North Carolina, where he hoped the loyalists would assist him. He utterly defeated General Gates at Camden on 14th August 1780, but suffered two defeats himself—one at King's Mountain, the other at Cowpens. Despite these setbacks, Cornwallis determined to root out the seat of disaffection, which he considered to be in Virginia.

⁵³ *ibid.*, No. 57, Part III, ll. 19-21 (p. 133).

⁵⁴ *ibid.*, ll. 1-3 (p. 132).

⁵⁵ *ibid.*, ll. 55-60 (p. 134).

⁵⁶ See *The American Rebellion: Sir Henry Clinton's Narrative, 1775-1782, with an Appendix of Original Documents*, ed. William B. Wilcox (Yale University Press, 1954). Clinton wrote (p. 158) : "When I took this move, my army was inferior to that my predecessors actually had by at least sixteen thousand men, the ships of war serving with me were not equal to a third of the number he had." He places the blame for the changes in his instructions upon Cornwallis (pp. 182-3), who was probably under the impression that Clinton was shortly to retire, leaving him as commander-in-chief.

At this time Clinton, believing that Washington intended to attack New York with the aid of the new French fleet which had just arrived, asked Cornwallis for reinforcements, thus seriously weakening the British cause in the South and directly contributing to Cornwallis's disastrous capitulation at Yorktown in October 1781. It was in the month preceding this disaster that the curious but intriguing proposals noted by Charles Wesley at some length were discussed by Clinton and Generals Arnold and Phillips:

Who has not heard of Rankin's proffer
To bring the rebel Congress over,
At little York to take them napping
Without a mother's son escaping . . .⁵⁷

Rankin was a colonel of the militia in York County, Pennsylvania, and acted under the code name of "Mr. Alexander" as a loyalist spy. He proposed an attack on Philadelphia, with which Clinton was in agreement:

The chief his bold design approves . . .⁵⁸

Cornwallis, however, thought the whole venture impractical.⁵⁹ Clinton had hoped to establish a post on the Delaware in order to control the greater part of the exports of Pennsylvania, as those of Virginia and Maryland were controlled by having command of Chesapeake Bay. Rankin was asked at a council of war in New York on 17th September about the state of the loyalists south of the Delaware, since Clinton hoped to enlist their support in a diversionary attack on Philadelphia. Washington's purpose had become clear when he and Jean B. Rochambeau arrived at Yorktown and met Lafayette and other French forces. To add to Clinton's troubles, in the midst of preparations for an expedition to relieve Cornwallis there arrived Prince William, the son of George III, and two days were devoted to parties and parades. Thus as the expedition sailed on 19th October, Cornwallis was actually in the process of surrendering. When the British fleet appeared off Chesapeake on the 24th, there was nothing for it to do but to sail back to New York.

The calamity of Yorktown struck England a heavy blow, and virtually ended the war. Lord North staggered about his apartment, exclaiming wildly, "Oh, God! It's all over!" Added to the military disaster was the apparent abandonment of the loyalists which the articles of surrender at Yorktown implied. Charles Wesley's great concern in the poems on America is the fate of the loyalists, and he comments on the Yorktown disaster not so much with regard to its military aspect as concerned with the destiny of those unfortunate supporters of royalty whom nobody really wanted and who

⁵⁷ "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", No. 44, ll. 1-3 (p. 94). ⁵⁸ *ibid.*, l. 9.

⁵⁹ "Being in the place of General Philips, I thought myself called upon by you to give my opinion with all deference to Mr. Alexander's proposals and the attempt upon Philadelphia. Having experienced much disappointment upon that head, I own I would cautiously engage in measures depending materially for their success upon the active assistance from the country." (Quoted in Clinton's *Narrative*, p. 535.)

were obviously going to constitute an extremely awkward factor in any peace negotiations :

. . . Till headlong and precipitate
C[ornwalli]s rush'd upon his fate :
Yielding at once without a stroke,
And passing, tame, beneath the yoke.
He beg'd the haughty Foe to spare
His sutlers and his tools of war,
But left the Loyalists to feel
The mercy of those Fiends from Hell. . . .⁶⁰

It is this period immediately following the capitulation at Yorktown with which Charles Wesley is most concerned in his poems specifically dealing with the loyalists. The tenth article of Cornwallis's surrender terms, which asked that no inhabitant of York or Gloucester who had aided the British should be punished, was refused,⁶¹ and this seemed to set the tone for all future negotiations in which the loyalists' position was discussed.

During the months after the Yorktown débâcle, the King's attitude towards politics changed considerably. He seemed to realize that his efforts to enforce personal rule by exerting his influence on the British Parliament had been utterly without success. The first three months of 1782 were characterized by the growing weight of attacks on the Government, the most important single assault being the famous resolution moved by General Conway on 22nd February :

That a humble Address be presented to his Majesty that the war on the Continent of America may no longer be pursued with the Impracticable Purpose of reducing the Inhabitants of the Country to obedience by Force.

The result of the division was remarkable : For the resolution, 193 ; Against, 194. Wesley's poem on this occasion is indicative of the general belief that the voting represented not only the end of the American war, but of Great Britain itself :

Shall the war be abandon'd, or still carried on ?
(Now we come to the point, and the day is our own)
Shall Britain exist as a Nation or not ?
It exists by a single, unfortunate vote. . . .⁶²

Conway put the same question on 27th February, but introduced the phrase "offensive war". The motion was carried, and Horace Walpole states that this was the decisive blow to Lord North's administration. In a poem entitled "Written after the Next Vote", Wesley describes the situation thus :

⁶⁰ "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", No. 48, ll. 55-62 (p. 103).

⁶¹ Shelburne had worked steadily for the gaining of compensation for the loyalists, and during Rockingham's ministry the American emissary, Benjamin Franklin, had proposed that Canada be ceded to America in order that the loyalists might be resettled there under American rule. The situation, of course, had now changed considerably, and Britain was in no position to bargain.

⁶² "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", No. 26, ll. 18-21 (p. 52).

So they promise and vow, w[h]o triumphantly sing
 For their victory over their Country & King;
 The King they have conquer'd, & routed his friends,
 In pursuit of their own diabolical ends,
 By hard struggling and lying their purpose attain'd,
 And by Treason—at last, a Majority gain'd!⁶³

Charles Wesley's claim that the Opposition had gained their majority by means of "treason" is, of course, utter nonsense. General Conway was a Whig of great respectability and moderation, and there was certainly nothing treasonable in the motion he carried except that it legitimately defeated the King's personal wishes; but in this defeat Charles saw theological implications, as the poems he dates from 26th February clearly show. One poem, which is in effect a prayer for the King, reiterates his belief in the doctrine of the divine right:

Preserv'd in perfect peace
 By Thee his only Lord,
 Till Britain's happiness he sees
 With harmony restor'd.
 United in Thy fear
 Till all his subjects join
 In George (Thine image) to revere
 The Majesty divine.⁶⁴

In March, to forestall further votes of censure, the North ministry resigned. Wesley writes:

With what madness and rage they now lay about 'em,
 The old ministers threaten, and rage till they out 'em,
 But the worst of them all, for whose horrible crime
 His blood shall atone, is the Minister Prime!⁶⁵

A new administration was formed under Lord Rockingham, whom the King detested, and the correspondence of George III shows the deep humiliation he felt at having to accept such a ministry, and how completely he regarded it as a personal defeat for himself.

There are many references in the poems to the new ministry—the greatest number appearing in the long poem "The Revolution", in which Charles greets the Rockingham Government with contemptuous irony:

All hail ye venerable Band,
 Who nobly for your Country stand,
 And from the yoke of tyranny
 Set an indignant nation free
 From Ministers that serv'd for gain,
 From Influence, and a Tory reign!⁶⁶

In the same poem he notes the Opposition's contention that the North ministry was indirectly responsible for the loss of America, on account of the misguided policies it pursued:

⁶³ *ibid.*, No. 27, ll. 13-18 (p. 53).

⁶⁴ *ibid.*, No. 15, ll. 41-8 (p. 34).

⁶⁵ *ibid.*, No. 27, ll. 19-24 (p. 53).

⁶⁶ *ibid.*, No. 32, Part II, ll. 1-6 (p. 66).

Mob undiscerning took their word,
 And turn them out with fury roar'd . . .
 " Turn them out, discard them all
 Who lost America ", they cried . . .⁶⁷

Rockingham died in June, and it was his successor, Shelburne, who eventually negotiated the Preliminary Articles of Peace which were signed on 30th November 1782. Wesley's thought immediately turned to the " Patriots " in England, who he considered had now achieved their aim :

Spirits perturb'd, ye now may rest,
 Nor stir the hell within your breast,
 The Rebels have their purpose gain'd
 Ye see your hearts desire obtain'd.⁶⁸

In a poem entitled " Written on the Peace, 1783 ", and probably composed in January of that year, he accuses Shelburne of similar " crimes " to those with which he had earlier charged Sir William Howe—namely that Shelburne, like Howe, had been more concerned with retaining his own appointments than with reducing the Americans to obedience :

But shou'd not the First Minister
 Make it his chief concern and care
 To save the nation from disgrace ?
 " No truly : but to save *his place*
 " And gratify the Factious tribes
 " And sell three kingdoms for a bribe ".⁶⁹

The poem continues with a very inaccurate account of the negotiations. Charles Wesley believed, as indeed many of his contemporaries must have done, that Shelburne had not only made no attempt to insist on restitution for the loyalists in any peace terms, but that he had prevented Richard Oswald, the British negotiator, from revealing the nature of those terms which Charles imagined were bound to be adverse towards the loyalists. In fact, he is quite wrong when he comments :

The truth let honest Oswald tell
 Which knavish Sh[elburne] wou'd conceal,
 To rebels, and arch-rebels prays,
 And for an ignominious peace
 Intreats our natural enemies . . .⁷⁰

That Oswald received definite instructions on the loyalist question is clear from the correspondence of George III. In a letter from Townsend to the King dated 19th November 1782, the King is informed that Oswald is to insist on

a Personal Amnesty to all who have adhered to Your Majesty without any exception ; likewise upon payments of Debts due before 1775 and restitution of Property to all Real British Subjects, taking care to obtain as clear and as favourable a definition of that Term as possible.⁷¹

⁶⁷ *ibid.*, Part I, ll. 50-4 (p. 65).

⁶⁸ *ibid.*, No. 42, ll. 1-4 (p. 90).

⁶⁹ *ibid.*, No. 46, Part III, ll. 6-12 (p. 100).

⁷⁰ *ibid.*, ll. 13-18.

⁷¹ *Correspondence of George III*, ed. Sir John Fortescue (1928), vi, p. 156.

The fact of the matter was not, as Charles believed, that Britain had disowned her faithful supporters, but that she was quite unable to enforce terms which were favourable to them. Moreover, Congress directed that each state should make restitution of property, but pointed out that Congress itself could only advise and not compel the states to do so; thus nothing was done. Charles may be excused for his ignorance in regard to the matter, but he is certainly wrong in inferring that Shelburne cared little or nothing for the loyalists' fate, as letters between negotiators clearly show. The treatment of the loyalists was the unfortunate result of an administration compelled to make peace on economic as well as political grounds. It could suggest rules of conduct towards the loyalists, but it was in fact powerless to enforce those rules.

Charles Wesley's political judgements may not have been sound, but his concern for the loyalists, whom neither side really knew how to deal with, was certainly charitable and right. His group of seven poems written towards the end of 1782 discusses the fate of the American refugees who had taken up residence in England, in extremely impecunious circumstances. A typical example reads:

So be it then! if God's decree
 Ordains, or suffers it to be
 For wisest ends unknown,
 The land from which our Fathers came
 Our native soil we see, and claim
 The country for our own.⁷⁸

The poem goes on to point out the poverty of these people, many of whom had lost all their wealth and importance:

We, who for all a table spread,
 Are forc'd to beg our bitter bread . . .⁷⁸

Throughout the war the position of the loyalists had become steadily worse. At first the majority condemned the objectionable acts of the British Parliament, but strongly opposed separation from the Empire. Before April 1775 few efforts were made to suppress the loyalists, but following the skirmish at Lexington, when war seemed to be inevitable, measures against them increased in severity.

The loyalists contributed about sixty thousand men to the royal colours, organizing themselves in militia companies under commissions from the Crown. Wesley gives the names of several such leaders—one of whom, Colonel Rankin, has already been mentioned. Another more enigmatic figure is that of Richard Swanwick, who was a customs officer in Philadelphia, and who, because of his loyalist sympathies, had all his estates confiscated. Apparently Swanwick acted as a scout for Sir William Howe in the attack on Philadelphia in September 1777, and enabled the British army to cross the Schuylkill, a tributary of the Delaware, by means of a "secret ford":

⁷⁸ "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", No. 36, ll. 1-6 (p. 75).

⁷⁸ *ibid.*, No. 37, ll. 19-20 (p. 77).

Brought by a way they never knew,
 Army and Chief their Guide pursue ;
 The secret ford is crost,
 And twice ten thousand men pass o'er,
 The loyal Swanwick goes before,
 And saves the British Host!⁷⁴

Wesley has two other poems which, according to his own note, were transcribed from a portrait of Swanwick, where, apparently, they had first been written "under the picture"; but of this picture I have found no trace. Both poems eulogize the loyalty of Swanwick, and draw attention to the loss which most loyalists suffered, namely, the confiscation of their property.

Galloway said that the loyalists who came into Philadelphia during the British occupation "had been plundered of everything in the world".⁷⁵ Wesley comments:

Punish'd for their Leaders ['] sin,
 Scourg'd for madness not their own,
 By infernal arts drawn in,
 Hear the loyal sufferers groan !
 Who shall bid their sufferings cease,
 Who shall give them back their peace?⁷⁶

It is true that the British abandoned the majority of the loyalists when Philadelphia was evacuated in 1778, but it is difficult to see what else they could have done. Worse still, however, several unfortunate loyalist leaders fell victim to the harsh laws of the state which branded loyalists as traitors with the penalty of death without benefit of clergy. John Roberts, mentioned by Galloway in his examination, was one loyalist who suffered in this way, and Charles Wesley, most probably using Galloway's information as raw material for the poem, cites him as an example of martyred loyalty:

Witness the venerable man
 Whose blood with that of thousands slain
 Beneath the altar cries:
 The martyr his reward receives,
 But an eternal monument leaves
 Of C [linto] n's Cowardice.⁷⁷

It is estimated that two hundred thousand loyalists died, became refugees, or were exiled during the course of the Revolution.

On the other hand, it must be admitted that the loyalists were not all that Wesley seemed to imagine them to be. Very often they could not be relied upon; if things went badly, they disappeared, as Burgoyne found to his cost when he advanced on Saratoga. Undoubtedly some of the responsibility for their plight must rest upon themselves. Galloway testified that he had never heard of any loyalist association opposing the Whigs in any part of Pennsylvania. He went on to say that instead of becoming involved in colonial

⁷⁴ *ibid.*, No. 45, ll. 25-30 (p. 96).

⁷⁵ Van Tyne, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

⁷⁶ "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", No. 7, ll. 25-30 (p. 14).

⁷⁷ *ibid.*, No. 57, Part III, ll. 49-54 (p. 134).

politics, they withdrew from "the noisy blustering and bellowing patriots".⁷⁸ He claimed that "in one place two men met, and one appointed the other [a] delegate to Congress", but this comment is probably soured by Galloway's own disillusionment. Nevertheless, whatever their faults may have been, the loyalists suffered great financial hardship. About £10,000,000 was probably seized, since this was the figure claimed from the commission set up by the British Government after the war to inquire into compensation.⁷⁹

On 3rd September 1783, independence was recognized in the definitive Treaty of Peace signed between the United States and Great Britain. In a number of ways the recognition of independence marks the end of an epoch in which British politics had been largely theocratic and autocratic. Furthermore, this recognition seemed to be a practical demonstration of the theory of the "rights of man", and had now made politics anthropocentric and democratic. Charles Wesley may have been obscurantist and narrow in his attitude towards reform in terms of political affiliations between the two countries, but at the least he was aware of the dangers inherent in it. Characteristically, he sees the peace as the final blow to Great Britain's existence:

Where is old England's glory fled,
Which shone so bright in ages past?
Virtue with our forefathers dead,
And public faith have breath'd their last,
And men who falsified their trust
Have laid our honour in the dust.⁸⁰

But it is difficult to see how either side could have continued much longer a war of which both were weary. In Britain, economic pressure, producing a national debt of enormous proportions, was forcing George III to conclude a peace on the best possible terms; whilst in America, many of General Nathaniel Greene's men were almost naked, and the government was practically bankrupt.

Charles Wesley was misguided in most of his judgements on the necessity for and the conduct of the war, which are all coloured by his predominant high-church Toryism and his almost fanatical adherence to the person of the King, but he was right in emphasizing the real sufferers in the struggle. The bitter rhetorical questions he caused an imaginary loyalist to ask might well apply to those miserable streams of hopeless and often stateless refugees of all nationalities that seem to be the inevitable backwash of international peace-making and diplomacy:

⁷⁸ Van Tyne, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

⁷⁹ The various authorities are not agreed on the exact amount which was confiscated, but this seems to be a fair estimate. The Penn family alone lost property worth £1,000,000. About £3,292,452 was allowed by the commissioners. See "Confiscation of Property", article in *A Dictionary of American History*, ed. James Truslow Adams (New York, 1951).

⁸⁰ "Hymns on Patriotism . . .", No. 54, ll. 1-6 (p. 112).

. . . "Where is your King?" the scoffing crowd
Exclaim, and "Where is now your God?"⁸¹

Charles Wesley was also right in pointing out, over and over again, that no system of government is of any real value unless it is permeated with the love, power and justice of God. Therefore his advice "To the American Republic" is equally pertinent when applied to Britain, and is as relevant today as it was when the poem was first written:

Great Peacemaker 'twixt God and man,
Who God and man hast join'd in one,
Turn and unite our hearts again,
That all Jehovah's work may own,
And Britons thro' the world proclaim
The wondrous powers of Jesus' name.⁸²

DONALD BAKER.

⁸¹ *ibid.*, No. 56, Part II, ll. 19-24 (p. 127).

⁸² *ibid.*, No. 9, ll. 43-8 (p. 20).

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*. We trust that the editors of "our contemporaries" find equal interest in this continuing exchange of historical material.

The Local Historian, Vol. 12, Nos. 1 and 2.

The Baptist Quarterly, July 1976.

Cirplan, Michaelmas 1976.

The Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society,
October 1976.

*The Journal of the Historical Society of the Presbyterian Church
of Wales*, October 1976.

Brief Notices

A Companion to the Sunday Service, by Clifford Jones (Methodist Publishing House: pp. 41, price 30p.) is an excellent introduction to and commentary on the new Methodist *Sunday Service*.

A Prisoner of France: A Narrative of the Napoleonic Wars, by George Richard Casse (Howard Baker: pp. 170, price £2 50p.) is a facsimile reprint of the second edition (1841) of *Casse's Narrative*, with a preface from the first edition of 1828.

The Central Records of the Church of England (Church Information Office: pp. 100, price £3) is a Report and Survey presented to the Pilgrim and Radcliffe Trustees.

"Wesleyanism in Sunderland in the later 18th and early 19th century", by G. E. Milburn, is contained in an extract from volume xxvi (1974-6) of the *Antiquities of Sunderland*—papers ordered to be printed by the Sunderland Antiquarian Society.

James Bone (1859-1939): Primitive Methodist Local Preacher (Bedfordshire), by J. W. Bushby (price 17p. post paid) may be obtained from Mr. David W. Bushby, 2, Barford Road, Eynesbury, Cambs, PE19 2SA.

ARCHIVES AND POSTAL HISTORY

A Warning

THE last twenty years have seen a remarkable growth of interest in postal history, and those who have a responsibility for safeguarding archives need to be aware of this development. Collections of early letters which are precious to church historians because of their authorship and the information that they contain may also have great interest for postal historians. In Britain and overseas there are many societies and journals devoted to the study of postal history.

Before 1840, mail within the United Kingdom, and much that entered it, was charged according to the distance travelled and the number of sheets of paper involved. Envelopes were therefore not used, as they would have increased the cost: letters were folded over and sealed, any postal markings being then applied to the outside. Consequently, most letters sent before the postal reforms of 1840, when charges became related to weight, and envelopes began to be used, are of postal interest. The place of posting is usually shown by a handstamp, and transit marks are often seen together with the rates payable by the recipient.

Apart from the historical interest that can be derived from the study of early posts, postal history has attracted the investor, and now early letters can be very valuable. A letter of the 1820s, sent by a Methodist missionary, was recently sold at auction for over £1,000, the valuation being almost entirely dependent upon the words "Jersey Ship Letter" handstamped beside the address. Most letters posted before 1840—and some thereafter—have a monetary value.

Regrettably, archives are attracting those who, by merely slipping a sheet of paper into a note-book, can make a large sum. The letter will probably be sent abroad and sold privately. A document may thus be lost to sight—part even being destroyed in order to make the theft difficult to prove.

The first step in safeguarding archives is to list and mark every paper in the archive. Until this is done, access must be banned, or be very strictly limited under supervision by a rota of overseers, one of whom must always be present. Advice should be taken about probable rarity and value—though the pace of postal history research is so rapid that books are being published almost weekly, revealing the rarity of hitherto little-valued markings: items that sold for a few pence some years past may now have acquired considerable value.

It will be of interest to readers to know that the listing of every letter written before 1850 in the Methodist Missionary Society Archives is now almost complete—an immense task that has been undertaken by Mrs. Ina Ellis. Each letter is indelibly marked, and by this means theft could be proved. These are necessary steps to take to preserve our Church's history. At the same time a financial

asset is being guarded—one that is appreciating in value more rapidly than property or stocks and shares.

In many respects it is sad that those of us who would long to see open access to records for both church and postal historians should need to recommend stringent security precautions, but our archives are our history; we look to them for instruction and guidance; we owe it to posterity to cherish them. Their security may be achieved ultimately by photostat and microfilm, but until then there should be no limits to our vigilance.

PHILIP O. BEALE.

[Mr. P. O. Beale, M.A., formerly Exhibitioner in History at Magdalene College, Cambridge, was Principal of Gambia High School, West Africa, and is now a Director of Studies in Sussex. He is a Fellow of the Royal Philatelic Society of London.]

The Manning Statue of John Wesley

ON Sunday, 27th June, the statue of John Wesley which once stood in the entrance-hall of Richmond College was unveiled in its new site at the Central Hall, Westminster. The ceremony was performed by the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Right Hon. George Thomas, M.P. Dr. A. Marcus Ward represented Richmond College, and Dr. John C. Bowmer the Archives and the Wesley Historical Society. The following account of the statue is taken from *Outlook*, the Central Hall newsletter, and is reproduced by kind permission of the minister, Dr. Maurice Barnett.

The actual statue is in marble and depicts Wesley in preaching gown and bands with a Bible in his hand, and in the attitude of preaching.

The long and interesting history of the work began in 1828. The Methodist Conference had directed that "a whole length statue of Mr. Wesley be executed", and the work was entrusted to a London sculptor Samuel Manning. After making a study of various paintings and etchings of Wesley, Manning felt he had sufficient inspiration, and began a model in clay. However, this was severely criticised by the then President of Conference, George Morley, and by Henry Moore, the Methodist Historian. A close friend of Wesley himself, Dr. Adam Clarke, outspokenly suggested that the sculptor was "unlikely to get an accurate portrait on his present plan". Much disturbed by this adverse criticism, Samuel Manning sought the help of Dr. Clarke, and in a letter dated September 30 1830, he offered the sculptor the loan of his portrait bust of Wesley, which had been so masterly executed by Enoch Wood the Burslem potter, and which Dr. Clarke, when writing to Wood, had declared to be "the only proper likeness". He further declared that he saw in the completed selenite of Mr. Manning "the perfect likeness of Mr Wesley".

In 1830 a site was requested for the statue in Westminster Abbey, but Dean Ireland, the then Dean, refused this "on account of the factious character of Mr Wesley" and so the statue stood in the Methodist Theological College at Richmond from 1849 until this year when training of men for the Ministry ceased at Richmond and the property was sold.

It is surely fitting that this famous statue of the founder of our Methodist Church should at last find its home in the headquarters of Methodism, across the road from a site where it had once been refused, and now be easily accessible for World Methodism, and to our many visitors.

BOOK NOTICES

From Wesley to Asbury: Studies in early American Methodism, by Frank Baker. (Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina, USA: pp. xiv. 223, \$9.75.)

Fifteen years' residence in the United States have enabled Dr. Baker to add to his encyclopædic acquaintance with Methodist history a knowledge of early American Methodism of which this volume is the harvest. The author does not set out to provide another history, but to bring to life some aspects of the period, particularly by relating them to their British origins.

With one exception, the chapters originated as lectures or articles produced for specific occasions, though subsequently revised and in some cases largely rewritten. Inevitably, as the author admits in his introduction, some repetition remains, and the book is perhaps better read as a series of separate—though related—chapters rather than as an organic whole. The unifying theme is, in any case, one which has an American rather than a British audience in mind.

Dr. Baker is not seeking here to break new ground, but to illuminate familiar territory, and he does so with a wealth of detail and careful documentation such as we have learned to expect from him. The volume is well produced and a pleasure to handle. Misprints are hard to find (p. 66, note 46 should read "*Journal VI*"; p. 21, line 1: "present"); and Americanisms such as "connection" (p. 96) are infrequent. But the hidden audience occasionally asserts its presence in the form of uncharacteristic rhetorical flourishes, as when (p. 183), having toyed with the terms "beginnings", "ends" and "endings", he assures us that "Purpose is more important than power, and meaning more significant than money". (The vaguely Chestertonian tone of this is reinforced, no doubt unconsciously, by the confession that follows it—that he "would rather contemplate a dandelion than the biggest aspidistra in the world"—a thoroughly English peroration!)

The opening chapters of the book do their best to establish a link between Wesley's Georgia ministry and the later rise of Methodism in Maryland and elsewhere, but the evidence remains fragmentary and elusive. On the vexed question of the rival claims of Maryland and New York to have established the first Methodist society, Dr. Baker comes down in favour of the former (notably, and appropriately, in an address delivered in Baltimore), though he manages even there, with masterly diplomacy, to offer a sop to New York's pride (p. 40). Captain Webb's green patch did not, in fact, remain in place for a century and three-quarters (p. 68), but was removed towards the end of the last century and placed in a sealed jar; nor is the Captain's own evidence, that the bullet which removed his eye passed through his palate and was swallowed, to be accepted without question (p. 53). But to mention these matters is no more than sniping at the flanks of a series of studies in which the pioneers and key personalities of early American Methodism are brought vividly before us.

JOHN A. VICKERS.

Thomas Coke and World Methodism, by John A. Vickers. (World Methodist Historical Society, British Section: pp. 20, price 40p. plus 9p. postage from the author at 87, Marshall Avenue, Bognor Regis, Sussex, PO21 2TW.)

This excellent introduction to the life and work of Dr. Coke contains

the text (with minor modification) of Mr. Vickers's Wesley Historical Society Lecture of 1964, and was produced in this form to mark the bicentenary of the first meeting between Coke and Wesley in August 1776. Readers of these *Proceedings* will no doubt be familiar with Mr. Vickers's full-scale biography of Coke—*Thomas Coke, Apostle of Methodism* (Epworth and Abingdon Presses, 1969), which was reviewed in vol. xxxvii, p. 167 f., but we are grateful for this summary of the life and work of this key figure in early Methodism. After an introductory "Prelude", Mr. Vickers has divided his study into four parts, each of which indicates an important phase in Coke's career in Methodism—"The 1784 Ordinations", "Coke in America", "Father of the Missions", and "Journey's End". It is good to see that Mr. Vickers answers the charge that Coke was ambitious by allowing him the only ambition which is worth while—"one over-riding passion . . . running like a thread through all he set himself to do and serving as a clue to his motives, and that was his devotion to the world-mission of the church" (p. 4). We can confidently commend this to all who know little or nothing of Dr. Coke, and hope it will so whet their appetite for further information that they will seek out the fuller biography already referred to.

JOHN C. BOWMER.

Early Victorian Methodism: The Correspondence of Jabez Bunting, 1830-1858, by W. R. Ward. (Oxford University Press: pp. xxiii. 440, £12.)

The importance of Jabez Bunting, "one of the first-rank churchmen of the nineteenth century", as Professor Ward judges him to be, has never been questioned. The nature of his influence, however, on Methodism and on the wider community has been very differently assessed. One school of thought was perhaps represented by the correspondent who wrote to Bunting in 1850: "Before you descend to the grave, which if you had done so the day you entered the ministry, would have been a blessing to thousands . . ."; but the fact that Bunting kept that letter may place him in the company of the saintly Curé d'Ars, who dealt similarly with the petition of his detractors. Jabez Bunting has been displayed to thousands of people who never met him as the one occupant of the "chamber of horrors" in the Methodist Madame Tussaud's. In 1835 a Cornish farmer stood in front of his chapel-door, blocking the superintendent's entrance, and saying: "You are an enemy, sent by Jabez Bunting!" A century later, in the same circuit, a probationer who adopted a temporary authoritarian stance was quickly told: "You are a proper Jabez Bunting!" Bunting, on the other hand, has always had his supporters, and Dr. Ward is among those who, whilst not entirely uncritical of Bunting, would not in the end dissent from the General Missionary Committee's testimonial to his "unrestrained disinterestedness and zeal" in his work for the consolidation of Methodism at home and the extension of Christ's kingdom world-wide.

Dr. Ward's present book contains a second selection of Bunting correspondence: this time covering the years 1830 to 1858. It contains 344 letters and a draft memorandum (pp. 1-422), with an Introduction (pp. ix-xxiii) which provides the historical background and discusses the nature and significance of the correspondence. Dr. Ward gives the reader the unexpected privilege of looking over Dr. Bunting's shoulder as he opens his morning mail, breaking the seals of the earlier letters and the frail envelopes of the later ones. At the same time, by his footnotes, Dr. Ward identifies the writers of the letters and evaluates the subject-matter.

The correspondence here reproduced passed for the most part through Bunting's "in"-tray, but it includes 41 letters written by Bunting himself. The subject-matter is largely that of Methodist administration—his main preoccupation—a subject entirely related to Christian theology at one level and to nineteenth-century politics at another. In these letters we see the bricks of Methodist organization falling down from heaven one at a time, and being skilfully used by Bunting to strengthen the fabric of John Wesley's century-old edifice. Unfortunately for Bunting, he was not building in a time of peace: like Nehemiah, he had to wield a sword in one hand and a trowel in the other, while the Warrenites and the "Forty-niners" were constantly threatening the walls of his Jerusalem.

Administration and strife are far from being the only themes in this correspondence. There are many others, such as education, politics, the new movements of revivalism and teetotalism, the problems of the pastoral office and of society and church membership. There are interesting sidelights on contemporary affairs, such as the Oxford Martyrs' Memorial, the "Puseyite" church in Leeds, and glimpses of non-Wesleyans such as "Briant, head of the Bryanites" and semi-Methodists such as Robert Aitken.

Church historians in the future will find this book invaluable. Local historians in many places will find it a mine of information, and it will direct their attention to the bulk of Bunting correspondence still unpublished. Not included in this selection are letters of purely local interest, those concerned with overseas missions, and with Scottish Methodism.

Our members will be interested to know that Dr. Ward has donated to our Library his alphabetically-arranged calendar (139 pp. typescript) of Bunting correspondence in the Methodist Archives and elsewhere.

THOMAS SHAW.

The Bitter Sacred Cup: The Wednesbury Riots, 1743-44, by J. Leonard Waddy. (World Methodist Historical Society, British Section (1976): pp. 46, price 60p. post free from Mr. John A. Vickers, 87, Marshall Avenue, Bognor Regis, Sussex, PO21 2TW.)

Adam Clarke, Controversialist, by Ian Sellers. (pp. 30, price 60p. plus postage from the author at 10, Wells Close, Woolston, Warrington, WA1 4LH.)

After having waited six years for the 1970 Wesley Historical Society Lecture and one year for the 1975 Lecture to appear in print, our readers will not be disappointed. These two books represent quite different types of historical writing. *The Bitter Sacred Cup* is a descriptive account of the organized and persistent attacks on the first Methodists in and around Wednesbury in 1743. It is not, however, a mere narration of the events, but a scholarly assessment of them. Mr. Waddy is surely right in refusing to place the entire responsibility for the riots at the door of the persecutors, but the almost unrelieved wickedness of the perpetrators is plain for all to see. Mr. Waddy's interest in the subject has been lifelong, and his research a labour of love. He has turned to advantage his intimate knowledge of the locality and his genealogical expertise.

Dr. Sellers's study of *Adam Clarke*, sub-titled "Wesleyanism and the Historic Faith in the Age of Bunting", is totally different. It is a study in historical theology within Methodism in the Clarke-Bunting era; and if his final conclusion is that modern trinitarian theology has long moved on, leaving Adam Clarke stranded and unquoted, the battle between Clarke

and the orthodox theologians is still of importance for students of our history. Dr. Sellers lights up some darkened corners, and invites us to reconsider the oft-repeated claim that no doctrinal differences underlay the divisions of nineteenth-century Methodism. The doctrine of the Eternal Sonship was the ground of a serious theological difference between Adam Clarke, "the greatest name in Methodism" in the post-Wesley generation, and the orthodox Wesleyan theologians, who, like the contemporary Tractarians, appealed in such matters to the Early Fathers.

THOMAS SHAW.

In volume xxxviii of these *Proceedings*, the Rev. Harold Bowes contributed an article on "The Launching of Methodism in Shetland, 1822". He has followed this up with an excellent transcript of *Samuel Dunn's Shetland and Orkney Journal, 1822-1825*—a foolscap booklet of vi + 73 pages. This is a notable piece of work, complete with helpful maps and diagrams. It brings to light a hitherto unpublished manuscript which will provide indispensable source-material for all future historians of Methodism in Shetland and Orkney. Samuel Dunn was ever a controversial character. As Mr. Bowes says, "Wherever Dunn went in later years he raised a storm", but there was no doubt, as we can see from his journal, that he was prepared to spend and be spent for Methodism in those northern isles. To quote Mr. Bowes again, "Dunn's long-lost Journal . . . allows us to see his turbulent two and a half years in Shetland through his own eyes, and make our own judgement on his methods and motives" (p. v).

Copies, price 40p. plus 20p. postage, may be obtained from the Rev. Harold R. Bowes at 8, Rippon Road, Sheffield, S6 4ND. J.C.B.

Sir Ronald Johnson has written an essay (24 foolscap pages, including music examples) about the tunes of John Wesley's hymns from the German—both those to which he sang them with the Moravians and those which he may have had in mind for his English versions. The essay claims to identify with reasonable certainty the melodies to which twenty-six of the thirty-three hymns were sung in the original German, and suggests that twenty of the hymns were sung to tunes which are still known to church musicians today. This part of the study tries to place Wesley's encounter with the Moravians in the stream of European psalmody; the second part is largely concerned with the melodies to which Wesley set his translations in the three tune-books that he published (described in Dr. Francis B. Westbrook's *Some Early Methodist Tune-Books*). Very little remains in use of the small volume of melody that Wesley adopted from the Moravians, but Sir Ronald suggests that the "up-hill-and-down-dale" style of singing, usually regarded as characteristically Methodist, may have owed something to a fashion followed by the Moravians in Wesley's day, but not before or since.

The essay is in effect an appendix to Dr. J. L. Nülsen's *John Wesley and the German Hymn* (containing the full German and English texts of the thirty-three hymns), which can be obtained from the Rev. Arthur S. Holbrook, 5, St. Wilfrid's Street, Calverley, Pudsey, West Yorks, LS28 5RQ, price £1 40p. post free.

Sir Ronald's essay is available at 14, Eglinton Crescent, Edinburgh, EH12 5DD, at the price of £1, which is the cost of printing and postage.

J.C.B.

NOTES AND QUERIES

1288. HYMN 386: ITS MEANING AND PUNCTUATION.

Hymn 386 ("O Thou who camest from above") in the 1933 *Methodist Hymn-Book* is printed with a full-stop at the end of verse 3. This leaves the final verse ostensibly as a self-contained sentence; but what does it mean?

Ready for all Thy perfect will,
My acts of faith and love repeat,
Till death Thy endless mercies seal,
And make the sacrifice complete.

The adjective "ready" has no noun or pronoun which it qualifies; the verb "repeat" has no subject, and can therefore only be taken as an imperative addressed to God, and this is nonsense.

Charles Wesley wrote verses 3 and 4 as a *single sentence* in a verse of eight lines, and it is so shown in his *Short Hymns on Select Passages of Scripture* (1762), with a *comma* after the words "Thy gift in me"—the words which now stand at the end of verse 3. The scripture passage linked with the hymn is Leviticus vi. 13. When we consider this complete sentence it becomes clear that the words "Still let me" govern the three following verbs: Still let me guard . . . — [still let me] stir up . . . — [still let me] repeat my acts of faith and love. All is plain, and the grammar is correct. The adjective "ready" goes with "me": Still let *me*, ready for all Thy perfect will, repeat my acts, etc. It was a mistake to split up the two verses into four.

If anyone has any remaining doubts about the meaning, let him refer to Matthew Henry's comments on Leviticus vi. 13 and ix. 24, from which Wesley clearly received the ideas expressed in the hymn. And not only the ideas; the words "ready", "holy fire", "kindle", all come from Matthew Henry.

At least four different punctuations have been used, including Wesley's original comma. *Congregational Praise* has a colon at the end of the third verse (as in the *Poetical Works of John and Charles Wesley*, ix, p. 58—where, however, the two eight-line verses are retained). The 1904 MHB had a semi-colon, as had the 1876 Wesleyan collection also. The PM and UMFC hymnals (both 1889) had a full-stop, and this punctuation appears in the book in present use.

A few years ago I drew the attention of the Book-Room to this mistake, but apparently no notice was taken. I am sorry to see that this great hymn, which is included three times in the new *Methodist Service Book* (1975), is incorrectly printed each time, with a full-stop at the end of verse 3. It seems that another generation of Methodists will be reading what Charles Wesley never wrote, and singing words which lack grammar and meaning!

Even when the correct punctuation is used, the division into four verses presents difficulties, as most people expect each verse to be complete in itself. Since the hymn is almost certain to continue in four verses, it would be an advantage to adopt the sensible alteration which occurs in *Hymns Ancient and Modern* (No. 698; in the Revised edition the number is 329). Here the final verse begins:

Still let me prove Thy perfect will,
My acts of faith and love repeat;

This is the version constantly used by Anglicans, as it has been for many years. In this instance a change is justified: it uses appropriate language, it removes ambiguity, and brings out the author's meaning.

Incidentally, a further change is that the second line of the hymn has become "The fire celestial to impart". This certainly gives a smoother scansion, and avoids compressing "to impart" into two syllables. But my main concern at the moment is with verses 3 and 4.

T. FRANCIS GLASSON.

1289. TITLES OF THE SHORTER SERVICE-BOOKS.

The Rev. R. Wesley Hartley, of Leigh Hall, 420, Liverpool Road, Enfield, New South Wales, writes:

The late Rev. Wesley F. Swift, in his article "*The Sunday Service of the Methodists: A study of Nineteenth-century Liturgy*" (*Proceedings*, xxxi, pp. 112-18, 133-43), referred to "other service-books with the title *Order of Administration of the Sacraments and other Services, for the use of the People called Methodists*" (p. 113), and then listed fifteen editions of this book between 1839 and 1881 which he had seen. He stated further (*loc. cit.*): "The *Order of Administration of the Sacraments* was discontinued after the major revision of 1882", and referred to "*The Book of Public Prayers and Services*, and its shorter version, the *Order of Administration of the Sacraments and other Services* (not to be confused with its namesake of an earlier date)" (p. 141). Throughout this article Mr. Swift referred to the shorter version of *The Sunday Service* as the *Order of Administration of the Sacraments*.

Dr. John C. Bowmer in *The Lord's Supper in Methodism, 1791-1960* (1961) says ". . . the Conference of 1835 authorized the publication of a smaller manual entitled, *The Order of Administration of the Sacraments and other Services* (p. 30). Elsewhere (pp. 30-2) he refers to this book simply as *Order of Administration*. The Rev. A. Raymond George's article "Books, Liturgical. 10. Methodist" in J. G. Davies (ed.): *A Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship* (1973) includes the statement: "It is curious that this [*The Book of Public Prayers and Services*] also had a shorter version with the same title as its predecessor, *Order of Administration of the Sacraments* . . ." (p. 89).

I have not seen all the editions of the shorter version of *The Sunday Service* referred to by Mr. Swift, but I have examined the following editions: 1848, 1852, n.d. but c. 1857, 1863, 1865, 1878. All of these editions have the title *Order of Administration of the Lord's Supper and Baptism* . . . I have also examined the following editions of the shorter version of *The Book of Public Prayers and Services*: 1883, 1883 (bound with Canticles and Psalms), 1884, 1898, 1899, 1901. All of these have the title *Order of Administration of the Sacraments* . . .

There are, therefore, at least for the editions I have seen, quite distinct titles for the shorter versions of *The Sunday Service* and *The Book of Public Prayers and Services*, the shorter version of *The Sunday Service* have the title *Order of Administration of the Lord's Supper and Baptism*, and not that ascribed to it by Mr. Swift, Dr. Bowmer, and Mr. Raymond George. It is probably correct to assume that the different title for the shorter service-book of 1883 and following years was deliberately chosen by those responsible for its publication in order to distinguish it from its predecessor.

R. WESLEY HARTLEY.

1290. METHODIST SECEDERS IN PRESTON.

Mr. W. F. Richardson, of 34, Queen's Drive, Fulwood, Preston, Lancs, writes:

I should appreciate any information pertaining to (1) seceders from the Back Lane (then the only) Methodist chapel in Preston in 1802, referred to by Pilkington (*Flashes of Preston Methodism* (1896)) as "Kilhamites", who occupied rooms in Lord Street; (2) "Kilhamites" who, according to Hewitson (*History of Preston* (1883)), occupied Vauxhall Road chapel, probably in the period 1814-17, or part of it; (3) Protestant Methodists who utilized Vauxhall Road chapel from 1828 until they erected the first Orchard chapel in 1831; (4) any connexion or relationship between the seceders of 1802, still in existence in 1826, though not known to be so subsequently, and the Protestant Methodists of Vauxhall Road, in view of the formation of the latter in 1828.

W. F. RICHARDSON.

MORE LOCAL HISTORIES

As we close the present volume, we are pleased to be able to include a somewhat more extended list of local publications than has been possible in recent issues owing to pressure on our space. Prices are stated where we have been informed of these.

A Church for all Seasons—the story of St. Peter's (Park Lane) Methodist chapel, Norwich, 1939-75, by Joan and Jim Bennett (pp. 12): copies from the Rev. William B. G. Ream, 123, Christchurch Road, Norwich, NR2 3PG.

Hockwold-cum-Wilton (Norfolk) centenary brochure (pp. 16): copies from the Rev. Clifford Jagger, 33, Abbeygate, Thetford, Norfolk, IP24 1AX.

The History of Methodism in Walton-on-the-Naze (pp. 42): copies from the Rev. John W. R. Robinson, 71, Fourth Avenue, Frinton-on-Sea, Essex, CO13 9DY.

Carnon Downs (Cornwall) 150th anniversary brochure (pp. 16): copies from the Rev. Peter H. Bolt, Crescent Lodge, Crescent Road, Truro, Cornwall, TR1 3EP.

Wylam centenary brochure (pp. 24): copies from the Rev. A. Glynn Lister, 17, Stephenson Terrace, Wylam, Northumberland, NE41 8DZ.

Gidea Park golden jubilee brochure (pp. 32): copies from the Rev. Kenneth V. Price, 411, Brentwood Road, Gidea Park, Romford, Essex, RM2 6DD.

History of Addington—25th anniversary exhibition souvenir booklet (pp. 24): copies, price 15p., from the Rev. Frank W. Smith, The Manse, Huntingfield, Croydon, CR0 9BA.

Seend (Wilts) bicentenary handbook, by Harold J. Griffiths (pp. 20): copies, price 25p., from the Rev. John G. Beard, 38, Horsebrook Park, Calne, Wilts, SN11 8EY.

Noah's Ark Methodist chapel, Netherton, Worcs, 50th anniversary brochure (pp. 12): copies, price 10p., from the Rev. Bertram L. Simpson, 82, Church Road, Netherton, Dudley, West Midlands, DY2 0JJ.

How Methodism came to Bournemouth, with special reference to the 75th anniversary of Westbourne (pp. 16): copies from the Rev. D. Claude Hearle, 7, Pinewood Road, Branksome Park, Poole, BH13 6JP.

- Historical record of Nicolson Square, Edinburgh, 1816-1976, by Alan J. Hayes (pp. 36) : copies from the author at 31, Liberton Brae, Edinburgh, EH16 6AG.
- St. John's, Bangor (North Wales) centenary brochure, by John H. Davis (pp. 28) : copies from the author at 3, Belmont Road, Bangor, Gwynedd.
- Oakridge Lynch centenary brochure (pp. 13) : copies from the Rev. E. David Edwards, Spring Cottage, Far Oakridge, Stroud, Glos, GL6 7PF.
- Hatfield Peverel centenary brochure (pp. 8) : copies, price 15p. plus postage, from Mr. J. Knight, The Spinney, Church Road, Hatfield Peverel, Essex.
- Elland Bethesda 150th anniversary brochure (pp. 20) : copies from Mr. W. Lloyd Keighley, 23, Blackley Road, Elland, West Yorkshire, HX5 0TB.
- A History of Wesley Church, Stoke-on-Trent*, by Agnes Curtis and Eva Beech (pp. 30) : copies, price 20p. plus postage, from Mrs. Curtis at 220, Princes Road, Hartshill, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffs, ST4 7JW.
- A History of Cambridge Park Church, Wanstead*, by L. A. W. Francis (pp. 54) : copies, price 50p., from the author at 81, Warren Road, Wanstead, London, E.11.
- Exploits of a Hundred Years*—a brief history of the Liverpool Mission (pp. 46) : copies, price 75p., from the Rev. Dr. Cyril E. Gwyther, Wesley House, Warren Street, Tenby, Pembs, Dyfed.

WORLD METHODIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY NOTES

Toronto Conference, 1977

A REGIONAL Conference will take place at Victoria University, Toronto, from 26th to 29th June 1977, under the auspices of the Canadian Methodist Historical Society. Speakers include Dr. Albert Outler, Dr. Frank Baker, and Dr. Frederick Norwood.

Registration, including accommodation and meals, costs \$60 (less for a shared room), but there is a possibility of financial help for British Methodists. Further information is available from me, or direct from the Rev. Glen Lucas, United Church Archives, Victoria University, 73, Queen's Park Crescent East, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 1K7.

JOHN A. VICKERS (British Secretary, WMHS).

Publications

EDITED by Dr. Kenneth E. Rowe, of Drew University, *The Place of Wesley in the Christian Tradition: Essays in Celebration of the Publication of the Oxford Edition of the Works of John Wesley*, by Albert Outler, Gordon Rupp, Martin Schmidt and Michael Hurley (the Drew Consultation Lectures) is to be published by The Scarecrow Press, Inc., PO Box 656, Metuchen, New Jersey, 07740, USA, at an estimated price of \$8.

The Editor would be glad to receive copies of Branch bulletins and local history brochures as published. After he has gone through them and (where appropriate) noted them in the *Proceedings*, he will deposit them in our Library.