
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.

Volume XXXIV **September 1963**

JOHN WESLEY ON CHRISTIAN PERFECTION

ALL serious students of Wesley's thought must be indebted to the Rev. George Lawton for his presentation in the last issue of the *Proceedings* (xxxiv, pp. 29-33) of the document on perfection, and the value of the article is greatly increased by the provision of a facsimile. The document is of sufficient importance to discuss at some length, in order to arrive at a more precise definition of its setting and significance.

Mr. Lawton's first question about the possibility that this is a Wesley autograph can quickly be answered. It is not in the handwriting of either John or Charles Wesley. Nor do I regard this as a matter open to reasonable doubt. To quote the document itself, "I affirm it flat and plain". It is true that similarities to Wesley's hand in the formation of some of the letters can be pointed out, as they could be if you or I had transcribed it, but the overall flow of the writing is not Wesley's, and some of the letters he never formed in this way. This is particularly true of *N*, *P*, *R* and *X*, but of other letters also, including the *W* of the signature. Nor is the unscholarly omission of capitals at the beginning of sentences, so frequent in the document itself, though corrected in the transcript, conceivable with Wesley.[1]

Nevertheless, in my opinion—and from this point "opinion" commands the stage—this is certainly a document which is genuine in the sense that it conveys Wesley's words as well as his thoughts, even though not in his own hand. Whether it was a simple transcript or a compilation from more than one source; whether it was prepared by his direction, with his acquiescence, or without his knowledge—contemporary copies of Wesley documents were made

[1] There are also two minor errors in the transcript, "y^t" (i.e. "that") having twice been misread, once for "the" (in question 3) and once for "this" (in question 18).

in each of these three categories—can only be matter of speculation. Nor would I care to hazard a guess, among hundreds of possibilities, about the identity of the amanuensis, except to state that he seems to have been a contemporary of Wesley—though even here an examination of the paper and ink might just possibly overturn this opinion.

Before discussing Mr. Lawton's suggestions about the nature of the document, I wish to offer three generalizations. First, it seems to me almost certain that this is a *private* document, outlining Wesley's views under the pressure of a specific situation, but not intended for publication as it stands. Secondly, the questions are propounded by an *opponent* rather than by a simple inquirer. The atmosphere of challenge colours both questions and answers. The questions appear to be overstated with some animus, especially those numbered 1, 4, 7, 14, 16 and 17. On the other hand, Wesley's answers are on the defensive rather than merely exploratory or expository, witness especially numbers 1, 4, 7 and 16; in 10, 17 and 18 Wesley turns from defence to something like attack. Thirdly, Wesley is defending not only himself but the Methodists in general. It is of some interest that although most of the answers are in the first person singular, in his reply to question 4 Wesley writes: "We humbly hope that God does not find sin in us." This is hardly the "editorial we"—which in any case he seldom used. In the first answer he combines both singular and plural as he speaks somewhat hesitantly for some of his followers: "I believe some would answer, we trust we do keep the whole law of love."

With these criteria in mind, I would argue that the latter two possibilities set out by Mr. Lawton are very unlikely, namely that the document incorporated the minutes of a formal Methodist conference, or that it provided a model series of questions and answers for Methodist use in the perfection controversy. This throws us back on to the first two suggestions—that it represents either a letter or the record of a conversation. Either of these would seem to be possible, though in each case there are "cons" as well as "pros". Certainly as it stands this is not a letter, though it could be the truncated copy of one. In this connexion one recalls Wesley's correspondence with Richard Freeman, a somewhat confused Quaker.[2] Strangely enough in this instance also twenty questions were propounded, and were also considerably lengthier than Wesley's laconic replies. My main objection to the letter theory is that Wesley's scrupulous economy of time would almost certainly forbid his incorporating in a private letter a lengthy series of numbered questions in addition to his own answers, naturally assuming that his correspondent would retain a copy of such a document. An open letter for publication might have been treated differently, but this does not seem applicable here. It is possible, of course, that the original

[2] See *Proceedings*, xxvi, pp. 114-18. The original of Wesley's letter to Freeman, dated 6th August 1779, is at Emory University, Georgia, U.S.A.

manuscript was a questionnaire prepared by Wesley's challenger, with blank spaces for his replies, similar to one which he answered in 1741.[3] Or some interested person may have got hold of both questions and answers and combined them into one series, as could well have been done with the two separate items in the Freeman correspondence.

On the whole I incline to the view that this is a record of one of Wesley's interviews, comparable to the famous one with Bishop Butler found among Wesley's papers, or those with the Chicasaw Indians and with Count Zinzendorf, which he himself published in his *Journal*.[4] Somewhat difficult to reconcile with this view, however, is the comparative lack of logical connexion between a number of the queries, which would seem to favour a prepared set of questions (whether written or spoken) rather than a genuine conversation.

As Mr. Lawton shows, the general setting of the document is in the third quarter of the eighteenth century, before the death of Whitefield in 1770, and probably about 1763. I think that we can pin-point the time more accurately than this, especially by means of the clue of question 19: "Mr. Bell says 'He shall never die'. Do you believe him?"—to which Wesley simply answers "No." Clearly the notorious George Bell is referred to, and to me it also seems certain that at this time the questioner regarded him as one of Wesley's followers—an assumption not challenged by Wesley. The likelihood is, therefore, that the exchange took place after Bell's professed experience of sanctification in March 1761 and before 28th February 1763, which according to Bell was to have been the end of the world—earlier that month he had separated from Wesley.[5]

We can indeed narrow the limits still more, confining the document to the year 1762, which Wesley described in his *Short History of the People called Methodists* as "from the beginning to the end . . . a year never to be forgotten", bringing him "more care and trouble in six months, than in several years preceding".[6] It was a year of revival, and therefore of spiritual peril. On 5th February he warned London Methodists "of the enthusiasm which was breaking in, by means of two or three weak though good men, who, from a misconstrued text in the Revelation, inferred that they should not die."[7] One of these was surely George Bell. Wesley left London in March, spent the summer in Ireland, and saw London again for a few days only in August. The *Plain Account of Christian Perfection* shows that the cult of immortality had developed into spiritual chaos during his absence:

[3] John Whitehead: *Life of the Rev. John Wesley* (1796), ii, pp. 144-6; cf. Wesley's *Works* (ed. T. Jackson, n.d.), xiii, pp. 509-11.

[4] Whitehead, op. cit., ii, pp. 118-21; Standard *Journal*, i, pp. 248-50; ii, pp. 487-90.

[5] Luke Tyerman's *Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley*, ii, pp. 431-41, provides a useful summary of Bell's career.

[6] *Works*, xiii, p. 353; *Journal*, iv, p. 452.

[7] *Journal*, iv, p. 486.

> Two or three began to take their own imaginations for impressions from God, and thence to suppose that they should never die; and these, labouring to bring others into the same opinion, occasioned much noise and confusion. Soon after, the same persons, with a few more, ran into other extravagances. [He added:] At my return to London, in autumn, some of them stood reproved; but others were got above instruction.[8]

His *Journal* for 20th August claims that he "pointed out to those who had more heat than light the snares which they had well nigh fallen into", and describes how on the following day he came to a satisfactory reckoning with Thomas Maxfield. Lulled into a false sense of security, he left for Bristol and the West, but returned to an even worse situation at the end of October.

It is apparently to this interval in the autumn of 1762 that Wesley refers in the continuation of the passage quoted above from the *Plain Account*, though it may take in November as well:

> Meantime, a flood of reproach came upon me almost from every quarter: from themselves [i.e. the "enthusiasts"], because I was checking them on all occasions; and from others, because, they said, I did not check them.

The Epworth document seems to represent one of these latter attacks, criticizing Wesley for defending Maxfield and Bell and their supporters. When Wesley returned to London on 30th October one of the first things he did was to prepare a candid critique of Maxfield's theology and conduct—which Maxfield resented.[9] The second was to hear Bell on several occasions for himself, finally arriving at the decision, on 22nd December, that Bell "must not continue to pray at the Foundery", to which Bell responded by withdrawing from the Methodist society on 4th February 1763.[10]

That the Epworth document belongs to the closing months of 1762, before Wesley broke with Bell, seems to be confirmed by its apparent relationship to another document quoted in the *Plain Account*, entitled "Queries, humbly proposed to those who deny perfection to be attainable in this life".[11] This Wesley places after Bell's beginning to prophesy the end of the world but before the death of Jane Cooper, which took place towards the end of November. The queries were written by "a plain man" (possibly Wesley himself) in answer to some questions published by those who opposed Christian perfection on account of Bell's extravagances. Some of these twenty-two queries either echo or are echoed by the Epworth document. The first asks: "Has there not been a *larger measure* of the Holy Spirit given under the Gospel than under the Jewish dispensation?"—which is challenged by question 17 of the Epworth document. Among the queries implying the possibility of human sinlessness, at least in the sense of a temporary experience of perfect love, the most interesting for our purpose is the seventeenth: "Do

[8] *Works*, xi, pp. 406-7.
[9] *Journal*, iv, pp. 535-8.
[10] ibid., iv, pp. 539-42; v, pp. 4-5.
[11] *Plain Account* (1766), pp. 85-8; cf. *Works*, xi, pp. 408-9.

you sincerely *desire* to be freed from indwelling sin *in this life*?", which is echoed by question 11 of the Epworth document.

Far more remarkable, however, are the likenesses between the Epworth document and Wesley's *Farther Thoughts upon Christian Perfection*, published in 1763 and later incorporated in the *Plain Account*. In this Wesley sets out more fully and in the more self-conscious manner befitting publication a number of the points roughly sketched in the manuscript dialogue, including that of sinless perfection (question 7). The point about the repealing of the Adamic law (question 8) is debated at some length. Wesley's answer to the related request for further clarification (question 9) turns up almost word for word in a footnote added in 1773 to the appropriate passage in volume xxiv of Wesley's collected *Works*: "I mean, it is not the condition either of present or future salvation." This almost looks as if when preparing the *Farther Thoughts* section of the *Plain Account* for his *Works* Wesley checked this (and perhaps other related documents), and said to himself: "Yes, probably a footnote along these lines would make the matter even clearer." He did not, however, take any steps to add this footnote to the separate editions of the *Plain Account* which he continued to publish.[12] Question 10, about distinguishing temptation from sin, also appears in similar form, though considerably expanded.[13] So does question 11, introduced thus: "But how do you *know*, that you are sanctified, saved from your inbred corruption?" The answer is once more provided by a reference to 1 John iv. 13: "By the Spirit that he hath given us".[14]

This is not the place for a full analysis of the Epworth document, nor for a detailed comparison with its possible predecessor and probable successor. It seems to me, however, that we can with some reason claim that it represents a controversial exchange in the closing months of 1762 between Wesley and one of the many persons who attacked his moderate stand on the doctrine of Christian perfection, brought into disrepute by the excesses of George Bell and company. As such it is of real importance as another link in the chain of evidence revealing the undoubted development of Wesley's views on this doctrine, which in later years he described as "the grand depositum which God has lodged with the people called Methodists; and for the sake of propagating [which] chiefly He appeared to have raised us up."[15]

FRANK BAKER.

[12] *Plain Account* (1766), pp. 98-100; *Works* (1773), xxiv, p. 81 (cf. Jackson edn., n.d., xi, pp. 414-15).
[13] *Plain Account*, pp. 108-9; cf. *Works* (Jackson edn.), xi, p. 420.
[14] ibid., p. 109; cf. *Works* (Jackson edn.), loc. cit.
[15] Standard *Letters*, viii, p. 238.

The first issue of the new volume of *Cirplan* comes to us in a new shape and size, which makes for easier handling. This number contains, among other items, an index of the first two volumes of *Cirplan* and an article by Mr. Frank Tice on early plans of the Cambridge PM circuit.

JONATHAN AND PENELOPE COUSSINS

LETTERS written by John Wesley, and hitherto unpublished, are still making their appearance; but the skeletons of his honoured preachers do not so often come to light. Yet that is what literally happened in November 1962 in the little Norfolk town of Diss, in which Methodism began in reality in 1785. Its first chapel was apparently built in 1790, and in October of that year the town received its first and only visit from John Wesley, who, with the ready consent of Bishop Horne of Norwich ("Mr. Wesley is a brother") preached in the parish church.[1] The town was in the very wide Norwich circuit until 1790, when it became the head of a newly-formed circuit, and has remained so ever since. The earliest chapel was superseded by a larger one, on the same site, about the middle of the last century, but there is a lack of certainty on this point.

It was while this second chapel was being demolished, preparatory to the building of more suitable premises nearby, that, on lifting floor-boards in the centre of the church, workmen discovered a stone bearing the inscription: "Jonn Cousins, who died on October 31, 1805, aged 49, having been 26 years a preacher of the Gospel". About four feet farther down was found an oak coffin in good condition, except for the caved-in lid, and containing a clean skeleton. The present-day Methodists were entirely unaware of the existence of the grave, and that the body of one of the members of the original Legal Hundred lay beneath them as they worshipped.

Jonathan Coussins (to give the name the usual spelling of his day) was born in Reading in 1757, and was converted at Cheltenham in 1776 through the influence of Miss Penelope Newman,[2] a bookseller and ardent class-leader and worker for Methodism in the town and neighbourhood. She so influenced him, indeed, that it came to pass that the soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of Penelope, and they were married in 1782, two years after Conference had given him his first appointment, which was to the Norwich circuit. There is a delightful sidelight on their engagement and marriage. Coussins's biographer says that "Mr. Wesley had been consulted respecting their union, and approved of it. God now opened the way before them. Mr. Coussins was appointed for the Gloucester circuit in which she resided." Nevertheless, Wesley evidently did not wish this "providential" action to be regarded as a precedent, for three months before the wedding he told Penelope: "I do not yet see any reason why Jonathan Coussins should not labour next year in the Gloucestershire Circuit. *But I do not use to determine things of this kind absolutely before the Conference.*"[3]

Jonathan's itinerancy, like most, took him to various parts of the country, but there were two further appointments to East Anglia—

[1] *Journal*, viii, p. 108.
[2] See *Proceedings*, viii, p. 165.
[3] *Letters*, vii, p. 129.

one to Norwich in 1784 and the second to Diss in 1803, which was renewed the following year in consequence of the severe illness to which he succumbed in October 1805.

The customary memoir, written for the *Methodist Magazine* by the Rev. Richard Waddy (the first of six related ministers of that name, and himself serving from 1793 to 1853), who also preached the sermon at the funeral, says that the grave was "in the centre of the building". The present writer knows, of course, that a number of the older Methodist chapels had graveyards attached to them; but was burial *within* a chapel a common occurrence or not? Whether there was a mural record of Coussins's burial, or whether any written record was made and subsequently lost, may never be known, but investigations are still proceeding.

Coussins, a very modest man, had fought against John Valton's suggestion that he should enter the itinerant ministry; but after much persuasion he allowed his name to be submitted to Conference. Wesley himself had said to him: "Do all you can, brother: angels can do no more".[4] His modesty did, in fact, commend him to Wesley, for in conversation with a friend, the old man spoke thus: "Brother Coussins is a man of integrity; I have had a strong proof of his wisdom; he thinks before he speaks; he is humble and teachable. He does not aim to be great, but to get and do good".[5] Such an opinion doubtless accounted for the inclusion of Coussins among the youngest section of the Legal Hundred, i.e., the men who had "travelled" only four years.

But whilst Wesley obviously esteemed Coussins for his own worth, one cannot but wonder if his interest in him deepened when he (Coussins) became Penelope Newman's man. For she herself, converted during one of Wesley's visits to Cheltenham, was one of a host of Methodist women for whom Wesley had the highest regard; and though she did not attain the fame of some of them it is clear that Wesley valued her ardour and devotion, and that they won her a warm place in his affection. To her he wrote on 23rd October 1772:

> I was much delighted when I saw you, with your artless, simple love; and love you the more on that account. As freely as you would talk to me if we were together, so freely write to [me], my dear Penny.[6]

In his correspondence with her, Wesley comments on a variety of subjects which are not without interest for us today, even though we may not wholeheartedly endorse his views. In the letter just quoted he refers to

> those that are called Mystic authors. These (Madame Guyon in particular) have abundance of excellent sayings. They have many fine and elegant observations; but in the meantime they are immeasurably wise above that is written. They continually *refine* upon plain Christianity.

[4] *Methodist Magazine* (1806), p. 337. [5] ibid.
[6] *Letters*, v, p. 342.

> But to *refine* religion is to spoil it. It is the most simple thing that can be conceived: it is only humble, gentle, patient love.[7]

Among other observations addressed to her are the following:

> It is continually needful to guard against spiritual religion degenerating into formality, as this strikes at the whole work of God.[8]

> I trust you will never sink into Quietism (or Quakerism, which is only one mode of it). For then you would soon sink into lukewarmness; and what would come next who can tell? I have not known ten Quakers in my life whose experience went so far as justification. I never knew one who clearly experienced what *we* term "sanctification". But, indeed, their language is so dark and equivocal that one scarce knows what they do experience and what they do not.[9]

> For the time to come (at least while I live) [Conference] will always continue ten days. No less time will suffice for sifting to the bottom the various points of importance that are to be considered.[10]

In these ecumenical days it is a pleasure to note that during his last illness Coussins rejoiced in the fellowship he had with a Baptist minister named Simpson, who, at his own expense, called in a physician to see the patient. This minister, with colleagues of his, also took part in the funeral service.

The Conference obituary notice on Coussins stated that "he was an acceptable and useful Preacher, and gained the love and esteem of the people wherever he went".

In addition to the names of Jonathan and Penelope Coussins, there was a "P. Coussins, junior" on the list of Diss members for 1805. This was doubtless their daughter, Philadelphia, who figures in an informative article by the late Rev. F. F. Bretherton on the Newman family in *Proceedings*, xxv, pp. 86-8. Incidentally, that article helpfully indicated that occasionally Wesley refers to Penelope as "Prizzy". She is also once called "Philly". The main point to be borne in mind is that in the indexes of the Standard *Journal* and *Letters* she is mentioned under Penelope and Priscilla Newman, and Penelope, Philly and Sister Coussins.

The disinterred remains of Jonathan Coussins are to be re-interred in the burial ground of the 150-year-old chapel at North Lopham in the Diss circuit. Methodism took root there before it did at Diss, and Coussins had preached to the villagers in their homes when he began his itinerancy in the Norwich circuit.

W. A. GREEN.

POSTSCRIPT

Since the foregoing article was written, the re-interment at North Lopham has taken place. The remains were enclosed in a wooden casket, in which were also placed copies of local newspapers and an account of the discovery and re-burial written by the Rev. F. S. Warwick, superintendent minister of the Diss circuit, who, during the short ceremony, paid tribute to Coussins for his share in the spreading of the Gospel in South Norfolk. W.A.G.

[7] ibid. [8] ibid., v, p. 227. [9] ibid., vii, p. 26. [10] ibid.

THE ANNUAL MEETING AND LECTURE

MRS. IBBERSON once again generously provided tea for members who were fortunate in being able to attend the Annual Meeting and Lecture at Preston. It was a most enjoyable meal, served in the Lune Street schoolroom, and at the end thanks were expressed to our absent hostess by Mrs. E. V. Chapman of Halifax.

Business Meeting

The Rev. A. Raymond George presided over the meeting, at which over twenty members were present. After the opening devotions, led by the chairman, standing tribute was paid to fourteen members who had died since the last annual meeting—a number which included historians of the calibre of Dr. R. F. Wearmouth and Dr. C. W. Towlson.

The secretary read prepared reports sent in by the treasurer and the registrar. The treasurer's statement showed a balance in hand of £525 10s. 5d., together with £225 invested in War Stock, and estimated liabilities of £540 12s. 11d. The registrar's report showed that 44 members had been enrolled during the year, 22 had retired or lapsed, and 12 had died. The membership of 772 is a net increase of 10 on the previous year. He suggested that the Society should endeavour to raise its membership to 1,000 as quickly as possible. The meeting agreed to the adoption of this target, and approved the plans of the Executive Committee to inaugurate a membership drive. To this end a newly-drafted prospectus is being prepared and will be distributed among the branches and selected centres throughout the country. Members will also receive along with the *Proceedings* a form on which they will be invited to give the names and addresses of potential members known to them to whom copies of the prospectus can be sent.

The Manuscript Journal secretary reported 23 members on the rota, and the meeting agreed to his suggestion that the Journal should be circularized in two parts—one among those known to pass it on promptly and the other among those who keep it longer! The membership of both rotas will be kept constantly under supervision!

The editor reported a successful year, and said that he would always welcome new contributors with worthwhile material.

Branch reports were received from East Anglia, Cornwall, Yorkshire, the North-East and Lincolnshire, and the secretary reported that plans were afoot to develop local branches in Devon, Kent, and Manchester. Altogether the picture of local activities was most satisfying.

The dampness rising from the ground in the Society's Library continues to cause concern, and the Executive Committee were authorized to take steps to remedy the situation.

A letter was read from the President of the Society tendering his resignation. The Rev. W. L. Doughty has served the Society faithfully, and it was only because they knew that his request was definite and had been reiterated that the meeting reluctantly accepted Mr. Doughty's resignation on account of deafness which made it difficult for him to fulfil presidential functions. The Rev. Dr. Maldwyn L. Edwards was then appointed President of the Society, with the Rev. W. L. Doughty as President-Emeritus. The remaining officers were reappointed.

The Annual Lecture

The architecture of Methodist chapels has become a subject for serious research during recent years, and many buildings which were once passed by without notice are now being closely scrutinized and appraised. The Rev. George W. Dolbey opened up the subject to a large and interested audience at Lune Street church, and illustrated "The Development of Architecture in Methodism from 1738 to 1840" with a set of transparencies. The publication of this year's lecture is still awaited, and will be of considerable value as the only full-length study of the subject.

Dr. Marjorie Lonsdale presided at the Lecture, and made her own distinctive and valued contribution to the success of the evening.

THOMAS SHAW.

Our New President

The Wesley Historical Society is honoured to have one of its most distinguished members, the Rev. Dr. Maldwyn L. Edwards, M.A., as its new President. Dr. Edwards is a first-rank Methodist historian, a universally-acknowledged authority on the Wesley family, and a former President of the Methodist Conference. It is, however, not only on account of these distinctions but because of his long and active membership of the Society that our members will give him a particular welcome. Dr. Edwards is the seventh President of the Society in a succession which began with the Wesley scholars Richard Green, John S. Simon and John Telford.

THOMAS SHAW.

WESLEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Financial Statement for the year ended 30th June 1963

RECEIPTS.	£	s.	d.
Balance in hand, 30th June 1962	451	14	11
Subscriptions and Donations			
General	298	13	6
New Life Members (2) ...	21	0	0
Irish Branch	32	18	0
Advertisements	1	5	6
Share of Lecture Collection	2	18	0
Chairman's Donation ...	5	0	0
Proceedings (back numbers) and Publications sold	55	2	5
War Stock Dividend ...	7	15	6
	£876	7	10

PAYMENTS.	£	s.	d.
Printing of *Proceedings* (4 issues)	225	0	0
Postages and Stationery ...	96	15	9
Secretarial and Editorial Expenses	17	2	0
Lecturer's Honorarium ...	7	7	0
Insurance	3	11	8
Bank Charges	1	1	0
Balance in hand, 30th June 1963	525	10	5
	£876	7	10

Balance Sheet

LIABILITIES.	£	s.	d.
Subscriptions in advance ...	276	0	11
Life Members—			
73 at (say) £3 13s. 6d. each	264	12	0

ASSETS.	£	s.	d.
War Stock (at cost) ...	225	0	0
Cash in hand—Treasurer ...	433	17	2
Registrar ...	91	13	3
Back numbers of *Proceedings*, Library, Filing Cabinet, etc. unvalued			

SYDNEY WALTON, *Treasurer*.
JOHN F. MILLS, *Auditor*.

10*th July* 1963.

THE CHURCH METHODISTS

FROM the days of Wesley, the question of the relationship of Methodism to the Church of England has constantly been a burning issue. It is abundantly well known that Wesley, himself a minister of that Church, desired to keep Methodism in close conjunction with the national church, that a small number of other Anglican clergymen served also as Methodist ministers, and that Wesley urged Methodists to attend the parish church for the sacraments. In his day, too, and for some little time after, Methodist services were not held at the hours of Church services. But, much as he sought to maintain a relationship that he himself cherished, Wesley, "like a strong and skilful rower", as Dr. Beaumont remarked, "looked one way while every stroke of his oar took him in the opposite direction."

If there was tension in Wesley's lifetime (as indeed was the case), that tension was kept in check simply by the almost universal reverence for "Mr. Wesley" on the part of Methodists of all trends of opinion. But this state could not be expected to hold indefinitely after Wesley's death; nor did it. Within a month of that event a group of nine leading preachers gathered at Halifax to discuss the future of the Connexion, and among the decisions they reached was one that they "must not appoint another king in Israel". Whether this was directly aimed at Alexander Mather (who had been ordained as "superintendent"—Wesley's word to translate *episkopos*—for England) or not, the fact remains that the "Halifax Circular" proposed that Conference should elect a President for one year only; and the first President was *not* Alexander Mather. From Wesley's death, there has been no single "superintendent" for English Methodism! The "Circular" also proposed the division of the Connexion into a number of districts, each of which should choose its "President" *for the ensuing year.* This plan was virtually adopted by the 1791 Conference, except that it provided that the district "President" should be elected for the occasion of the meeting only. And, as Dr. A. W. Harrison remarks, "Any attempt from that day to this in British Methodism to exalt the leaders in each district to an episcopal position has always been suppressed."

The year 1794 saw the appearance of the "Lichfield Plan". In April of that year eight senior men, led by Dr. Coke, met to consider a new constitution for Methodism; and, remembering that Wesley had ordained "superintendents", they planned that there should be an order of superintendents appointed by Conference who should have the oversight of "seven or eight general divisions" of the Connexion; though again, these superintendents were to be "annually changed if necessary". Conference rejected the proposals "as tending to create invidious distinctions among brethren". In spite of that, the following year, 1795, Samuel Bradburn brought forward a motion for "travelling bishops"; but not even *his* renowned eloquence could commend the scheme to Conference, the members of

which, on his resuming his seat, called out almost as with one voice: "Down with the bishops!" And another scheme for setting up a constitution based on the Anglican model was rejected, as "it would give these men undue power and influence". How far, if at all, these schemes were designed so as to make possible a rapprochement between Methodism and the Church of England it is now, and perhaps always was, impossible to say; but it is significant that the Conference composed of preachers, and not simply the body of membership of the Connexion, rejected the proposals decisively.

The "Plan of Pacification" in 1795 did not deal with this question of episcopacy, but it did raise again the question of relationship with the Established Church, in that it made provision for societies which unanimously desired to have the sacramental services conducted by their own ministers and those which desired to have their services during Church hours. In either case, the form of service of the Established Church was to be used. This was undoubtedly a valiant attempt to reconcile all parties—to grant the Christian observances and full rights of a Church to those who desired them on the one hand, and to respect the consciences—one might almost say the prejudices—of the "High Church" party on the other. It was also clearly an attempt to cause as little offence as possible to the Church of England; to perpetuate what was now fast being seen to be an illusion: the conception of Methodism as a society whose members cherished their place as members of the national Church. That this was in fact an illusion was evident from the events in Bristol in the previous months. The trustees of the New Room had inhibited Henry Moore from preaching there because he had assisted in the conduct of the sacramental service in Portland Chapel; and when Old King Street chapel was built by his supporters, the New Room trustees were surprised to find that eight hundred of the circuit's one thousand members supported Moore. Clearly feeling throughout the Connexion was increasingly in favour of complete independence both in fact and in form from the Established Church.

Another significant step took place in 1796. In that year the *Minutes of Conference* began to refer to the first preacher in a circuit no longer as an "assistant" (the term used until then, suggesting his assistance in Wesley's superintendence of the Connexion), but as "superintendent", the term we still use. This can hardly be other than deliberate: a proclamation that there was to be neither one king nor half a dozen kings in Israel. When one man in three was a "superintendent", he could have no exalted idea of his own importance! Superintendency was to be a function, and not an order. It was the death-blow to any scheme for a hierarchy in Methodism.

Henceforward the "Church Methodists"—those who in one way or another wanted Methodism to be subservient to the Church of England—were fighting not only a losing but a lost battle. In 1823 one Mark Robinson, a linen draper of Beverley, who was also a local preacher and a class leader, was disturbed at the proposed separation of Beverley from the Hull circuit. His dissatisfaction led to his

examining the polity of Wesleyan Methodism (as we must now call it), and in particular the powers of Conference. He could have supported the other—liberal—branches of Methodism, where laymen had a share in Conference, were it not for the fact that he was decidedly a "Church Methodist"; and one of his complaints against the preachers was that they led the people away from the Church. His aim was therefore to bring the whole Connexion into intimate association with the Established Church. He propounded that Methodism should be a sort of minor order within the Church of England, recognized by the episcopate and locally subject to the parish clergyman. It was really a new and attenuated form of a scheme of Coke's, who in 1798, without any instructions from the Conference, approached the Bishop of London with the suggestion that a given number of the preachers appointed by the Conference should be ordained by the bishops of the Church of England and allowed to travel through the Connexion for the administration of the sacraments. But neither Conference nor the Anglican authorities would have anything to do with Robinson's scheme. To become acceptable to the Anglicans, it would necessarily cease to be Methodist. As a contemporary writer put it:

> There would then be societies uncontrolled by any of the parish clergy; laymen leaders of classes, and therefore spiritual teachers; laymen engaged in spiritual exercises, holding meetings for prayer, visiting the sick, and instructing the ignorant; a system of doctrines openly and publicly taught in every parish, certainly contradicting the opinions of all the Calvinistic part of the clergy, and not very well harmonising with those held by a majority of the remainder. . . . Now we put it to any bishop, rector, vicar or curate throughout the kingdom, whether he wishes Methodism in this its primitive character and state, to be recognised and formally patronised by the Church? The answer is obvious to all the world. He would not. And he would determine wisely; for the two systems, though they may be made friendly to each other, by liberal and candid administration, can never become one, nor can they operate in direct connexion.

But Robinson pressed on; he got a Primitive Wesleyan Methodist preacher to come over from Ireland and address a meeting in Beverley town hall; a society taking the name of "Church Methodists" was established, and in 1825 a chapel was actually opened in the neighbouring village of Cherry Burton. But by the time he had elaborated his system and published it, all his followers had left him.

It hardly needs pointing out that all these disputes took place within the parent—Wesleyan—church. The Methodist New Connexion came into being because Alexander Kilham felt that the Plan of Pacification showed undue deference to the Church Methodists; and in the other churches, with their emphasis on ministerial and lay equality, no question of affinity with the Established Church could ever arise. The underlying sympathy with the Church of England among some Wesleyans derived from the fact that their founder was a minister of that Church. The rest of Methodism—nearly half of it—never had even that historical connexion. OLIVER A. BECKERLEGGE.

TWO COMMENTS ON RUPERT E. DAVIES'S "METHODISM"

THE publication of *Methodism* (Penguin Books and Epworth Press)[1] has been widely welcomed and well received by the general reader. At the same time, as it is a study which is likely to be used and quoted extensively as an authoritative work, it is well that it has been carefully scrutinized for errors of fact, if not for alternative opinions and judgements. It is not therefore surprising that some members of our Society with an acute faculty for accuracy of historical detail have sent us comments on Mr. Davies's book. Two of these contributions we publish below in the belief that our readers may wish to insert appropriate marginal notes in their copy of "Davies". EDITOR.

THE REV. ALBERT B. LAWSON writes:

The Rev. Rupert E. Davies, in his excellent work on Methodism,[2] mentions that Edward Stillingfleet wrote his *Irenicum*[3] "in 1656", when 24 years of age. Stillingfleet, however, was born in 1635, and indeed did write this work when only 24 years of age, i.e. in 1659, not, as Mr. Davies says, in 1656. The first edition, which I personally have used extensively, was followed in 1661 by the second and last edition, a copy of which is in my possession.

Mr. Davies further asserts that Stillingfleet never repudiated the main contentions of his *Irenicum*.[4] This is hardly correct. The most important argument in this work was that neither Christ nor the apostles left any precise orders for any particular form of church government, and the purpose of Stillingfleet is to effect a compromise between the Church of England and the Presbyterians. A glance at the elaborate title of the work will suffice:

> *A Weapon-Salve for the Churches Wounds, on the Divine Right of Particular Forms of Church Government; Discussed and examined according to the Principles of the Law of Nature, the positive Laws of God, the practice of the Apostles, and the Primitive Church, and the judgment of Reformed Divines. Whereby a foundation is laid for the Church's peace, and the accommodation of our present differences,*
>
> *Humbly tendered to Consideration.*

Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury (1689-1715) says of the *Irenicum*:[5]

> He in his youth writ an Irenicum for healing our divisions, so much learning and moderation, that it was esteemed a masterpiece. His notion was, that the Apostles had settled the Church in a constitution of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, but had made no perpetual law about it, having only taken it in, as they did many other things, from the customs and practice of the synagogue; from which he inferred, that certainly the constitution was lawful since they had made no settled law about it. This took with many; but was cried out upon by others as an attempt against the Church. Yet the argument was managed with much learning and skill, that none of either side ever undertook to answer it.

[1] Reviewed in *Proceedings*, xxxiv, pp. 45-6.
[2] Pelican edition, p. 126.
[3] Sometimes called the *Irenicon*.
[4] loc. cit.
[5] *History of His Own Time* (1766 edn.), i, pp. 264-5.

[He continues:] The writing of his *Irenicum* was a great snare to him; For, to avoid the imputations which that brought upon him, he not only retracted the book, but he went into the humours of a high sort of people, beyond what became him, perhaps his own sense of things.

Burnet says he retracted the book, and therefore repudiated its contents. However, there was, among many other subjects, the question of apostolic succession, which Stillingfleet asserted could not be proved. He says:

> Come we therefore to Rome, and here the succession is as muddy as the *Tiber* itself.... Certainly if the line of Succession fails us here, when we most need it, we have little cause to pin our Faith upon it as to the certainty of any particular form of church-government settled in the Apostles' time.[6]

Whether or not the churches were governed by a bishop only, and deacons, or by a college of presbyters, is a question, he says, that cannot be answered. The "defectiveness, ambiguity, partiality and repugnancy of the records of the succeeding ages which sought to give information about what Apostolic practice was" makes it impossible to determine what form of church-government was used in the early Church.

He insists that the proving of the idea that the Apostles instituted any in a superior order of "presbyter" will require three things:

> First, the Personal Succession of some persons to the Apostles in Churches by them planted; secondly the appropriating of the name *episkopos* to Bishops in a superior order to Presbyters, after the Apostles' decease, thirdly, the Churches owning the order of Episcopacy as of Divine institution. If now we can make these three things evident: *First, that personal succession might be without such superiority of order; Secondly, that the names of Bishop and Presbyters were common after the distinction between them was introduced; and Thirdly, that the Church did not own Episcopacy as a Divine institution, but Ecclesiastical; and those who seem to speak most of it, do mean no more;* I shall suppose enough done to invalidate the testimony of antiquity as to the matter in hand.[7]

Stillingfleet is reported to have said later in life that

> There were many things in it [i.e. the *Irenicum*] which, if he were to write again he would not say; some which show his youth and want of consideration; others in which he yielded too far in hopes of gaining the Dissenting parties to the Church of England.

In spite of Burnet's statement that no one replied to it, it was answered by Archdeacon Parker (later bishop of Oxford) in 1680.

In addition to Burnet's and Stillingfleet's own statements about the withdrawal of the *Irenicum* views, a perusal of Stillingfleet's later works affords sufficient proof that he altered his views, especially on episcopacy and succession. In 1684, in an ordination sermon, he says:

> The universal consent of the Church being proved, there is as great a reason to believe the Apostolic Succession to be of Divine institution as the canon of Scripture or the observation of the Lord's Day.

In a charge to the clergy of his diocese, as bishop of Worcester, he writes:

> His [St. Jerome's] reasons are very much for the Advantages of Episcopal Government. ... nothing but Faction and Disorder followed the

[6] *Irenicum* (2nd edn.), p. 322. [7] ibid., p. 321.

> Government of Presbyters, and therefore the whole Christian Church agreed in the necessity of a higher Order.[8]

Referring to apostolic succession, he says:

> I can see no medium, but that either the Primitive Bishops did succeed the Apostles (which Irenaeus expressly affirms) or else those who governed the Apostolical Churches after them, out-went Diotrephes himself; for he only rejected those whom the Apostles sent, but these assumed to themselves the Exercise of an Apostolical Authority over the Churches planted and settled by them. . . . They who go about to Unbishop Timothy and Titus may as well Unscripture the Epistles written to them and make them only some particular and occasional Writings, as they make Timothy and Titus to have been only some particular and occasional Officers. . . . We have no greater assurance that these Epistles were written by St. Paul, than we have that there were Bishops to succeed the Apostles in the Care and Government of Churches.

It is quite clear, then, that there was a substantial change in Stillingfleet's own views on church government. This does not, of course, alter the fact that his first views became Wesley's last.

THE REV. WILLIAM PARKES contributes the following notes:

(1) p. 136—". . . Bourne and Clowes joined forces, and in 1812 formed the Society of Primitive Methodists. Bourne seems to have taken this step with great reluctance; Clowes was, perhaps, of a more sectarian temper."

In fact the reverse order of desire is likely to be the more true. Clowes of course agreed for a period to restrain himself from supporting the Camp Meeting movement. Kendall and J. T. Wilkinson must be allowed to speak with the greatest authority on this question, and it is clear that both see Clowes as the more consistently loyal Wesleyan of the two during the formative early months of the movement. It is clear that he regarded his local preacher status within the Wesleyan circuit as of no little importance. On the other hand Bourne, who had lost his status both as class leader and member, had nothing to lose by holding to a "sectarian temper", if indeed he ever did, which is doubtful.

(2) p. 138—[Mr. Davies speaks of the connexion between O'Bryan and Thorne in the Bible Christian work.] ". . . But James Thorne was a balanced and catholic-spirited man, and under his guidance the New Connexion advanced steadily in the West country."

There is nothing wrong with this statement as such, but the use of the capital letters in "New Connexion" is of course most misleading for obvious reasons.

(3) p. 142—The passage on the Leeds organ case.

Dr. Kent has pointed out the confusion in Mr. Davies's work on the earlier reform agitations, and how certain important matters have got somewhat out of order, or have even been overlooked altogether. Here, however, the picture would have been a great deal clearer if it had been plainly stated that in fact the Leaders' Meeting at Brunswick chapel led the attack against their own trustees. Some comment on those Reformers who refused to enter the UMFC would also have been valuable.

[8] *Of the Duties and Rights of the Parochial Clergy* (published in 1702), pp. 4 ff.

(4) p. 148—". . . Hugh Price Hughes. He was a full-blooded Welshman . . ."

I cannot turn up the reference, but I am certain that Hughes had no small amount of Jewish blood in his veins, of which he was exceedingly proud, and often spoke. A glance at his biography would clear up this point.[9]

(5) p. 156—". . . William Booth was first a Wesleyan local preacher, then (no doubt in the interests of freedom) a minister in the Methodist New Connexion."

True, only through the "gaps". Booth first of course associated himself with the Reform movement, and was one of the first appointed ministers of the Wesleyan Reform Committee. He served the Spalding Reform circuit from 1852 to 1854.

(6) p. 164—"The Civil War resulted also in the formation of three powerful Negro Methodist Churches in the South, and they remain independent to this day."

Very false on two counts. Firstly, neither the African Methodist Episcopal Church nor the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, of the three that he names, originated in the Civil War period. Both were well established before then, the AME Church dating from as early as 1786, and the AMEZ Church in 1796. Both of them in fact originated in the North, not the South, being created in Philadelphia and New York respectively. The third Church, the Christian Methodist Episcopal body, was in fact the creation of the white Conferences in the former Methodist Episcopal Church South, when they sought to retain their old coloured membership from the pre-war period by allowing them freedom of separate organization. Though it remains a body separate from major Methodism, it retains certain links with the wider Church that are of an order different from those relating to the first two Negro Churches.

(7) p. 174 [Mr. Davies is here speaking of Methodism in Europe.]—". . . there were small ones in France and Spain before they were united with other Protestant Churches; . . ."

One cannot blame Mr. Davies for this part-truth, as he clearly simply follows the standard accounts of the distribution of Methodism in Europe. In fact a continuing Methodist Church does remain in France. It has about eight churches, and is under the leadership of a former French Conference President and outstanding French Protestant, Pastor F. Guiton.

[9] See *The Life of Hugh Price Hughes*, by his Daughter, p. 12—EDITOR.

We have received a copy of *Renaissance and Modern Studies*, vol. vii (1963), which carries an article of considerable importance to Methodist historians. It is entitled "Samuel Wesley Senior: New Biographical Evidence", and has been written by Miss H. A. Beecham. This monograph will be the subject of an extended review by Dr. Maldwyn Edwards in a future issue of the *Proceedings*. In the meantime, however, we commend it to our readers, especially to librarians of colleges and seminaries. Copies, price 15s. 9d. post paid, can be obtained from Miss H. A. Beecham, Florence Nightingale Hall, The University, Nottingham.

BOOK NOTICES

John Wesley's Doctrine of the Sacraments, by John R. Parris. (Epworth Press, pp. viii. 119, 12s. 6d.)

This book, which was written in part-fulfilment of the requirements for a B.D. degree at Chicago, begins with a chapter on the Anglican background of Wesley's thought. Then follow chapters on Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and the final chapter sums up Wesley's teaching and assesses its contemporary significance, especially for Australian Methodism, with which Mr. Parris is connected. Like Hooker, who is taken as the typical representative of the Anglican view, the author is himself judicious. He sees that Wesley's teaching shows a tension between "Catholic" and "Protestant" elements, and that, though his position to some extent shifted, yet the tension was never finally resolved. If anything, he was more "Protestant" about Baptism and more "Catholic" about the Lord's Supper.

On the Lord's Supper the author does not really add much to what has already been said by Mr. Bowmer and by the late Dr. J. E. Rattenbury; nor are his own definitions so precise as to justify the criticisms which he occasionally makes of other authors. He does not altogether bring out the complexity of Wesley's background—the difference, for example, between classic Protestantism and pietism. The Roman position, from which Wesley's is distinguished, is itself more difficult to define than it here appears to be.

On Baptism there is a gap in our literature, and the author's remarks on baptism as event and as process and on the relation of Baptism to prevenient grace deserve careful attention. Like many other authors, he does not pay sufficient attention to *The Sunday Service*, which is particularly important for the subject of Baptism. There are important articles on this in earlier numbers of these *Proceedings* by the late Rev. Wesley F. Swift, and on Wesley's doctrine of Baptism in general by the Rev. Brian J. N. Galliers.

There is no other volume which simply deals with Wesley's doctrines on the two sacraments, and this slight volume will serve as a useful introduction to this all-important topic, especially at the present time.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE.

William Grimshaw (1708-63), by Frank Baker. (Epworth Press, pp. 228, 45s.)

As was expected from a Methodist historian, Dr. Frank Baker has enriched the treasure trove of every Wesley collector with this book.

Because Grimshaw itinerated over a wide area, riding out from Haworth along every packhorse track, country lane and road, Dr. Baker has of necessity been a most painstaking author, exploring every nook, cottage, chapel, hamlet, village and town touched by "Mad Grimshaw". Wherever a library or museum was suspect of possessing a Grimshaw manuscript or document the Methodist sleuth-hound followed the trail, and the book results from an exciting, exacting search for sources. The trail went to ground in two places, but the quarry had gone. First there was Grimshaw's "shorter covenant", entered on the blank leaf between the Old and New Testaments of his folio Bible: the Bible came to Bradford Parish Church (now Bradford Cathedral), and has disappeared without trace. Next, that outstanding Methodist biographer Luke Tyerman thought Grimshaw, along with the Wesleys, Whitefield and Fletcher, worthy of his

scholarship; but his *William Grimshaw*, a holograph copy, noted as in the Methodist Archives in London in 1921, cannot now be found. Has anyone a clue to the whereabouts of these lost treasures?

Better fortune followed the labours of James Everett, who gathered material as early as 1825 for an extensive biography—"The Curate of Haworth". This was in manuscript twenty years later, but was never published, and is now to be found in the library of Hartley Victoria College, Manchester.

The select bibliography illustrates how documents can wander. Mrs. Gallatin, wife of Major Gallatin, met Grimshaw in Manchester in 1749, and from that time throughout their wandering life in the Dragoons they were in constant postal communication with him. Thirty-three of Grimshaw's letters to them survive, and these are held at the New Room (Bristol), the Methodist Archives (London), Wesley College, Headingley (Leeds), Emory University (Georgia), and the Rylands Library (Manchester).

This book exemplifies collecting Wesleyana for a purpose: to throw light upon the growth of Methodism in an area and on a particular pioneer. There gathered around Wesley men of like mind and determination: Grimshaw, Dr. Coke and Francis Asbury showed a vigour and daring we earnestly covet. George Fox, the man who dressed in leather to face all weathers, was of the same genre. If you want to warm to this method of winning souls by being on fire for Christ—unstoppable, unquenchable, lighting up individuals, communities and countries, only ending when burned out—read this book. This is the ministry! This is Methodism! This is Christ!

Dr. Baker's book can be read and re-read. It challenges; it carries the atmosphere of the age, the weather, the muddy roads, the tough characters, the racy humour, the passionate evangelists walking long distances, the hard-hitting controversies, the reckless cruelties of the mob; above all Grimshaw's soul unveiled—"fightings within and fears without", but radiant with love for Christ and a passion for souls. ARCHIE BRADFORD.

Adam Clarke, by Robert H. Gallagher. (Wesley Historical Society, Irish Branch, 5s.)

It is pleasing in reviewing this book to notice that it has been published under the auspices of the live and flourishing Wesley Historical Society in Ireland. All students of Methodist history when visiting Belfast must make a special point of visiting the Society's headquarters, so splendidly furnished, and adding continually to its already impressive Wesleyana.

Robert Gallagher, who is a driving force behind that venture, is also giving himself in his fruitful retirement to works on early Methodism of particular interest to Ireland. In this monograph, however, he deals with an Irishman who became one of the greatest orientalists of his day and the outstanding figure in Methodism in the generation succeeding Wesley. The book is a descriptive portrait rather than an interpretative one. In easy fashion it takes the reader through the life of Adam Clarke, and indicates the offices he held and the books that he read. It would have been of even greater interest to the student had Mr. Gallagher cared to discuss the importance of Adam Clarke as a leader of the more liberal section of the church at a time when conservatism in politics and ecclesiastical polity was dominant. He was the only man of equal stature to the rising Dr. Bunting who could speak for the Whigs in politics and the Reformers in church order. Even though Bunting proved too strong for him at the

end of his life, his influence persisted, and it is significant that the rebel James Everett was one of his close friends.

Mr. Gallagher quite properly draws attention to the fact that in his famous *Commentary* Adam Clarke propounded a view of Christ which refused to accept His eternal filial relations to the Father. In the theological discussion which followed he was answered by Richard Watson in his *Remarks* (Works, vol. vii) and by Richard Treffry, jun. in a once-famous treatise called *An Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of our Lord Jesus Christ* (1849).

Mr. Gallagher tells of the marriage relationship of Adam Clarke to James Butterworth, but it would have been even more interesting had he been able to show that through Adam Clarke Methodism had a strong link with the Clapham Sect. For what the author has done, however, Methodists will be deeply grateful, because Adam Clarke was a great man with remarkable gifts of mind and heart, and it is good that once again we should be reminded of the service that he rendered to the Methodist Church in that stormy, unsettled period which followed the death of John Wesley.

MALDWYN L. EDWARDS.

[Copies may be obtained, price as above plus 6d. postage, from the Rev. R. H. Gallagher, B.A., c/o Aldersgate House, University Road, Belfast, 9. —EDITOR.]

The Local Preacher in Early Methodism, by John C. Bowmer. Article in the *Preacher's Handbook*, No. 8. (Epworth Press, 12s. 6d.)

John Wesley was originally described on his memorial in City Road chapel as "the Patron and Friend of the Lay Preachers, by whose aid he extended the plan of Itinerant Preaching"—a clear indication that the Methodist ministry developed out of Wesley's order of lay preachers. The great order of Local Preachers has a different line of ancestry. Mr. Bowmer gives a clear account of the origin of the order, tracing it back to 1796 when (five years after Wesley's death, be it noted) it became an official part of Methodism, to 1777 when the earliest known local preachers' plan was issued in Leeds, to the early 1750s when the "local preacher", with or without the name, emerged, and to 1746 when Charles Wesley counselled a number of "exhorters" at Gwennap. It is among these exhorters, who were selected and controlled by Wesley's itinerants, and who at first exercised their ministry in the local *society* rather than the circuit, that the original local preacher must be sought. THOMAS SHAW.

From our President-Emeritus

MEMBERS will learn from the report of the Annual Meeting of the Society that I resigned the office of President, in order that a younger man might be appointed. I am very grateful for the kind and reluctant way in which my resignation was accepted, and also for the honour conferred upon me by making me President-Emeritus, which position I accept with great pleasure.

I congratulate the Society on obtaining the consent of Dr. Maldwyn Edwards to become my successor, and wish him all happiness and success. I assure you all that my deep interest in the Wesley Historical Society will continue unabated, and I shall promote its work and influence at every opportunity.

My very good wishes to all our members. W. L. DOUGHTY.