The thesis is presented in five books each with a number of subdivisions or chapters. The first is composed of two chapters: chapter one deals with pan-evangelical developments from the early Evangelical revival to 1789. It examines the centripetal and centrifugal forces that served to unite but also to separate like-minded evangelicals. It briefly describes several early institutional attempts at church union, the proto-types of the great pan-evangelical organizations studied in the body of the thesis. Chapter two examines the more immediate forces between 1789 and 1795 that gave rise to the first major experiment in pan-evangelical cooperation - the London Missionary Society. It focuses on the ambivalent effects of the French Revolution on church union, initially separating evangelical Dissenters from churchmen, but later bringing them back together again. It also looks briefly at the role millennial prophecy played in drawing evangelicals closer together before the anticipated Second Coming.

Book two examines the London Missionary Society in three chapters. Chapter three traces the largely abortive attempt to found an institution that was intended to unite all evangelical denominations, examining why this attempt ultimately failed. Chapter four studies inter-societal relations between the L.M.S. and other foreign missionary societies following this failure, and the continuing, though largely unsuccessful attempts to recreate a pan-evangelical union or federation in the mission world. Chapter five describes the state of internal relations within the Society itself, concluding with a brief analysis of its fall into Congregational hands by 1818.
Book three is a study of the British and Foreign Bible Society and is divided into four chapters. Chapter six examines the forces in Britain and on the Continent which led to the formation of an evangelical Bible society, showing that because of the simplicity of its objectives - the circulation of Bibles without note or comment - it could attract a much larger denominational patronage than either the L.M.S. or the Tract Society. Chapter seven demonstrates, however, that even in this simple design, the Society evoked criticism from High Church opponents who saw in it an immediate threat to the establishment. The controversy that issued from this opposition is examined in detail, together with the adverse effects that controversy had on the Society's internal cohesion. Chapter eight shows that many of the High Church accusations were based on fact, and that because of its growing size, the institution could not always control some of its more irregular provincial auxiliaries. The sometimes arbitrary and largely ineffective way that the parent society tried to reassert its control over provincial affairs created dissident groups in Scotland and England leading to two major conflagrations - the Apocrypha and Tests Controversies - which are examined in chapter nine.

Books four and five examine the Religious Tract Society and the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, each in two chapters. Chapters nine and twelve trace the early developments of each society (the London Society being at first a branch of the L.M.S.) from the late eighteenth century through to their emergence as major pan-evangelical institutions in the first decade of the
nineteenth century. We discover that until the Bible Society had been in existence four years, the Tract Society and the evangelical mission to the Jews were much like the L.M.S. in denominational composition; only after 1808 did they also comprehend all the major evangelical bodies. Chapters ten and thirteen examine the internal controversies that plagued both societies showing why the R.T.S. was able to overcome internal dissension while the London Society fell into Anglican hands after only six years.

Each book describes society activities during the period examined in this thesis, and attempts to show the impact of interdenominational cooperation on the church at large. Close attention has been paid to theological, social, and political developments contemporary with the pan-evangelical impulse and the impact these in turn had on the societies studied. By a comparative analysis of the four societies, their successess and failures, the thesis hopes to make a contribution to the ecumenical dialogue today.
Preface

For the most part, historical studies of Christian missions, examine in detail the social and religious impact of Western Christianity on indigenous cultures in the mission field itself. Thus Kenneth Scott Latourette's voluminous and classic History of the Expansion of Christianity (1938-45), comprehensively documents the settlement and progress of Christian missionaries around the world and their profound impact on non-Western cultures. So too, many students have traced in great detail the progress of British missionaries in Africa, Asia, and other parts of the world, and their impact on the nascent empire. Curiously, little has been written about the impact of the missionary movement on the home churches themselves, which, initially at least, may have been greater than on the heathen. Not only did the zeal for the conversion of the heathen galvanize European Christians into fresh enthusiasm, but it also led to the creation of societies which brought them into closer contact with those in their own churches - and those in other churches too. The sources of the modern ecumenical movement are many and diverse, but among them may be reckoned the great upsurge of mission activity, both foreign and domestic, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries which brought many different Christians together into a union of common purpose and mutual respect. Though the story of this impulse is perhaps less dramatic than the events which transpired in foreign lands, it is none the less important. The first flowering of the spirit of pan-evangelical unity was of relatively short duration, but it profoundly influenced the course of Christian ecumenicalism for years to come.
Unfortunately, only one or two historians have examined this period in any depth. Charles Foster's *An Errand of Mercy: The Evangelical United Front 1790-1837* (1960) is a commendable attempt to study interdenominational cooperation in Britain and America, but it was written in America, and the British section of the study was based on secondary sources. It was followed by Ford K. Brown's *Fathers of the Victorians* (1961) which, though a mine of information, is primarily concerned with the social history of evangelical societies. Several excellent monographs have recently been published on the subject, but they deal only with limited and regional aspects of the pan-evangelical impulse, and therefore, hardly satisfy the need for a more comprehensive examination of the period. The nineteenth century histories of the various pan-evangelical societies that flourished at this time are voluminous and detailed, but they were written by official society historians who concentrated on the mission field and who wrote about their respective societies in the best light possible. Consequently, these histories are often uncritical and lack objectivity. A history is therefore needed which not only examines in the light of theological, social and political developments, the institutional growth (and later decline) of pan-evangelicalism in Britain, but which also critically studies the strengths and weaknesses of the movement in the light of contemporary developments. Too often it is assumed that the modern ecumenical movement, inspired by God's revelation, was based on no immediate historical precedent beyond, perhaps, the missionary conferences of the early twentieth century. But this assumption is an unfortunate one, for by overlooking the union impulse of an earlier era,
the modern ecumenicist has sometimes only repeated many of the same mistakes made by his predecessors over 150 years ago. By bringing the early history of church unity to light, we can perhaps benefit greatly in our own thinking today.

This thesis is an original work for primarily two reasons. Firstly, it studies an aspect of British ecclesiastical history that had largely been neglected by the modern historian. Secondly, it examines the institutional operations of four London-based societies which, until now, have only received attention in commissioned histories written for the most part in the last century. The thesis draws upon published and manuscript sources hitherto unexamined by the church historian. Denominational and interdenominational periodicals have proven especially useful in studying not only the month by month activities of the evangelicals who initiated and led the impulse for church unity, but their ideas on a wide range of topics then under discussion. The Evangelical Magazine merits special recognition here not only because it was the first interdenominational periodical of the period, but because it also served as the house organ for at least two of the pan-evangelical societies here studied. The numerous biographies written by and about the leading evangelical figures of the day have also been extremely useful though they often lack the objectivity found in modern biographies. Sermons by the leaders of the pan-evangelical impulse, often on the theme of unity, have been extensively used, together with a large number of controversial tracts and pamphlets written by advocates and critics of the various societies.

The thesis, however, is primarily based on manuscript sources. These come from the archives of the four pan-evangelical
societies surveyed, though they are supported by materials
drawn from a number of denominational missionary organizat­
ions and, of course, the libraries of Oxford. Manuscript
materials for the London Missionary Society are very extensive.
They include well-calendared correspondence and minute books
-together with the early correspondence and papers of the
Committee for Jewish Affairs which eventually evolved
into the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst
the Jews (hereafter called 'The London Society'). These
manuscripts were examined at the home office of the Congregat­
ional Council for World Mission, but they are now on permanent
loan to the School of Oriental and African Studies at the
University of London.

The archives of the British and Foreign Bible Society
are even more massive than those of the L.M.S., but because
the Bible Society did not have an archivist until a few years
ago, they have not, for the most part, been examined prior
to the writing of this thesis. For the period under study,
ever twenty-thousand pieces of correspondence were read
along with the very detailed account of the Society's
proceedings in its minute books. The private correspondence
of Lord Teignmouth, the Society's first President, and John
Paterson, a Society agent in Copenhagen, have proven especially
enlightening. The minutes of the London Secretaries Association,
which after 1818 informally linked together the major London-
based missionary organizations, are also to be found in the
archives of the Bible Society though disappointingly they only
list the agenda discussed at their meetings and not the
substance of the discussions themselves.
Since manuscript materials for the Religious Tract Society and the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews were largely destroyed during the last war, we have been compelled to rely solely on minute books and printed sources. This partially explains why we have not been able to examine these organizations in more detail, though neither were as large as either the Bible Society or the L.M.S. The minute books of the Religious Tract Society are on deposit at the United Society for Christian Literature in Guildford Surrey. The minute books of the London Society were read at the home office of the Church's Ministry Among the Jews in London though they are now on permanent loan at the Bodleian Library in Oxford. Supportive materials have been gleaned from a number of other sources. They include the archives of the Baptist Missionary Society, the Methodist Missionary Society, the Methodist Church Archives, the Church Missionary Society, the Angus Library, Regent's Park College Oxford, and the Bodleian Library.

Because of the wide scope of the period under study and the restrictions of time and space, there are by necessity several limitations to a study of this nature. In the first place, it deals primarily with the four major pan-evangelical institutions of the day, drawing most of its information from their London-based archives. Some mention is made of the various regional pan-evangelical organizations that flourished at this time, and, when pertinent to home operations, to the numerous auxiliary societies both in England and on the Continent, but a thorough examination of these 'branch organizations' must await future regional studies of the
pan-evangelical impulse. Secondly, this study does not pretend to deal comprehensively with either the ideology of pan-evangelicalism or the general results that flowed from it. Rather, it is a study of four pan-evangelical organizations with a bias to their institutional developments. It is hoped that it will lay the groundwork for the historian of ideas to write a broader and more general study of pan-evangelicalism, perhaps over a longer period of time. Thirdly, the thesis is restricted to the thirty-five years between 1795 and 1830. The year 1795, of course, is a natural starting point because it was then that the first major pan-evangelical institution - the London Missionary Society - was founded. The year 1830 is a somewhat arbitrary cut-off point since pan-evangelicalism continued well into the nineteenth century; but by 1830, most of the original fathers of the pan-evangelical movement had either died or retired from the management of their respective organizations. Unfortunately, the second generation of pan-evangelicals had lost much of the enthusiasm and idealism of their fathers. So too, the forces of denominationalism, so evident in the various denominational unions that were finally established after 1830, did much to hamper the forces of church union in subsequent decades. Only in the 1840s was pan-evangelicalism given a temporary spiritual transfusion in the founding of the Evangelical Alliance, but it was a pan-evangelicalism only vaguely reminiscent of the early impulse.

The thesis has an organizational peculiarity which must be explained. Chronologically, the London Missionary Society was founded in 1795 as the first (though largely unsuccessful) attempt at pan-evangelicalism on a large scale. It subsequently
gave birth to the Religious Tract Society in 1799, the Bible Society in 1804, and the London Society in 1809. For the purpose of analysis, however, the Bible Society is examined immediately after the L.M.S. because it was really the first pan-evangelical institution to win the patronage of virtually all the evangelical denominations. Only after 1808, did the Tract Society and the London Society emerge as truly interdenominational organizations and then largely because of the precedent set at the Bible Society. Consequently, the Tract and London Societies appear in this thesis after the Bible Society even though both were operative, in one form or another, several years before.

Finally, a word of apology must be made for what might seem to be a pre-occupation in this thesis with controversy and interdenominational dissension. While there can be no question of the great and noble achievements that flowed from the various pan-evangelical organizations studied, and the positive impact these achievements had on church unity then as now, we cannot overlook the fact that the pan-evangelical impulse was an experiment in Christian understanding and as such often failed to achieve the high aspirations set by its advocates. Yet in a positive sense, there is much to be learned from the movement's short-comings since we often face today the very same problems faced by our forefathers over 150 years ago. It is therefore very necessary to examine at some length the forces which created interdenominational dissension and controversy, an understanding of which might very well help us to avoid the same pitfalls today. The author hopes, therefore, to make a positive contribution to an understanding of the ecumenical movement of our own era.
Though the author claims sole responsibility for the ideas and concepts expressed in this thesis, mention must be made of the people who generously contributed of their time to its making. Thankful appreciation must, of course, be extended to the General Secretaries of the organizations studied in this thesis who readily made available for examination their respective archives. But several individuals merit special recognition. The late Rev. Stuart Craig, former General Secretary of the London Missionary Society and its Librarian until his death, was particularly generous in locating valuable manuscript materials and lending his own experience as a missionary to its understanding and interpretation. Irene Fletcher, former Archivist of the L.M.S. read critically the first draft of Book Two and freely gave of her vast knowledge of the Society's domestic operations to its final formulation. Kathleen Cann, Archivist of the British and Foreign Bible Society went beyond the call of duty by adding her own valuable insights to Book Three.

The gratitude that I owe to my supervisor, Dr. John Walsh of Jesus College Oxford, cannot really be expressed in words. His reputation as a scholar is well known, and this thesis has benefitted greatly from his suggestions and criticisms. But he is also a great teacher who has freely given of his valuable time far beyond what is normally required of a man responsible for many other students. He has been an inspiration to a future teacher of history.

Finally I would like to thank my wife, Susan Martin, for her encouragement and support during the past three years and for her valuable help in bringing this thesis to fruition.

R.H. Martin
Lincoln College
Oxford
May 1974
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BOOK ONE

THE BEGINNINGS

O when, almighty Lord
Shall these glad scenes arise
To verify thy word,
And bless our wond'ring eyes?
That earth may raise
With all its tongues,
United songs
Of ardent praise

Philip Doddridge
Chapter One: The Early Developments to 1789

I. Setting the Scene

'Christian Unity' is a concept as old as the Christian Church itself. The Apostle Paul indefatigably reminded Christians in his era that the Church was the Body of Christ, that His Body bound all Christians together in a Koinonia or community of life over which God ruled, and that though there were many members of the community as there were many parts of the physical body, the spiritual Body, nevertheless, was still one in Christ. It did not take long for the Church in its pristine state to break and splinter into many divisions and sects. Nevertheless, the simplicity of the Pauline message was compelling enough to challenge Christians through the centuries and all over the world to heal the wounds and piece back together again the fractured limbs of the Church as best they could. Christian councils met, Christian governments legislated, and Christian saints prayed for Church unity. But in Britain as elsewhere, if the quest for unity was usually sincere, the results were seldom successful, and if so, usually only short-lived.

Henry VIII's break with Rome took England out of Western Catholicism. The Act of Supremacy was an assertion of national sovereignty, turning the Church in England into the Church of England. Though the Henrican Reformation brought a new jurisdictional unity, it brought also, by the end of the reign, doctrinal discord and the clash of Catholic conservatives with those increasingly drawn by Continental Protestantism. After the compromise Elizabethan settlement, Protestantism had itself fragmented: within
the Church, Puritans drew apart from Laudian Anglicans: beyond the pale of the established Church, separatist groups of Independents and Baptists grew up. When civil war shattered old social moulds and released new energies and freedoms and a ferment of new ideas, the Separatists gave birth to new and sometimes bizarre sects, not only Quakers but Ranters, Seekers and Muggletonians.

But as well as the centrifugal forces of schism there were already centripetal forces which tried to reverse the trend towards disunity, and repair, however partially, the Seamless Robe of Christ. The Westminster Assembly of 1643 was one significant attempt to unite differing Christians, although it failed as a result of Anglican reluctance and Presbyterian intransigence. After the Restoration, the rigours of the Clarendon Code pushed Nonconformists towards each other in a union of sympathy based on common suffering. When Toleration came in 1689, it was followed in 1691 by a mutual federation of Presbyterians and Independents known as the Happy Union, though it was of brief duration owing to conflicts between the Presbyterian and Independent idea of church polity. So too, a number of early undenominational churches sprung up in a number of towns. The New Road Church in Oxford, for example, was open to Baptists, Independents as well as Presbyterians. If churchmen fell out on issues of faith and order, they could still sometimes combine in the cause of moral reformation: Anglicans and Nonconformists joined together at the end of the seventeenth century in the Society for Reformation of Manners whose aim was to combat vice and immorality in London and its environs. This
cooperation too was short-lived; Anglican High Churchmen like Bishops Nicholson of Carlisle and Sharp of York disliked the interdenominationalism of the societies and they fell first into Anglican hands and then slowly dissolved.

The early decades of the eighteenth century saw little movement towards the reunion of Christians within Britain - though Anglicans like Wake were ecumenical enough to explore the possibility of relations with both the Lutheran and the Reformed churches abroad. The dogfights in Convocation in Anne's reign, when Highflyers and Low Churchmen were bitterly at odds, revealed deep tensions among Anglicans. The failure to repeal the Test Acts in the 1730s, exacerbated relations between Church and Dissent. Among Nonconformists themselves, the infiltration of the liberal theologies led to sharp internal disputes and heresy hunts. Many Presbyterian congregations drifted from Calvinism into Arminianism and then into Socinianism while some Baptists and Independents moved the other way towards a more rigid and hyper-Calvinistic 'orthodoxy.'

The schism between Presbyterians and the older Separatist denominations at Salters' Hall in 1719, ostensibly over the issue of 'Scriptural Sufficiency' was symptomatic of cleavages over a wider range of issues, which continually broadened. True, when their political freedoms were at stake, Nonconformists could unite, as they did in the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers founded in 1712 whose function was to provide them with a common lobby in Parliament; but this was more a political alliance than a spiritual union, and one called into being by a common fear of the Anglican establishment.
Though the urge to unite the broken limbs of the English Church did not die, it was continually thwarted by the force of political, social, and religious tensions. But, the advent of the Evangelical Revival brought with it a new initiative, and fresh optimism about the reunion of sects, parties and churches around the shared experience of 'vital religion.' How it fared is the subject of this thesis.

II. The Evangelical Revival 1739-1780

From the beginning, the Evangelical Revival professed catholic intentions. This was a revival, said John Humphreys in 1739, in which "all controversial points were left alone, and Christ alone was preached." Indeed, it was never the intention of the Revival leaders to create new denominations. William Seward, George Whitefield's close friend, echoed Whitefield himself when he told a congregation in Wales:

I told them I did not desire them to leave the Church but to attend it closely - and that I only wanted to bring them to Jesus Christ and then if they were fully persuaded in their own mind let each remain in the communion in which he was called. If he was called a Churchman let him remain; if called a Quaker, a Baptist, or Presbyterian let them remain so.

To Seward and other evangelicals, denominational labels were of only secondary importance; what mattered was the individual's awareness of the living Christ.

John Wesley also deplored party, though unlike Whitefield, his remaining High Church principles somewhat

(1) J. Humphreys, Experience (1742), p. 27.
(2) "Journal of an Early Methodist," 24 Aug. 1740, Library of the University College of North Wales, MS. Bangor 34.
dimmed his 'catholic spirit.' Fifty years after the Revival commenced, Wesley still claimed that the original design of the Methodists was "not to be a distinct party, but to stir up all parties, Christians or heathens, to worship God in spirit and in truth," though he hastened to add that his societies were particularly concerned to stir up the Church of England. As we shall see, Whitefield never made this qualification. If Wesley was prejudiced towards the Church, Whitefield moved with remarkable freedom between Churchmen and Dissenters, among the various denominations in America, and even among the Arminian societies of Wesley.

The Moravians also claimed to be not only an historic church but, far more, a 'vital leaven' set on stirring up the existing confessions of Christendom. Borrowing heavily from the seventeenth century Pietistic tradition of Jacob Spener, the ecumenical principles of the Moravians were brought to England by Nicholas Zinzendorf, the central figure of the German movement. Zinzendorf, himself an ordained Lutheran, claimed that the principal doctrine of Christianity around which all denominations would be united was a simple, loving trust in 'the Lamb of Christ.' Since in the Father's house there were many mansions, so on earth it was God's will that there should be a multiplicity of distinctive 'tropoi' or 'schools of wisdom.' Each tropus had at its

(2) W.E. Collins called Wesley the "founder of undenominationalism." It would perhaps have been more accurate to give this appellation to Whitefield. See W.E. Collins, Typical English Churchmen(1902), p. 218.
centre the Lamb of Christ, but each also possessed its own 'jewel' of truth, ritual, and order to contribute to the 'Invisible Church' which was one in the fellowship of the Lamb. Zinzendorf built upon Spener's concept of ecclesiola in Ecclesia, a communion of churches within the Invisible Church. The 'Unity of Christ' therefore, was not an organic union based on the destruction of denominational peculiarities, but rather a unity transcending all ecclesiastical and theological divisions. Zinzendorf intended the Moravians in England and elsewhere to be a religious society encompassing all Christian denominations. Their mission, he said, would be to "'gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad'... and to make visible 'that great Invisible Church of Christ...'"

Theological and denominational labels played a minor role during the initial honeymoon period of the Revival. In its first exhilarating phase, the suddenness of the awakening, the sense of millennial expectation it aroused, the freshness of the evangelical experience, created a powerful sense of fraternity among the converts of the movement. Arminians and Calvinists, Churchmen and Dissenters, appeared almost as united as the Christians of the first century. Methodist societies in England and Wales were largely free of party labels until 1740 but even after this date many of them remained organizationally undenominational.


The distinction between theologies, parties, or even social classes, seemed trivial compared with those between the regenerate and the damned. As Joseph Milner, the great Evangelical Anglican later remarked, "insignificant indeed are all the distinctions of another kind compared with these, converted or unconverted...heirs of heaven or heirs of hell." In its infancy, the Revival was far less a matter of organizational allegiance, more an open, expectant, spontaneous attitude to life and religion.

After 1740, however, the unity of the early Revival began to deteriorate in much the same way as previous movements for unity. First, there was serious disagreement between John Wesley and the Moravians at the Fetter Lane Society where Molther's quietism had led Wesley to suspect the Germans of antinomianism; Molther in turn had serious doubts about Wesley's doctrine of Perfection. The strong personalities of Wesley and Zinzendorf increasingly came into conflict with each other. The split between Wesley and the Moravians was perhaps precipitated by the publication of Charles Wesley's hymns on "The Means of Grace" which were circulated by him "as an antidote to stillness."

Consequently, on 16 July 1740, it was decided that Wesley should no longer preach at Fetter Lane, and this action led to his separation one week later and the establishment of the first Wesleyan society at the Foundery.

(3) Towison, op.cit., p. 79.
There was also growing discord between Wesley and George Whitefield. Whitefield had not been a strong Calvinist prior to 1740, but extensive travels in America brought him into contact with sophisticated Calvinistic theologians like Jonathan Edwards who slowly converted him to a strong predestinarian position. This never ceased to irritate the Arminian beliefs of the Wesleys. The intensity of their feeling is vividly reflected in the deliberate underlining of Arminian phrases in Charles Wesley's hymns.

For every man He tasted death,  
He Suffer'd once for all;  
He calls as many souls as breathe,  
And all may hear the call.

And

Father, Whose everlasting love  
Thy only Son for sinners gave,  
Whose grace to all did freely move  
And send Him down a world to save.

At first Whitefield tried to smooth over the disagreements. He wrote to Charles Wesley from Bristol on 1 September 1740.

Oh, my friend, if you have the glory of God and the salvation of souls at heart, resolve, by the Divine grace, that nothing upon earth, nor under earth, shall part us. God increase the horror He has given me of separation! I had rather you saw me dead at your feet than openly opposing you... Many, I know, desire nothing so much as to see George Whitefield and John Wesley at the head of different parties... but be assured, my dearest brother, our heart is as your heart.

But three weeks later, he ominously told a friend

I hope nothing will cause a division between me and Messrs. Wesley. But I must speak what I know, and confute error wheresoever I find it.

(3) Cited in Tyerman, op. cit. 1, p.412.
(4) Ibid. p. 415.
Between 1740 and 1770 there was an uneasy peace between the Arminian and Calvinistic camps of the Revival which periodically broke out into an open controversy and hardened the boundaries between the two. Arminians feared that predestination encouraged fatalism and led believers into an antinomian carelessness for the moral law; Calvinists held that the admission of an element of free-will into justification detracted from the glory and sovereignty of God and qualified that fundamental axiom of Reformed theology, the doctrine of total depravity. Though Wesleyans and Whitefieldites still tried to recapture the 'catholic spirit' of the first days, they found it elusive. In 1764, for example, John Wesley attempted to bring together Evangelical clergymen in a union, 'offensive and defensive, of all soldiers of Christ,' but only three clergymen bothered to reply to his eirenical circular. The evangelical's distinction between mere 'opinions' which should be tolerated as non-essentials, and the 'fundamental doctrines' shared by all the children of light, was not easy to maintain in practice. Wesley's doctrine of Christian perfection, for example, was regarded by Calvinists "not as an opinion, but as a dangerous mistake which appears to be subversive of the very foundations of Christian experience." To a large extent, theological distinctions were now used to legitimate the clash of rival organizations, hungrily competing in some areas for members in a limited market and engaged in periodic sheep-stealing raids into each other's territories.

These smouldering animosities flared up in 1770 with the publication of the famous minutes of Wesley's Conference and generated a Calvinistic Controversy which rent the 'Gospel World' for at least a decade and embittered relations long into the nineteenth century. At that conference, Wesley persuaded his preachers to approve a minute which not only warned the Connexion against incipient Antinomianism, but declared that it was false to believe that man could do nothing in order to justification. When made public, the minutes fell into the hands of Lady Huntingdon who misinterpreted them as a direct attack on Calvinism and a denial of the sovereignty of God. Consequently she closed the undenominational college at Trevecca to Arminians even after Wesley's preachers had signed a declaration at the Bristol Conference in 1771 declaring the doctrine of justification by works "as a most perilous and abominable doctrine." A very bitter pamphlet war ensued between both theological camps over the doctrines of free-will and predestination which degenerated into a vindictive campaign of personal abuse when the Calvinists August Toplady and Rowland Hill entered the fray.

Nor was doctrine the only fault-line between evangelicals; issues of church-order played an increasing part in distancing Methodists from Anglican Evangelicals. The early 'Gospel clergymen' had often shown few scruples about field preaching, or fraternization with Methodist or evangelical Dissenters, but these attitudes slowly changed. Evangelical parish clergymen began to take an increasingly strict interpretation of their duty to give full canonical obedience to the established Church. 'Irregular' and 'half irregular' clergymen
became increasingly rare; regulars the norm. Why was this? Partly because Evangelicals became concerned at the way in which their own casual itinerancy built up Nonconformity at the expense of the Anglican church. William Grimshaw, a first generation Evangelical clergyman, for example, proudly told John Newton at the end of his life that he knew of no less than five Dissenting congregations in which the minister and most of the members were awakened under his ministry. To second and third generation Evangelical churchmen, however, Grimshaw's boast was more an object of embarrassment than applause. In 1788, Miles Atkinson, representing the new breed of 'regulars' complained that

The people of the godly ministers go over to the Dissenters. Can this be wondered at when these very ministers in all their private ministrations and often in their public ones, forsake the mode of worship in the Establishment, and adopt that of the Dissenters? And even encourage the people when they have not faithful preachers in the church to go and hear Dissenters.

Atkinson was referring to a number of very real problems that his generation had inherited from their forefathers. First there was what Charles Smyth has labelled the 'problem of continuity.' An Evangelical clergyman would build up a great and fervent congregation but then die or remove to another parish; as likely as not, his replacement was an 'unconverted' incumbent, whose ministry drove the faithful either to form a new schismatic chapel, or to join one or another of the local Dissenting meetings, sometimes (as in the case of Henry Venn) with the encouragement of their

---

(2) Ibid. p. 331 f.
old pastor. The frequency of this process worried later Evangelicals. So did what John Walsh has called 'the problem of the eloquent convert.' A parishioner of humble means and little education would be called, under the preaching of an Evangelical clergyman, to enter the Anglican ministry, but because he did not possess a university education or the means of getting one, his bishop would refuse to ordain him, and he would seek ordination in an evangelical Nonconformist denomination. Above all, field preaching broke down the protective walls of church order and provided Nonconformity with a host of converts. As Charles Simeon put it "the clergymen beat the bush, and the Dissenters catch the game." By the late 1780s, when a revived Dissent was once more pressing for the repeal of the Test Acts, and in the 1790s, when it began to whisper menacingly of disestablishment, Evangelical clergymen felt guilt and anxiety at the unforeseen results of their irregularity. The reaction towards 'regularity' intensified. Evangelicals felt themselves to be loyal members of the national establishment as well as members of the invisible Church of Christ. Itinerancy was

(3) After 1780, for example, many regular Evangelicals like William Wilberforce, Hannah More, Lord Teignmouth and Charles Simeon were very ashamed of having even attended the conventicle. See G. Redford (ed.), The Autobiography of the Rev. William Jay (1855), p. 302; C. Jay, Recollections of William Jay (1859), pp. 16 f., 18. Hannah More was so ashamed of attending Jay's chapel in Bath, that she publicly denied the fact later. See Redford, op. cit. p.331 f; C.J. Shore, Memoir of the Life and Correspondence of John Lord Teignmouth (1843), II, p.60. Second generation Anglicans were also embarrassed by the irregularities of their forefathers. See H. Venn Jr., The Life...of Henry Venn (1843), II, p.170 f. For Simeon's apology for Berridge's irregularity, see A.W. Brown, Recollections (1863), p. 200.
frowned on. If the world was still Wesley's parish, for
the newer breed of Evangelical the parish was his world.

But there were other issues that increasingly separated
regular Evangelical clergymen from their irregular Non-
conformist and Methodist brethren. As they became respectable,
beneficed clergymen, they increasingly disowned the
enthusiastic doctrines of their forefathers and irregular
contemporaries. Unlike the Methodists who taught that
instantaneous conversions were normative Christian experience
and that man's heart was often drastically re-directed
toward God before his mind had absorbed the full significance
of the 'doctrines of grace,' the regulars taught that grace
was mediated by quiet and rational means, and that the
Holy Spirit worked first in the intellect and only after-
wards in the affections. Instantaneous conversion was not
necessarily the pattern of Christian experience. So too,
Evangelical clergymen rejected the belief of many Methodists
that a strong feeling of assurance was a normal, perhaps
even necessary concomitant of justification, teaching instead
that simply by relying on the atonement of Christ Christians
could be in a state of salvation although they possessed no
assurance of it. The regulars believed that Methodists
of all varieties had placed too much emphasis on emotionalism.
Salvation by feelings was not a proper foundation for sound
Christian doctrine.

Another factor making for regularity among Anglican
Evangelicals and separating them from their allies in the

(1) I am indebted to John Walsh's unpublished "Theology of
the Evangelical Revival" for much of the material above.
Gospel, was their increasing articulation in associations and
groups. A number of clerical societies, like those at
Elland, Rauceby, and in London, brought clergymen into
closer fraternity. Here, matters of faith, order and pastoral
practice were hammered out and codified for the direction
of members; future clergymen were recruited for the Anglican
ministry and financed through a course at Oxford and Cambridge.
Proprietary chapels and advowsons were bought to insure
ministerial continuity and prevent the drain to Dissent.
Most importantly, these societies, connected together by
correspondence, became almost a quasi-denomination for the
Evangelical regulars. This development significantly affected
the future role of Evangelical churchmen in pan-evangelical
societies, for the clerical societies not only united regulars,
but created an internal cohesion that insulated them to
some extent from complete involvement with evangelicals
outside the Anglican fold. This increased, as we shall see,
the reluctance of regular Evangelical churchmen to participate
with other evangelicals in the pan-evangelical movement of
the late eighteenth century.

(1) The association in London, which we shall later have
occasion to mention, was called the Eclectic Society.
Though at first nominally interdenominational, it
later was patronized only by churchmen. For its history,
see J. Pratt Jr., Memoir of the Rev. Josiah Pratt (1849),
p. 10 f; J. Pratt Sr., Eclectic Notes (1865), p. 1;
M.M. Hennell, John Venn and the Clapham Sect (1958), p. 220 f;
The Christian Observer developed out of the Eclectic
meetings in 1802 though an Evangelical Anglican magazine
had been discussed as early as 1799. See Christian Observer
(1802), p. iii; J. Pratt Sr., op. cit. p. 93 f; M.M.
Hennell, op. cit. p. 198.
III. The Heritage of George Whitefield

It was perhaps surprising that the divisions of the Calvinistic Controversy in the 1770s did not permanently destroy the conception of pan-evangelicalism which survived to burst out again in the 1790s. That it survived was due to George Whitefield more than any man. Though he died in the year the Calvinistic Controversy broke out, he left behind him both within the old Dissenting denominations he had helped to revive, and the new evangelical societies he had helped to create, an evangelical 'catholic spirit' which inspired a later generation to rediscover something of the accord of 1739. It is to George Whitefield, therefore, more than to John Wesley or the regular Evangelical Anglicans that we must look for the well-springs of the late eighteenth century pan-evangelical impulse.

Wesley's first concern (as we have seen) was with the Church of England. If he was patently prejudiced towards Anglicanism, he was more or less latently prejudiced against Dissent - witness his habit of terming the Baptists 'Anabaptists.' This blunted the impact of his ministry on Dissent and helped to create barriers between Wesleyans and evangelical Nonconformists which lasted for over a century. Whitefield, by contrast, was ecclesiastically far less prejudiced, at least within the context of the Restoration. Sharing a common Calvinism with the Dissenters, he was far more cordial in his relations with them than

(1) In 1741, for example, he told a friend, "I am resolved not to rest till everything, contrary to true, catholic, Christian love, be rooted out of my soul." Cited in L. Tyerman, The Life of the Rev. George Whitefield (1867), I, p. 534.
Wesley. Because he did not try to force them into the Anglican mould, they received him more eagerly than any other churchman. Thomas Olivers, a Wesleyan, complained of Whitefield's intimacy with Dissent when he wrote to a friend several years after Whitefield's death:

That Mr. Whitefield was strongly prejudiced in favour of the Dissenters, as Dissenters, is notorious. I myself have, perhaps on forty occasions, both at my own house and elsewhere, heard him speak, with great partiality, of our English Dissenters in general—particularly of the Puritans of old, and also of our modern Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists. The whole world knows how uncommonly fond he was of the Scotch Presbyterians, and the American Independents; while the Episcopalians, in both these countries, were almost entirely overlooked by him.

It was by the ministry of George Whitefield that many first generation evangelical churchmen and Dissenters were awakened and by them the Whitefieldite heritage was transmitted to Calvinists of the second and third generations—those who produced the great united evangelical societies of the 1790s. The missionary-minded, undogmatic Calvinism which was the doctrinal cement of pan-evangelicalism, was largely inspired by Whitefield.

It was something of a paradox that Whitefield's failure properly to unite his own societies assisted the union of evangelicals within the pan-evangelical societies of the late eighteenth century. Both John Wesley and George Whitefield disclaimed any concern for party, but

---

Wesley built up a connexion of formidable cohesion and
loyalty which was compared with the Jesuit order, and his
control over it earned him the nickname of 'Pope John.'
The loyalty, cohesion, and discipline of his connexion
was such that it effectively insulated Wesleyanism from
any deep involvement with Christian societies beyond its
fold. Whitefield, however, remained true to his 'catholic'
principle and remained the generous, roving evangelist
rather than the ecclesiastical leader. He did not have the
time nor the inclination properly to govern societies,
even those which he had created. He told a friend in 1748:

My attachment to America will not permit me to abide
very long in England; consequently, I should but weave
a Penelope's web, if I found societies; and if I should
form them, I have not proper assistants to take care of them.
I intend therefore to go about preaching the Gospel to
every creature.

When Whitefield died, he left behind him far more spiritual
children in evangelical Dissent and the Church of England
than in his own small and loosely-associated societies.
Yet in his weakness as a party leader lay his strength
as the inspiration of pan-evangelicalism. His type of
broad, emotional, missionary Calvinism was the common
denominator between many different chapels and societies;
his spiritual children, though scattered in different
'causes,' recognized a common paternity. By his itinerancy,
Whitefield had kept many groups of Christians in fraternal
association. In a real sense, Whitefield could be claimed
as the founder of the London Missionary Society and the other
great pan-evangelical societies of the late eighteenth century.

(1) Whitefield said of Wesley's 'catholic spirit:' "Most
talk of a catholic spirit; but it is only till they
have brought people into the pale of their own church.
This is downright sectarianism, not catholicism." See
(2) Ibid., II, p. 169 f.
At least three new denominations that would later figure prominently in the pan-evangelical impulse, indirectly owed their foundations to George Whitefield. Lady Huntingdon had founded, at least with his initial help, her famous connexion of chapels into which she hoped to place Evangelical clergymen. But as the connexion matured and developed, Nonconformists were allowed to participate. In 1781, she was forced to license her chapels under the Toleration Act thereby pushing the Connexion into practical Dissent, even though the forms of the Church of England were still used in its worship. The Connexion chapels were ministered to by itinerant preachers who received their appointments from the Countess herself and, when she died, from a central board of trustees. The itinerant would remain in an assigned chapel for a short period of time before moving on to the next appointment elsewhere. Each chapel in turn, would contribute to the itinerant's upkeep. Lady Huntingdon owned only seven or eight chapels outright, but many more were informally linked with her name.

The English Calvinistic Methodists on the other hand, evolved out of the societies that Whitefield himself had established in his lifetime. After 1770, they joined together into a very loose federation which unlike the Countess's Connexion, did not adopt a uniform system of administration or worship. Some chapels were independently governed by a board of trustees which appointed a permanent

pastor; others were supplied by an itinerant ministry. While most of the chapels closely followed the forms of the Church of England, some were not as strict in their forms of worship and often followed the practice of the Independents. Though each chapel managed its own affairs, they considered themselves bound together by common interests; their ministers therefore participated in each others ordinations and helped each other out in times of need and crisis.

The Welsh Calvinistic Methodists were largely indigenous in origin, owing their existence to Welsh leaders like Howell Harris and Daniel Rowlands, yet they too had close connections with Whitefield, and their societies were for a time in close association and union with the English Calvinistic societies. During Whitefield's absence in America between 1743 and 1748, the direction of the English preachers was given over to Harris. The formal ties of the Welsh societies with the Church of England continued far longer than their English counterparts, however, and it was not until 1811 that they formally separated into a denomination modelled on the Presbyterian system of church government.

Older denominations like the Independents and Baptists, as we have seen, owed a great deal to Whitefield's ministry, but more than the newer denominations, they remained unorganized except by way of regional association. The small

(1) See T. Timpson, British Ecclesiastical History (1838), p. 456 ff; J. Campbell, Letters on Wesleyan Methodism... and a History of Whitefield's Churches (1847), p.6 f. The London Calvinistic Methodists were later united in the Associate Congregations. See J. Ball, Union among Christian Societies (1808), passim.
(2) See Watson, op.cit. p. 174 f.
number of English Presbyterians who had not fallen into Unitarianism and the evangelical Presbyterians in Scotland, both of the Church and Seceders, were likewise profoundly influenced by him.

Evangelical Anglicans, of course, were greatly influenced by both Wesley and Whitefield; whether Calvinists or Arminians, many of the first generation were, like them, highly 'irregular.' Henry Venn, John Berridge, William Grimshaw and others left their parishes periodically to itinerate on extended 'Gospel rambles.' Most second generation Evangelical churchmen, as we have seen, reacted against the irregularities of their forefathers, and patterned their ministries on the accepted order of the established Church, but a small remnant of irregular or 'left wing' Evangelical churchmen carried on the tradition of their Anglican forefathers well into the nineteenth century. These included famous names that we shall later meet with like John Eyre, Curate of Weston in 1779 and then Cecil's curate at Lewes in 1781; Thomas Wills, Curate of Perranzabuloe and St. Agnes in Cornwall from 1764; David Simpson, the Assistant Curate of St. Michaels Church in Macclesfield; Robert Hawker, Vicar of Charles near Plymouth; Thomas Hawe's, Rector of Aldwinckle from 1764; and Rowland Hill, minister at Surrey Chapel in London. Most of these were moderate Calvinists, though some like Robert Hawker, tended to Hypercalvinism. One or two, like David Simpson, were associated with Wesley. But all

(1) See W. Peddie, Discourses (1846), p.82; Timpson, op. cit. p.544.

(2) Thomas Haweis was at first a strict Calvinist. Henry Venn once remarked to him, "allow me, my dear Haweis, to be something more than a stone." He later became more moderate. Cited in A.S. Wood, Thomas Haweis (1957), p.75 f.
shared in common a 'catholic' view of the church. David Simpson, for example, could say

I confess though a clergyman of the Establishment, I see no evil in joining for public worship or social intercourse, with any of the denominations of Christians. I hear what passes with candour, join where I approve, and reject whatever appears contrary to Scripture, and the plain dictates of sound reason and common sense. I am well aware this comes not up to the full standard of orthodoxy. But if such conduct constitutes a bad churchman, I feel not anxious to be accounted a good one.

Because of this spirit, 'left wing' Evangelical churchmen moved with ease between Church and Dissent.

The sense of denominational identity sat lightly on those who moved in the Whitefieldite Calvinistic milieu. This was illustrated by the astonishing facility with which they moved from one evangelical grouping to another. This denominational mobility or fluidity is perhaps best illustrated by the Calvinists who led the pan-evangelical movement in the late eighteenth century. We know who these men were, yet in so many cases, it is virtually impossible to determine to which denomination they were affiliated. John Ball of London, for example, was called at various times and in various places, a Calvinistic Methodist and an Independent; Joseph Brooksbank, also from London, was listed as an Independent and a minister in Lady Huntingdon's Connexion; Thomas Haweis was both a trustee of the same Connexion and a clergyman. Matthew Wilks at various times in his life, was a Calvinistic Methodist, a member of Lady Huntingdon's Connexion and an Independent, while Rowland Hill of London and Archibald Douglas of Reading had such varied denominational

backgrounds that even their closest friends often failed
to discover exactly where they stood on matters of church
polity. Another indication of the degree to which Calvin-

istic denominations were fluid at this time, were the number
of what Ruth Rouse calls 'Borderland Churches;' churches
that defied a denominational label. Perhaps the most
famous undenominational church that appeared in the 1780s,
was Rowland Hill's Surrey Chapel built for him in 1782. It
was open to preachers of all denominations, enjoying at
various times sermons from the Baptists John Ryland and
Samuel Medley, the Anglicans John Newton, Henry Venn, and
John Berridge, and the Independents Joseph Slatterie and
William Jay. The home of Robert Haldane at Airthrey, with
its temporary chapel fitted out in the stable, became for
several years Surrey Chapel's counterpart in Scotland.

Denominational mobility was perhaps nurtured in many
leaders of pan-evangelicalism by their very 'liberal' Calvin-
istic upbringings. For instance, Edward Williams, the great

(1) Many historians have called Hill a Dissenter eventhough he
was ordained to first orders in the Church of England.
See A. Plummer, The Church of England in the Eighteenth
Century (1910), p. 137; E.R. Routley, The Story of Congre-
Hill died, he professed Presbyterianism. See Redford,
op.cit.p. 350. But Elliott-Binns says that Hill resented
being called a Dissenter. See L.E. Elliott-Binns, The
a friend in 1831, "I am thankful to God, that I have
ever continued to serve the Christian Church at large."
L.M.S. Home C Extra 2.4.A; R. Hill to J Wilks, 19 Sept.
1831. For Douglas, see A. Douglas, Sermons by the late

(2) R. House and S.C. Neill, A History of the Ecumenical

(3) See Redford, op.cit. p. 48; E. Sidney, The Life of the
Rev. Rowland Hill (1834), p. 137; G. Weight, The First
and Last Sermons Delivered in Surrey Chapel (1833), p. 5 ff.

(4) A. Haldane, The Lives of Robert...and his Brother, James
Rotherham Independent and tutor of so many evangelical Nonconformists, was brought up an Anglican, came under the influence of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists and was eventually ordained an Independent minister. Thomas Raffles of Liverpool, and a future director of the London Missionary Society, was brought up by his mother a Wesleyan Methodist, baptized an Anglican, educated at a Baptist boarding school and eventually became an Independent minister. Archibald Douglas, another future director of the London Missionary Society, had an even more eclectic religious odyssey. He received his first "abiding religious impressions" from Dr. Peckwell, an Anglican; he was then induced into the "full light and liberty of the Gospel" by Timothy Priestley (then a minister in Lady Huntingdon's Connexion); he was "relieved from the perplexities which beset his path" by a Baptist, and finally was "indebted for his establishment in the faith" by an Independent.

Some second and third generation Evangelical clergymen had similarly mixed religious upbringings. William Goode, the future Vicar of St. Andrews London and a Bible Society advocate, was brought up in a family that had migrated from Church to Dissent. In later youth, he and his brother John met with another friend, the future Oxford Baptist James Hinton, for prayer and Bible reading. After attending the undenominational seminary at Newport Pagnell, William decided to be ordained a clergyman, though his brother remained an Independent and later took a church in Spitalfields, London. John Eyre, the future

(1) See D.N.B.
(3) A. Douglas, op. cit. pp. xxiv - xxv.
Anglican Secretary of the London Missionary Society and editor of the *Evangelical Magazine*, had a similar background. Brought up in a very liberal Calvinistic family, John later opted for the Church of England while his brother Thomas became a deacon in the Baptist church at Launceston. Many more examples of early 'liberal' Calvinistic families could be cited which would illustrate even further why some evangelical Calvinists were highly receptive to pan-evangelicalism in the late eighteenth century.

IV. The Emerging Irenic Forces

The years between 1770 and 1780 were bitter and divisive ones for the evangelicals, so much so that many abandoned Gospel religion in disgust. In this troubled decade, Calvinists were pitted against Wesleyans in the theological controversy ignited by the Wesleyan minutes of 1770. Anglican 'regulars' meanwhile, in their quest for ecclesiastical respectability, had nearly severed ties with evangelical brethren outside the establishment. Many Baptists, closed their communion table to paedobaptists. Each of these evangelical denominations assumed an isolationalist position in their relationship with other evangelicals, the result of which seriously blunted the impact of the Evangelical movement itself. But even in the midst of controversy and division, there always existed centripetal forces of unity.

(1) Letter of the Baptist Historical Society to the L.M.S., 31 July 1942 in the L.M.S. archives.
(2) In Wednesbury, for example, the Wesleyan society was reduced from 300 to 70 members because of the 'janglings' over predestination. See C. Wesley, *Journal*, II, p.85. For impact of controversy in Rotherham, see *ibid.*, p. 116.
and reintegration that eventually brought into harmonious relations not only the Calvinists, but other evangelicals also. Evangelicals were more united than they were perhaps aware. The 'Gospel world,' for all its bickerings, was a cultural, and ideological entity, rather like the 'left' in the modern political world; its unities of thought and outlook were always present and capable of reasserting themselves in a propitious climate. Even in the midst of controversy, evangelicals realized that they shared an experience which marked them off decisively from all others and ranged them together in the fellowship of the invisible Church of Christ to which all 'vital Christians' belonged. This evangelical experience was not a matter of theological reflection, but rather was a general experiential crisis, rooted in a deep-seated sense of sinfulness and spiritual insufficiency and a thirst for assurance and personal salvation. This experience had been shared not only by the Puritans but by a host of others throughout Christian history. Joseph Milner, whose Church History traced the evangelical succession through the centuries wrote

How uniformly similar are the dealings of God in the Kingdom of grace in all ages: The experience of Augustine, a Christian who lived in the latter end of the fifth century, is precisely the same as that of any Christian in the eighteenth. The phraseology may differ...but it requires no uncommon discernment to see that it is the work of the same God, leading to the same ends.

In the changeless nature of a Christian experience shared by an army of Christians past and present drawn from many

---

(2) J. Milner, Completed Works (1794-), VII, p.387.
churches and denominations, evangelicals found a great sense of spiritual security. Nonconformists and Churchmen alike rejoiced to find that others had fought through the same spiritual and temporal conflicts as themselves. John Newton once told his congregation that "my sentiments are confirmed by the suffrages of thousands who have lived before me, and with many with whom I have personally conversed in different places and circumstances, unknown to each other; yet all have received the same views because taught by the same spirit."

If theologies divided, experience could unite. Even in doctrine, evangelicals sensed that they were closer together than they realized in the heat of controversy. They held in common not only the Biblical word but the leading doctrines it contained: original sin, justification by faith, and illumination and sanctification by the Holy Spirit. But the central doctrine that transcended in importance all of the others was justification by faith; the articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae of Nonconformist as well as Anglican belief. John Wesley agreed that the difference between evangelicals was small compared with their agreement on justification by faith. Several years later, Joseph Milner, a Calvinist, spoke of justification as the "distinguishing doctrine of Christianity, without which indeed, the Gospel is a mere name." "What are all the ideas of Christian government and discipline," he asked,

(2) Walsh, op. cit. p. 37.
"what are all rites and ceremonies...what a thousand such
subjects, compared with the article of Justification?"
Most evangelicals, regardless of their theological biases,
would have heartily agreed. Here Anglican Evangelicals
felt more in common with their Methodist or Dissenting
brothers in the Gospel than with their High Church
colleagues of the cloth. They had experienced the same
salvation; they believed in the same essential theological
doctrines. Though episcopalian, they did not hold with
High Churchmen that episcopacy was the esse of the church;
it was ancient, apostolical, beneficent, but not of
dominical authority. For the Evangelicals, the 'Church
of Christ' was the visible body of all regenerate believers:
it alone could be held to be one, holy and catholic. If
they did not like Dissent, they did not completely condemn
it, for they realized that between Church and Dissent
stood no substantial spiritual gap. Evangelical churchmen,
therefore, experienced a conflict of mind and heart; they
knew in their minds that they were respectable and loyal
members of the national establishment, but they also knew
in their hearts that they were evangelicals sharing with
other evangelicals, a common faith and experience that
transcended denominational barriers and theological parties.
This tension was expressed by Charles Simeon who, at one of
his famous conversation parties many years later, said

Dissent is an evil; but where the Gospel truth is not
declared in the Church pulpit, I dare not blame a man
for where he thinks or feels that his soul can be fed.
True, he ought to throw his influence in the scale of
the Church; but if he feels that his soul is perishing
how can I say he is wrong to go where there is a doctor?

(1) J. Milner, Selection of Tracts and Essays (1810), p.417.
(2) A.W. Brown, Recollections of the Conversation Parties
The conflict of mind and heart - the problem of divided loyalties - was later overcome by what Geoffrey Best has called the principle of 'practical inconsistency.' Evangelical churchmen allowed in their scheme of things an established church which they conceived to be the 'ideal' visible church, but without repudiating their loyalty to the national establishment, they would acknowledge the existence of an invisible Church that transcended denominational barriers. The interests of the Church of Christ, wherever they appeared manifest in the world, claimed prior allegiance.

By the 1780s, a realization of these shared fundamentals began to reassert itself and a reaction began to set in against the acrimonies of the Calvinistic Controversy. Evangelicals saw that they had perhaps placed too much emphasis on circumstantial, not enough on essentials. The death of Toplady in 1778 coincided with a relaxation of the 'rigours of Calvinism' and a reappraisal of the Moderate Calvinism which had been held by many Dissenters and not a few Evangelical Anglicans. The roots of Moderate Calvinism run back to the early seventeenth century and beyond. At the Huguenot Academy of Saumur in France, Moyse Amyraut and John Cameron had developed a 'hypothetical universalism' which veered away from the rigidities of the conservative Calvinists; in England, moderates like Davenant, delegate to the Synod of Dort, held similar theories. The Anglican Homilies and Articles seemed to

(2) I am grateful to John Walsh's unpublished "Theology of the Evangelical Revival" for much of the following material.
countenance a milder and more ambiguous form of pre-destination which appealed strongly to evangelicals.

Eighteenth century evangelicals were usually restless under the Calvinistic label. They resented the assertion that they subscribed *ex animo* to the whole of Calvin's *Institutes*, still more the implication that they were the doctrinal heirs to those who had killed King Charles I. They were embarrassed by the general belief that they regarded man as a mere automaton and God as the author of sin. It was particularly in the theological writings of second and third generation evangelicals like the Anglican Charles Simeon, the Baptist Andrew Fuller and the Independent Edward Williams, that Moderate Calvinism was developed in forms yet more moderate.

The moderates wished to dissociate themselves from what they believed were three unscriptural doctrines; particular redemption, limited atonement and predestined reprobation. Particular redemption and limited atonement taught that Christ's blood was shed only for the elect; the moderates wanted to stress, however, that Christ shed his blood for all men. The atonement of Christ, they believed, was a 'general benefit' for which no man would be excluded save from unbelief. But this was not exactly Arminianism or Universalism, for if the benefit of Christ's Passion was of infinite sufficiency for all mankind, it did not follow that the whole world would effectively partake of it. Though the merits of Christ were enough to assuage the sins of the whole world, these merits would be appropriated only by

---

those who possessed the saving faith to lay hold of them, and only to the elect was this saving faith given. In other words, if in one sense there was general redemption, there was in another sense particular election; grace, though sufficient for all, proved efficient only for the elect who possessed special or prevenient grace which allowed them to repent and believe. But the moderate Calvinists felt no constraints in offering salvation to all mankind, since it was for all that Christ had died. Unlike the 'no offer of grace' theology of the Hypercalvinists, the exponents of hypothetical universalism combined acceptance of predestined election with belief in the indiscriminate preaching of the Gospel to all unbelievers. They dissociated themselves firmly from the idea of predestined reprobation, which appeared to make God the author of sin. If man's salvation was of God, they insisted, his damnation was his own fault, conditioned upon his disobedience, foreseen by his Creator.

Moderate Calvinism had its logical difficulties and was not always easily explained to a congregation. Its apparent incongruities, though often admitted, were regarded as part of a divine synthesis which lay beyond the limited understandings of men, and they were therefore to be accepted on simple trust. William Jay, describing the betrayal of Jesus by Judas, told his congregation

He was foreordained of God to betray the Saviour, and yet he betrayed him willingly, and is damned for the deed. Now, do not look at me for an explanation of this subject; both statements are true - the foreknowledge of God, and the free agency of man; and when we reach heaven, and not till then, shall we be able to understand all which in our imperfect condition is quite beyond the grasp of our finite minds.

(1) Cf. R. Balmer, Academical Lectures and Pulpit Discourses (1845), I, p. 80.
Moderate Calvinism served at least three irenic functions. First, it provided second and third generation evangelical Calvinists with the kind of theological unity that Whitefield had provided for the first. Simeon, Fuller, and Williams were all basically in agreement on their Calvinistic beliefs. Second, by softening the harshness of the predestinarian scheme, it eventually brought the Arminian and Calvinistic camps closer together than they had ever been since the Calvinistic Controversy. Significantly, Toplady's strict Calvinistic Gospel Magazine had by 1793 evolved into the moderate Evangelical Magazine, while the Arminian Magazine, in turn, had changed into the less provocative Methodist Magazine five years later. This is not to say that all was peace between Calvinists and Wesleyans. Especially in provincial areas, Calvinistic itinerants like Thomas Wills, still kept the controversy alive by preaching strict Calvinistic doctrines often to shocked Wesleyan hearers, but much of the bitterness of the 1770s was greatly tempered by a new era of theological moderation. Finally, the moderate position gave impetus to the growing missionary urge. The Moderate Calvinist believed that none could with certainty know who were the elect

(1) At Worcestershire in 1784, for example, Wills preached to an assemblage that included a large number of Wesleyans. "Judging them to be unsettled in the doctrine of grace," Wills reported, "I trust I was enabled to be faithful in contending for the faith, and confuting arminian errors." At Wolverhampton in 1785, he again preached to a number of Wesleyans on "By grace ye are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves." See T. Wills, Memoirs (1804), pp. 99, 157.
(that pertained to the secret counsel of God). He knew for certain, however, that on the basis of the revealed will of God, it was his duty "to go into the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." This command was fully obeyed in the foundation of numerous domestic and foreign missionary societies at the end of the century.

There were other currents which led to a perceptible softening of doctrinal rigidity. Among the Baptists who stood aloof from their non-Baptist brethren on the question of entry into the covenant of church membership, there was a parallel move towards moderation. The old controversy between Baptists and paedobaptists had been two-fold. Did Christ institute believer's adult baptism in the form of immersion, or the baptism of children in the form of sprinkling? Was spiritual regeneration separate from or contingent upon the baptismal act? These theoretical issues had divided evangelicals, but it was on the practical level of worship and ritual that the controversy had been most serious. Since the Lord's Supper was the highest statement of fellowship for all Christians, it was important to Baptists to admit to the communion table only those who had been baptized believers. Consequently, prior to about 1780, paedobaptists had been barred from the communion table in most Baptist meetings. This appeared to some men tantamount to an assertion that Baptists did not recognize most Protestants as Christians. The controversy over open communion lay dormant until 1772, when Daniel Turner of Abingdon and John Ryland of Northampton published statements

(1) The most notable exception was Bedfordshire where open communion in Baptist churches was a tradition since the days of Bunyan.
favouring open communion, and they were followed by Robert Robinson of Cambridge and Robert Hall then in Bristol.

What brought these men to a moderate position on communion is uncertain; perhaps the influence of evangelicalism on a younger generation of pastors had something to do with it. All we know is that there came into being a new breed of 'open communionists' who, in the tradition of Bunyan, welcomed other evangelicals to their table thereby recognizing them as fellow Christians. The impact of this irenic theological development, as we shall see, was very important for the future pan-evangelical impulse.

Besides these irenic theological developments, there were also a number of social forces at work which contributed to the pan-evangelicalism of the late eighteenth century. In the area of education, for example, many future pan-evangelical leaders attended the same seminaries, though they later belonged to different denominations. Perhaps Lady Huntingdon's college at Trevecca did more to bring evangelicals together than any other educational institution of the day, even after it had broken off its connection with the Wesleyans. Men who shared a common educational experience

---


at Trevecca included prominent evangelicals like the Anglicans John Eyre, Thomas Wills and William Winkworth; the Independents John M'All, Edward Parsons, and William Roby; members of Lady Huntingdon's Connexion like John Clayton, George Townsend and Timothy Wildbore; the Calvinistic Methodist Matthew Wilks and his Baptist brother Mark. Another undenominational seminary of a slightly later period was the academy at Newport Pagnell founded in 1782 by John Newton and William Bull. The Independent founder of the Bedfordshire Union of Christians, Samuel Greatheed, was a student and early member of the academy's staff; its other pupils included John Clement Bicknell and Thomas Palmer Bull, two prominent evangelical Independents; the Baptists John Scroxton, John Millard and William Tomlin; and the Anglicans Robert Cottam, Curate of Broomsgrove, Worcestershire, and William Goode, later Rector of St. Andrew-by-the-Wardrobe, London.

If future pan-evangelical leaders had not rubbed shoulders at the academy, they often did so in their work and ministries and even in their domestic lives. Extensive social contact brought not a few evangelicals to the pan-evangelical cause in later years. The Anglican Thomas Haweis, for example, claimed that association with Dissenters like Walter Wilson gave him a fresh insight into the

---

(1) For list of Trevecca graduates, see Allon, op.cit. p. 68; A.C.H. Seymour, The Life and Times of Selina Countess of Huntingdon (1844), II, pp. 112 f., 529 f.

character of Dissent, thus evoking a new sympathy with it. So too, William Wilberforce's daily business and political contacts with Dissenters removed many, though not all, of his former prejudices. The early practice of itinerating also did much to diminish denominational prejudice. Thomas Wills, the 'itinerant' Anglican, chronicles in his Memoirs the warm reception he received not only from Calvinistic paedobaptists but also from Baptists and Wesleyans. In 1781, for example, he claimed after a sermon at Tiverton, that "there were four or five ministers of different denominations present, and the congregation were very attentive - some were observed to be in tears." At Coventry, Wills reported, "Mr. [George] Burder, Mr. Butterworth, (the Baptist minister), and Mr. Reader, at whose house I slept, having taken an affectionate leave of us...most earnestly and cordially request[ed] me to visit Coventry again..." George Burder himself enjoyed a career of itinerating which by 1778 had brought him into touch with most of his co-workers in future pan-evangelical enterprises. Finally, we must not underestimate the importance of early inter-denominational contacts through marriage. Samuel Greatheed, the Independent, for example, had a special and personal interest in bringing Church and Dissent together in Bedford, for he was married to the daughter of Christopher Stephenson, the Vicar of Olney. So too, another Independent, William Jay

(3) T. Wills, *op. cit.* p. 76.
(4) Ibid., p. 138.
of Bath, was married to the daughter of Edward Davies, then 1 the evangelical Rector of Bengeworth in Worcestershire.

The growth of fraternity among the evangelicals did not go unchallenged. Among Nonconformists one can detect a conservative reaction by those who disliked what seemed to them too early and indiscriminate an abandonment of the denominational traditions and beliefs handed down from their Puritan forefathers. In the rush towards a more 'catholic spirit' there seemed grave danger of becoming denominationally nondescript and theologically lax. Like the Anglican 'regulars' so the Nonconformist conservatives were anxious to preserve their sense of historic identity. Walter Wilson, the London Independent, expressed this feeling sharply some years later. "By giving way too much to that laxity of principle and indiscriminate zeal which distinguish the Methodists," he wrote, "Dissenters have lost that peculiarity of character for which their forefathers were so eminent." Though in some ways sympathetic to the pan-evangelical feeling, Wilson defended the denominational conservatives who had preserved their heritage and had not been stampeded into a hurried acceptance of a fashionable, but 'spurious' and imprecise, evangelical pietism.

(2) W. Wilson, The History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches and Meeting Houses in London (1808-), IV, p. 550. In this regard, the Evangelical Magazine and the Protestant Dissenters Magazine bear comparison. The first was a liberal evangelical publication that looked ahead to the period when Christians would be united. The latter was not an evangelical publication though it probably had a large number of conservative evangelicals subscribing to it. It looked back to the great era of Puritanism. See J.D. Walsh, "Methodism at the End of the Eighteenth Century" in R.E. Davies and E.G. Rupp, A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain (1965), p. 297.
This reaction was most evident in the Baptist camp. Open communion, it seemed to many conservative 'closed communionists,' was an untenable position because it denied basic Baptist principles. To open the communion table to non-Baptists, they argued, was to recognize ipso facto the validity of infant baptism and by implication to deny the doctrine of the baptism of believers. The fact that there were still many prominent closed communionists explains why to a large degree the Baptists (like the 'regular' Anglicans) tended occasionally to dissociate themselves from the pan-evangelical movement and why, when pan-evangelical societies were formed, they were first reluctant to patronize them. This type of reaction was not powerful enough to restrain the spirit of unity which began to well up in the 1780s, but it continued to harrass the course of evangelical union and in the early nineteenth century produced the Congregational and Baptist Unions which were in part a reaction to pan-evangelicalism and an assertion of denominational loyalty.

V. Early Interdenominational Institutions

The interdenominational cooperation among evangelicals which found its fruition during the 1790s, owed not a little to several previous experiments in united effort. The

(1) For example, Joseph Ivimey, Andrew Fuller, and Joseph Kinghorn. See E.A. Payne, The Baptist Union (1959), p. 40.
first of these was the Prayer Call of the early 1740s, which, early as it was, influenced the direction of the foreign missionary movement half a century later. At this time a group of Scottish ministers including John Erskine of Edinburgh periodically met together in prayer and intercession. Not much is known about these early prayer meetings or indeed, exactly why they took place, but they paralleled in a remarkable fashion, Philip Doddridge's plan of 1742 to establish quarterly prayer meetings in England as a first step towards a foreign missionary movement. The Prayer Call was not confined to Britain, for the correspondence of Erskine with Jonathan Edwards in New England led the Connecticut theologian to produce his famous tract, An Humble Attempt to Promote Explicit Agreement and Visible Union of God's People in Extraordinary Prayer. Disturbed by the deplorable state of religion in America, divisions within the Church of Scotland, the Jacobite uprisings in Northern Britain, the persecutions of Protestants in France and increasing wickedness and luxury all over the world, Edwards encouraged Christians of different denominations to unite in fervent prayer in anticipation of an imminent millennium. As we shall see, many years later the Humble Attempt inspired Baptists in England to organize the famous Prayer Call of 1784, which called upon Christians of all denominations to join the Baptists in united prayer for revival and mission. In turn, the Prayer Call movement

(1) E.M. Sept. 1797, p. 376.
(2) A copy of the Humble Attempt was passed on to John Ryland in the early 1780s by Erskine. It was Ryland's colleague John Sutcliffe who translated Edward's Prayer Call of the 1740s into the famous English Prayer Call of 1784 organized by the Northampton Baptist Association. The Prayer Call was meant to be a monthly meeting of
did much, according to the evangelical founding fathers of the London Missionary Society, to encourage the establishment of an undenominalnstitution that would unite the evangelical denominations in foreign missions.

Already, by 1745, the early Prayer Call may possibly have inspired one or two interdenominational societies. For example, the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge in the Highlands and Islands, was founded in that year partly to Anglicize the Scottish Highlands after the Jacobite rebellions, but also as an important instrument of the Evangelical Revival. The earliest interdenominational evangelical society in England was perhaps the Society for Promoting Religious Knowledge Among the Poor founded in 1750. The 'Book Society,' as it was better known, gave away to the poor, Bibles and "other good books" in the hope that "under the divine influence, the tendencies of corrupt nature may receive a timely check, and the powerful influence of vicious examples, in these sinful times, be more effectively guarded against."

It was hoped that because the Society was "wholly void of

Footnote Contd

(1) Cf. D. Bogue, A Sermon Preached...before the...Society in Scotland...for Propagating Christian Knowledge in the Highlands and Islands (1793), pp. v - xviii. This society and the ones that follow were not affiliated with either the S.P.C.K. or the S.P.G.

(2) An Account of the Society for Promoting Religious Knowledge Among the Poor (1769), p. 4.
all party views" that it would "engage others of every
Christian denomination among us, who truly fear GOD, love
protestant religion and liberties, and wish well to immortal
souls, to countenance, encourage, and promote it." Pre-
dating the pan-evangelical Religious Tract Society by
almost fifty years, the Book Society numbered among its
patrons in 1770 evangelicals like Lady Huntingdon, Thomas
Haweis, Martin Madin, John Newton, John Ryland, William
Romaine, Henry Venn, George Whitefield and many others.

The formation of the Book Society was closely followed
by Wesley's refounding of the Society for Reformation of
Manners in 1757. The new society attempted, like its
predecessor in the late seventeenth century, to improve the
manners of the lower classes by legal threat and literary
encouragement and to agitate for laws that would check the
profaneness of the British Sunday. The Society was un-
denominational and included in 1763 fifty Wesleyans, twenty
Whitefieldites, twenty Anglicans, and seventy Dissenters. By
1765, however, it was in heavy debt because of a verdict
secured against it for using false evidence in the Court of
the King's Bench and it had to close down one year later.

The first major interdenominational society after the
Calvinist Controversy was the Naval and Military Bible
Society, founded in 1779 by several Wesleyans and Anglicans.
The purpose of this society, as its name implied, was to
provide British forces, both at home and abroad, with Bibles
and religious tracts. It therefore anticipated the pan-evangelical

(1) Ibid, p.5.
(2) See J. Wesley, A Sermon Preached before the Society For
Reformation of Manners (1763), pp. 7, 11. Cf. W. B.
Whitaker, The Eighteenth-Century English Sunday (1940), p.119 f
By the 1780s the evangelicals had as yet not established an interdenominational missionary society, but this did not mean that they had not tried. In 1783, Thomas Coke proposed founding an undenominational missionary society which would embrace all evangelicals, Calvinists and Arminians alike. Though Coke's "Plan for the Establishment of Missions among the Heathen" never came to fruition, it anticipated the pan-evangelical London Missionary Society by eleven years. Four years later appeared the Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade which was an inter-denominational attempt to ban slavery through Parliamentary legislation. Though not a foreign missionary society, the Abolition Society nevertheless led many evangelicals to see in the West Indies and in Africa virgin territory for a future missionary effort.

(1) See G. Cussons, Memoirs (1819), p. 71 f.
The greatest organizational response to the irenic developments that we have been discussing, however, was the Sunday School movement of the mid 1780s. The Sunday School movement which began simultaneously in England and Wales was a voluntary movement financed largely by the middle class to supplement the inadequate number of poor schools built in the early half of the eighteenth century. In this sense it was partly a revival and partly a continuation of the early Charity School movement. But unlike the Charity School movement, the Sunday Schools soon became organizationally undenominational. At Stockport, for example, the local Sunday School established in 1784, was managed by a committee of gentlemen belonging to the various Nonconformist denominations and the Church of England. According to its rules of order published in the year the school was founded, it was decided that the town should be divided into six parts; that there should be at least one school in each part; that two subscribers should visit each school, and report to the Committee; that scholars should attend from nine to twelve in the forenoon, and from one to the hour of worship in the afternoon, when their teachers should conduct them to Church or Chapel...and that the children of Protestant Dissenters should, if possible, have masters of their own persuasion, and 'choose their own mode of catechizing.'

At Manchester in the same year, a committee composed of Churchmen and Dissenters and even Roman Catholics united to

(1) There has always been debate over whether the Sunday School movement was first started in England by Robert Raikes or in Wales by Thomas Charles. Recent research, however, has shown that both regional developments were part of a much larger national movement and that Raikes and Charles knew about each others work from the start. See W.T. Owen, Edward Williams (1963), p. 49 f.


form a Sunday School in that city, while in Coventry, George Burder wrote a letter to the Mercury urging the adoption of a similar plan. The Sunday School movement was so popular by 1785 that prominent religious leaders of the day including Bishop Bathurst and John Wesley gave it their unqualified support.

For the first two or three years, the movement was only loosely organized on a national level, but out of the modest Sunday School established in London by the Baptist William Fox there grew, in 1785, the Society Established in London for the Support and Encouragement of Sunday Schools, or, as it was better known, the Sunday School Society. Directed by a committee of twenty-four laymen, half churchmen and half Dissenters, the Society gave away to its affiliated Sunday Schools spelling books, Bibles, grants of money and timely organizational advice. It recommended strongly that in order to avoid interdenominational conflict students should not read denominational catechisms on the Sabbath, but instead restrict themselves

(3) J.H. Overton, The English Church in the Nineteenth Century, (1894), p. 247. John Wesley wrote to Richard Hodda in 1787 "I am glad you have taken in hand that blessed work of setting up Sunday-schools in Chester. It seems these will be one great means of reviving religion throughout the nation." Cited in J. Ivimey, Memoir of William Fox (1831), p. 77. There were, of course, many opponents of the early Sunday School movement among Dissenters as well as churchmen. See Ibid, pp. 51, 54.
(4) Jonas Hanaway must share credit with Fox for founding the Society eventhough his role is played down by Ivimey. For the history of the Sunday School Society, see Ivimey, op. cit. passim; Whitaker, op. cit. p. 219 ff; W.T. Whitley, A History of British Baptists (1923), p.260 ff. According to Ivimey, Fox, an Oxford draper, occasionally attended Thomas Haweis' ministry when both were living in that city.
to the reading of the Old and New Testament. It was also suggested that on Sunday scholars should attend a place of worship chosen by their parents. Because of its undenominational plan, the Society (in the beginning at least) was approved by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of Salisbury and Llandaff, recommended by the Dean of Lincoln in a widely publicized charge and applauded by men as dissimilar in outlook as Robert Raikes, Thomas Charles and the Unitarian Joseph Priestley.

It is difficult to determine to what degree the Sunday School movement was meant to be an interdenominational church-oriented movement. Many, of course, saw Sunday Schools simply as instruments of social control to stem the tide of vice and immorality, and viewed in this light the schools merit comparison with the earlier societies for the reformation of manners. Joseph Fox, for example, said that its purpose was "to prevent vice - to encourage industry and virtue - to dispel the darkness of ignorance - to diffuse the light of knowledge - to bring men cheerfully to submit to their stations [and] to obey the laws of God and their country..." It seems that the Sunday Schools largely served this purpose. In the Manchester Mercury of 1786, it was reported "that where Sunday Schools have been opened, their good effects have been plainly perceived in the orderly and decent Comportment of Youth who are

(1) Plan of a Society Established in London...for the Support and Encouragement of Sunday Schools (1793), pp. 8, 11, 13.
(2) See W. Dealtry, A Vindication of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1810) p. 185; M.G. Jones, op.cit. p. 152. The Unitarians had their own Sunday School Society.
(3) Ivimey, op.cit. p. 29 f.
instructed therein." Observers in Ireland many years later, felt that Sunday Schools were "the best security which the government can have, for orderly, peaceable, industrious & loyal behaviour of the people." Another commentator was sure that the good manners of Sunday School scholars would rub off on their parents. Many historians, therefore, have emphasized the importance of Sunday Schools as institutions of social control; unfortunately, not enough has been said about the movement as an early instance of pan-evangelicalism.

Many evangelicals saw the Sunday Schools as excellent vehicles through which to inculcate undenominational Protestant Christianity. The Baptist James Dore, for example, claimed that the Sunday School in his neighborhood was "animated by the very soul of Protestantism, and breathes its genuine spirit." He went on to say that the principles of Protestantism are its support. The worth of truth, the fallibility of man, the perfection of Scripture...are the pillars on which this institution rests. And it is pleasing to see Churchmen and Dissenters, Friends, Paedobaptists and Anti-paedobaptists, cordially unite in supporting this truly Protestant cause.

In the same spirit, Rowland Hill hoped that by encouraging children to attend in rotation Church and meeting house on Sunday, they would grow up to find "themselves at liberty from the narrow contracted spirit of party; so

(3) J. Barington, An Essay on the Depravity of the Nation with a view to the promotion of Sunday Schools (1791), p. 23. Barington was a Roman Catholic.
(5) J. Dore, A Sermon Preached at Maze Pond (1789), p. 32.
as that if they meet with a bad minister in a meeting they may seek for a good one in a church; and if a bad preacher be found in a church, they, on the other hand, may seek for a good one in a meeting..." So too, many evangelicals imagined that the Sunday School movement itself would perhaps have an even more irenic effect on the adults that subscribed to it. Robert Hawker thought the plan of many Sunday Schools an excellent remedy for the needless divisions in Christianity "for it embraces in its bosom all orders, sects and persuasions." Indeed, the Sunday School Society could congratulate itself by 1789 "that the mutual animosities which have in former times disunited the professions of the Christian faith have now given way to a more liberal construction of each others motives..." Self congratulation, however, was premature, for as we shall see in the next chapter, the Sunday School movement (and indeed interdenominationalism itself) received in 1789 a temporary though damaging blow from the French Revolution.

(2) R.Hawker, "Sunday Schools Recommended" in Works (1826-) II, p. 207. This was a sermon preached in 1789.
Chapter Two: The New Factors 1789-1795

I. The French Revolution

The outbreak of Revolution in France in 1789 affected the interdenominational movement, especially as it was institutionalized in the early interdenominational organizations, in two rather contradictory ways. In the long run, the Revolution united Dissenters and churchmen behind their government in a concerted effort to protect English liberties and religion against French radicalism and atheism. But this unity was enjoyed only after the Revolution veered to the left. The immediate impact of the Revolution on an emerging pan-evangelicalism, was extremely divisive.

Many Dissenters applauded the Revolution in 1789 because they believed that the new constitutional liberties given to French Protestants were a portent of the repeal of Nonconformist disabilities in their own country. Joseph Priestley's position in this regard is well known, but even otherwise orthodox Dissenters welcomed the Revolution with enthusiasm. In 1792, for example, David Bogue, the Independent minister at Gosport, preached a very pro-Revolutionary sermon before the Society in Scotland for propagating Christian Knowledge in the Highlands and Islands. Robert Haldane of Glasgow echoed Bogue's words in the North. Both of these men believed that ultimately the Revolution would not only benefit Nonconformity, but also deal a deadly blow to the Roman church whose fall

(1) See G.A. Williams, Artisans and Sans-Culottes (1968), p. 6 f.
(3) See D.N.B.
they felt to be imminent. To Evangelical Anglicans, however, the Bogues and the Haldanes and the Dissenters they represented appeared 'perfect democrats' set on destroying Church and State. Thomas Robinson of Leicester wrote William Wilberforce in 1792 regarding Nonconformist support of the Revolution

I am sorry to observe, that among the numerous class of dissenters, whose aim is to abolish every national establishment of religion among us, there are many of real piety. I know not how they can reconcile their conduct with the Scripture injunctions to obey magistrates & follow after peace. But, by an unhappy association of ideas, they seem to think, that while they are opposing our Church they are doing God service and promoting the cause of his truth.

John Newton, hitherto one of the most catholic-minded 'regulars,' believed in 1793 that "all the Dissenters, even the orthodox not excepted, are republicans and enemies to Government." Even as late as 1801, John Crosse, another 'regular,' told Wilberforce that political Dissent "so far as nature prevails...must accomplish the downfall of the Establishment." Remarks like these served to promote unfounded fears that English Dissenters were agents, or at least dupes, of the Continental Illuminati whose clandestine conspiracy might soon subvert Church and government in England as it had done in France. Such fears did much to hinder the emerging pan-evangelicalism of the late eighteenth century. They not only brought the interdenominational Anti-slavery campaign to a temporary halt, but forced many Sunday Schools into

(1) Bodl. MSS Wilberforce, C 3, f. 12; T. Robinson to W. Wilberforce, 12 Dec. 1792.
virtual dissolution.

Many of the Dissenters who initially supported the Revolution were sickened by the excesses of the Terror and then by the militarism of Napoleon. There was soon a reaction to the euphoric welcome given to the Revolution in its early stages, and Dissenters hurried to demonstrate their loyalty to King and constitution and to dissociate themselves from the Jacobin taint. Some refused even to support the movement for the repeal of the Test Acts because it was led largely by 'democratic' Unitarians. Despite these assertions of loyalty, the Dissenters did not quickly regain the confidence of their Anglican brethren.

(1) For the dissolution of Sunday Schools during the French Revolution, see A.P. Wadsworth, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXXIII(1950), p. 315; A.T. Hart, The Eighteenth Century Parson(1955), p. 84; M.G. Jones, The Charity School Movement (1935), p. 153 ff; J.H. Overton, The English Church in the Eighteenth Century (1894), p. 247 ff. There were, of course, many other reasons why undenominational Sunday Schools declined at the end of the century. The Blue Coat School in Birmingham, for example, closed because Dissenters complained that the scholars were being apprenticed only to Anglicans, See A.H. Driver, Carr's Lane (1948), p. 28. Schools also foundered on the rocks of the Calvinistic Controversy, as did the Sunday School at Bamford, Lancs, in 1800. See B. Nightingale, Lancashire Nonconformity (1890), III, p. 255. Others broke up when one denomination imposed its catechism on the other. See J.W. Middleton, An Ecclesiastical Memoir (1822), p. 209. It must be noted, however, that many Sunday Schools weathered the Revolution and remained undenominational.

(2) For Nonconformist disappointment in the Revolution, see J. Griffin, The Encouraging Aspects of the Times (2nd edn. 1806), p. 27 ff.

(3) See for example, E. Parsons, A Vindication of the Dissenters against the charges of Democratic Schemes (1802), passim; Anti-Jacobin Review, Jan. 1799, p. 99 and Nov. 1799, p. 347; W. Button, National Calamities Tokens of the Divine Displeasure (1794), advertisement; R. Hawker, An Appeal to the People of England on the Subject of the French Revolution (1794), passim; R. Haldane, Address to the Public Concerning Political Opinions (1800), passim.
and suspicions of Nonconformist politics still prejudiced Evangelical churchmen against the Missionary and Tract societies when they were founded at the close of the century. Not until about 1810 did large numbers of Anglicans care to fraternise closely with Dissenters in a joint campaign against vice and lower class sedition. Yet some thaw in relations was already perceptible by the late 1790s, and the tension gradually relaxed until, after about 1810, still more in the millennial hope excited by the collapse of the Napoleonic regime in Europe, evangelicals were drawn closer than they had ever been.

(1) Thomas Robinson, for one, was permanently drawn to the Church in opposition to Dissent because of the Revolution and as late as 1802, castigated Thomas Scott for preaching in Surrey Chapel. See C. Hole, The Early History of the Church Missionary Society (1896), p. 54.


(3) According to Patrick Colquhoun, only nineteen societies were founded in the last half of the eighteenth century, and only five in the last quarter. The 'mushroom' growth came only after the Revolution. See F.K. Brown, Fathers of the Victorians (1961), p. 328. For parallel developments in religious periodicals, see F.E. Mineka, The Dissidence of Dissent (1944), p. 48 f.

(4) See D. Bogue and J. Bennett, History of the Dissenters from the Revolution in 1688 to the Year 1808 (1808-), IV, p. 23 f.
II. The Millennium

The Revolution excited an atmosphere of millennial prophecy and expectation unparalleled since the Civil War. The social dislocations produced by war, coupled with the continual excitement as regimes toppled and huge armies marched across the Continent, produced a bizarre crop of millennial prophets like Joanna Southcott or Richard Brothers. The continual failure of prophecy did not seem to abate the demand for it, since the Scripture could be reinterpreted to take account of new developments. The millennial hope profoundly affected the evangelicals, most habitual of all students of the Bible, and a flood of prophetical writings flowed from their pens. Many of these were relevant to the theme of evangelical reunion. A typical example is provided by an article in the *Evangelical Magazine* entitled "Remarks on the Prophecies and Promises Relating to the Glory of the Latter Day," which examined prophecy under three headings: the millennium and the downfall of the Papacy, the millennium and missions, and the millennium and Christian unity.

Studying political developments in France in light of the book of Revelation, the evangelicals felt confident that they were about to witness the dawn of a new period in Christianity when Anti-Christ would fall, civil and religious liberties would spread and bigotry would be

(1) See also E. May, *Remarkable Extracts, selected from a work...entitled The accomplishments of Scripture principles* (1790), passim; J. Bicheno, *The Signs of the Times* (4th edn. 1794), passim. For detailed discussion of these and other works, see M. Verete, "The Restoration of the Jews in English Protestant Thought," *Middle Eastern Studies*, VIII (1972), p. 8 f.

suppressed forever. Ever since the Reformation, they pointed out, the Papal power had gradually decayed; now its humiliation at the hands of France confirmed that it was on the brink of total ruin. At this very moment, they believed, the Angel was pouring out the 'sixth vial' on the Kingdom of the Beast. A correspondent to the Evangelical Magazine spoke for many interpreters of Revelation 16:12 when he wrote

'And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates, and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the East might be prepared.' As the river Euphrates was the support and defence of Babylon literally taken, so here it is understood metaphorically: By the great river Euphrates we may understand everything that tended either to support or defend the popish power; And the drying-up this river, is a taking away the incomes and supplies, and thereby hastening its downfall. How remarkably are the incomes and supplies of the Roman church dried up by the revolution which has taken place in France!

At first, the evangelicals believed that the French Revolution itself was God's instrument in bringing about the downfall of Anti-Christ, but when the Revolution veered to the left and the Christian religion in France was replaced with a form of state Deism, their exegesis had to be altered. It now became evident that France itself was the Beast prophesied in Scripture and, when war broke out, that Britain would be God's agent in its destruction.

If Anti-Christ was to fall in France, and Protestant religion was to eventually replace it, the evangelicals also had good reason to believe that Christianity would be brought to the heathen and the Jew. Of the well-known millennial text "the earth shall be full of the knowledge

(1) Ibid, p. 163.
(2) J. Griffin, The Encouraging Aspect of the Times (2nd edn. 1806), p. 46 f.
of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea," the Evangelical Magazine observed.

Waters are often, in prophecy, put for nations, and multitudes of people; so the waters of the main ocean seem sometimes to be put for the inhabitants of the earth in general; as in Ezekiel's vision of the waters of the sanctuary, which flowed from the sanctuary, and ran east, till they came to the ocean, and were at first a small stream, but continually increased, till they became a great river; and when they came to the sea, the water even of the vast ocean was healed, representing the conversion of the world to the true religion of the latter days. It seems evident that the time will come, when there will not be one nation remaining in the world, which shall not embrace the Christian religion.

British evangelicals saw themselves as God's chosen agent to disseminate the Gospel and to convert the heathen both at home and abroad.

The conversion of the Jewish nation to Christianity presented special problems to the prophets of the millennium. The sixtieth chapter of Isaiah had declared that the prosperity of the Church would not be accomplished until "Jew and Christian shall meet in one fold under one shepherd." Yet in the eleventh chapter of Romans, it was implied that a remnant of the Jewish nation would be gathered in first and only then would the Gentile and the heathen follow. As we shall see, the juxtaposition of Isaiah and Romans created logistical problems for the evangelicals when they established the Missionary and Tract societies. Most thought that the evangelical mission should be directed exclusively to the heathen abroad and the Gentile at home, but they came into conflict with a small group of evangelicals who felt that before either the heathen or the Gentile would

(1) E.M. Oct. 1793, p. 159.
be converted to Christianity, the Jewish nation would have
to be gathered in. This difference in Scriptural inter-
pretation later led to a bitter internal controversy
between the two parties, indirectly resulting in the
emergence of the London Society for Promoting Christianity
Amongst the Jews in the early nineteenth century.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly of all as
far as the pan-evangelical movement was concerned, in the
process of missionizing the heathen and the Jew, the
evangelicals believed that God would remove certain
divisive 'obstacles' within the Christian fold itself.
Thus the Evangelical Magazine, referring to "the unhappy
contentions and divisions which subsist among Christians"
remarked:

These prejudice the minds of men against Christianity, and
lead them to conclude, that it is not so excellent in its
nature, and so amiable in its tendency, as its advocates
pretend. The heathen nations form their opinion of it,
from the conduct of its professors. And, alas! what a
melancholy picture does it exhibit! But before the nations
of the earth shall be brought in, both Jew and Gentile
shall be united. And I am inclined to think, that the
present diversity of opinions shall, in a great measure,
cease, and that golden age of Christianity return, in which
it shall be said, the multitudes of them that believed
were of one heart, and one soul.

There was much debate about the date of the millennium
and the form in which it would appear. Brothers thought
that it would take place in 1795; Thomas Coke, on the other
hand, thought that it would come in 1866; Andrew Fuller

(1) For more material on millennial prophecy and the Jews,
see C. Jerram, An Essay tending to shew the grounds
contained in Scripture for expecting a future restoration
of the Jews (1796), passim; Verete, op. cit. passim;
J. Parkes, "Lewis Way and his Times," Transactions of the
(2) E.M. Oct. 1793, p. 163.
who refused to pin down a date, said that it was not far off; David Bogue predicted after 1795 that the millennium would probably take place in the distant future. But it did not matter what the precise date was; far more important was the general conviction shared by evangelicals of many kinds that their own generation was either to be the last of this world, or the first of the latter days. There was considerable debate on how the millennium would be ushered in. Most evangelicals expected that Christ's advent as Judge of the world and the final defeat of Satan would take place after the millennium. This thought, as we shall see, prompted many evangelicals to draw together in preparation for the final judgment. But there was also a small number who believed that Christ's Second Coming would precede the millennium. Preparation, they believed, was useless since Christ alone, unassisted by finite beings, would usher in the new age. The so-called 'Pre-Millennialists' grew in numbers during the nineteenth century and proved to be a very inhibiting force in the pan-evangelical societies they patronized, but for the time being they were only a minority party.

Most evangelicals were not only unified in their belief

---

(1) A. Fuller, "God's Approbation of our Labours Necessary to the Hope of Success" in Works (1846), Part XI, p. 572. This sermon was preached in 1801.
(2) D. Bogue, Objections against a Mission to the Heathen stated and considered (1811), p. 6 f. Preached before the L.M.S. in 1795.
(3) Cf. Verete, op. cit. p. 31.
(5) See I.H. Murray, The Puritan Hope: A Study in Revival and Prophecy (1971), p. 187. Murray points out that the pre-millennialists could only be found in the backwaters of Nonconformity in the 1790s.
(6) This was especially true of the Bible and Jews Societies.
that they had a very important role to play in the millenium but, as we have seen, believed that the millennium called for a united Christendom. Thomas Coke, for example, prophesied that a "complete external union" of the Christian church would take place during the millennium. The Baptist Robert Hall also predicted that during the millennium, Christians would all be of one mind and one heart, though his colleague Andrew Fuller half-jokingly pointed out that they would be of one mind and heart as Baptists. By 1797, the Evangelical clergyman David Simpson could even see the union predicted in millennial prophecy already taking place in the various pan-evangelical societies that had been established.

III. Concepts of Pan-Evangelicalism

Two basic concepts of pan-evangelicalism had emerged by the end of the eighteenth century which shaped and moulded the pan-evangelical societies which we will shortly examine. The first could be described as 'idealistic,' since its adherents applauded the non-denominational ideals of the early Evangelical Revival, especially as they were propagated by George Whitefield, hoping to reconstruct them in a number of institutions open to all evangelicals. Like the Apostle Paul, the idealists believed that while there were many Christian communities in the world, the communities were one in the Body of Christ. Samuel Greathheed's General Union

---

(1) Vickers, op. cit. p. 331.
(2) R. Hall, The Duty and Importance of Free Communion (1820), p. 43.
(3) D. Simpson, A Plea for Religion and the Sacred Writings (1808), p. 324. This was written in 1797.
Recommended to Real Christians, an early manifesto of this group, pointed out

The Church is one body, of which our Lord Jesus Christ is the Head. Whether as private Christians, or as distinct Societies, we are all members one of another; and if we neglect the duties, which, as such, we owe to each other, and to our exalted head; it must be displeasing to Him and hurtful to us...The first Christian Churches were united. They corresponded, sympathized, and cooperated together. We have too long resembled the scattered bones of Ezekiel's Vision.

Because the idealists considered the Church as one in Christ, they tended to emphasize the points on which all Christians agreed, minimizing the points in which they differed. Greathed again wrote

What are the points of difference between real Christians, compared with the greatness of those objects in which we all agree?...We ask you, therefore, to treat your separate interests, as subordinate to the general cause of our Lord; to lay aside, so far as the occasion requires, the things in which we differ...

Stress, therefore, was placed on Christian experience shared by all evangelicals. "It is an affecting consideration to them who are brethren in Christ," Greathed wrote, "that, amidst all the diversity of their forms and opinions, there is a general and striking resemblance, both in their inward, and their outward experience." Therefore, by virtue of their oneness in Christ, Christian denominations were urged not only to cooperate with each other in a wide range of Christian activities, but, indeed, to sit with each other at a common communion table. John Mitchell Mason, the great American evangelical who was also instrumental in many of the pan-evangelical organizations established in

(1) S. Greathed, General Union Recommended to Real Christians (1798), p. viii f.
(2) Ibid. p. ix.
(3) Ibid. p. 33.
Britain, wrote

Communion is indisputably an act and expression of union. And it is on this very ground that the reciprocal communion of Christians and Christian churches is asserted to be their privilege and duty. They are united - they are one. They are one in interests infinitely more valuable, they are united in bonds infinitely more strong, than all the other interests which subordinate them.

The idealists did not immediately press for an organic union of the church. Rather, like Zinzendorf, who they greatly admired and read, they emphasized unity over uniformity. Greatheed again wrote

We aim at Union, not Uniformity; We wish to excite your zeal, not alter your opinions; We long to promote your love to all fellow Christians, not to lessen your attachment to those with whom you are immediately connected.

Nevertheless, in the process of cooperating with each other in various activities and sharing the same communion table, the idealists looked forward to the day when the Church would again be organically one. Significantly, Greatheed declared that the primary objective of the Bedfordshire Union of Christians which he founded in 1797, was to "restore the universal Church to some measure of its primitive harmony and unity;" only secondarily to spread the knowledge of the Gospel to the domestic heathen.

The second concept of pan-evangelicalism was a more 'realistic' or pragmatic one, because its adherents realized that a united Church in the eighteenth century was impractical and a dream only to be realized in the millennium. In 1802, for example, the Christian Observer

(1) J.M. Mason, A Plea for Catholick Communion in the Church of God (2nd edn. 1816), p. 355. This pamphlet was written many years before under the title "A Plea for Sacramental Communion on Catholick Principles."
(2) See Greatheed, op.cit. p. 74.
(3) Ibid. p. ix.
(4) Ibid. p. xvii.
remarked that evangelicals would.

rejoice to see the Church on earth resemble that which is in heaven, in unity as well as in holiness; but they have no hope, at this late period of the world, of reducing all its members to one model.

The realists were a denominationally diverse and unrelated group of 'regular' churchmen, Baptists, and Wesleyans. During the Revival, for reasons that we have mentioned, all three had established denominational perimeters which effectively served to insulate themselves from other evangelical denominations. Although they still shared with other evangelicals common spiritual experiences and theological beliefs, they desired to preserve their respective denominational identities. Christian unity, therefore, was not discussed by them in terms of inter-communion or organic union, but rather in terms of cordiality and candour. The Christian Observer urged that "the exercise of... forbearance, candour, and brotherly love, towards those who differ from [us]... so repeatedly and so forcibly inculcated in the New Testament" was more incumbent upon Christians of different denominations than the sharing of the sacraments. The Magazine continued: "and with respect to such of the Antisectarians, as belong to the Church of England, I have found them capable of acknowledging and honouring the piety found among Dissenters, without the least diminution of attachment to the constitution of their own church..." Unity, therefore, was primarily a unity of spirit. "Christian unity consists in having one heart: renewed, guided, sanctified by the same spirit,"

---

Daniel Wilson told the Eclectic Society, quickly adding that "uniformity is not necessary." In a similar vein, William Parry, a Nonconformist, wrote in the Protestant Dissenters Magazine

The spirit of Candour is the spirit of forbearance and gentleness towards all men; and of love towards all whom it can view as serious Christians. It might exist therefore among every denomination of professing Christians, without either of them giving up their own peculiar views; and its proper operation would be, to lead professors of Christianity to pursue and promote the cause of true religion, in connexion with their own denomination, according to their own views of it; while they let those of other denominations at full liberty to do the same, without upbraiding or censuring them for it. The prevalence of this true spirit of Candour would do more to eradicate a party spirit among Christians, than any heterogeneous union of persons of different views, which must always lay a foundation for mutual jealousies and suspicions.

Generally speaking, the realists were willing to participate with other evangelicals in a number of activities, but only if this participation did not compromise their denominational allegiances or theological beliefs. Respecting the sharing of pulpits, for example, Andrew Fuller, the Baptist closed communionist, wrote somewhat caustically

I have no partiality, certainly, for the Established Church. I believe it will come down, because it is inimical to the kingdom of Christ; yet I respect many Churchmen, and still shall not refuse preaching in their pulpits, provided I may go on in my own way.

Evangelical Anglicans also set limits to the degree in which they would cooperate with Dissenters and Methodists in pan-evangelical enterprises. If cooperation meant the formation of undenominational mission churches that might somehow prejudice the national establishment, they would

---

(2) Protestant Dissenters Magazine, 1798, p. 62. In this article, Parry was challenging Grecanhead's 'idealism.'
(3) A. Fuller, Works (1846), Part XVIII, p. 847 f.
demur and withhold their patronage, but if cooperation did not compromise church order, requiring them only to distribute Bibles without note or comment or tracts that portrayed universal Protestant truths, they would participate in pan-evangelical activities with as much zeal as anyone else. The realists, therefore, subscribed to pan-evangelicalism as long as it did not require them to overstep denominational boundaries or compromise theological principles. How these concepts of pan-evangelicalism worked in practice after 1790, is a matter that we must now discuss in more detail.

BOOK TWO

THE LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY

Here lies old Bigotry, abhor'd
By all that love our common Lord;
No more his influence shall prove
The torment of the son of love.

We celebrate with holy mirth
This monster's death, of hellish birth;
Ne'er may his hateful influence rise
Again, to blast our sacred joys.

Glory to God, we now are one,
United to one Head alone;
With undivided hearts we praise
Our God for his uniting grace.

Let names, and sects, and parties fall
Let Jesus Christ be all in all;
Thus, like the Saints above, shall we
Be one with each as one with thee.

Rowland Hill
Evangelical Magazine
June 1796
It is not surprising that the feelings of evangelical union finally took an institutional form in 1795. The time was propitious. The evangelical 'idealists' hoped that the fears aroused by the Jacobinical sermons of Bogue and Haldane had died away. On the Continent, the excesses of the Terror had come to an end and hopes were aroused that peace might be negotiated between Britain and Revolutionary France.

If fears were subsiding, hopes were still mounting; the millennial expectation was still in the ascendant, soon to be given new impetus by the spectacular descent of the French armies into Rome, the citadel of Anti-Christ.

Nor was it surprising that the first focus for a united evangelical front should be in foreign missions. The Revival was nothing if not mission-minded. There had been several tentative attempts to further the cause of foreign as well as home missions: the English Moravians had long contributed to the missionary enterprises of their church; Lady Huntingdon's Connexion had made an abortive attempt in 1772 to dispatch missionaries to the Cherokee Indians in Georgia; in 1783, Thomas Coke had drafted his famous "Plan for the Establishment of Missions among the Heathen."

Interest in the conversion of the heathen had been widely aroused in the publication of Captain Cook's Voyages, read by a large public including fascinated evangelicals who

(1) After reading Cook, for example, Thomas Haweis, future director of the London Missionary Society, set in motion a plan to send two students from the College at Trevecca to Tahiti. Haweis' plan was not interdenominational but,
quickly realized its significance for the extension of the Gospel. Hope had become actuality with the Baptist Missionary Society in 1792 and in 1793 with the Warwickshire Independent Association for the Spread of the Gospel at Home and Abroad, led by George Burder. The B.M.S. had been inspired in part by the injunction of Jonathan Edwards' *Humble Attempt* to carry the Gospel to the remotest parts of the earth; also by Cook's *Voyages*. Significantly, it had originally occurred to William Carey, one of the founders of the B.M.S., that foreign missions might be an interdenominational enterprise, but, as he later wrote in his missionary manifesto *An Enquiry into the Obligations of Christians, to use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens*, "if there is any reason for me to hope that I shall have any influence upon any of my brethren, and fellow Christians, probably it may be more especially amongst them of my own denomination." Carey went on to say that he did not mean to confine missions to any one denomination

Footnote contd.

as he told a friend in 1791, based on the hope "that the religion of our country as in the Church established may be the form there propagated." Bodl. Wilberforce MSS, d 17, f. 21; T.Haweis to J. Way, 30 Jan. 1791. Though Wilberforce and Sir Joseph Banks at least gave lip-service to the project, it finally foundered when the Archbishop of Canterbury refused to ordain Haweis' missionary candidates, ostensibly because they had not received a university education. Significantly, when the Missionary Society was founded several years later, their first missionaries were sent to the South Seas. See W. Ellis, *The History of the London Missionary Society* (1844) I, p. 6; E.A. Payne, *The Church Awakes* (1942), p. 105.

(1) Titles of the societies are hereafter contracted to their initials.

(2) The Warwickshire Association had been influenced by the Baptist Prayer Call. For a plan of the mission, see E.M. Dec. 1794, p. 509 f.
"but in the present divided state of Christendom, it would be
more likely for good to be done by each denomination engaging
separately in the work, than if they were to embark in
it cojointly." The Independent initiative of Burder and
his Warwickshire friends echoed Carey's view. Burder
wrote in 1793, that "though a union of different denominations,
in promoting any charitable end, appears in some respects
desirable, yet it may be granted by all who consider
attentively human nature, that an effect greatly superior
may be expected from each denomination working separately." 2
As we shall see, it was not until 1794, when Melvill Horne
penned his famous Letters on Missions, that evangelicals
began seriously to consider a joint response to the mission
call.

II. Melvill Horne and the Founding Fathers

It was Melvill Horne who openly discussed (for the first
time since Coke's premature Plan of 1784) the concept of
foreign missions in the context of pan-evangelicalism.
Formerly a Wesleyan itinerant preacher in the Wolverhampton
Circuit, Horne was ordained in 1786 to fill the curacy at

---

(1) W. Carey, An Enquiry (1792), p. 84. For an interesting
evaluation of this work, see E. A. Payne, An Enquiry (1961),
passim. Carey's position was incorporated into the
constitution of the B.M.S. on 2 October 1792, wherein
it was stated that "as in the present divided state of
Christendom, it seems that each denomination, by
exerting itself separately, is most likely to accomplish
the great ends of a mission. Cited in J. Ivimey, A History
of the English Baptists (1811-), IV, p. 65.

(2) Cited in I. Fletcher, "The Fundamental Principle of the
(1965) p. 224. See also E. A. Payne, Before the Start
Madeley left vacant at the death of John Fletcher, and later migrated to Olney, after serving a short stint in Africa as Chaplain of the Sierra Leone Colony. At Sierra Leone Horne faced a very difficult missionary situation. Baptists and Wesleyans not only refused to cooperate with Zachary Macaulay, the Anglican governor of the Colony, but incessantly competed with each other for converts, and seriously jeopardised whatever success the mission in Sierra Leone managed to achieve. The daily squabbles that plagued Horne's own work probably prompted him to write his famous *Letters on Missions: addressed to the Protestant Ministers of the British Churches*, published in 1794, fourteen months after his return to England.

The importance of Horne's *Letters* lay in the way they linked together the conceptions of mission and pan-evangelical unity, in a manifesto calling for joint missionary effort. In his advice to future missionaries, Horne wrote, "I would not have him indifferent to his own peculiarities, whether they respect the doctrines he receives as truth, or the points of ecclesiastical polity he considers as most friendly to religion; but I would have him

(1) Horne was subsequently the incumbent of Christ Church Macclesfield (1799-1810) in succession to David Simpson. From 1810 to 1814 he was Curate of West Thurrock in Essex and then Minister at Marazion in Cornwall. After serving as Curate of St. Stephens, Salford from 1818 to 1823, Horne became physically feeble and lived the rest of his life in retirement. Ironically, he never really patronized the L.M.S. except for one year (1797) as a director, but he was a prominent director of the C.M.S. when it was founded in 1799. See Hole, C.M.S. Hist. p. 632.

thoroughly sensible, that the success of his ministry
rests not on points of separation, but on those wherein
all godly men are united." Though the missionary should
remain faithful to the church he was ordained in, his message
to the heathen should be completely undenominational.

Therefore he

must be far removed from narrow bigotry, and possess a
spirit truly catholick. It is not Calvinism, it is not
Arminianism, but Christianity, that he is to preach. It
is not the hierarchy of the Church of England; it is not
the principles of Protestant Dissenters, that he has in
view to propagate. His object is to serve the Church
Universal.

Horne's conclusion was clear. "Let liberal Churchmen and
conscientious Dissenters," he wrote, "pious Calvinists and
pious Arminians, embrace with fraternal arms."

If evangelicals had not encountered Horne's work first
hand, they quickly learned about his ideas through a review
written by the Anglican Thomas Haweis, published in the

Evangelical Magazine for November 1794. We shall encounter

(1) M. Horne, Letters on Missions (1794), p. 60.
(2) Ibid.
(4) E.M. Nov. 1794, p. 467 f. See also A.S. Wood, Thomas Haweis
(1957), p. 192. The Evangelical Magazine, founded in 1793
by John Eyre, Matthew Wilks, Timothy Priestley and a group
of evangelical churchmen and Dissenters, was the inher­
tor of several earlier pan-evangelical journals; but
because it was committed to the idea of Moderate Calvinism,
it survived the kind of internal conflict that had plagued
the other publications. The 'Evangelical' was a fair
gauge of evangelical Nonconformist opinion as one of its
critics, Robert Southey, attested to. See J.W. Warter, ed.,
Selections from the Letters of R. Southey (1856), IV, p. 428.
According to Eyre, its circulation in 1803 was 12,000;
three years later it could claim 18,000 readers. See
F.E. Mineka, The Dissidence of Dissent (1944), p. 64 fn.
According to William Lovett, before the founding of the
L.M.S., the Magazine "had already done something towards
bringing into fellowship evangelical clergymen, Noncon­
formist ministers, and laymen of both sections." R.
Lovett, The History of the London Missionary Society (1899),
I, p. 10. Until 1810, it served unofficially as the
denominational journal for both Independents and Baptists.
After 1795, it also served as the house journal for the L.M.S.
Haweis frequently throughout the years to come. A Cornish
convert of Walker of Truro, Haweis had been a successful
though controversial curate at St. Mary Magdalen, Oxford
and thereafter occupied an anomalous position as both
Rector of Aldwinckle and chief trustee of the Countess of
Huntingdon's Connexion, which brought down upon his head
the censure of the Anglican Evangelicals like those of the
Christian Observer. But though Haweis was an unrepresentative
and somewhat isolated Evangelical, his position in the
movement towards evangelical unity was central. After
reading Horne's Letters and Haweis' review of them, John
Townsend, minister of the Independent church at Bermondrey,
said that he was "powerfully stimulated to desire that some
measure might be adopted to procure a simultaneous movement
of British Christians in this honourable service." Samuel
Greatheed, the Independent minister of Newport Pagnell,
even offered to contribute a sum of money towards the
founding of an undenominational missionary society.

The founders of the L.M.S. were for the most part
the 'idealists' of evangelical unity. It was not (as has
sometimes been supposed) the work of Anglican 'regulars,'
nor (as has also been alleged) was it exclusively the
inspiration of Independents, although they later predominated
its membership. Its sponsorship was broad. During the
Spring of 1794, a small group of evangelical Calvinists

(1) For Haweis' biography, see A.S. Wood, Thomas Haweis (1957).
(3) E. Ellis, The History of the London Missionary Society
    (1844), I, p. 16.
(4) See for example, C.I. Foster, An Errand of Mercy (1960),
    p. 65 f; A. Armstrong, The Church of England, the Methodists
    the L.M.S. "The London Missionary Society for Missions to
    Africa and the East." He is confusing it with the C.M.S.
met once or twice at the Dissenter's library Red Cross street in London, to discuss missions in general and Melvill Horne's *Letters* in particular. These men had been called together by the Anglican John Eyre, the Society's future Secretary. Eyre was also to play a pivotal role in the affairs of evangelical union. Like many of his type, he had a varied evangelical inheritance. At first an itinerant in Tavistock, he entered Lady Huntingdon's Connexion as a student and minister, moved on to Anglican orders after graduating from Emmanuel College, Cambridge, serving for a time as curate to the 'strict regulars' Cecil and Cadogan, and by now was editor of the undenominational *Evangelical Magazine*. The men who met with Eyre included Alexander Waugh, the Independent minister at Wells Street Chapel, John Love, the Presbyterian minister at Artillery Street, James Steven, the Presbyterian minister of Crown Court Chapel and Matthew Wilks, the Calvinistic Methodist minister at the Tabernacle. During the summer these meetings evolved into a regular fortnightly discussion which gradually grew in size and involved a larger number of men. But they did not as yet draw in David Bogue the prominent Independent from Gosport whom many historians believe to have founded the Missionary Society on his own initiative. Born in Berwickshire and educated

(1) The importance of Horne's *Letters* at these early meetings is made very clear by Matthew Wilks in a letter that he wrote many years later to the historian James Bennett. The letter (dated 22 August 1827) is in the possession of Miss Irene Fletcher, Librarian emeritus of the L.M.S.

(2) For biography of Eyre, see E.M., June 1803, p. 225 ff.

at the University of Edinburgh, Bogue came to England after a short Presbyterian ministry in Scotland to serve as the Independent minister at Gosport where, in 1780, he opened an academy for Independent ministerial candidates. Bogue had been converted to the foreign mission cause, but his conversion came from reading William Carey's Serampore letters in the summer of 1794, and not from reading Horne, like many others. Agreeing with Carey that missions should be denominationally organized, Bogue subsequently published in the **Evangelical Magazine** for September 1795 an article addressed "To the Evangelical Dissenters who Practice Infant Baptism" which, as its title suggested, called for a paedobaptist and Nonconformist missionary society to match the Baptist enterprise. But by November 1794 Bogue had been converted to the pan-evangelical cause in missions and he, together with the other London ministers, met at Baker's Coffee House to plan the new organization and to form its first committee.

By January 1795, the committee numbered amongst its members some of the most prominent Nonconformist ministers

---


(2) Apparently, some of the London ministers wanted Bogue to be excluded from planning the Society because they considered him to be a "high and overbearing man." But they were later overruled. See I. Fletcher, "The Fundamental Principle of the London Missionary Society," *Tr. Cong. Hist. Soc.*, XIX (1963), p. 225. For an account of Bogue's visit to Bristol and John Ryland's chapel, see Ellis, *op.cit.* p. 16; Lovett, *op.cit.* p. 802; W.C. Northcott, *Glorious Company* (1945), p. 17. Ryland's involvement in this meeting has led at least one historian to assume that he was one of the founding fathers of the L.M.S.; but this is incorrect. See J.T. Godfrey, *The History of Friar Lane Baptist Church* (1903), p. 218.

(3) *E.M.* Sept. 1794, p. 378 f.
In London. Besides many of the men whom we have already met, these included William Francis Platt, Independent minister of Holywell Mount Chapel, Joel Abraham Knight, Connexion minister at Spa Fields Chapel, John Towers, Independent minister at the Barbican, Thomas Williams, one-time Wesleyan but now an Anglican ordained member of Lady Huntingdon's Connexion, James Knight, the son of Titus Knight and Independent minister at Collier's Rent in Southwark, Joseph Brookbank, Independent minister at Haberdasher's Hall, and George Townsend, former member of Lady Huntingdon's Connexion but now pastor of the Independent chapel in Ramsgate. Though few colleagues from outlaying provincial areas could attend these early meetings, their support was none the less warm. Prominent evangelicals like William Roby, Independent minister at Canon Street Chapel in Manchester and Edward Williams then Independent minister at Carr's Lane Birmingham were only two of the more enthusiastic provincial patrons.

The first major task for the founding fathers was to solicit nation wide support for their mission. John Love was appointed on 8 January 1795 to prepare a letter for circulation in the London area, and this was also printed in the Evangelical Magazine. Love's letter was in part

(1) Based on attendance record (nine meetings or more) between 8 January 1795 and 8 September 1795. To this list must be added John Eyre, Matthew Wilks, and Alexander Waugh, L.M.S. Minutes, 8 Jan. - 8 Sept. 1795. Five of these men had attended the college at Trevecca. They included Eyre, Wilks, Platt, Williams and Townsend. Biographies can be found in J. Morison, The Fathers and Founders of the London Missionary Society (1839).

(2) E.M. Jan. 1795, p. 11. Other letters were written. See, E.M. April 1795, p. 160 f; Morison, Fathers and Founders (1844 edn), pp. xvii - xix.
a corrective to Bogue's call for a Nonconformist and paedobaptist missionary society, for it hoped that "not only Evangelical Dissenters and Methodists [and he did not exclude Baptists or Wesleyans] will be generally disposed to unite in instituting a society...but that members of the established Church, of evangelical sentiment, and of lively zeal for the cause of Christ, will also favour us with their kind cooperation."

As the founding fathers prepared for the first general meeting of the new society, they continued to approach influential evangelicals not only from London, but also from the provinces and even the Continent. It was apparent from the very beginning therefore, that unlike the Sunday School movement, the new missionary society was to be an international institution.

The activities of the first General Meeting of the L.M.S. in London the following September, and the sermons that were preached on the occasion, have been described too often to merit repetition here. Since this was the first time in recent memory that Dissenters and churchmen had joined together in an interdenominational enterprise, the occasion seems to have been an emotional one: one historian of the L.M.S. described David Bogue and John Eyre rushing into each others arms when they met at Spa Field's Chapel, an encounter which epitomized the reconciliation of Church and Dissent. The sermons aroused deep feeling and excitement. The preachers included Thomas Haweis, Rowland Hill, David Bogue,

(1) E.M. Jan. 1795, p. 11 f.
(2) Ellis, op.cit. p. 25.
Samuel Greatheed and others; but Bogue's sermon was the most dramatic by far. His famous homily on the 'Funeral of Bigotry' has been appreciatively remembered through the years, and its fame perhaps explains why it has so frequently been assumed that he alone was the moving force behind the Society's formation. In a classic expression of evangelical idealism, Bogue declared that henceforth 'bigotry was dead!'

We have now before us a pleasing spectacle, Christians of different denominations, although differing in points of church government, united in forming a society for propagating the Gospel among the heathen. This is a new thing in the Christian church...here are Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Independents, all united in one society, all joining to form its laws, to regulate its institutions, and manage its various concerns. Behold us here assembled with one accord to attend the funeral of bigotry: And may she be buried so deep that not a particle of her dust may ever be thrown up on the face of the earth.

The Evangelical Magazine records that the crowd's response to Bogue's words was "one general shout of joy;" such a scene, it reported, "was perhaps never before beheld in our world." Describing Bogue's sermon, one observer wrote

In the evening Reverend Mr. Bogue of Gosport preached in Tottenham Court Chapel...This was a great sermon. It was two hours within five minutes, and I suppose not an individual thought it too long. The chapel was quite full before it began...I understand that there were 270 ministers present.

But for the more sober minds at this gala occasion, Samuel Greatheed's sermon was perhaps more prophetic of the future of pan-evangelicalism in foreign missions. Greatheed told a similar audience

Blessed be God for the numerous assembly present, of those who preach, as well as those who hear the Gospel! Yet

(1) Sermons Preached in London at the Formation of the Missionary Society (1795), p. 130.
(3) C.M.S. Venn MSS. C7, acc. 81; W.Sumner to Mr.Elliot, 25 Sept. 1795.
(4) Sermons, op.cit. p. 64 f.
were so many others?...Whether prejudice or prudence separates them, as yet, from our assemblies, I trust they will, upon mature reflection, either do us the pleasure to unite with us, or the honour to follow us, as far as we are followers of Christ. If they do neither we cannot but grieve, for the honour of their Lord and ours.

Conspicuously absent at the meeting were a large number of evangelicals representing the Baptist, Wesleyan, and even Anglican churches. The L.M.S., for reasons that we shall examine, lacked denominational comprehensiveness even at this early and euphoric stage.

III. The Fundamental Principle and the Missing Denominations

(1) The Fundamental Principle

The foundation of the L.M.S. was not always greeted with enthusiasm, not even by some of those who professed to share the Reformed 'doctrines of grace' which it propagated. The Protestant Dissenters Magazine which largely reflected conservative and un-evangelical Nonconformist opinion, treated the Society circumspectly and even critically. One correspondent called for great "caution and prudence" in dealings with this new and "unnatural coalition of parties." The Hypercalvinists, who objected to 'indiscriminate' offers of grace, believed that God would convert the heathen by his own sovereign authority and that the L.M.S., as a merely human contrivance, lacked the "miraculous power" which was indispensable for the conversion of the

---

(1) The P.D.M. was published by the 'Ministers of the three Denominations,' though it did not claim to be the official organ of Dissent. Otherwise conservative theologically, its political liberalism was attributed to the (General) Baptist Joshua Toulmin who wrote for the magazine. See F.E. Mineka, The Dissidence of Dissent (1944) p. 70 f.

heathen. Far more dampening than criticism from those who who did not share the evangelical assumptions, was the lack of interest shown by some fellow evangelicals. The Particular Baptists, Wesleyans, and the 'regular' Anglican Evangelicals were notably absent from the meetings which founded the Society. It seemed that 'bigotry' was still alive; from its inception the L.M.S. was dominated by Calvinists, and indeed paedobaptist Calvinists, and so it remained. But was this the intention of the founding fathers? There is a good deal of evidence - which we shall now examine - that it was not and that a number of the founding fathers of what became the L.M.S. expected their society to comprehend and unite evangelicals of all kinds of denominational allegiance. Since the L.M.S. was the first of the four great pan-evangelical societies, and its creation deeply influenced the outlook of its successors, this question needs some discussion.

It has traditionally been assumed that the founding fathers (themselves Calvinists and paedobaptists) never hoped to win over Arminians like the followers of Wesley

(1) This was the opinion of Thomas Towle, the Hypercalvinist from Aldermanbury. See J. Stoughtor, Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges (1878), II, p. 346 fn. William Huntingdon expressed similar views. See J.R. Leifchild, John Leifchild (1863), p. 24. For Hypercalvinistic opposition in Scotland, see R. Hill, A Plea for Union (1800), passim.

(2) According to Irene Fletcher, contributions to the L.M.S. between 1 July 1796 and 20 June 1797, came from the following churches: 73 Independent churches in England (out of a possible 794), 5 Independent churches in Scotland, 1 Church of Scotland in Scotland, 1 Church of Scotland in London, 2 Anglican churches, 20 Scottish churches of unknown affiliation and 2 Scottish missionary societies. The Calvinistic Methodists and Lady Huntingdon's Connexion were probably included as Independents. See I. Fletcher, "The Formative Years of the London Missionary Society," (unpublished MS in L.M.S. Archives, 1961).

(3) This was in part George Cowie's argument in 1797, but
or Baptists, eventhough they anticipated heavy support from Anglican Evangelicals, the great majority of whom shared the theological assumptions of the founders. Perhaps hopes somewhat outran expectations; it may well be that the fathers of the L.M.S. were less optimistic about support from the Baptists than from the Wesleyans and Anglicans. Nevertheless, they pitched their aspirations higher than has generally been realized, and the customary view of the L.M.S. as a society designed merely for Calvinistic and paedobaptist Nonconformists needs some qualification.

This traditional interpretation has rested on four main premises. Firstly, it is pointed out that the Baptists and the Wesleyans did not participate in any of the events which led up to the Society's founding in 1795. Though this is mostly true, we cannot conclude on this evidence alone that the Calvinistic founding fathers did not intend or indeed desire Baptist and Wesleyan participation in the formative months of the Society's development. Secondly, because it has been mistakenly assumed by many historians that David Bogue founded the Society on his own initiative, his 1794 *Evangelical Magazine* article calling for a Nonconformist and paedobaptist response to the challenge of the B.M.S. has taken on undue significance as proof that Baptists and Anglicans were never intended to be welcome in the

Footnote contd

Cowie, a Presbyterian Seceder from Huntley, was trying to sell the L.M.S. to his Calvinistic colleagues. He therefore told them that the Arminians had been excluded. See Missionary Magazine, 1797, p. 448.

new society. But in fact, Bogue became involved in the founding meetings of the Society only after his article was printed by which time he had changed his mind and became an exponent of a more broadly based, pan-evangelical mission. Thirdly, it is often assumed that the L.M.S. was an Independent organization from the start. Though the Society indeed became this later on in the nineteenth century, it is erroneous to assume that it was originally intended to be so in 1795. Finally, and most plausibly, it is argued that since the Baptists and the Wesleyans had already launched their own respective missionary operations when the L.M.S. was founded, the architects of the new society intended only to design an organization for those evangelicals who did not yet have their own mission to patronize. We will discuss this point later, but in the meantime we must remember that in comparison to the L.M.S. the Baptist and Wesleyan missionary efforts were as yet minuscule. It is therefore not preposterous to suggest that the founding fathers of the L.M.S. hoped that their organization in some yet undetermined way, would unite the missionary activities of all the evangelicals.

Though it is extremely difficult to determine exactly how catholic the founding fathers initially intended their society to be, clues may be found in the Society's so-called 'Fundamental Principle' and, indeed, in what the fathers themselves said about their new organization. The Fundamental Principle of the L.M.S. was added to the Society's constitution in 1796. It was an irenic statement which set out to define the kind of mission that the Society would
establish in foreign lands. It said:

As the union of Christians of various denominations in carrying on this great work is a most desirable object, so, to prevent, if possible, any cause of future dissension, it is declared to be a fundamental principle of the Missionary Society, that its design is not to send Presbyterianism, Independency, Episcopacy, or any other form of Church Order, and Government, about which there may be differences of opinion among serious persons, but the glorious Gospel of the Blessed God, to the heathen; and that it shall be left (as it ought to be left) to the minds of the persons whom God may call into fellowship of His Son from among them to assume for themselves such form of Church Government as to them shall appear most agreeable to the Word of God.

It seems quite clear that the word 'denomination' was taken to mean ecclesiastical order and government. Thus Presbyterians, Independents, and Episcopalians would be sent into the mission field to establish whatever form of church government appeared to them most agreeable to the word of God. No doubt the founders assumed rather naively that once in the mission field, surrounded by a great multitude of heathens, such diversities of polity would seem irrelevant and insignificant. The Fundamental Principle, however, says nothing at all about divisions of theological principle. Consequently we are left unsure whether or not the framers of the Principle also meant the Society to send out Arminians as well as Calvinists and Baptists as well as paedobaptists, to preach the word of God in whatever way they thought best. This ambiguity, however, is partially cleared up by examining what the founding fathers themselves said about the catholicity of their new society.

In the first place, the founding fathers never declared

(1) L.M.S. Minutes, 9 May 1796. Controversy exists over who was responsible for this entry. Some credit it to Alexander Waugh, others to Thomas Haweis. See Morison, Fathers and Founders, II, p. 1; A.S. Wood, Thomas Haweis (1957), p. 208.
that their society was exclusively designed to send out Calvinistic and paedobaptist missionaries. Melvill Horne, an Arminian, called for a missionary effort that would embrace denominational as well as theological diversity; and it was close study of his tract that had originally brought the founding fathers to contemplate mission in pan-evangelical terms. Thomas Haweis, as we have seen, had echoed Horne's call in his *Evangelical Magazine* review. After the Society was established, the call for theological catholicity went on unabated. Christopher Sundius, himself a prominent Wesleyan layman and early director of the Society, wrote a letter to the evangelical brethren in Sweden proclaiming his hope for a general reconciliation between all evangelical denominations in Britain and praying that the L.M.S. would be instrumental in that realization.

Though acknowledging the existence of other evangelical missionary societies, the founding fathers called their organization "an extension" of the denominational plan and hoped that "all who hold the truth in love [will] unite in exertions which may hereafter be found extensively successful." What they said here about a foreign missionary union was repeated in their other printed works at this time and indeed by their practice in domestic missions. Perhaps the L.M.S. was never as completely pan-evangelical

---

(1) L.M.S. Home C. (1.5. A.): C. Sundius to the Swedish Brethren, April 1798.
(2) Printed circular in L.M.S. Scrapbook, Box A, f. 1.
(3) See for example, S. Greathed, *General Union Recommended to Real Christians* (1798); T. Haweis, *A Plea for Peace and Union among the Living Members of the Church of Christ* (1796); J. Eyre, *Union and Friendly Intercourse Recommended* (1798); R. Hill, *A Plea for Union* (1800); and many more.
as were the Tract, Bible, and Jews societies that grew out of it; but as far as the intentions of the L.M.S.'s founding fathers were concerned, this mattered little. If the L.M.S. failed to attract Baptist and Wesleyan patronage, the evangelical county unions and village itinerancy societies that sprang up in its wake did; since all of these branch organizations were largely established by the same men who founded the L.M.S., we may surmise that it was also originally intended to embrace theological as well as denominational diversity.

Finally, the first name of the L.M.S. was simply the 'Missionary Society.' It was not until 1818 that the Society officially changed its name to the less sweeping and inclusive title of the 'London Missionary Society.' If the founding fathers had intended to found a society only for Calvinists and paedobaptists, they would probably have called their new organization the 'Calvinistic Missionary Society,' or, following David Bogue's earlier suggestion, 'The Missionary Society for those who Practice Infant Baptism!' It is true that there was a party within the Society which, in 1796, tried to force on missionary candidates a Calvinistic and paedobaptist subscription of faith, but their position was soundly defeated in committee by vote of the directors present, and the subscription issue did not resurface again until the 1820s. After

(1) See Appendix A.
(2) Infra, p. 134.
(3) L.M.S. Minutes, 11 May 1796. Subsequently, the Baptist George Veeson and the Arminians John Cock and John Jefferson were sent out as missionaries. See S. Piggott, ed., An Authentic Narrative of four years Residence at Tongataboo (1815), passim; J.T. Godfrey, The History of Friar Lane Baptist Church (1903), pp. 227, 233; Lovett, L.M.S. Hist. I, p. 48.
1796, therefore, there was no reason to believe, at least from the viewpoint of most of the founding fathers, that the L.M.S. was anything but the missionary society for all evangelicals who wished to patronize it or who wished to serve it as missionaries. But if the invitation was freely given, there were unfortunately, reasons why many evangelicals could not accept.

(ii) The Missing Denominations

The Baptists, of course, were the least likely to patronize the L.M.S. By 1799, Carey, Marshman, and Ward, the 'Serampore Trio,' were firmly entrenched in India. Initially they had faced difficulties with the colonial government, but now their mission was beginning to bear fruit. At home, the B.M.S. seemed to be organizationally sound, due, no doubt, to the wise administration of Andrew Fuller. Despite some financial difficulties, there was no reason, at least from the Baptist perspective, why they would have wanted to establish a financial, let alone organic, liaison with the L.M.S. Nevertheless, some Baptists showed a great deal of interest in the L.M.S. when it was founded in 1795. Samuel Pearce, the catholic-minded open communionist, attended the first general meeting of the L.M.S., where he heard David Bogue preach his famous 'Funeral of Bigotry' sermon and he wrote back to his wife several days later: "You my love, will join me in a hearty amen to so evangelical a wish." As praise was given, so praise was received, and one year later

Pearce could tell Carey that "the London Society publicly owned that our zeal kindled theirs and that it was God who first touched your heart with the fire from His holy altar."

Unfortunately, much of this Baptist good-will was later misinterpreted by the directors of the L.M.S. Encouraged by open communionists like Pearce who shared with them some of their aspirations many L.M.S. directors hoped in 1795 either to establish some kind of informal liaison with the Baptist organization or, more realistically, to draw Baptists into the Society's affairs. Referring, for example, to instances in which paedobaptist denominations had supported the B.M.S. before and even after the L.M.S. was founded, Samuel Greatheed wrote to the Baptist John Sutcliffe in November 1795 a letter which hinted that there would surely be "some among your congregations who have the ability and disposition to help us..." But herein lay a misunderstanding that was to have serious repercussions in the future. The Baptists had meant their friendship to be a simple demonstration of Christian goodwill, not an encouragement for L.M.S. collectors to raise money in Baptist chapels as they would later do.

(2) As did George Osborne's Independent congregation at Angell Street Worcester. See B.M.S. Minutes, 10 March, 1795. Two years later, the L.M.S. would contribute money to supplement the salaries of Carey and Thomas. See L.M.S. Minutes, 28 Aug. 1797.
(3) L.M.S. MS Autograph Book: S. Greatheed to J. Sutcliffe, 3 Nov. 1795. Enclosed was the 'Plan' of the L.M.S. to be circulated by Sutcliffe among the Baptist churches.
Wesleyan patronage of the L.M.S., on the other hand, was much more within the realm of possibility. The Wesleyans (theoretically at least) had every reason to establish a liaison with the L.M.S. Their missionary organization (if indeed it could be called that) was still pitifully weak. It suffered not only from lack of Connexional interest, but also from Thomas Coke's administrative ineptitude. Furthermore, by 1795 most evangelicals wanted to extinguish for ever the last flickerings of the Calvinist Controversy. For several years now, Calvinists and Arminians alike had seen the controversy as an extremely unfortunate chapter in the history of the evangelical movement not only because it had almost destroyed the evangelical cause itself, but also because, as they now realized, it had been based on faulty theological premises. Moderate Calvinism, of course, had already done much to pave the way for reconciliation; there were now many indications that this would finally be achieved.

Perhaps the most significant development in this direction was the invitation to the Calvinists Rowland Hill, John Eyre, and Samuel Greatheed to preach at Wesley's

---

(3) In 1798, for example, the Independent church at Ipswich made the liberal decision of extending the right of 'occasional communion' to a Wesleyan. This was considered at the time a very "charitable decision." See J. Browne, *History of Congregationalism* (1877), p. 383. In reciprocation to a number of these early 'olive branches' the Wesleyans changed the name of the *Arminian Magazine* to the less objectionable *Methodist Magazine*. 
City Road Chapel in 1798. This was indeed a most remarkable invitation. Not a few of the City Road trustees would have remembered Rowland Hill's slanderous attacks on John Wesley not many years before, yet Hill was one of the men invited to preach. Of John Eyre's invitation, William Jay, the Independent minister from Bath, commented several years later "how it was wondered at, when Mr. Eyre of Homerton, of Calvinistic sentiments, was asked to preach at Mr. Wesley's Chapel in Moorfields, and preach without giving offence..." But it was not offence that Eyre and the others meant to give. Indeed, the reason why these men agreed to accept the invitation, was to lay the groundwork for a lasting peace between themselves and the Wesleyans and possibly to work out some sort of arrangement on missions.

Eyre's sermon entitled Union and friendly intercourse Recommended among such of the various denominations of Calvinists and Members of the late Mr. Wesley's Societies as agree on the essential truths of the Gospel, provides us with a good indication of the distance which Moderate Calvinism had come since the 1780s and how far Calvinists were willing to go in achieving reconciliation with their former enemies. Eyre not only suggested in his sermon that both parties could unite around the 'grand essential truths of the Gospel,' but even remarked that the Wesleyans

(1) The invitation came from Thomas Coke, John Pawson, Thomas Rankin, Adam Clarke, and others. The proceedings of the collection were to benefit the Protestant Dissenters School in Spitalfield. See E.M., April 1798, p. 161.
were really 'practical Calvinists!' But it is the preface to Eyre's sermon that most concerns us. Eyre prophesied that both parties could look forward to a new era of interdenominational cooperation when evangelical Christians would perhaps actively share in foreign missions. He wrote:

When the enemy of souls is uniting myriads under the banners of infidelity, for the purpose of destroying every principle religious and moral, a discourse recommending brotherly love and union to all who are truly alive to God, in the different denominations, needs no apology. Such an union has long been desired by many, both for the credit of religion, and the more effectual spreading of the important truths of the Gospel. That this is practicable, upon the principles mentioned by the author, can scarcely be doubted. It has, in a great degree, been effected by the cordial cooperation of persons of various denominations in promoting the objects of the Missionary Societies, and several subsequent institutions. The scale may yet be extended; and the circumstances in which the following discourse originated, and the favourable manner in which it was received, induce a hope that the period for accomplishing it is not far distant.

Reaction to the City Road sermons was interesting. Six months before the event, the Wesleyan John Pawson threatened to take 'sheep stealing' Calvinistic preachers to court unless they stopped taking collections for the L.M.S. among his people. Just after the City Road sermons, however, Pawson's mind had changed considerably; indeed, it now appeared to him "that many of the Calvinist ministers were weary of contending for opinions" and that they were willing "to acknowledge us as brothers, to love and esteem us, and to strengthen not weaken our hands." Pawson even wanted Connexion to observe a day of solemn prayer and fasting to celebrate the occasion, but was not sure how

(2) Ibid, p. 5. Underlining my own.
to bring this about. For Pawson and other Wesleyans, however, a 'union of brotherly affection' meant only the occasional sharing of pulpits, certainly not (as Eyre and some of the other L.M.S. people might have thought) a sharing of missions.

The Missionary Society's greatest disappointment, however, came when regular Evangelical churchmen failed to give it their patronage. Unlike the Baptists and the Wesleyans, there was really no theological barrier to Evangelical Anglican participation. Evangelical churchmen, of course, practiced infant Baptism, and, with several important exceptions, almost all of them were Calvinists. In 1795 they did not have their own missionary society. The fears which Evangelicals had entertained in the early years of the French Revolution, that Dissenters were Jacobins and republicans, had - or so the fathers of the L.M.S. hoped - died away by 1795, for many Nonconformists had now publicly disowned their pro-French sympathies. It was therefore difficult for them to understand why so

(1) M.C.A. Pawson Papers: J. Pawson to J. Benson, 9 April 1798.

(2) In their enthusiasm for reconciliation, the Calvinists had seriously underestimated the internal cohesiveness of the Wesleyan denomination. Indeed, if there was an ecumenical thrust within Wesleyanism, it was directed not towards the Calvinistic Nonconformists, but towards the Church of England. Thomas Coke, for example, who had proposed the interdenominational missionary plan in 1783, would never have underwritten a union with the L.M.S. at this time because in 1798 he was secretly negotiating with William Wilberforce a reunion of the Wesleyan Connexion with the Church of England. He probably knew that any kind of liaison with the Dissenters would have prejudiced his cause with Evangelical churchmen. See Bodl. MSS Wilberforce, d 17, f. 129; c 3, Fols. 39, 43; T. Coke to W. Wilberforce, March 1798, 26 March 1798, 3 Nov. 1798. Also, Vickers, op.cit. pp. 202-204.
many of their Evangelical brethren in the Church of England, resisted repeated invitations to join the L.M.S.

Of course, there had been from the beginning, and would continue to be, a small number of 'left wing' Evangelical churchmen who patronized the Society; but their influence and prestige in the Anglican world was not very extensive. Rowland Hill, for example, belonged really more to a denomination of his own than to the Anglican church in which he had been ordained a deacon. Educated at St. Johns College, Cambridge, from which he graduated in 1769, Hill was refused ordination by six bishops in succession because of his irregular activities while a student. Not until 1773 did he receive ordination to the deaconate by Dr. Wills, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and he never proceeded to the priesthood. In 1773 he was curate in Somerset though he spent most of his time itinerating, and in 1783 the proprietary Surrey Chapel was erected for him, where he remained the rest of his life as a prominent, though eccentric, London preacher. Thomas Haweis and John Eyre, who we have already met with, both served as parish clergy, but they owed their allegiance as much to Lady Huntingdon as to the Church of England. Apart from these three, there was little firm Anglican support. Men like George West, Rector of Stoke-next-Guildford and William Winkworth, Chaplain at St. Saviours, London, both Anglican priests, only played peripheral roles in the Society's early development. Melville

Horne was a director for one year (1797) and preached an occasional sermon for the Society, but his efforts were re-directed to the C.M.S. when that organization was founded in 1799. So, from the very beginning, the L.M.S. fought an uphill battle to win Evangelical Anglican support for the pan-evangelical cause in foreign missions. As we shall see, the battle was largely lost by the turn of the century.

One month after the L.M.S. was officially incorporated, four directors, including John Eyre and Thomas Haweis, were appointed a committee and charged with the responsibility of asking prominent Evangelical clergy and laymen for their much needed assistance. Sir Richard Hill, Rowland's brother, and Henry Thornton, the rich Anglican merchant and M.P. for Southwark, were subsequently considered for directorships, but for some reason, both men turned the offer down. Thomas Robinson, Vicar of St. Mary's Leicester, told J.C. Bicknell, the Independent minister from Welford who was soliciting his patronage, that though he was a "friend to the cause" he could not collect money for the

(1) Other clerical directors of the L.M.S. between 1795 and 1800 were George Campbell Brodbelt, Incumbent of Loudwater Bucks., David Jones, Rector of Llangan, and John Walker, Fellow of Trinity College Dublin and a future leader of the Walkerites. This list must be extended to include Thomas Pentycross, Rector of St. Mary's Wallingford and Thomas Wills, one-time Chaplain to Lady Huntingdon and an itinerant preacher. Neither of these men were directors, but they did play a very influential role in the Society's early development.

(2) L.M.S. Minutes, 5 Oct. 1795; 11 Jan. 1796.

(3) L.M.S. Minutes, 9 Nov. 1795.
Society owing to several 'circumstances' none of which were mentioned. Approaches to the nobility proved equally unfruitful. In 1799, Thomas Haweis and George Cowie, the Seceder from Huntley in Scotland, presented the King's librarian with a copy of the Society's first missionary journal, but with no apparent effect on the King. The same presentation was made to the Earl of Liverpool, extracting from him a more hopeful promise that he would be happy "to render the society any service in his power," but this appears no more than a polite courtesy, for we hear nothing more from him in Society correspondence or minutes. Perhaps the Duchess of Beaufort best represented the feelings of Anglican nobility when her secretary told the L.M.S. some years later, that "tho' she feels the warmest interest in the proceedings of the Society, she fears she must confine herself to prayers for its success..."

Four reasons may be suggested why Evangelical churchmen were reluctant to patronize the L.M.S. Firstly, the divisive effects of the French Revolution on evangelical unity lingered on as late as 1795 and even beyond. As war with France continued, 'regulars' like William Wilberforce

(1) L.M.S. Home C. (1.2.A); J. Bicknell to M. Wilks, 18 Dec. 1795. Robinson also turned down an invitation to preach for the Society the following year. L.M.S. Minutes, 12 Dec. 1796. It was probably Robinson's political suspicions that would not allow him to patronize the L.M.S. See Supra., p. 49.

(2) L.M.S. Minutes, 29 April 1799. The King was warned about this deputation by the Anti-Jacobin Review who said that the design of the L.M.S. was to undermine Church and State. See Anti-Jacobin Review, Nov. 1799, p. 360.

(3) L.M.S. Minutes, 15 May 1799.

(4) L.M.S. Minutes, 20 June 1825.
remembered the days of 1789 when Dissenters like David Bogue and Robert Haldane espoused 'republican' ideals; even though both men had disowned the Revolution by 1795, suspicion was still strong enough to preclude much regular Anglican patronage, for churchmen still believed that the Society contained too many anticlerical republicans. Even some of the Anglican assistance afforded the new missionary society appears to have been given for dubious motives. In 1796, for example, Robert Haldane, David Bogue, Greville Ewing and William Innes decided that they would establish a mission at Bengal. Haldane sold his estate at Airthrey in Scotland, and with the proceeds, the men approached Henry Dundas, the President of the Board of Control of the East India Company for his permission to build a mission on company property. Wilberforce had apparently agreed to give the missionaries a character reference, but when asked by Dundas for his personal opinion of the project, he remarked (apropos of Haldane)

It is on your own grounds the best thing you can do. In Scotland such a man is sure to create a ferment. Send him, therefore, to the back settlements to let off his pistol in vacuo.

With such an ambivalent recommendation, the application, needless to say, was turned down.

Secondly, recent Anglican experiences with Nonconformist missionaries in Sierra Leone, had been unfortunate, and Zachary Macaulay, the Colony's Evangelical governor, had a low opinion of the Baptist missionaries Grigg and Rodway. One was young and feeble and had to be sent home almost immediately; the other became heavily involved in Freetown

(1) Cited in Hole, C.M.S. Hist., p. 156.
politics and had to be extradited. The L.M.S's own Foolah Mission in 1797 only confirmed Macaulay's prejudices concerning the immaturity of the early Nonconformist missionaries. Macaulay at first agreed to lend his advice and assistance to the Society's two agents Alexander Russell and George Cappe, but their "improper conduct and unchristian spirit" once they arrived in Freetown proved a heavy burden to Macaulay and his chaplain, and an extreme embarrassment to the L.M.S.

Thirdly, eventhough 'regular' Evangelical churchmen were prepared to cooperate with Dissenters in projects which did not involve communal worship, many questioned the propriety of assisting in the establishment of undenominational mission churches. Some feared that Nonconformist control of the Society would ultimately prejudice mission churches in favour of a congregational form of church government. Others feared that the undenominational principle, by its vagueness, would encourage a disintegration of church order and lead to anarchy and indiscipline.

(2) L.M.S. Minutes, 25 Sept. 1797; 1 May 1798.
(3) The fear that undenominational churches would become congregational in polity had some basis. At least in the South Seas, most of the mission churches established by the L.M.S. quickly became partly congregational and partly Presbyterian. See _Congregational Magazine_, April 1831, p. 212.
(4) See N. Goodall, _A History of the London Missionary Society_ (1954), p. 3 ff. Goodall defends the L.M.S. against this charge. Richard Cecil told Thomas Haweis at an Eclectic Society meeting, that "in an established church the missionaries are less in danger of being wired up into a little sect by private opinion." Cited in M.M. Hennell, _John Venn and the Clapham Sect_ (1958), p. 235. For more material on why Evangelical churchmen would not join the L.M.S., see W. Goode, _A Memoir of the Late_
The sensitivity of the 'regular' churchmen to issues of church order later became apparent in the embarrassing relationship between the C.M.S. and its Lutheran missionaries.

There was a third reason for the unwillingness of Evangelicals to be drawn into the affairs of the L.M.S. in 1795. In that year, Joseph Jane, the Evangelical Vicar of St. Mary Magdalen, Oxford, gave £4000 toward the founding of an Evangelical missionary society. Consequently, a group of Evangelical clergymen, including Jane himself, met at Rauceby to lay the foundations for what would later become the Church Missionary Society. Though it was not until 1799, when the project was passed on to the Eclectic Society in London, that Jane's dream became a reality, many Evangelical churchmen were no doubt aware of the Rauceby meetings in 1795 and preferred to defer their work for foreign missions until their own Church society was in being.

Footnote Contd.


(3) Norman Sykes and others are incorrect in saying that the Church Evangelicals withdrew from the L.M.S. when the C.M.S. was formed in 1799. With one or two exceptions, most of the 'regulars' were previously uninvolved in mission support except as occasional contributors to several societies including the L.M.S. After 1799, however, several 'regulars' held joint directorships
Though several L.M.S. Anglicans participated in the Eclectic Society discussions which ultimately led to the founding of the C.M.S., they did so largely in order to protest against a fresh organization which would rival their own. Thomas Haweis, at one Eclectic Society meeting, said that though a loyal Anglican, he feared that the formation of an Evangelical Church missionary society would diminish any chance that the bishops would bestow patronage on his own society. Rowland Hill, on the other hand, could not understand why his Church friends wished to form a new missionary society when one already existed; and when they finally committed themselves to the C.M.S. in 1799, he felt that he had been betrayed and deserted by them. Not all evangelicals, however, saw an implied rivalry between the C.M.S. and the L.M.S. Thomas Chalmers, the great Church of Scotland evangelical said that he liked

Footnote Contd.

in both organizations. See N. Sykes, "Ecumenical Movements in Great Britain in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," in A History of the Ecumenical Movement ed. by R. Rouse and S.C. Neill (1954), p. 166. One close friend of either John or Henry Venn said, after describing the first general meeting of the L.M.S., that "if my dear honored friend Mr. Venn had been present he would have been ready to have said Lord now let us thou thy servant depart in peace for mine eyes have seen the commencement of the latter day glory." John did not attend the meeting, but Henry, who was then very ill, would probably also have stayed away. C.M.S. MSS Venn C 7, acc. 81: W. Sumner to Mr. Elliot, Sept. 1795.

(1) See Hennell, op.cit. p. 234. In a letter to Thomas Scott, Haweis lamented that "all Christians foreign as well as my countrymen cannot unite in one great object... If only all the zealous ministers of the Church of England had united with the London Missionary Society, how large a region would have been opened, if they chose to take the right hand, & their brethren the left, C.M.S. General C. (G.AC.3.1) f. 39: T. Haweis to T. Scott, 15 Nov. 1800.

(2) E. Sidney, The Life of the Rev. Rowland Hill (1834), p. 177. Hill said "ours is a missionary society for all: why leave us?"
to see "the experiments multiplied and diversified in every conceivable way" and welcomed the C.M.S. as a friend 1 and partner of the L.M.S. Yet it must have been lamented by some of the more idealistic exponents of evangelical union that their great plan for a pan-evangelical foreign missionary society would never be as comprehensive in membership as it set out to be. Baptists and Wesleyans and now even 'regular' churchmen had gone their separate ways, leaving the L.M.S. incomplete in its denominational representation. The next three decades of the Society's history, therefore, were to be years of a half-realized ideal, but the story of the pan-evangelical impulse in foreign missions, as we shall see in the next chapter, was not yet over.

IV. The Society in Action: An Interlude

Even though the L.M.S. was never able successfully to establish a comprehensive evangelical union in foreign missions, its success as a missionary organization in its own right and its influence over future pan-evangelical operations, must not be underestimated. The size of the Society and the scope of its activities made it one of the largest missionary enterprises in Britain. Domestically, it attracted the support of a high proportion of the important paedobaptist and Calvinistic Dissenters in the Kingdom: no less than 850 prominent evangelical ministers and laymen served as directors of the Society between 1795

(1) W. Hanna, Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers (1849-), III, p. 193.
and 1830. These men built up a network of auxiliary missionary societies which by 1830 linked evangelicals together from Scotland to Cornwall. In Europe, the Society's example inspired similar organizations which maintained strong ties with London. The first Continental societies were the Netherlands and Swedish Missionary Societies, founded shortly after the L.M.S., and they were followed by others in Basel, Berlin and Paris. The movement spread to the United States in 1796 with the creation of the New York Missionary Society. In the mission field itself, the L.M.S. by 1820 had established fifty stations manned by 140 missionaries. By 1830, L.M.S. missionaries had brought Christianity to every continent on the globe; to Capetown in South Africa and Travancore in India as well as obscure and little known places like Eimeo in the Society Islands and Great Namaqualand in Africa.

The impact of the L.M.S. on the pan-evangelical ideal was important; it was the first major attempt at pan-evangelicalism on a large scale in Britain and it therefore set the pace and example for similar associations. Indeed, the Tract and Jews societies directly owed their foundations to the L.M.S.; the Bible Society indirectly. Its network of auxiliary societies, constantly in contact with each other and with the parent society in London, brought thousands of Christians into practical and spiritual

(1) See Appendix B.
harmony. Unity was also nurtured in London each year when Society directors and patrons from all over the country, attended its anniversaries. Unfortunately not much is recorded of the spirit of fraternity within the domestic operations of the L.M.S. As is so often the case, when a movement flourishes, its successes and achievements are taken for granted; only when it faces controversy, are its failures examined in detail. Nevertheless, there are several instances on record which demonstrate how pan-evangelicalism in the L.M.S. reached out to the larger church. In the early years of the Society, for example, its directors frequently participated in the ordination of Society missionaries. In the case of the missionaries John Jefferson and John Eyre (no relation to the Anglican Secretary), the Evangelical Magazine reported that "two such ordinations have seldom occurred, in which Episcopalians, Seceders, Antiburghers, Presbyterians, Independents and Methodists all united." This encouraged the directors of the Society also to take part in the ordinations of their other colleagues. Thus when Sir Egerton Leigh was set aside for an itinerant ministry, the Anglican John Eyre joined in his ordination service with the Calvinistic Methodist J.A. Knight and the Independent George Burder. At the Society's anniversary of 1799, the directors took a critical step and initiated a communion service at the end of Missionary Week; perhaps the first time in recent memory that Anglicans and Dissenters

had sat at the same communion table. The service at Haberdasher's Hall, performed by twelve ministers, included the Anglicans Thomas Haweis, William Cooper and George Hamilton, besides an interdenominational group of Dissenters. The Evangelical Magazine thus reported this memorable event:

About fifty ministers were among the communicants. Such a solemn, delightful season, had seldom been known... It was highly gratifying, to behold ministers and brethren of the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent, and Methodist denominations, uniting as one body in Christ, to eat of the same bread, and drink of the same cup... May we not hope that this example of liberality will excite multitudes at home and abroad to unite in the same manner, and that the members of the whole church of Christ on earth, thus living in peace, shall enjoy the presence of the God of Peace among them.

Indeed, this hope was realized in the founding of several union chapels in the early years of the nineteenth century like that opened in Islington in 1806 by the Anglican Henry Gauntlett, the Independent David Bogue, and the Presbyterian Benjamin M'Dowell - all three associated with the L.M.S.

It was perhaps in its foreign operations, that the L.M.S. contributed most to Christian union. Since it is not within the scope of this thesis to discuss at length pan-evangelicalism outside Britain, we have not been able to do justice to the creative impact of the Society in this field. But others have. As Norman Goodall points out, the L.M.S., through its 'fundamental principle,' did much to

(1) E.M. June 1799, p. 252. The following year, the service, attended by 100 communicants, was held at Sion Chapel where it became an annual event during Missionary Week.
(2) See T. Lewis, A Retrospect of the Moral and Religious State of Islington, during the last forty years (1842), p. 51; J. Leifchild, Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Lewis of Islington (1863), passim.
provide an environment in which the great 'union' churches of North and South India, China, and Malagasy could later develop and flourish. So too, it was partly because of the L.M.S. and its links with the various Continental missionary societies, that Christians saw, perhaps for the first time in the history of the church, the possibility of universal peace based on international pan-evangelicalism. This hope led directly to the founding of the Society for the Promotion of Permanent Peace. But it was the individual efforts of the missionaries themselves that deserve special praise and recognition here. Isolated from Britain, often in foreign lands hostile to their ministries, the missionaries from virtually all of the societies found a very real and vital Christian union in their common successes and failures, joys and sorrows. The stories of interdenominational fellowship in the mission stations that dotted the world (several of which we will allude to in the next chapter) are touching and place in a proper perspective the relative unimportance of subsequent interdenominational strife at home. Nevertheless, though the achievements of the L.M.S. were inestimable, the Society faced many formidable problems not only in its relationship with other missionary societies, but indeed, with its own members. Bearing in mind, therefore, the great achievements which flowed from the Society, we must now turn to a critical examination of its domestic operations.

(2) See The Substance of a Pamphlet Entitled A Solemn Review of the Custom of War (1822), p. 18; D. Bogue, On Universal Peace (1819), passim. 'Universal Peace' was also an important aspect of millennial prophecy.
Chapter Four: The External Relations

I. Introduction

The L.M.S., unlike most of the pan-evangelical societies that we shall examine, was never able entirely to fulfill within itself the dream of pan-evangelical unity. From the very beginning, it had to coexist with other evangelical missionary societies. As a result, part of the history of the movement towards evangelical unity must necessarily concern itself with the external or inter-societal relations between the L.M.S. and its 'competitors.' Yet this competition was always qualified: there was a movement after 1800 to reunite the evangelical foreign missionary societies either organically or into a federation of independent societies. We shall therefore examine in two areas, the history of the relations of evangelical missionary groups. The first will deal with the way in which the L.M.S. after 1800 managed (or mismanaged) its affairs with other similar societies. The second will examine the continual pressures from within the individual societies to promote the kind of pan-evangelical cooperation that the L.M.S. had disappointingly failed to accomplish in 1795.

The history of the L.M.S.'s external relations with other missionary societies between 1800 and 1830, falls into three periods which are roughly co-terminous with the first three decades of the nineteenth century. The first decade was primarily marked by cordial relations between the L.M.S. and its sister organizations, but by a cordiality that was superficial. Even by 1800, the L.M.S. gave the impression that it had not quite accepted the fact that it was not, after all, the missionary society for all evangelicals.
Consequently it began to take missionary collections in Baptist, Wesleyan, and Anglican churches, a levy which aroused some opposition. The second decade of the century, therefore, was largely a period of rather unfriendly competition between the L.M.S. and the other societies for patronage. This competition, needless to say, greatly damaged inter-societal relations so that even the rather formal expressions of good-will that had marked the previous decade, seemed by 1810 to have waned. The third decade of the nineteenth century, however, marked a surprising return to the cordiality of former years for reasons that we will examine. Yet by 1830, the L.M.S. was predominantly a Congregational society that finally saw itself as one among a number of denominational organizations. It therefore stopped meddling in the affairs of its rivals, and lived at peace rather than in conflict with them. Nevertheless, throughout the thirty years between 1800 and 1830, some idealists, together with pragmatists who had been in the mission field and had seen the drawbacks of four evangelical societies working at cross-purposes with each other, continued to search for a compromise that would unite in some form the common concerns of all the organizations. But even in this, as we shall see, they were largely unsuccessful.

II. The L.M.S. and the Other Societies

(1) The Baptist Missionary Society

Relations between the L.M.S. and the B.M.S. during the first decade of the nineteenth century were cordial. Since William Carey and his colleagues were well established in
India by 1800, their information and encouragement, while the L.M.S. planned its own Indian mission, was gratefully received. In 1801, for example, Carey told the directors of the L.M.S., that he was very busy in the Baptist mission and that there was work "for a thousand more." When the L.M.S missionaries George Cran and August Des Granges arrived in India four years later, Carey told them that "no difference of opinion respecting any of the ordinances of the Gospel will be permitted to interrupt our Christian union and fellowship," and hoped "that you will write in the most frank and unreserved manner, and permit us to participate in your joys and your sorrows, that by mutual counsel we may animate each other in the work of the Lord." Since the Serampore Baptists practiced open communion at this time, the missionaries from both societies would often sit at the same communion table and worship together. Cooperation on the home front was equally cordial. Baptists frequently appeared at L.M.S. anniversaries as official representatives of their society, and the L.M.S. reciprocated. Literature freely flowed back and forth between the two societies. The L.M.S. sent all their general circulars to the B.M.S. and its missionaries and the Baptists did likewise.

The end of the first decade of the nineteenth century

(1) L.M.S. Minutes, 10 Aug. 1801.
(2) Cited in W. Innes, Remarks on Christian Union (1811), p. 36 f.
(3) As did Joseph Hughes (1798, 1799 and 1810), John Rippon (1798 and 1801), John Ryland (1803), and Andrew Fuller (1803). See E.M. June 1798 - 1810; Missionary Magazine and the Missionary Register also record these visits.
however, witnessed some deterioration in Baptist-paedobaptist relations and this in turn damaged goodwill between the two societies. In 1810 Thomas Haweis had made some serious accusations about Baptist 'sheep-stealing' in an Evangelical Magazine article, and this led to an indignant walk-out by the Magazine's Baptist contributors, and the subsequent re-founding of the Baptist Magazine. Since Haweis and most of the contributors of the Evangelical Magazine were also L.M.S. directors, the affair affected relations between the L.M.S. and the B.M.S. It was now that Andrew Fuller, who for years had been agitating for a return to a closed communion table, finally got his way, and from 1812 on, most Baptists, in Britain as in the mission field, ceased sharing their table with paedobaptists. Robert Hall, himself a Baptist

(1) For Haweis' article entitled "The Present State of Evangelical Religion," see E.M. Supplement 1810, pp. 505-506 wherein he wrote "the Particular Baptists have greatly enlarged their numbers, not perhaps so much from the world, by awakenings of conscience in new converts, as from different congregations of Dissenters and Methodists." But the controversy also involved the doctrine of Baptism which until 1810, had been judiciously avoided by the Magazine. After 1810 it began publishing anti-Baptist articles to the great dismay of Andrew Fuller. See L.M.S. Home C. (2,5.A.): A. Fuller to G. Burder, 17 July, 1810. Both of these issues precipitated the Baptist walk-out in 1812. See E.M. Preface, 1812; Baptist Magazine, May 1814, pp. iv, 209 f; Angus Fuller Letters: A. Fuller to C. Anderson, 31 Dec. 1811, 27 Jan. 1812 wherein Fuller describes the refounding of the Baptist Magazine, Cf. J. Ivimey, A History of the English Baptists (1811-), IV, p. 117 ff.

(2) In 1812, for example, Fuller told William Ward "we have no quarrel with the Evangelical Magazine and mean to have none. But they are extremely jealous and envious; and The Society, of which it is the organ, are in my opinion on the road to ruin." Angus Fuller Letters: A. Fuller to W. Ward, 15 July, 1812.

(3) Fuller wrote to Ward, "there have been many speeches abroad about your returning to Strict communion. Rowland Hill has propagated through the country that it was in consequence of orders from Fuller..." Angus Fuller Letters: A. Fuller to W. Ward, 17 Nov. 1812. But it was indeed
and an advocate of open communion, lamented this decision, and said that though he had the highest esteem for the Baptist mission in India, he could not "but feel some alarm for the consequences of the fact being known to the heathen world, that they form a separate caste from their fellow Christians."

Two other irritating problems further exacerbated an already fragile relationship between the two societies. First there was the question of the missionary collections being taken by L.M.S. fund-raisers among the Baptists. During the first decade of the century, the L.M.S. had been very careful not to do this. When the L.M.S.'s first ship, the Duff, was captured by French privateers in 1799, and the Society launched a massive campaign to cover the financial loss, George Lambert, the Independent minister from Hull, checked himself from calling for a collection at an interdenominational prayer meeting because he was on Baptist premises, and realized that the Baptists were understandably "rather inclined to support their own mission." After 1810, however, L.M.S. collectors were not so reluctant to go after Baptist money. Whether

Footnote Contd.


(1) R. Hall, The Duty and Importance of Free Communion (n.d.), p. 42. For a paedobaptist reaction to the Baptist decision, see J.M. Mason, A Plea for Catholick Communion in the Church of God (2nd ed. 1816), pp. viii – ix. This was the reprint of a pamphlet published several years before.

(2) L.M.S. Home C. (1? A.); G. Lambert to J. Eyre, 6 Aug. 1799. Samuel Pearce also refused to "preach a begging sermon" in an Independent meeting. Angus Pearce Letters; S. Pearce to wife, 29 Jan. 1798.
or not the L.M.S. thought that previous paedobaptist support of the B.M.S. justified this practice is uncertain, but it nevertheless provoked the wrath of Andrew Fuller who complained that the leaders of the L.M.S. were greatly driven for money; and betake themselves to strange means to obtain it. We have never pushed collections; but they have increased of their own accord, and go on to increase; especially in our own denomination.

The second problem of this period involved what we shall call 'the problem of the Baptist convert.' A number of L.M.S. missionaries, after baptizing countless numbers of adult native converts, announced their own conversion to the doctrine of adult baptism and migrated to the Baptist mission. While this naturally delighted the B.M.S. which gained seasoned missionaries at the expense of its rival, it distressed the L.M.S. The problem of the Baptist convert commenced early in the century and continued to plague relations between the two societies long after. In 1800, for example, Andrew Fuller somewhat gleefully told William Ward that Spence Broughton, one of the L.M.S.'s first missionaries had "fallen into the water, and has offered himself for joining you." Another L.M.S. missionary, Gottlob Brückner, changed his sentiments on baptism in 1816 while in Java, and offered his services to the Baptists. An indecisive series of exchanges took place between the two societies before Brückner was unilaterally received

Partly as a result of these frictions, the societies 'boycotted' each others' anniversaries throughout most of the second decade of the century and had as few dealings with each other as possible. Then, suddenly, in 1820, the L.M.S. asked William Ward, on leave from Serampore, to preach at their annual meeting. The B.M.S. reciprocated two years later by inviting William Jay, the famous Independent pastor of Argyle Chapel in Bath and a director of the L.M.S., to preach at their anniversary, thus re-commencing a pattern of reciprocal invitations that continued beyond our period. This was indeed a surprising turn of events, but events which had taken place as early as 1818 had begun to pave the way for reconciliation. In 1818, the L.M.S. decided to change its title to the less presumptuous 'London Missionary Society.' Andrew Fuller had always disliked the arrogance of the Society's title; if alive his animus would have been abated. In 1819 was founded

(1) L.M.S. Minutes 11, 18 Nov. 1816; 16 Dec. 1816. Cf. B.M.S. Minutes, 31 Dec. 1816. Such also was the case of a Mr. Harle, an L.M.S. missionary in Calcutta, who changed his sentiments on Baptism. In this instance, John Dyer, the B.M.S. Secretary, personally requested Harle's release from the L.M.S. See L.M.S. Minutes, 28 Oct. 1822.

(2) Baptist Magazine, July 1822, p. 305 fn.

(3) B.M.S. Minutes, 21 June 1822. B.M.S. platform tickets at their anniversary in 1825 included the following L.M.S. directors: George Burder, John Arundel, Alexander Waugh, George Clayton, Spedding Curwin, George Collison, Mathew Wilks and many others. B.M.S. Dyer Papers f. H/7(1825).

(4) Writing about the L.M.S., J.C. Marshman said: "The Society took the designation of The Missionary Society, and Mr. Fuller was accustomed, when alluding to it, to write the word THE in capital letters, and many facetious remarks did he make, in his letters to Serampore, on the pride which 'lurked under the definite article.'" J.C. Marshman, The Life and Times of Carey, Marshman, and Ward (1859), I, p. 395.
the London Secretaries Association which brought the various missionary society secretaries together for monthly discussion on mission-related topics, and provided for the various societies a much needed channel of communication denied them in previous years. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, a gradual change had taken place within the L.M.S. itself. Dominated primarily by Congregationalists by 1820, the L.M.S. began to see itself as a Congregational organization. A second generation of directors had by now replaced most of the founding fathers who, because of death or retirement, no longer managed the Society's affairs. Much of the pan-evangelical idealism of the 1790s had retired with them.

(ii) The Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society

L.M.S. relations with the Wesleyans had at first also been warm. The tone had been set in 1795 when the L.M.S. assured Thomas Coke that its intention was "to act as Brethren towards missionaries from other denominations." In the mission field, fraternal relations continued, for the most part, throughout our period and were little affected by events in England. In 1816, for example, one Wesleyan missionary reported that he had been graciously received by John Henry Schmelen of the L.M.S. who "very kindly offered to assist me in every possible way, assuring

(1) See Infra. p. 127 f.
(2) The Wesleyans did not officially possess a separate organization by this name until 1813 but for the sake of clarity we shall use this title to cover whatever organization existed until then. But see, N.A. Birt-whistle, "Founded in 1786: The Origins of the Methodist Missionary Society," W.H.S., XXX (1955), p. 25 f.
(3) L.M.S. Minutes, 29 Sept. 1795.
me, that if I should accompany him to Nemacqua Land, he
would make me welcome to part of his house, where after
remaining with him a sufficient length of time to speak
their language, he would then introduce me to other tribes,
where I might form a settlement on what plan so-ever I
thought proper." The Wesleyans reciprocated. When the
L.M.S. missionary Richard Knill arrived in Colombo in
Ceylon in 1819, he was openly received by the Wesleyans
with "kindness & attention" and for this act of Christian
candour, the L.M.S. voted the Wesleyans a set of the
Society's transactions and their annual report. On the
home front, dealings were equally friendly. Representatives
of the Wesleyan Connexion regularly attended L.M.S. anniver-
saries as late as 1808 and the L.M.S. reciprocated.
Christopher Sundius, a wealthy London merchant and prominent
member of the Wesleyan Connexion, was also a director of
the L.M.S. between 1797 and 1802, and seems to have acted
as a liaison between the two groups. In the provinces,
where L.M.S. and Wesleyan fund-raisers often met each
other, there was also much fraternization. For example, one
Wesleyan fund-raiser told Thomas Coke that while on a
collection tour at Stamford, he "very unexpectedly...met
Mr. Berry from Bath, & Mr. Greatheed of Newport Pagnell.

(1) Missionary Notices ...of the Wesleyan Methodists, Dec.
1816, p. 92.
(2) L.M.S. Minutes, 13 Dec. 1819.
(3) For example, Thomas Coke (1798 and 1808), John Pawson
and Thomas Rankin (1799), and Jabez Bunting (1805).
See E.M. and Missionary Magazine.
who lent us their assistance on the Lord's day..."

By the second decade of the century, however, relations had deteriorated substantially. This was primarily due to three factors. In the first place, the West Indies had always been a bone of contention between the L.M.S. and the Wesleyan Connexion. As early as 1798, Thomas Coke begged the L.M.S. not to compete with the Wesleyans in Jamaica when he heard that they were planning to establish their own mission there. Nevertheless, the L.M.S. decided "on account of the great extent of the unoccupied field in that Island...to go forward immediately to bring into effect the mission already determined..." At first this proved to be only a minor point of irritation between the two groups, but when the L.M.S., with its superior financial and organizational strength, began to expand its West Indian mission, the traditional Wesleyan predominance in the area was seriously threatened, for the Wesleyans had neither the money nor the manpower to compete. Consequently, in 1809, Coke warned Robert Johnson, a fellow Wesleyan, that we must endeavour to supply the West Indies well, or we shall lose them. There are, I think, five Calvinist missionaries now in that archipelago. They do not preach where we have preachers, but watch every opportunity to seize on a vacancy.

(1) M.M.S. Home C. Box 1: R. Brackenbury to T. Coke, 19 Aug. 1806. The "Mr. Berry" referred to was probably Joseph Berry, the Independent minister at Warminster and not Bath. Berry was a director of the L.M.S. from 1812.
(3) M.M.S. Home C. Box 1: T. Coke to R. Johnson, 15 Nov. 1809.
Early the next year, the threat apparently still existed, for Coke again wrote Johnson:

It is a melancholy observation, that for many years (I believe, for five or six) the work in the West Indies has been losing ground, and I ascribe this in a great manner to the want of a full supply of missionaries. If we do not keep up a full supply of missionaries, God will give up that great work to the Calvinists.

This kind of competition did not merely involve the West Indies: the Wesleyans were also worried about possible encroachments on their mission in Gibraltar, Demerara, Madagascar, and even France. Of the last, Coke wrote to George Highfield in 1811:

but if we do not immediately seize upon the Plymouth depots, Mr. Bogue of Gosport will in a little time send one or two of his students, who are learning French to these depots. I know it is intended, if we do not get the start on him... Oh let us send Christianity in the form of Methodism, to France, and in this there is no time to be lost. Bogue's youngsters will supplant us, if we do not make haste.

Secorily, relations had deteriorated over the problem of missionary collections. As in the Baptist case, L.M.S. collectors had no qualms after 1800 about asking Wesleyan Methodists for money. Perhaps the Wesleyan 'olive branch' at City Road Chapel in 1798 had encouraged the L.M.S. to do this, but as we have seen, the Wesleyans never meant their invitation to give carte blanche to the L.M.S. to seek patronage amongst the Wesleyan congregations, especially now that the Wesleyans needed every penny they could get to replenish their own diminishing funds. In 1810, two Wesleyan fund-raisers complained that it was difficult to tap the financial resources of their own congregations.

(1) M.M.S. Home C. Box 1: T. Coke to R. Johnson, 1 Jan 1810.
(3) M.M.S. Home C. Box 1: T. Coke to G. Highfield, 26 Dec. 1811.
since "the Calvinists dog us from place to place and they aim to lead astray all they can." Another Wesleyan complained to Robert Smith, the Wesleyan's mission Secretary, that John Hunt of Chichester, a director of the L.M.S. and a "bitter enemy of Methodism," had hired out for a collection sermon a meeting house that was originally promised to the Wesleyans for the same purpose, and added that, "in this mission, he watches us as narrowly as a cat does a mouse and says he'll oppose us wherever we go..." Intrusions like this provoked the wrath of not a few Wesleyan leaders. Thomas Coke, for instance, told Smith in 1812 that

The London Missionary Society are forming Committees of two or three of our friends, to raise annual subscriptions among our Societies and hearers for the support of their mission. This they have been doing for some time by the means of their own friends only. This was the case in Portsmouth and Portsea. But they now are endeavouring to enlist our friends in this work...Our people love to promote missions, and if we do not follow some Plan to counteract the above, many hundreds, if not thousands of pounds will be taken out of the pockets of our people to support the London Missionary Society...When we are so pressed with debt, shall we throw hundreds or thousands of pounds into their laps? If we are to employ hundreds or thousands of pounds in Asia, shall we employ them in establishing Calvinism in that immense country, in preference to Methodism?... The Calvinists exert every nerve. A Rev. Mr. Collinson [sic] has already been here and at Newcastle, and I believe, at Bristol, and all over the kingdom, to preach in our Chapels as well as other places for the Calvinist missions.

So too, Jabez Bunting told Smith one year later

(1) M.M.S. Home C. Box 1: J. Alexander and J. Eddy to R. Smith, 22 June 1810.
(2) M.M.S. Home C. Box 1: G. Banwell to R. Smith, 1 Dec. 1813.
(3) M.M.S. Home C. Box 1: T. Coke to R. Smith, 20 Oct. 1812.
Cf. G.G. Findlay and W.W. Holdsworth, The History of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society (1921), I, p. 37. The "Mr. Collinson" referred to was George Collison (1772-1847) who was the divinity tutor at Hackney College. He was a director of the L.M.S. from 1803.
(4) Cited in Findlay, op. cit. p. 43 f.
It is impossible for me to tell you the strong sensations that some of us felt when we read, in the last Evangelical Magazine, that the Dissenters had recently preached and made collections in one of our chapels in Leeds for their Missions, at a time when our own missionary affairs are so awfully embarrassed.

Finally, relations were further exacerbated in 1813 by a new outbreak of the old Calvinistic Controversy. This time the controversy involved several pamphlets and newspaper articles written by Wesleyans, in which the L.M.S. was accused of 'excommunicating' their missionaries if they professed Arminian beliefs. The accusation was based on the very unfortunate and (as far as the L.M.S. was concerned) very embarrassing Duff episode of 1796, in which the L.M.S. missionaries John Jefferson and John Cock were 'excommunicated' by their colleagues while en route on the Duff to the South Sea Islands for embracing Arminian beliefs. Though the L.M.S. later repudiated this act, it provoked the Wesleyans to make further accusations most of them unfair or exaggerated. It was asserted, for example, that the 'fundamental principle' of the L.M.S. was steeped in hypocrisy since the Society had always discriminated against Wesleyan missionary applicants.

(1) See W. Hatton, A Reply to the Rev. John Cockin...to which is added, a supposed dialogue at sea, between twenty-eight missionaries of the Calvinian, and two of the Arminian persuasion (1815), passim.
(3) The Wesleyans pointed to an article in the Leeds Intelligencer of 14 February 1814, in which an L.M.S. director under the nom de plume of 'Non Nobis' submitted a fragment of a L.M.S. mission journal in which it was said that "as the directors hold the doctrinal articles of the Church of England, in the sense usually termed Calvinistic... it was an original decision, that none should be sent out as Missionaries who did not make out a clear and explicit confession of their faith, agreeable to this rule." See Hatton, op.cit. pp. 9-10. Samuel Greatheed identified this fragment as having been written by Thomas Haweis, but he pointed out that it did not reflect the sentiments of the directors. Indeed, he said that the L.M.S. was willing
This of course, was not accurate though by 1814 the Society was discouraging non-Calvinists from seeking its patronage.

L.M.S. encroachments played a part, albeit a minor one, in the establishment in 1813 of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society. The founding of a Wesleyan missionary society, of course, was a dream that well predated the second decade of the nineteenth century; Thomas Coke had long wanted Conference to give more recognition to foreign missionary concerns and establish them on a sounder basis, but John Wesley had felt that Conference should give home missions priority. In the troubled days that beset the Connexion immediately after Wesley's death in 1791, Conference had been compelled to turn its attention to more pressing problems. Until 1813 therefore, the Wesleyan foreign missionary effort was left largely to the supervision of Thomas Coke and one or two associates. Once the connexion had attained a certain degree of internal stability, however, it was able to pay closer attention to its missionary concerns. Yet this attention may well have been given special urgency by the realization of Conference, that unless their foreign mission was consolidated and better funded, the mission field

Footnote Contd.

to accept missionary candidates recommended by the leading ministers of the Wesleyan Connexion. See J. Campbell, Maritime Discovery and Christian Mission (1840), p. 280 f. It is doubtful, however, that these could have been Haweis' words since he had initially supported Calvinist-Wesleyan cooperation.

(1) It was partly for this reason that Wesley had vetoed Coke's missionary 'Plan' of 1783. See J.D. Walsh, "Methodism at the End of the Eighteenth Century," in History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain, ed. by R.E. Davies and E.G. Hupp (1965), p. 300.
would fall into Calvinistic hands by default.

It was perhaps one of the ironies in mission history, that in its quest to be a 'catholic' society, the L.M.S. almost forced the Wesleyans into the position of having to found their own missionary organization in self-defence. Indeed, when the Wesleyans announced to the world the birth of their new society, many L.M.S. directors were both surprised and hurt. When, for example, William Eccles, Independent minister at Old White Chapel Leeds and a prominent director of the L.M.S. attended the founding of the Wesleyan Society in his city, he naively protested that "the missionary cause is but one cause, and that in which all denominations of Christians are united." When he then called upon the Wesleyans to continue their patronage of his society, Jabez Bunting had to instruct him that "the cause is one; but it is promoted by several distinct Societies, each of which has its distinct and separate fund." Bunting was discreetly telling the L.M.S. to keep its hands off of Wesleyan money.

Like the Baptists, the Wesleyans avoided L.M.S. anniversaries during the second decade of the nineteenth century. But by 1818, for reasons that we have already mentioned in the Baptist connection, relations between the two societies had greatly improved. Jabez Bunting was present at the 1818 general meeting of the L.M.S. when it altered its name. One year later, through a generous offer from Joseph Butterworth, the Wesleyan M.P., the L.M.S. held one

---

(2) *E.M.* June 1818, p. 263 ff.
of its anniversary sermons at the Wesleyan chapel at
1 Queen Street. It was not however until 1823, that a
director of the L.M.S., William Jay, preached at a
Wesleyan Missionary Society anniversary, thus recommencing
a regular pattern of mutual invitations. So too, the founding
of the London Secretaries Association in 1819 and the
change of outlook that had taken place within the L.M.S.
itself, all contributed to the easing of former animosities
and a resumption of peace and cordiality.

(iii) The Church Missionary Society

Relations between the L.M.S. and the C.M.S. were able
to weather the vicissitudes of the first three decades of
the nineteenth century for a number of reasons. In the first
place, because the evangelical patrons of both societies
shared similar theological beliefs, doctrinal controversy
did not stand in the way of cooperation to the same degree
that it had done for the Baptist and Wesleyan societies.
Moreover, a small number of 'regular' churchmen who were
directors of the C.M.S. also served token appointments on
the directory of the L.M.S., thus opening channels of
communication hitherto not enjoyed by either the Baptists
or the Wesleyans until the founding of the London Secretaries
Association in 1819. The threat of misunderstanding, therefore,

(1) L.M.S. Minutes 15 March 1819; 22 March 1819.
(2) Cyrus Jay said that William Jay was "the first minister,
I believe, in England, not belonging to their connection,
who was selected to preach their annual Missionary Society
Jay gives no date for this, but according to G.J. Stevenson,
he preached for the Wesleyans for the first time in
1823. See G.J. Stevenson, City Road Chapel London and its
Associations (1873), p. 302. Jay and Bunting were always
good friends even when L.M.S.-Wesleyan relations were
very bad.
was greatly minimized.

The hard feelings harboured by some L.M.S. Anglicans against colleagues who decided to patronize the C.M.S. when it was founded in 1799, were mitigated somewhat by the attitudes of the Church society itself. When the Duff was captured by French privateers in the summer of 1799, the C.M.S. sent to the L.M.S. a contribution together with several letters of condolence from prominent directors assuring the L.M.S. that the C.M.S. was its coadjutor and not its rival. Even Charles Simeon, who by this time was very careful about his dealings with 'left wing' Anglicans and Dissenters, dashed off a quick letter to the L.M.S. encouraging the directors to "persevere in their efforts." Needless to say, the L.M.S. was grateful for this help and encouragement.

Relations between both societies were perhaps most cordial in the mission field. The C.M.S. was very slow in getting its first missionaries off, but when they finally succeeded, the missionaries sent out by them were Lutherans whom C.F. Steinkopf, Lutheran Pastor of the Savoy in London and Foreign Secretary of the L.M.S., had helped the directors of the C.M.S. to find. The C.M.S.

(1) Thomas Scott wrote a friend in 1799: "One thing we have done - as soon as we heard that the Duff was taken, we, as individuals of the Committee, sent the Missionary Society a hundred guineas, as a token of regard and condolence, which has tended greatly to conciliate them, and to convince them that we are coadjutors and not rivals." Cited in J. Pratt, Eclectic Notes (2nd edn. 1865), p. 131.
(2) L.M.S. Minutes, 9 Sept. 1799.
(3) Cf. L.M.S. Minutes, 6 Aug. 1799.
(4) See Hole, C.M.S. Hist. pp. 76,78,85. Steinkopf introduced C.M.S. directors to the new missionary academy established in Berlin by Baron Von Schirnding and Father Janicke. Out of this contact, the C.M.S. hired Peter Hartwig, a Prussian, and Melchoir Renner of Württemberg, for their mission in Sierra Leone. C.F. Frey, future President of the Jews Society,
reciprocated. In New South Wales, for example, the great Anglican missionary Samuel Marsden, offered in 1802, to act as a liaison between the two societies in his area, and even to visit the L.M.S. station at Otaheite "in order to inspect the mission, and promote as much as possible the designs of the Society." Consequently, it was men like Marsden and Steinkopf who set the pace for continued cooperation between the two societies. In 1806, for instance, the C.M.S. resolved "to communicate with the Secretary of the London Missionary Society, in order to ascertain what station in the East they had already occupied" before sending missionaries there themselves. The L.M.S. responded to this gesture. In 1811 it was asked to supply a missionary to St. Mary's Falls in Canada, but before fulfilling this request, George Burder diplomatically asked the directors of the C.M.S. if they were planning to send a missionary of their own to the same station. Both societies also avoided the irritating practice of unilaterally encouraging missionary transfers from one society to the other. Though this problem did not arise as often in the mission field itself as it had in the case of the converts to the B.M.S., it arose at home. C.M.S. candidates frequently applied to the L.M.S. if, for some reason, they had failed to pass C.M.S. requirements. As a general rule,

Footnote Contd.
then employed by the L.M.S., also provided the C.M.S. with valuable information about the academy of which he was a graduate.
(1) L.M.S. Minutes, 29 March 1802.
(2) C.M.S. Minutes, 7 April 1806.
(3) C.M.S. Minutes, 5 July 1811; L.M.S. Minutes, 8 July 1811. Such was also the case in Bermuda when the L.M.S. was asked to send a churchman. L.M.S. Minutes, 14 Feb. 1814.
however, the L.M.S. would not consider these applications even though it was actively looking for Anglican recruits. For example, in 1822 David Evans of Hescombe near Newport, told the L.M.S. "that he was a Clergyman of the Church of England but admiring the broad principles of the Missionary Society should be happy to labour under its patronage."

Upon further investigation, and through consultation with the C.M.S., it was discovered that Evans had been rejected by the Church society because of bad references. The L.M.S. decided, therefore, to decline Evans's application.

Relations, at least during the first decade of the century, were as cordial at home as they were in the mission field. Unlike the Baptists and the Wesleyans, the 'regular' Anglicans affiliated with the C.M.S. participated in L.M.S. anniversaries almost without interruption from 1799 to 1830 and beyond. The L.M.S. reciprocated. It was also a normal occurrence that C.M.S. strongholds in London like St. Saviours, St. Brides, St. Leonards and St. Andrews, would throw their doors open to at least one missionary sermon during the L.M.S.'s anniversaries. So too there was a regular sharing of missionary literature between the two societies throughout the first thirty years of the century and beyond.

(1) L.M.S. Minutes, 28 Oct. 1822; 25 Nov. 1822. On the other hand, if a man had, by mutual agreement, left the C.M.S., and if the C.M.S. had no objections, the L.M.S. would pick him up as it did in the cases of Orlando Dobbin of Armagh and Henry Beidenback of Islington. See L.M.S. Minutes, 30 March 1829; 14, 21 Sept. 1829.

(2) See E.M. 1841, p. 493 for a list of Anglican clergymen who attended L.M.S. anniversaries and preached for the Society. The list includes prominent 'regulars' like John Martin Longmire, William Gurney, Martin Whish, R.W. Sibthorp, and Baptist Noel.
While relations between the societies remained relatively fraternal through the years, we must stress that it was a fraternity initially qualified by at least two Anglican suspicions. In the first place, churchmen suspected that many of the men who patronized the L.M.S. were politically irresponsible because they had supported the French Revolution in 1789. Secondly, they believed that undenominational mission churches were in some way irregular and ultimately prejudicial to the establishment. These suspicions largely explain why the C.M.S. was established in the first place, and as the Evangelical party within the Church of England grew in size, importance, and respectability, why its members were even more circumspect than before, in avoiding unnecessary associations with individuals or organizations which might give evangelical Anglicanism a bad name. Consequently, 'regular' Anglican churchmen, who before 1800 had avoided the L.M.S., continued to do so after 1800 even when they had securely established their own missionary organization and no longer believed that the Dissenters were republicans bent on undermining Church and State. In 1808, for example, the L.M.S. asked Wilberforce to present a petition on their behalf to Lord Castlereagh protesting against the treatment of an L.M.S. missionary at the hands of the British government in Demerara. But even though Wilberforce probably sympathized with the dilemma, he would have nothing to do with a petition that associated his name with an organization dominated by Dissenters and he suggested instead that the Missionary Society send its own delegation to Lord Castlereagh with the petition. 'Regular' clergymen had

other reasons for maintaining a distance from the affairs of the L.M.S. The L.M.S. never ceased trying to involve Charles Simeon in its activities, knowing that his approbation would be worth the support of a hundred other 'regulars;' but Simeon, now very concerned about Church order, never publicly lent his support to the L.M.S. after 1800, even as a casual preacher at its anniversaries. Perhaps this attitude was best expressed by Charles Sumner, the Evangelical Bishop of Winchester who, when asked to preach for the L.M.S. in 1830, had to tell John Arundel, one of its secretaries, "I must beg you will acquaint the Directors, that although I cannot comply with their request consistently with what appears to me my duty as a Bishop of the Church of England, I do not the less rejoice as a Christian minister, the success which God has been pleased in so many instances to distinguish their missionaries..."

The L.M.S. was hoping for much more than such vague affirmations of good-will.

If anything disrupted inter-societal relations during our period, it was again the difficult problem of missionary collections. Like the Baptists and Wesleyans, so too the C.M.S. objected to L.M.S. incursions into Anglican parishes. In 1814, for example, the C.M.S. complained of a L.M.S. circular entitled "To Friends of Missionary Societies." It was designed, they claimed, to convince Anglicans that churchmen were among the L.M.S.'s strongest advocates, so

(1) See for example L.M.S. Minutes, 25 Feb. 1805 where Simeon turned down an invitation to preach for the L.M.S.
(2) L.M.S. Home C. (5.5.B.): C. Sumner to (J. Arundel), 23 Oct. 1830.
that they could gain "a footing (an intrusion, some thought) in Church of England congregations" that would otherwise have patronized the C.M.S. This complaint was not unfounded. James Vaughan and Thomas Biddulph, two C.M.S. directors from Bristol, had complained two years before that they "had no atom of jealousy of the missionary success of the Dissenters on their own grounds; but to see Dissenters who had a broad area of their own, coming to gather a harvest out of Church fields," made them "extremely uneasy." There was a similar situation in Liverpool where, in 1813, Richard Blacow, the Vicar of St. Marks, protested that "scarcely a finger is moved among us, while the whole body...of...Calvinist Dissenters are pushing forward with vast momentum" and warned that if nothing was done about the situation "we shall soon have an episcopal Establishment with a dissenting population."

The arrogant sounding title of the 'Missionary Society' also created a great deal of mischief. In 1813, Basil Woodd, then Rector of Drayton Beauchamp, complained that the clergy perpetually confounded the Missionary with the Church Missionary Society and suggested that "this circumstance, on the occasion of future sermons, ought to be very distinctly stated, as the interests of the Church Missionary Society are very materially injured by the confusion." The degree to which this confusion irritated

---

(1) Hole, C.M.S. Hist. p. 409.
(2) Ibid. p. 233. Vaughan and Biddulph consequently established a C.M.S. auxiliary in Bristol.
(3) Ibid. p. 307.
(4) Ibid. p. 329.
C.M.S. officials in London can be gauged by a letter that Josiah Pratt, the C.M.S. Secretary, wrote to the Cork Auxiliary in 1814. In it he expressed "regret...that the Missionary Society is putting forth pretensions to the support of the Church" when the C.M.S. had existed in Ireland for several years. The effect of this situation, Pratt continued, was to seriously cut into his society's collections. One enterprising 'regular,' George Tyndale, the Vicar of Wooburn Bucks even suggested turning the tables on the L.M.S. by omitting the word 'Church' from Church Missionary Society circulars thereby leading the Dissenters to believe that the C.M.S. was their society! But after the change in name of the L.M.S., even these irritations had vanished by 1820.

III. Pan-Evangelicalism in Foreign Missions after 1800

(1) Introduction

One of the sad results of the pan-evangelical movement in foreign missions, was that it only half realized what it set out to accomplish. In the mission field it had introduced Christianity to the heathen and in the process united many of the missionaries to each other, but it had done relatively little to unite the evangelical denominations at home. This situation must have been disappointing to all concerned, especially to the missionaries themselves. Depending on each other for spiritual encouragement and in some cases even physical survival, they were directed by their

(1) C.M.S. Home C.t J. Pratt to H. Irwin, 9 March 1814 (copy).
(2) Hole, op.cit. p. 284.
superiors in England to have as little commerce with each other as possible, simply because the parent societies did not get on with each other in London. For the most part, these directives were simply ignored except, of course, when they were enforced by denominational officials. Nevertheless, there were always catholic-minded men in all of the societies who never ceased trying to patch together the broken pieces of the pan-evangelical foreign missionary impulse. These men sponsored several proposals during our period which attempted to reconstruct the kind of missionary 'union' dreamed of but never completely realized in the L.M.S. after 1795. When this failed, they encouraged a 'federation' or association of independent missionary societies that at least attempted to coordinate evangelical missionary affairs.

(ii) Union Proposals

Union proposals came forward in several forms, but for the most part they proved to be unacceptable to the societies involved. One such proposal was privately submitted to William Wilberforce in 1812 by Joseph Hardcastle. Though a member of Thomas Beck's Independent chapel at Bury Street London, Hardcastle often attended the parish church at Clapham where his close association with the Clapham Sect earned him an appointment as one of the only non-Anglican directors of the Sierra Leone Colony. But it was his involvement in the Missionary, Tract and Bible societies

(1) As in the closed communion controversy when the Serampore Baptists were instructed by the B.M.S. in London after 1812, not to share their Eucharist with non-Baptist missionaries. See Supra p.103.
all founded at his business premises in London, that earned
for him his reputation as a philanthropist. Subsequently, he
became treasurer of both the L.M.S. and the Village

1 Itinerancy Society. Circa 1810, Hardcastle was asked by
the C.M.S. for his professional advice on whether it would
be financially feasible for them to adopt Samuel Marsden's
recent proposal and to invest in a ship that would link
together their mission stations in the South Seas. Hardcastle's
opinion was valued because of his experience in purchasing
and financing for the L.M.S. the ill-fated Duff. According
to Charles Hole, the historian of the C.M.S., the project
was discouraged by Hardcastle, and action was temporarily
postponed. By 1812, however, the project was again under
discussion although this time it was proposed that in order
to eliminate duplication of expense, Marsden's project for
a mission ship should be jointly sponsored by both the
L.M.S. and the C.M.S. Unfortunately, this proposal was
rejected by the directors of the L.M.S. and temporarily
dropped. But when announcing his society's decision to
Wilberforce, Hardcastle privately put forward a proposal
of his own which was more far-reaching than the first.
Instead of merely cooperating in the finance of a mission
ship, Hardcastle suggested that it might be even more
practical for the two societies to jointly sponsor an

(1) Hardcastle was also a director of the R.T.S. from 1800
to 1815. His country home at 'Hatchem' was famous for
its interdenominational parties. For his biography, see
Morison, Fathers and Founders, I, p. 295 ff; W.B.
Collyer, The Death of a Servant of God. A funeral sermon
in memory of the late Joseph Hardcastle (1819).
(2) Hole, C.M.S. Hist. p. 143.
undenominational missionary society in the South Seas Islands. This society, he urged, should be supported by private subscriptions from L.M.S. and C.M.S. patrons and would be directed by Samuel Marsden from New South Wales. Hardcastle concluded his proposal by cautiously telling Wilberforce, "I need scarcely add, that these merely being my private suggestions, I do not in the least commit or pledge our Society but should they meet your approbation, and you will undertake to communicate them to the Society to Africa & the East, I will do the same to that which I have the honour to be connected." We do not know what Wilberforce's response was to Hardcastle's irenic proposal, though we can surmise that it did not meet with his approval because on 6 February 1812, he merely recommended a modification of Marsden's original scheme. Hardcastle's proposal surfaced again at least twice after 1812, but in both cases it failed to receive the approbation of the parties concerned.

The other major attempts at a 'union' of the various missionary societies involved the familiar and divisive issue of missionary collections. Individuals through the years had circumvented this simply by collecting for more than one society at the same time. Thus the Rev. W. Reeve of Hull told the L.M.S. that he had "the pleasure of

(3) C.M.S. Minutes, 7 Feb. 1814; Hole, op.cit. p. 369. In 1822 the plan to jointly fund a mission ship was expanded to include the Wesleyans, but it too was unsuccessful. L.M.S. Minutes, 18, 25 March 1822. There was also a proposal put forward in 1824 to found an undenominational missionary college to train future missionaries for India. This proposal, like the others, did not succeed. L.M.S. Minutes, 22 Nov. 1824.
advocating the cause of missions for the Baptists & for
the Episcopalians, as well as for our own society."  
Reeve was only one among many of the more catholic-minded
evangelicals who did this, but because he was acting as a
private agent, he was never criticized. But when auxiliary
societies connected with one or the other of the four
missionary societies unilaterally did the same thing,
protestations from the parent societies often became very
loud. In 1812, when the Shoe Lane Auxiliary of the L.M.S.
told George Burder that because half of its patrons were
Baptists, it would remit half of its collections to the
B.M.S., it was accused by Burder of "unfair and improper
principles." When this failed to stop the Shoe Lane
Auxiliary, Burder summarily dismissed it from any further
association with the parent society. The Cork Missionary
Society faced the same kind of dilemma, but in its case,
censure came from the C.M.S. Josiah Pratt complained in
1814 that at Cork some "pious members of the Established
Church" had formed themselves into a society for the purpose
of jointly raising funds for both the L.M.S. and the C.M.S.;
a decision, he feared, that would seriously prejudice the
latter organization. Robert Shaw, the Rector of Kilkenny,
later explained to Pratt, that when an Irish Protestant

(1) L.M.S. Home C. (4.6.B.): W. Reeve to J. Arundel, 22 June
1825.
(2) L.M.S. Home C. (2.7.B.): W. Purton to G. Burder, Nov. 1812;
18 Nov. 1812.
C.M.S. Minutes, 3 Jan. 1814.
(4) Shaw was a director of the L.M.S. in 1809.
met any person who loved the Lord Jesus, he naturally united with him in a country where the struggle has not been between the Church and Dissenters, the name Dissenter being hardly known, but between Protestant and Papist...Hence all the societies hitherto formed were of a heterodox nature.

Whether Pratt, an Englishman, understood this fine distinction is uncertain; nevertheless he still continued to cast a jaundiced eye at union organizations.

(iii) Federation Proposals

Ironically, it was William Carey, the man who thought that pan-evangelicalism in missions would never work, who proposed in 1806 a federation or conference of missionary societies to meet every ten years in Cape Town. He told Andrew Fuller that year: "I have no doubt but it would be attended with very important effects; we could understand one another better, and more entirely enter into one another's views by two hours conversation than by two or three years epistolary correspondence." But due to bad relations between the L.M.S. and the Baptists at this time, Fuller vetoed Carey's 'pleasing dream' and nothing more came of it.

Perhaps the only successful attempt to bring the various missionary societies together in a federation occurred in 1819 with the founding of the London Secretaries Association.

---

(1) See Supra. p.65.
(3) Andrew Fuller wrote to William Ward, "Seriously, I see no important object to be attained by such a meeting...In a meeting of all denominations, there would be no unity, without which we had better stay at home. The different parties in a certain society have caused endless strife, of which perhaps they do not tell you. Angus. Fuller Letters: A. Fuller to W. Ward, 2 Dec. 1806.
(4) Minutes of the London Secretaries Association are deposited in the archives of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Unfortunately, only the topics discussed have been recorded
This was hardly more than an informal monthly meeting of the missionary society secretaries where matters of a general and theoretical nature were discussed. The topics for discussion were hardly substantive but centered around issues like that discussed in October 1819, "What hints can be suggested as most likely to contribute to the preservation of cordial regards among the various societies engaged in missions?" Not until 1838 did the Association really begin to coordinate inter-societal missionary affairs. Nevertheless, as we have repeatedly seen, the Association opened channels of communication between the missionary societies thus easing considerably past irritations and conflicts after 1820.

Footnote Contd.

for the early years, and not the substance of what was said. See J.H. Ritson, Records of Missionary Secretaries: An Account of the Celebration of the Centenary of the London Secretaries Association (1920). The Association had its roots in the Missionary Register founded by Josiah Pratt in 1813 to provide a common source of information for all the missionary societies.
Chapter Five: The Internal Relations

I. Introduction

Though the L.M.S. never enjoyed substantial Baptist, Wesleyan or even Anglican assistance, it was nevertheless pan-evangelical to the degree that Calvinistic Methodists, members of Lady Huntingdon's Connexion, Presbyterians, Independents, and a handful of 'left wing' churchmen sat on its board and patronized its activities. There is, therefore, an important story to be told about interdenominational relations within the Society itself. Consequently, the first part of this chapter will deal with relations during the early period, noting in particular how difficult it was to achieve unity and accord even in a society dominated by Calvinists and paedobaptists. We must bear in mind, however, that to an important degree, the L.M.S. was the first major interdenominational experiment in Britain which overflowed national boundaries by its creation of many auxiliaries overseas. The results of this experiment, even though only partially successful, profoundly influenced the way similar societies were later designed.

The second part of our analysis will examine the way in which the sharp tensions between the L.M.S. and other societies between 1810 and 1818, affected their internal relations in the following decade. We shall see that the Society's relationship with other missionary institutions forced it to change into a Congregational organization with rather devastating effects on its own internal stability. Only when the L.M.S. gave up all pretence to being the principal evangelical foreign missionary society in Britain, did it once again regain its equilibrium. The result of this
metamorphosis however, was an alteration of the Society's 'fundamental principle' requiring future missionaries to subscribe to Calvinistic and paedobaptist doctrines. When this happened, the concept of pan-evangelicalism in foreign missions was eclipsed by a new and growing sectarian consciousness.

II. The Early Years 1795-1818

An examination of the internal workings of the L.M.S. during the early years is difficult because the evidence available is slender. The Society's homogeneous theological base, made up as it was of Calvinists and paedobaptists, minimized the danger of internal theological controversy and friction. On most of the explosive theological issues of the day, the directors of the L.M.S. saw eye to eye. Not much is reported therefore, in Society correspondence and minutes about internal doctrinal dissension because it scarcely existed. This is not to say, however, that all was peace and charity at the L.M.S. Unlike future pan-evangelical societies, the L.M.S. and its ministerial leaders were more sensitive than most laymen to the minutiae of religious activity. Sixty-seven percent of its directors between 1795 and 1830 were either ministers or clergymen and not even Calvinistic theologians could avoid the temptation of fighting over 'party' issues.

(1) Originally, the directors were only to be ministers or clergymen. See L.M.S. Minutes, 23 June 1795. But it was quickly decided that laymen could also become directors. Even then, the ministerial directors tended to dominate board meetings, especially in the early years.
In 1800, George Jerment, pastor of the Scots church at Bow Lane London, accused his colleagues in the L.M.S. of "clerical domination, secret influence, undue partiality, pride, and vain glory..." There was some truth in this, and Society meetings witnessed frequent scenes of dissension. Alexander Waugh, often saddled with the awesome task of quelling the violence of a most threatening debate frequently had to restore the Christian tone after it had been considerably impaired. Matters got so much out of hand, that a motion had to be passed in 1800 requiring that "nothing personal shall be introduced in debate, nor any wandering from the subject allowed; the Chairman shall call to order in such cases, and he shall be supported in the exercise of his authority by the whole body."

Unruly meetings were not limited to London; John Arundel had to tell William Alers-Hankey several years later, that he hoped "something will be fixed by the Board this evening to render the meetings of the officers of the Auxiliary societies less turbulent, and more interesting."

Since the ministerial direction of the L.M.S. was composed of dynamic and sometimes eccentric men, personality conflicts often disrupted the internal harmony of the Society. William Jay said of Rowland Hill, for example, that "the greatest [failing] I ever observed in him was an extremely quick sense of injury or offence [which he allowed] to

---

(3) L.M.S. Various Memoranda, 21 March 1800.
linger about his spirit." Thus in 1812, Hill threatened to resign from the Society unless an 'insult' printed about him in the Evangelical Magazine was retracted by George Burder, the Magazine's editor and L.M.S. secretary.

More serious perhaps, were the 'party' conflicts which were generated at the business meetings of the Society. Despite his own eccentricities, Hill often had to play the role of arbitrator, especially when tensions between Anglican and Nonconformist directors got out of hand. At one "sparring match" that was "growing warm," Hill was called in to referee, and his biographer tells us that Rowland "put on one of his arch looks, and said 'well I declare I must say you are both equally wrong; and I was just thinking that if you were tied together by the tail, like two cats, and thrown over a forked stick, you would scratch each others' eyes out.'" This kind of internecine warfare was not limited to the clash of Anglicans and Nonconformists; according to John Reynold's diary of 1795, two 'parties' within the Society, the Calvinistic Methodists and the Scottish Presbyterians, also battled over trivial issues. When, for example, William Shrubsole, a Calvinistic Methodist, was nominated by his colleagues to be the Society's secretary, a major altercation broke out between the two groups. Only

(2) L.M.S. Home C. (2.7.B.); R. Hill to G. Burder, 14 Nov. 1812. Apparently, Samuel Lowell of Woodbridge, had called Hill an eccentric in an Evangelical Magazine article which Burder allowed to be printed.
when John Love, a Presbyterian, agreed to be co-secretary, did the squabble stop.

The other major issue around which party lines were drawn, was the problem of missionary training. In 1798, John Love offered to tutor missionary candidates for the Society. But when Love's offer was seriously considered in committee, Robert Little, the Independent minister from Hanley Staffordshire complained that Love "might in time excite an unfriendly suspicion, that [the candidates'] minds would be biased in favour of certain peculiarities, in which the great body are not agreed." Little, therefore, thought that it would be more appropriate if several ministers were engaged as tutors "and that not more than one or two candidates at a time, be committed to the tuition of any one person." In a conciliatory move, the directors then proposed that George Jerment, an Anti-burgher, Alexander Waugh, a Presbyterian churchman, and John Eyre, an Anglican, be appointed joint tutors instead of one man. The matter again became an issue in 1800, with the proposal that David Bogue should establish a mission college in conjunction with his Independent seminary at Gosport. Fearing that the seminary might be linked with the Independents and thus prejudice the Anglican interest, Thomas Haweis vigorously opposed the project. Writing to George Burder many years after the missionary academy had been opened, Haweis continued to complain that Bogue

(1) L.M.S. Home C. (1.5.A.): R. Little to J. Eyre, 23 June 1798
(2) L.M.S. Minutes, 24 June 1798.
has assumed the entire authority, and though he cannot destroy, he will impede by diverting every missionary that is sent to Gosport. We refuse episcopal government and have adopted another independent [sic] authority and set him at the head of it.

But by 1819, when Haweis wrote this letter, the L.M.S. had already evolved, as we shall see, into a predominantly Independent organization.

III. The Later Years 1818-1830

Internal relations between the denominations that patronized the L.M.S. during these years were largely affected by the Society's external relationship with the other missionary organizations. Between 1810 and 1818, the L.M.S. tried to assert its primacy in the mission field by claiming to be the primary evangelical missionary society to which all evangelicals could belong; only after several years of tension did the Society recognize that it was in fact but one evangelical missionary society among many. This acceptance of reality was perhaps symbolized by the Society's change of title in 1818. At that year's anniversary, Robert Steven, an Independent lay director of the L.M.S. proposed that the name of the Society be changed from the 'Missionary Society' to the less presumptuous 'London Missionary Society.' Reporting on this event, which significantly was attended by representatives from the other missionary organizations, the Evangelical Magazine said

that several other Missionary Societies having been formed since the institution of this in 1795, some confusion had arisen from want of a title more distinctive than that which was then adopted; and that other societies, at home and abroad, having generally given us the appellation of the London Missionary Society, [Steven] proposed, and it

(1) E.M. June 1818, p. 263 f.
was unanimously agreed, that hereafter in all publications of the Society, its Title shall be thus expressed: - "The Missionary Society, instituted in the year 1795, usually called The London Missionary Society."

At the same meeting, David Bogue, who many years before had said that bigotry was dead, had to admit that when the L.M.S. was instituted, it stood nearly alone - it was a General Society, and the name was by no means improper: but other Societies have arisen. It is now highly proper that we should take a name that may not be thought assuming or improper.

The change in title, however, only reflected a more basic change in the Society's composition by 1818. In the early years, the L.M.S. was a united evangelical institution to the degree that it welcomed the support and participation of all the evangelical denominations including the Baptists and the Wesleyans. By 1818, however, the Society was dominated by Independents and therefore was no longer so interested in recruiting Baptist, Wesleyan or even Anglican assistance in the form of money or missionaries. In part, the development of the L.M.S. into a Congregational organization was assisted by the migration of many Calvinistic Methodists and members of Lady Huntingdon's Connexion into Independency. Conversely, as the other missionary societies gained in strength and prominence, they attracted away from the L.M.S. what little Baptist, Wesleyan or Anglican patronage it possessed. But the development of the L.M.S. into a Congregational organization reflected broader changes within Nonconformity itself. As we have seen, there had always been, prior to 1818, a small anti-pan-evangelical faction within the evangelical movement. Proud to be called Baptists

(1) Ibid., p. 265.
or Independents, these men had no desire to sacrifice denominational identities at the altar of pan-evangelicalism. The centrifugal force of denominationalism within the evangelical movement was, as we have seen, not very strong in the early years, but by the first decade of the nineteenth century, it had become an increasingly powerful force, and gave birth to several attempts to group like-minded chapels into a coherent union.

Unintentionally, the L.M.S. itself had done much to nurture the hardening of denominational consciousness within the Congregational camp. Independents, who had previously been unified only in regional associations and county unions, began to find a national identity in London when they came each year from all parts of the country to attend the Society's anniversary. Indeed, it was at the L.M.S. anniversary of 1806, that a group of Independents formed the first Congregational Union. Because the leading Independents of the day did not support this early scheme, the Union dissolved after only three years, but the success of Welsh Calvinistic Methodists in 1811 and the Baptists in 1812 in forming their respective unions probably forced the unionless Independents into making the L.M.S. a kind of surrogate union for their denomination until a more permanent union could be established in 1832.

(1) See A. Peel, These Hundred Years: A History of the Congregational Union of England and Wales (1931), pp. 10, 58.


(3) See E.A. Payne, The Baptist Union (1959), p. 22 and passim; S.J. Price, "The Early Years of the Baptist Union," The Baptist Quarterly, IV (1928), p. 35. The Baptist Union died out in 1817, but it was refounded in 1831.
The Parent Society in London, however, did everything it could to preserve the semblance of evangelical unity even when pressed for change by the Independent-dominated provincial auxiliaries. There were still a few of the founding fathers left to remind the younger generation that the L.M.S. was never meant to serve a party or a sect. But demands from provincial 'young Turks' that the Society be brought more in line with denominational policy portended conflict between the interdenominational parent society in London and the Congregationally dominated auxiliaries in the provinces. In 1814, for example, John Angell James of Birmingham complained to George Burder, that the parent society's plan to establish an interdenominational auxiliary in his area was wishful thinking, since most of the Birmingham evangelicals were already engaged in their own denominational activities. So too, David Jones, the Independent minister from Holywell in Wales, remarked two years later that the Calvinistic Methodists could no longer work with the Independents in foreign missions, and therefore suggested that in the future, each denomination be supplied with the Society's reports separately. London's inability to be realistic about the changing times only created internal ill-will and tension. Consequently, a Congregational pressure group representing several provincial auxiliaries suggested in 1818 that it would perhaps be better if the

---

Independents formed a missionary society of their own which made no pretence to being pan-evangelical. John Griffin, the Congregational minister of Portsea, for example, wrote to William Alers-Hankey, one of the parent society's Congregational directors in 1818:

Have you heard that it has been agitated 'whether another Missionary Society formed only of the Independent denominations meeting either in London or some other large City, or Town, would not greatly advance the cause by concentrating that extensive body of Christians, and by the influence of competition - without opposition - excite more attention to the subject and more effectively promote the object.' This denomination has now a magazine, it is said, of rising influence, which originated in the same kind of question with relation to the Evangelical Magazine and some think that it should have a distinct Society for missionary and general objects, in self-defence in order to counteract the avowed principles of some other Societies.

Though a Congregational schism never took place, a compromise was worked out to make the L.M.S. more responsive to the wishes of its chief denominational patrons. This was done largely by modifying Society policy on Baptist and Wesleyan missionaries. The Society had originally been happy to send out Baptist missionaries and even keep the ones who had converted to adult baptism while in the field; they began to have second thoughts about this practice when missionaries with Baptist leanings began to propagate their views among the heathen and drift over to the B.M.S. As a society now controlled by the Congregationalists, the L.M.S. solved this problem by simply refusing to accept Baptist missionary candidates and by requiring others to

adhere strictly to the principles of paedobaptism. Earlier attempts to deal with the Baptists - by discouraging their application to the Society, or by supplying missionaries who appeared to be veering towards the B.M.S. with tracts defending the paedobaptist position - had not been particularly successful. It was probably no coincidence that the L.M.S. decided in 1823, after John David Pearson of Chinsura had to be dismissed for openly embracing Baptist sentiments and zealously propagating his new-found beliefs among the heathen, to reinterpret the Society's 'fundamental principle' in the following way:

That whilst it has been ever since the foundation of the Missionary Society, a principle regarded as fundamental, that a difference of sentiment relating to ecclesiastical polity should not form an impediment to Christian ministerial cooperation in carrying on its labours, it has been the opinion of the board, not less uniformly admitted, that the missionaries employed in its service, should practice infant baptism.

This reinterpretation of the Society's 'fundamental principle' was significant because it clarified what to many people had always been a very ambiguous point in its constitution. But if the Principle of 1796 had been ambiguous, there was no question, after 1823, that the L.M.S. was now a paedobaptist institution.

(1) As in the case of a Mr. Davidson of Olney who was a member of John Sutcliffe's meeting. L.M.S. Minutes 23 Sept. 1822.
(2) As with Henry Townley of Chinsura in 1823. L.M.S. Minutes, 10 June 1822. The most popular tracts were Greville Ewings "Essay on Baptism" and Irwich's "On Infant Baptism." L.M.S. Minutes 22 Nov. 1824.
(3) L.M.S. Minutes, 24 March 1823. Pearson was later re-admitted after promising that he would conduct himself in such a way as to preserve the peace and harmony of the mission. We must also note the case of Henry Townley above-mentioned, who continued to hold doubts about child baptism. But because he agreed not to make a point of it, and not to perform the sacrament, he was kept on by the Society. L.M.S. Minutes, 9 June 1823; 9 Feb. 1824. Townley became a director of the Society in 1827.
As early as 1814, the L.M.S. also began to discourage missionary candidates who held Arminian views. In that year, for example, George Lawson of Astley Bank, a Scottish Presbyterian, recommended a Mr. Reynolds, a Wesleyan, as a missionary candidate. The normal procedure would have been to refer Reynold's name to the Committee of Examination, but this was never done. We must assume, therefore, that Reynolds was probably discouraged from even gaining an interview because he was a Wesleyan. Even the great South African missionary Robert Moffat, who was drawn to mission work under the influence of the Wesleyans, was not considered as a candidate in 1815, until the directors were satisfied that he was a bona fide member of an Independent congregation and held Calvinistic views. But it was not until 1824 that the Society clarified once and for all what had also been an ambiguous position on Arminian missionary candidates. In that year a Mr. Coppleston from Thame was recommended by the Committee of Examination as a missionary printer "provided his Arminian principles should not be considered an objection to the Board." The board, however, thought differently and resolved "that the application of Mr. Coppleston be respectfully declined on account of his principles." Thereafter, as far as we can tell, the L.M.S. refused to consider Wesleyan candidates.

These decisions probably served to placate the more militant Congregationalists while maintaining the semblance

(1) L.M.S. Minutes, 22 Aug. 1814.
(3) L.M.S. Minutes, 27 Dec. 1824; L.M.S. Committee of Examination Minutes, 27 Dec. 1824.
of interdenominational cooperation at least among the paedobaptist and Calvinistic denominations. But from 1820 the Society moved organizationally further into Congregationalism. In 1819, the L.M.S. auxiliary in Sheffield founded the Home Missionary Society for the West Riding of Yorkshire, the purpose of which was to encourage the establishment of Congregational churches; in earlier years this kind of activity would have been considered a serious violation of the Society's interdenominational principle. By 1828, the monthly meetings of the London Board of Congregational Minister's was being held on L.M.S. premises. Indeed, by 1829, the Society's evolution into a Congregational missionary society cum denominational union, was so complete, that the Baptist Isaac Mann believed the Society was established in 1795 by the Independents.

(2) L.M.S. Minutes, 22 Dec. 1828.
(3) I. Mann, Twelve Letters on Ecclesiastical History and Nonconformity (1829), p. 478.
You've join'd yourself to nasty fellows
Who hold such notions 'bout the church
They poison every book they touch.
Don't tell me that a Broadbrim's Bible
Isn't on the other quite a libel;
That Baptists don't blot out the verses
And turn the blessings into curses.
Only that Bible's good, I say,
Which good sound churchmen give away.
Tell what you will to foolish people,
Your plan's to batter down the steeple,
To pull down our gothic abbeys;
Perhaps to unbaptize our babies.

An Old Fable with a New Application;
The Dog in the Manger (1812).
Chapter Six: The Foundations
I. Setting the Scene
(1) Introduction

Not very long ago, almost any British child brought up in an evangelical home could recite the famous story of the Welsh girl Mary Jones, and her part in the founding of the British and Foreign Bible Society. This story is worth briefly retelling since it illustrates the dramatic way in which many evangelicals rather naively believed that their society came into existence.

Mary Jones lived in the rural Welsh village of Llanfihangel y Pennant at the turn of the nineteenth century, near one of Thomas Charles' famous Circulating Schools. Her greatest dream was to possess a Bible of her own for which she had industriously saved her pennies. When she asked her tutor where she could purchase a Bible in her native language, she was told that she must go to Bala, some twenty-eight miles away, and see Thomas Charles himself. Though the distance was great, "she walked it cheerily, her young heart sustained by the hope of finding at the end of her journey the long-yearned-for treasure." At first it seemed that her journey had been in vain, for Charles and his colleague David Edward told Mary that Welsh Bibles were very scarce, and that they could not afford to sell her even one of the few they possessed. Mary "wept as if she would break her heart." Kindhearted

(1) The Bible that Charles gave to Mary Jones in 1800 is still prominently on display at Bible House in London. The Mary Jones story is best retold in W. Canton, A History of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1904), I, p. 465. I draw my quotations from this source.
Thomas Charles finally relented and sold her one of his own valuable Welsh Bibles. We are told that after the transaction had been made, in a characteristically Welsh response to the situation, Mary Jones with her benefactors stood with "tears streaming from their eyes; the girl now weeping sweet tears of unutterable joy; Mr. Charles shedding tears of mingled sorrow for his country's famine for the Word of God, and of holy sympathy with that young disciple who so rejoiced in the possession of the great treasure; while good David Edward was overpowered with the scene before him, and he also wept like a child." Then Charles said to Edward, "Well, David Edward, is not this very sad, that there should be such a scarcity of Bibles in the country, and that this poor girl should thus have walked some twenty-eight or thirty miles to get a copy? If something can be done to alter this state of things, I will not rest till it is accomplished." With this solemn vow, Charles then set out on his famous quest to supply Bibles for his countrymen, and the result, was the founding of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

The importance of the Mary Jones story lies more in the realm of myth and symbol than of history. Though Mary Jones really existed, her influence over Thomas Charles in the founding of the Bible Society was more legendary than real. Nevertheless, the national dilemma that the legend

(1) See Canton, _op.cit._ I, p. 468. Significantly, the story in its present form became current only after it was published in the _Monthly Reporter_ of 1867. No reference is made to Mary Jones in early histories of the Bible Society. As early as 1804, however, Charles told Joseph Tarn that "young females in service have walked thirty miles to me with only the bare hopes of obtaining a Bible each; & returned with more joy and thanksgiving
came to symbolize had a profound impact on future pan-evangelical developments.

From the very year that the L.M.S. was founded, pan-evangelicalism in foreign missions had faced insurmountable barriers. There was, indeed, only one missionary society that claimed to represent all of the evangelical denominations, but its claim was contested by the existence of Baptist, Wesleyan and Church organizations. Nevertheless, there were other causes around which the evangelical denominations could unite. Soon after the L.M.S. was founded, the evangelicals turned their attention to Britain itself as a mission field, and a number of interdenominational itinerant societies and evangelistic county unions were established. But like the Religious Tract Society founded in 1799 to provide itinerant home missionaries with religious literature, the itinerant societies and county unions were only slightly more pan-evangelical than the L.M.S. out of which they had evolved. As we shall see in Book Four, the Particular Baptists had joined the Calvinistic Nonconformists in the Religious Tract Society, but the Wesleyans and the 'regular' Evangelical Anglicans as yet had not.

It was probably the emergence of new home missionary enterprises, together with the dearth of Bibles in Wales

Footnote Contd.

than if they had obtained great spoils." B.S. Home C., T. Charles to J. Tarn, March 1804. Through the years, Charles probably added to this basic story which produced not only the tale of Mary Jones, but other fabrications. See for example, Canton, op.cit. I, p. 468 where it was suggested that the Bible Society was Mary Jones' idea. For a continuing discussion of the Mary Jones story, see K. Monica Davies, "Mary Jones 1784-1864," Transactions of the Calvinistic Methodist Historical Society, LII (1967).
and still more on the Continent, which directed evangelical attention to the Bible as a focal point for interdenominational cooperation. The Bible was so obviously suited for this role that it is surprising that a society far larger than the small, regional Naval and Military Bible Society had not been founded before. The primacy of the Biblical word in evangelical theology was paramount: here was the oracle of religious truth. The Bible, moreover, was not only the medium of a past revelation of the divine will, it was the medium through which the Holy Spirit continued to awaken and regenerate sinners; it was the most potent of all forces for the conversion of mankind. How many evangelicals had themselves been converted while studying its pages! Even without commentaries and glosses, the Word of God was capable, when illuminated by the light of the Spirit, of transforming men by its own self-evidencing truth. It seemed therefore axiomatic that since all evangelicals recognized the unique value of the Scriptures, none could refuse to cooperate in a united campaign for its distribution. In the Bible, therefore, the evangelicals found what they thought to be the most powerful (and inexpensive) instrument of conversion ever known; and in the Bible Society when it was founded, the perfect institutional embodiment of the pan-evangelical impulse.

(ii) Bible for Wales and France

Historians of the Bible Society have always held that it was the spiritual famine in Wales which led to the discussion of a possible Bible Society at meetings of the
R.T.S. in the winter of 1802. This is largely correct for it was a Welshman, Thomas Charles of Bala, who first brought the Welsh Bible crisis to the attention of the Tract Society directors. Charles, the leader of Welsh Calvinistic Methodism and an unbenefticed 'irregular' clergyman, had long been concerned in the spiritual education of his fellow countrymen, having organized 'Circulating Schools' since 1785, and established a publishing house to supply his Sunday Schools with textbooks.

As early as 1787, Charles had discussed the shortage of Welsh Bibles with Thomas Scott, the great Evangelical Bible commentator, then a chaplain at the Lock Hospital in London. Scott and his friend John Thornton informed Charles that they had been given twenty-five Welsh Bibles by the Naval and Military Bible Society which they would dispatch to Bala, and that they would apply to the S.P.C.K. for more. But their application was turned down. The S.P.C.K., which alone was responsible for publishing Welsh Bibles, had not printed an edition since 1769 and their stocks were diminishing rapidly. The Welsh bishops, the S.P.C.K. claimed, had priority over the evangelicals and there were not enough Bibles for both. A new S.P.C.K. edition appeared in 1789, but this did not ease the situation and Scott was once again compelled to report to Charles that the supply

---


(2) For Charles' biography, see D.N.B.; D.E. Jenkins, The Life of the Rev. Thomas Charles (1908). The following material is taken largely from Jenkins, op.cit. I, p. 567ff; II, pp. 107 ff, 248 ff.
of Bibles had virtually dried up.

A second attempt to meet the growing crisis was engineered in 1791 by Thomas Jones, another Welshman and Curate of Creaton in Northants. Jones urged the S.P.C.K. to mass-produce Welsh Bibles so that they could be sold to his countrymen at reduced prices, and even promised to give the S.P.C.K. a substantial advance raised among Evangelical churchmen in England, but in spite of the help and advice received from William Wilberforce (then a member of the S.P.C.K.) Jones' scheme ended in failure. This time the S.P.C.K. complained that the evangelicals had exaggerated the need for Welsh Bibles, even though the need was well documented by Jones.

The S.P.C.K. finally printed 10,000 Welsh Bibles in 1799, but when they were distributed, the evangelical strongholds in Montgomery, Cardigan and Carmarthen were notably neglected. In 1802, therefore, Jones proposed a second scheme, or what he called his 'Plan:' he now aimed to circumvent the S.P.C.K. by funding and printing his own Bibles. Jones' Plan was significant because unlike the previous proposals, it was completely interdenominational. When, however, Jones was informed that it was illegal to print Welsh Bibles without the approval of the Welsh bishops, he became discouraged and abandoned his scheme. But his friend Thomas Charles was not as easily put off. While in London in December 1802, to preach at Rowland Hill's Spa Fields Chapel and to find funds and a printer for the Bible scheme which had now become his own, Charles had the

(1) Ibid. II, p. 496 f; Canton, Bible Society Hist. I, p. 468.
excellent idea of asking the Tract Society to sponsor his project. Edward Morgan, Charles' biographer, tells us, in the true evangelical anecdotal tradition, that Charles' inspiration came one morning in London while lying in bed. "He was so pleased with it," Morgan retells, "that he instantly arose, dressed himself, and went out to consult with some friends on the subject." This in turn led to the formal discussions on the topic at the Tract Society later that month.

At what most historians consider to have been the first of the series of early Tract Society meetings which led to the founding of the Bible Society in 1804, it is recorded in the Minute Book for 7 December 1802 that Thomas Charles introduced the subject of Welsh Bibles, whereupon the R.T.S. directors present decided that it would be highly desirable "to stir up the public mind to the dispersion of Bibles generally..." Yet there are reasons to believe that

(1) E. Morgan, A Brief History of the Life and Labours of the Rev. Thomas Charles (2nd ed. 1828), p. 286. In a letter to Charles dated 7 March 1804, Joseph Tarn said, "We cannot, my dear brother, but rejoice together when we consider that this work had its beginning in a conversation we had together one morning, which will never be forgotten. Hence I was induced, the next meeting of the Committee of the Tract Society to mention the scarcity of bibles in Wales, and then it was that the flame was kindled, which now breaks out." Cited in Ibid., p. 292.
(2) R.T.S. Minutes, 7 Dec. 1802. Cf. H. Morris, A Memorable Room: The Story of the Inception and Foundation of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1898), p. 12. Over the years, the story of the 7 December meeting took on a great deal of embellishment. For example, Joseph Hughes in later years wished people to believe that after Charles presented the case for Wales, he (Hughes) said, "If for Wales, why not also for the Empire and the world?" See J. Leifchild, Memoir of the late Rev. J. Hughes (1835), p. 490. This claim, together with a later addition to the 7 December minute suggesting that Hughes had proposed that the topic of Bibles be continued at R.T.S. meetings,
the seminal importance of the Welsh Bible crisis in the founding of the Bible Society, has been somewhat exaggerated at the expense of another famine of the Word in France.

Evangelical interest in France can be dated well before 1794, but in that year, John Townsend, one of the founding fathers of the L.M.S. suggested that Paris should be the new Society's first mission station. In this proposal, Townsend was supported by Joseph Hardcastle and David Bogue, both of whom had visited Paris in 1784; but due partly to the very sensitive political situation at the time, partly to Thomas Haweis' overpowering argument that the L.M.S. should start in the South Seas, the French plan was shelved. Missionary interest in France, however, revived periodically during the next five years, and by 1799, the L.M.S. was again in a position to reconsider a French mission.

Footnote Contd.

have led many historians to suggest that Hughes was the founder of the Society. But William Hankey, who also attended the meeting, later disputed Hughes' claim. See ibid, p. 484.

(1) J. Townsend, Memoirs of J. Townsend (1828), p. 56. As early as 1792 there existed in London an organization known as the French Bible Society, but because of political developments in France, it had dissolved by 1803. Not even John Owen knew much about this organization. See John Owen, The History of the origin and first ten years of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1816), I, p. 26 f; Canton, Bible Society Hist., I, p. 3. It is also important to note that emigre priests from France, seeking political refuge in London, constantly rubbed shoulders with the evangelicals and did much to cultivate their interest in French ecclesiastical developments. See A.S. Wood, Thomas Haweis (1957), p. 186 f; R. Rouse and S.C. Neill, A History of the Ecumenical Movement (1954), p. 271 f.

(2) In 1796, for example, Thomas Haweis and Ambrose Serle discussed in private a possible mission to France, but a rebuff from the French ambassador in London checked the scheme. See Wood, op.cit., p. 214.

(3) Correspondence between the L.M.S. and its Continental affiliates especially in Holland and Switzerland concerning the French mission can be found in the 'Europe-Holland' correspondence in the L.M.S. archives. This correspondence was kept in a separate box because the negotiations were
The decision at the L.M.S. directly affected Tract Society policy at this time. Both societies, after all, largely shared the same directors. In 1800, the Tract Society began exploring the possibility of publishing tracts and pamphlets in French for distribution among French prisoners of war. By June 1801, the plan was expanded to include the publication of portions of the Bible in French, and William Hankey was commissioned to draw up plans for this activity. But it was probably after the return of the triumphant L.M.S. delegation to Paris in 1802 following the Peace of Amiens, that the Tract Society began to think

Footnote Contd.
highly secret. The L.M.S., for obvious reasons, did not want it known publicly, that it was corresponding with French agents. This might explain why the Welsh Bible crisis was publicized while the French crisis was kept secret.

(1) R.T.S. Minutes, 18 March 1800. Popular tracts included "Considerations Serieuxes," and "Doctrines et Devoirs de la Religion Cretyen." Both were written by Hankey. They enjoyed a circulation of 5,000 and 11,000 respectively. R.T.S. Minutes, 16 Dec. 1800, 16, 24 March 1802. Even Zachary Macaulay was involved in writing tracts for French prisoners of war. R.T.S. Minutes, 9 Sept. 1800. Later, tracts were published in French against "the errors of Rome." R.T.S. Minutes, 28 Sept. 1802, 26 Oct. 1802.

(2) R.T.S. Minutes, 30 June 1801. This decision must be seen in light of L.M.S. developments. In the spring of 1800, the L.M.S. adopted a proposal submitted by David Bogue "for promoting the Christian Religion in France, by circulating the New Testament, with a preliminary dissertation on the evidences of Christianity." L.M.S. Minutes, 7 April 1800, 14 April 1800, 15, 19 May 1800. See also E.M., June 1800, p. 255; J. Morison, Fathers and Founders (1844 edn.), p. 82. The decision of both the R.T.S. and the L.M.S. might have evolved out of a suggestion made by Joseph Hardcastle in 1800 when he wrote to David Bogue on religious developments in France, that "perhaps it would be advisable to compose new works, adapted to the actual state of the people in France, rather than republish old ones" and that "perhaps the Missionary Society, or that for the Circulation of Religious Tracts might consider this object as directly connected with those institutions." Cited in ibid., p. 80 f.
seriously of a more comprehensive Bible programme. According to John Morison, the L.M.S. delegation met with the directors of R.T.S. "a few weeks before" Thomas Charles brought up the subject of the Welsh Bible crisis, and informed them of the great need for Bibles in France. Although the L.M.S. proceeded to publish ten thousand French Testaments in June 1803, it had already been acknowledged one month before, at the Tract Society anniversary in London, that the L.M.S. could never hope to supply on its own the number of Bibles needed for France.

(1) The deputation consisted of Joseph Hardcastle, Matthew Wilks, Alexander Waugh, and David Bogue. See Morison, op.cit., p. 83. For Waugh's diary of the tour, see J. Hay and Henry Belfrage, A Memoir of the Reverend Alexander Waugh (1830), p. 228 ff. Wilberforce was very much interested in this tour. He wrote in his journal in 1802: "Mr. Hardcastle with me - going to France to enquire, etc., with a view to the diffusion of the Bible. Assured by Fouché that he would assist them gladly." Cited in R.I. and S. Wilberforce, The Life of William Wilberforce (1838), III, p. 69. From the L.M.S. deputation in Paris came these very optimistic words: "The religion of Rome, unsupported by extensive Funds, and destitute of Civil Liberty seems fast verging towards its fall...The anxious feelings of the mind after the true religion seems to be increasing in France - disgusted with the superstitions of Popery they betook themselves to the principles of infidelity and have proven them to be insufficient for their happiness as well as pernicious in their tendency - The day of infidelity & superstition is closing, and as soon as the Son of Righteousness arises, this will be chased into Eternal darkness..." L.M.S. Minutes, 25 Oct. 1802.

(2) Morison, op.cit., p. 86.

(3) L.M.S. Minutes, 20 June 1803. In July Bishop Porteus was presented with a copy of the Society's first French Bible, L.M.S. Various Memoranda, 25 July 1803. Because of the resumption of war in 1803, the L.M.S. had to postpone buying a chapel in Paris. L.M.S. Minutes, 24 Jan. - 8 Aug. 1803. They later had to circulate their French Bibles through Swiss agents. L.M.S.Minutes 8 April 1805.

(4) R.T.S. Minutes, 12 May 1803. The minute reads: "The Rev. Mr. Tracy stated that in those countries which had been under the destroying hand of infidelity during the French Revolution the Holy Scriptures had been generally destroyed in the conflagration with other Religious Books which occasioned such a scarcity as cannot be possibly supplied by the Missionary Society."
We must conclude, therefore, that it was the simultaneous need for Bibles in France and Wales which gave immediate rise to the British and Foreign Bible Society.

II. Designing a Society

Intermittently, between 1802 and 1804, the Tract Society met to plan the new Bible society. Their task had been greatly simplified by lessons learned from previous pan-evangelical experiments. The new society was to be a united enterprise like its predecessors, but by avoiding their mistakes and miscalculations it was hoped that much greater denominational and national support could be gained. Pan-evangelicalism in the L.M.S., they had learned, failed to mature because of the Society's church-oriented 'fundamental principle;' churchmen could not participate in the establishment of undenominational mission churches which they considered to be highly irregular. Pan-evangelicalism in the Tract Society, as we shall see, was encumbered by the complexity of its objectives; it was unrealistic, for instance, to expect a great deal of unanimity in an interdenominational reviewing committee before which passed an interminable number of different tracts and pamphlets on sundry theological topics. The architects of the new society realized, therefore, that only by avoiding church-oriented issues, and by whittling down its objectives to one simple goal that was acceptable to all, could their new organization ever hope to achieve pan-evangelical accord on a grand scale. That goal, later also to be known as the 'fundamental principle,' was to be found in the simple distribution of the Bible without
Several important decisions were made at the R.T.S. between December 1802 and March 1804, which significantly contributed to the Society's future design. On 8 February 1803, it was decided by the directors of the Tract Society "that the translation of the Scriptures established by Public Authority, be the only one in the English language to be accepted by the Society." By limiting translations to those established by public authority, the founders hoped to avoid accusations that the new society was circulating Bibles translated from 'Popish' or heretical texts. It was also decided on 8 February, that the committee of the new society should be composed of an equal number of churchmen and Dissenters. For some unaccountable reason, the minute was immediately altered to a more ambiguous formula, viz that the committee simply consist of twenty-four directors whose denomination was unspecified; but when the Society was finally established in 1804, the control was again divided equally between Church and Dissent.

The outcome of these resolutions was to encourage the participation of 'regular' Evangelical churchmen like William Wilberforce, and Wesleyans like Adam Clarke. As we have seen, 'regular' Anglicans and Wesleyan Methodists had hitherto preferred not to patronize pan-evangelical organizations in force. Wilberforce began attending Tract Society meetings as early as 1803, and chaired a committee

(1) R.T.S. Minutes, 8 Feb. 1803. See also H. Morris, A Memorable Room (1898), p. 13 ff.
(2) R.T.S. Minutes, 21 April 1803.
that unsuccessfully approached the King for his patronage;
but his participation was significant for another reason.
By 1803, many 'regulars' were more ready to acknowledge
that orthodox Nonconformists were not seditious 'republicans'
but loyal Englishmen who supported the British constitution
as they did. Suspensions faded, the barriers to cooperation
so evident in the history of the L.M.S. and the Tract Society,
were largely removed.

There is no doubt that Wilberforce's name attracted
many Anglican patrons who otherwise would have been
reluctant to join the new society. Still, as the inaugural
meeting of the Society approached, there were many who
hesitated to support it. One such was Charles Simeon, the
Rector of Holy Trinity Cambridge and doyen of the 'regular'
Evangelical Anglicans; another was John Owen who would soon
become the Society's Anglican secretary. Because he was a
'regular' clergyman, Owen initially regarded the combination
of churchmen and Dissenters in a pan-evangelical institution

(1) Morris, op.cit., p. 15. Wilberforce's sons have created
the illusion that he was one of the initiators of the
Bible Society, but this is incorrect. See R.I. and S.
Wilberforce, The Life of William Wilberforce (1838), III,
p. 91. But it is equally wrong to say, as does Ford K.
Brown, that because Wilberforce did not attend the
inaugural meeting of the Bible Society on 7 March 1804,
"he was afraid to risk the loss of his moral influence
by a premature support." See F.K. Brown, Father of the
Victorians (1961), p. 246. As we have seen, he was active
in the Society's affairs before 1804.

(2) Even after the Society was founded, Simeon was hesitant
actively to solicit patronage. In a letter to Joseph
Tarn, the Society's assistant secretary, he expressed
relief that he would not personally have to circulate
the Society's plan in Cambridge. He did, however, include
a list of clergy to whom Tarn himself might write. B.S.
Home C., C. Simeon to J. Tarn, 14 Aug. 1804.
as "utterly chimerical" and therefore took "little pains either to understand or to recommend it." Other clergymen probably shared his doubts. Owen finally decided to attend the Society's inaugural meeting on 7 March 1804, only because he noticed the name of his friend, Granville Sharp, among the signatures on a Society circular. But at the inaugural meeting, Owen quickly gave up his scepticism. He saw gathered before him 'respectable' men of different denominations - even Quakers - and when C.F. Steinkopf, the Lutheran pastor of the Savoy gave a passionate address, Owen found himself standing up "by an impulse which he had neither the inclination nor the power to disobey," and adding his testimony to those which exulted in the spectacle of so many people of different denominations gathered together for the purpose of circulating the Gospel. By March 1804, the Society had a sufficient number of prominent names on its subscription lists to prove its strength and seriousness of purpose.

Several other important resolutions were passed in the spring of 1804 which developed the Society's design. At the inaugural meeting itself the new society adopted the R.T.S. resolution of 8 February 1803 which laid down that the committee should consist of thirty-six (increased from twenty-four) members. Josiah Pratt, Lecturer at St. Mary Woolnoth, feared that the ambiguity of the Society's directorial composition might cause an imbalance in denominational representation, opening it to charges from

(1) Owen, Bible Society Origin I, p. 37.
(2) Ibid., p. 38.
churchmen or Dissenters that the other controlled the affairs of the Society. Consequently it was decided in May that the committee would consist of thirty-six laymen: fifteen to be Anglicans, fifteen to be Dissenters, and the rest to be foreigners resident in London. Significantly, the committee was to be composed entirely of laymen, although every clergyman or minister who subscribed one guinea or more each year, would be entitled to vote at committee meetings.

A second important resolution involving the Society's secretaries was passed on 12 March 1804. The most likely candidate for the position seemed to be Joseph Hughes, the Baptist who chaired many of the early Tract Society meetings at which a Bible society was discussed. Educated at Aberdeen University where he founded the first Sunday School in the district, Hughes had for a time been professor at the Baptist College in Bristol, but eventually moved to Battersea in 1787. Because of his proximity to Clapham, Hughes was on friendly terms with the Evangelical churchmen of the Clapham Sect. In 1799, he became the first Secretary of the Religious Tract Society.

When Hughes' name was put up for nomination, his friend John Owen objected, feeling that it would be impolitic to constitute "a Dissenting Minister, however highly respectable and meritorious, the Secretary of an Institution which was designed to unite the whole body of Christians, and for which its directors had evinced so laudable an anxiety to

(1) B.S. Minutes of General Meetings, 2 May 1804.
(2) This in itself was significant. Committee meetings throughout our period were generally dominated by laymen, not by clergymen as in the L.M.S.
(3) For Hughes' biography, see J. Leifchild, Memoir of the late Rev. J. Hughes (1835).
obtain the patronage and cooperation of the Established Church."
Consequently, the office of Secretary was split in three ways: Josiah Pratt was appointed the Anglican Secretary, Joseph Hughes the Nonconformist Secretary, and C.F. Steinkopf the Secretary for the foreign churches. A final important decision was the appointment of John Shore, Lord Teignmouth, former Governor-General in India, as the Society's first President. This was a good choice, not only because of his prominence in public affairs, but because he was an able linguist who contributed to the Bible Society's translations.

As things stood by the end of 1804, the Bible Society was a well-balanced institution. Though clergymen and ministers possessed a vote in committee, the Society's directors were all laymen, and equally divided between Church and Dissent and the foreign churches, as were the Society's three secretaries. The architects of the Society intended to attract no criticisms on the ground that they favoured a particular party. If anything, the balance swung in favour of the Church. When it was realized that the Society's President and Vice-Presidents were churchmen, Lord Teignmouth proposed that the Dissenters should nominate from within their own ranks an equal number of patrons, but the offer was declined. "The Wesleyan Methodists," we are told, "assigned, as their ground of refusal, that they

(1) Owen, op.cit. I, p. 53.
(2) Pratt was Secretary for one month, but due to responsibilities as Secretary of the C.M.S., he handed the post over to John Owen.
(3) For Teignmouth's biography, see C.J. Shore, Memoir of the Life and Correspondence of John Lord Teignmouth (1843).
considered themselves represented by the Bishops; the Quakers pleaded their averseness to distinction; and the other classes of Dissenters expressed their unwillingness to interfere, in a manner equally as creditable to their humility and their candour."

Oddly enough, the new society seemed to have forgotten its most important rule. At the Tract Society meeting of 8 February 1803, as we have seen, it had been decided that the Bible Society would only circulate the authorized version of the Bible, but for some strange reason, this resolution was not included in the legislation of 1804. Only with the onslaught of controversy with the S.P.C.K. did the directors realize the importance of this omission, and quickly added to the Society's constitution the 'fundamental principle' that only Bibles authorized by public authority, without note or comment, would be circulated by it.

III. Building a Society

The strength of the Bible Society rested in the simplicity of its design and objective; a fact which it relentlessly tried to communicate to friends and enemies alike. When, for example, Thomas Twining, in a letter to the chairman of the East India Company in 1807, accused the Society of inflaming

(1) Owen, op. cit. I, p. 81.
(2) The only resolution passed at the inaugural meeting of 7 March 1804 was: "A Society shall be formed, with this designation, The British and Foreign Bible Society; of which the sole object shall be to encourage a wider dispersion of the Holy Scripture." This was reaffirmed at the General Meeting of 2 May 1804 with the substitution of "circulation" for "dispersion." B.S. Minutes of General Meetings, 7 March 1804, 2 May 1804.
the delicate religious situation in India by the "universal dissemination of the Christian faith," John Owen was quick to assure him that the "ultimate point, in the case of the Society...is...not 'the Dissemination of the Christian Faith,' - but THE CIRCULATION OF THE SCRIPTURES" and furthermore that the Society "can support no Missionaries, erect no Churches, endow no Schools, disseminate no Tracts; it cannot issue even a Dissertation to recommend the Bible, nor annex a single Note to explain it."  

The identification of the Bible Society with foreign missions was natural. Bible Society directors sat simultaneously on the boards of most of the evangelical foreign missionary societies. The fact that it had foreign agents, only confirmed this association of ideas in the minds of many people. The Society, however, went out of its way to deny this link. To a correspondent who thought that the Bible Society was but another foreign missionary organization, Joseph Tarn, the Society's assistant secretary, wrote, "...allow me to assure you that the British & Foreign Bible Society never sent out missionaries or had such a measure in contemplation; their sole object being the more extensive circulation of the Holy Scriptures, to which they have most scrupulously adhered..."  

The image that the Society wanted to create, in fact,

(1) Owen, op.cit. I, pp. 325, 332 f.
(2) See for example, B.S. Home C.: T. Hawkins to J. Tarn, July 1805; Miss Cottrell to Bible Society, 30 July 1810.
was not that of some kind of sectarian organization
noisily propagating a disruptive brand of religion, but
that of a respectable business institution which simply
published and disseminated Bibles. John Owen even liked
to compare the Bible Society with Lloyds, the insurance
company. "The line of business is, with a few exceptions,"
he wrote, "as direct at the Bible Committee as it is at
Lloyds; and there is little reason to expect the peculiar
tenets of Calvin or Socinus to enter into a debate for
dispersing an edition of the Scripture, as there would be
if the same men were met to underwrite a policy of insurance." ¹
Consequently, in order to avoid being identified by critics
with any church or conventicle, it was rigid policy that
the general meetings of the Society should be held in
non-religious places like the London Tavern. Religious
activities, such as prayers and sermons, were carefully
avoided at Society meetings. Proceedings were so business-
like, that one clergyman could tell his superior

On going to the committee room, or to the hall, I make
no compromise of principle, even in appearance, in any way.
I offend not, either in letter or in spirit, against any
one article of my Church. I break no law, or canon which
I have subscribed. I violate no duty which I owe to my
ecclesiastical rulers. I am countenanced by many of my
superiors, by some of the highest authority in the Church.
And when I have transacted the business on which I attended,
I leave the assembly, I trust, uncontaminated by the work
in which I have been engaged, or by the persons with whom
I have associated.

The very make-up of the Society's committee and the
business it transacted, at least prevented the Society from
gaining too clerical an appearance. As the governing body

¹ J. Owen, A Letter to a Country Clergyman, occasioned
by his Address to Lord Teignmouth (1805), p. 50.
² Poynder, op.cit., p. 69 f. Cited from an address by
Edward Cooper, Rector of Yoxall.
was composed entirely of laymen, laymen predominated in committee meetings; as the directors were mostly prominent businessmen and politicians, the meetings were carried on in a very business-like and parliamentary fashion. In fact, the Society's minutes and correspondence are, for the most part, singularly monotonous, for they deal almost exclusively with business transactions, including orders for Bibles, payments and receipts. Yet the business-like image that the Society tried to project, was not always accepted by Society patrons. As we shall see in the Tests Controversy of 1830, there were indeed many people who believed the Society to be a religious institution that dispersed more than Bibles.

As a business institution which only circulated Bibles and did not interfere with denominational autonomy, the Bible Society was a very attractive proposition to pan-evangelical 'realists' who had previously refused to patronize the L.M.S. and the Tract Society. Regular clergymen like Thomas Biddulph, Richard Cecil, William Dealtry, Thomas Scott, Basil Woodd, Thomas Gisborne and later, even Charles Simeon, became amongst the Society's warmest advocates. Among prominent evangelical Anglican laymen, the Society numbered William Wilberforce, Zachary Macaulay, Henry Thornton, Charles Grant, Granville Sharp and, of course,

(1) John Owen wrote in the preface to the third volume of his history, "to the charge of monotony it will not be perhaps quite so easy to reply. Such a quality is, to a certain degree, inherent in the very nature of the Bible Society; and cannot be wholly avoided, by any contrivance, however artificial and ingenious with which its transactions may be related." Owen, Bible Society Origins, III, p. viii.
Lord Teignmouth, the Society's first President. Virtually all of the evangelical Dissenters who patronized the various missionary societies, also supported the Bible Society. The Wesleyans valued their connection with the Society so highly, that they took the unprecedented step of allowing Adam Clarke to remain permanently in London so that he could continue to assist the Bible Society with its foreign translations. A Baptist, as we have seen, was the Society's Nonconformist Secretary.

Although the Bible Society was predominantly patronized by evangelicals, it attracted a number of non-evangelical subscribers. In the Anglican camp, Bishops Beilby Porteus of London, John Fisher of Exeter, and Thomas Burgess of St. David, immediately accepted Vice-Presidencies. By 1810 eleven bishops and two Irish archbishops patronized the Society. Two years later, William Otter, a future Bishop, claimed that of the forty-eight bishops in Great Britain, twenty openly supported the Society. Not a few non-evangelical Anglican clergymen and laymen also patronized the Society. At Cambridge, Edward Daniel Clarke, the professor of mineralogy, though no Evangelical, rallied to the support of the Society when the Cambridge auxiliary was founded; at Oxford the Principal of Jesus College, David Hughes, also no Evangelical, gave his patronage to the Society. In government circles not only did the Evangelical Spencer Perceval back it, but also Lord

(1) See G. Smith, History of Wesleyan Methodism (1863), II, p. 447. 
Liverpool and Robert Peel, who could not be numbered among
the Parliamentary 'Saints.'

Dissenters not usually associated with pan-evangelical
enterprises also found their way to the Bible Society in
surprising numbers. We have already noted the Quakers' contribution to the founding of the Society; they continued
to support it through the years. So did many General
Baptists. In 1810, for example, a General Baptist minister
was to be found addressing the founding meeting of the
Leicester Bible Society auxiliary where he recommended
the Bible cause to his brethren. There were also an
embarrassing number of Unitarian patrons. When the Society
was criticized for this fact in 1810, William Dealtry
claimed that there were only one or two, but upon further
investigation he had to admit that the number was larger
than he originally imagined. As we shall see, Unitarian
patronage was to precipitate much controversy.

Those least expected to patronize the Society were the
Roman Catholics. Late in 1804, Johann Gossner, a Roman
Priest from Swabia, asked C.F. Steinkopf for Bibles with
which to supply his people. Later, Gossner negotiated
directly with the German Bible Society at Nüremberg and

(1) For Peel, see B.S. Home C.: T. Mottershaw to J. Owen,
12 Feb. 1812 where it is said that the proposed auxiliary
at Stafford enjoyed his support.

(2) The colourful story of the Gurney family's involvement
in the founding of the Norwich Auxiliary Bible Society
can be found in A.J.C. Hare, The Gurneys of Earlham (1895),
I, p. 229 f.


(4) Dealtry, op.cit. p. 83 f. The correction was made in a
MS note in Dealtry's handwriting in the Bodleian copy
of A Vindication and appears in the second edition.

(5) B.S. Miscellaneous Book, I, p. 33 f: J. Gossner to
C.F. Steinkopf, 18 Oct. 1804.
became a regular agent of the Society. Contact with Catholics existed at home also. In 1805, Robert Shaw, the Rector of Kilkenny, reported that he had written to the "Popish" Bishop of the Diocese of Waterford and Lismore to enquire "whether he has any objection to the Testament being introduced into schools as a school-book," and was pleased to report that the Bishop had responded favourably to his letter. Shaw cautioned London, however, that if this news were to be made public, it would be prudent to avoid printing his name lest the Bishop be censured by his superiors. Instances of cooperation between British Roman Catholics and the Bible Society continued through our period, even when the Pope condemned Bible societies in 1816.

The soliciting of patronage in the early years was rather unsystematic. In the autumn of 1804 a number of prominent provincial evangelicals were asked by the directors in London to submit a list of the people in their areas most likely to support the new society; this procedure caused some confusion at first because many of the evangelicals approached for lists were not quite sure

(2) For example, R. Sainthill reported that he has received the following letter from a Quaker in Dublin: "...thou wilt rejoice to hear that a Roman Bishop has enlisted himself in our cause & has already given proof of his attachment to the principles of the society. Thou wilt be surprised to hear that this liberal minded Bishop gave me his decided opinion - 'That the Scriptures should be distributed without note or comment' - and that he had advocated the measure in a synod of the Bishops of his own community." B.S. Home C.: R. Sainthill to J. Tarn, 26 March 1818.
(3) Cf. Anti Biblion, or the Papal Tocsin...The present Pope's Bull against Bible societies (2nd edn. 1817).
what type of supporter the directors had in mind. One Nonconformist minister, for example, assumed that Anglicans were not intended and therefore sent back his list with only Nonconformist evangelicals listed. It was soon clear to all, however, that Church patronage was crucial to the Society's success. Thomas Richardson of Bristol told Joseph Tarn, "whenever the effort is made, in order to succeed, it appears to me requisite that the scheme originate with the Establishment" and doubted whether recruitment would meet with much success if launched only by Nonconformists.

At first the Society's search for patrons met scant success, but with the introduction of the auxiliary system in 1809, membership increased rapidly. Though the auxiliary system found its genesis in London, Birmingham and Glasgow between 1805 and 1806, the first 'official' auxiliary was established in Reading in 1809. From now on the number of auxiliaries established each year increased rapidly. In 1809 alone, auxiliaries were established in Nottingham, Newcastle, Exeter, East Lothian and Edinburgh. By 1811, the number of auxiliaries had increased so phenomenally that the parent society in London faced a crisis of control. Too many auxiliaries, as we shall see later, had diverged from the simple principle of the Society and directed portions of their collections to non-Bible distribution activities like Sunday Schools and missionary societies.

(1) B.S. Home C.; T. Kidd to J. Tarn, 5 April 1805.
(2) B.S. Home C.; T. Richardson to J. Tarn, 23 Feb. 1809.
(3) See F.K. Brown, op.cit. p. 246 f.
(4) For a complete list of the auxiliaries and their dates, see Canton, Bible Society Hist. II, p. 471 f.
Consequently, in 1811 the parent society saw a need to regulate and codify the constitutions of its provincial auxiliaries by publishing a small pamphlet entitled *Rules by which Auxiliary Societies, Branch Societies and Bible Associations, might be regularly and effectively organized.*

IV. The Society in Action: An Interlude

The Bible Society was by far the largest and most ambitious of the great pan-evangelical organizations. It can safely be said that most evangelicals in Britain subscribed to and patronized its activities. Membership statistics put the size of the Society in perspective: Baptist Noel estimated in 1832, that there were well over 37,000 committee members; Joseph John Gurney claimed in the same year that there were over 100,000 subscribers. By 1814, the Society had auxiliaries in every English county. Ten years later, according to one estimate, there were over 859 Bible Society auxiliaries, 2,000 Bible Associations.

(1) See Owen, *Bible Society Origins*, II, p. 537 f. This was supplemented one year later by "Hints on the Constitution and Objects of Auxiliary Societies." See C.I. Foster, *An Errand of Mercy* (1960), p. 89 ff. Auxiliaries could choose between three associational plans: (a) Those independent of London who did not contribute money directly to the parent society, and received Bibles from the parent society at cost. The Edinburgh Bible Society was perhaps the most prominent of the 'independent' societies. (b) Auxiliaries that gave half their subscriptions to London and kept the other half for themselves. The auxiliaries at Newcastle and Nottingham were two examples. (c) Auxiliaries that were totally dependent on the parent society and remitted all their subscriptions to London. Reading and Birmingham exemplified this last type.

(2) B.W. Noel, *An Appeal on behalf of the British and Foreign Bible Society* (1832), p. 13 f.

(3) J.J. Gurney, *Terms of Union* (1832), p. 23 f.
and 500 Ladies organizations dotting the nation. The Southwark auxiliary alone had twelve supporting associations with 650 agents working in a population of 150,000. There were twenty-four associations connected with the Tyndale Ward auxiliary; ten associations in the Blackheath district; 500 ladies actively engaged in Glasgow and 600 in Liverpool. On the Continent and in America, Bible societies in close association with London mushroomed between 1804 and 1830: in Russia alone, there were over 300 Bible societies by 1824. With a growth rate like this, we should not be surprised to find that the Bible Society in the first five years of its life, distributed over 150,000 Bibles; 800,000 in the second five years. Indeed, by 1825, the Society had spent well over £1,165,000 printing and issuing 4,252,000 Bibles in 140 languages and dialects, including 55 languages in which it had never before been printed.

Statistics alone, however, do not really indicate the importance of the Bible Society both as an agency of religious revival and as perhaps the most important institutional embodiment of the pan-evangelical urge. The importance of the Bible Society as an agency of reformation cannot be disputed. As Ford K. Brown somewhat humorously suggested, "if every one of the 4,252,000 Bibles issued by 1825 had been printed in the language of the Esquimaux and piled up on the frozen tundra the Bible Society would still have been next to Abolition, the most powerful agency of evangelical reform." Not only did

(2) Ibid., p. 258.
(3) Ibid., pp. 249-250.
(4) Ibid., p. 261.
Society Bibles convert by themselves abject sinners, dangerous convicts and seditious radicals, but the group activities of the auxiliaries that distributed them throughout Britain seemed to promote revival and a general increase in church attendance. One correspondent from Tavistock, for example, claimed that "since the establishment of the Auxiliary Society in this town there has been an increased attendance, at the Established Church, and in other places of public worship." Another reported that because of the distribution of Bibles in Ireland, "the Sabbath Day now becomes a truly delightful scene." The Anglican Charles Jerram said that Bible Society meetings in his neighborhood brought clergymen together from different parishes to ascertain by what means their respective parishioners might be supplied with Bibles: as a result the clergy "became better acquainted with each other and were led to consider the religious state of their people, and to concert the best means of promoting their spiritual interests."

The Bible Society also had a profound impact on the spirit of church union. Bearing in mind the obstacles that the Society had to overcome when it was first established - the Anglican fears of Nonconformity and the Nonconformist suspicions of establishments - its progress in bringing Christians of various churches and denominations together

(1) Robert Stevens of the Bible Society, for example, told of a radical in Ireland who, after reading a Bible, exclaimed "if this be Christianity no Christian can be a rebel." B.S. Paterson Letters, Book I, f. 123: R. Stevens to J. Paterson, Oct. 1815.
(3) B.S. Home C.: J. Hawksly to A. Blest, 22 June 1818.
was quite remarkable. Writing in 1816, the *Christian Observer* only exaggerated a little when it said:

Prejudice, selfishness, indolence, covetousness, the spirit of nationality, of monopoly...had, up to this period, proved to be principles of a tough, unbending, unaccommodating texture...But now, except in a committee room or two, or in the shady purlieu of a professor’s solitary study, or in the chilling corner of a few quadrangles, where the spirit of Popery is not cast out, these once formidable enemies have, like the army of Sennacherib, melted away.

Alexander Knox paid tribute to the Bible Society when he described it as an incubator of Christian good will and understanding, in which Arminians rubbed shoulders with Calvinists, Baptists with paedobaptists, and churchmen with Dissenters. One enthusiastic Anglican Evangelical claimed proudly that the Bible Society had the honour of commencing a new era in the Christian world. "They have roused the torpor of other religious institutions; they have thrown down the barriers which separated man from his brother, and united in one body the energies of the pious and the wise."

That this section concentrates less on the enormous achievements of the Bible Society, and more on the controversies that troubled it, is due to an insuperable deficiency in source materials. Though the Society's minutes and correspondence are voluminous, they deal mainly with the routine of administration - the receipt and dispatch of orders for Bibles and the posting of bills and receipts - and hardly ever do they record the instances of interdenominational

---

(1) *Christian Observer*, Nov. 1816, p. 728. This was part of a review of Owen's history of the Bible Society.


cooperation which continually took place. But then the Bible Society was never meant to be a 'religious' institution: sermons and prayers, as we have seen, were forbidden at Society meetings, and so we find no instances of Bible Society officials taking part in groups at ordinations or communion services, as did those of the L.M.S. Printed sources provide surprisingly little help in gauging the influence of the Society as an agency of interdenominational union. The biographies of Bible Society directors and patrons, for instance, were mostly written in the 1840s and 1850s when the Oxford Movement had hardened Anglican and Nonconformist relations, and their authors were too prone to dismiss the pan-evangelical movement as a relatively unimportant force in the lives of the men they wrote about. Nevertheless, we get occasional glimpses of the kind of fraternization that flowed directly from the activities of the Bible Society and its interlocking chain of auxiliaries. In Augustus Hare's The Gurneys of Earlham, for example, Joseph John Gurney, the great Quaker reformer and patron of the Bible Society, reminisced about the founding of the Norwich Auxiliary Society which was attended by a concourse of Quakers, Anglicans, Lutherans, and Baptists.

(1) Wilberforce's biography is perhaps the best example of this problem. In 1827, William Jay lamented: "Mr. Wilberforce's life is forthcoming, but I expect it will be a very partial representation of him, especially on the score of his liberality. It is written by his two clerical sons, who are now so high, that one of them has published a tract [which] calls upon members of the Church to have 'no social or friendly intercourse with any Dissenters...Yet their honoured father used to say, - 'Though I am an Episcopalian, I should like to commune once every year with every Christian church that holds the Head." See G. Redford, ed., The Autobiography of the Rev. William Jay (1855), p. 311 fn.

We had a vast party at Earlham, and a remarkable day, a perfectly harmonious mixture of High Church, Low Church, Lutheran, Baptist, Quaker! It was a time which seemed to pull down all barriers of distinction, and melt us into one common Christianity. Such a beginning warrants us to expect much.

Joseph Hughes, the Baptist Secretary of the Bible Society, who was also present, caught something of the deep emotion and comradeship which an occasion like this could inspire, when he wrote, "we seemed generally to feel like the disciples whose hearts burned within them as they walked to Emmaus." The bristling barriers, social as well as doctrinal, which set Christian apart from Christian, fell as committee members sat round tables or on platforms, discussing how best to propagate the Word which was the symbol and vehicle of their common spiritual life. If the meetings of the Society precluded communal worship or doctrinal discussion, they could easily lead to further, less inhibited associations elsewhere. Thus John Leifchild, the Independent, told of frequent walks with Joseph Hughes, perhaps after a Bible Society meeting, from Hughes' house at Battersea to Mrs. Rebecca Wilkinson's at Clapham "where we met a select party of clerical brethren, and discussed with them the texts we had preached from, and other subjects of a theological nature." In a period when religious controversies ran high, and the social gap between churchman and Dissenter yawned increasingly wide, the continued association of evangelical men of good will in innumerable Bible Society auxiliaries was a force for charitableness even more than for charity, a quiet but

(1) Ibid., p. 232.
(2) J.R. Leifchild, John Leifchild (1863), p. 70.
incalculably important agency for the integration of Christians into a common fellowship and shared purpose, however limited it might be. Indeed, we may even conjecture with Elie Halevy, that the shared ideology of evangelicalism, which brought peers, merchants, shopkeepers and workman into a common constituency of the spirit, was one of the most important stabilizing factors in English society in this period of acute social tension. The association of different classes and denominations in philanthropic causes like the Anti-slavery movement or - on a far larger and longer basis - in the Bible Society, was a force for unity in many directions. These achievements must be kept firmly in mind as we turn to the tensions both within the Society and in its external relations, which it had to struggle to overcome.

Chapter Seven: The External Relations

I. The Welsh Bible Controversy and the Fundamental Principle

With an aim that could unite all evangelicals, and a constitution that was designed to minimize internal friction, the Bible Society got on with the seemingly uncontroversial business of publishing and distributing Bibles. The Society was soon to learn, however, that even this simple task would excite the opposition of many fellow Christians, especially High Church Anglicans. Indeed, High Churchmen considered the Bible Society as an enemy from the start. Not only did it challenge the authority of the S.P.C.K., but it threatened to draw unsuspecting clergymen into an organization that was professedly the agent of no particular party or sect, but in reality a front for the recruitment of evangelicals, even Nonconformists. High Churchmen felt far more embattled towards the Bible Society than to comparable evangelical institutions because a steady trickle of High Church clergymen were joining it. Even before the Bible Society had issued its first Bible, therefore, it reeled under a swift and unexpected attack from High Church writers. As a result, much of the early energy of the Society was directed to defending itself on this flank rather than with the task of promoting general evangelical union.

It was the printing of the Welsh Bible which brought the Bible Society into collision with the S.P.C.K., setting off a long and protracted controversy between High Churchmen and evangelicals that continued on and off for eighteen years and ultimately shook the foundations of the Bible Society. In April 1804, the Society appointed a subcommittee to investigate the possibility of publishing Bibles in English,
Welsh and Irish, and by the end of the summer, it was decided to print 20,000 Welsh Bibles and 5,000 Welsh Testaments. Thomas Charles was then commissioned to work from the 1799 Oxford Welsh edition of the Bible originally published by the S.P.C.K., making necessary corrections in the text and sending these corrections back to London for the subcommittee's approval. Charles' proposal to alter only the orthography of the text was agreed to by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, and work commenced.

But by December 1804, the S.P.C.K. had lodged a complaint against Charles' work before it was even completed. The initiator was John Roberts, Vicar of Tremeirchion, who had himself edited the 1799 Oxford edition of the Welsh Bible for the Church organization. Roberts complained in a letter to George Gaskin, the General Secretary of the S.P.C.K., that unwarranted 'innovations' were being introduced into Charles' text, which, he felt, would be detrimental to the interests of the Church of England. He also protested that the care

(1) The following account is based primarily on William Dealtry's excellently documented summary of the controversy, published in 1810. See W. Dealtry, A Vindication of the British and Foreign Bible Society in a letter to the Rev. Dr. Wordsworth (1810). The first Bible published by the Society was a limited edition of St. John's Gospel in Mohawk.

(2) It is interesting to note that some years before (c. 1793), Charles had submitted to William Wilberforce "A Few Hints Respecting a New Edition of the Welsh Bible" in which he proposed to use either the 1746 or the 1752 edition and to eliminate the Apocrypha, only admitting singing Psalms. Bodl. MSS Wilberforce, d 17, f.37; T. Charles to W. Wilberforce, n.d.

(3) Roberts wrote to Joseph Tarn four months later, "will not the new Dialect which he introduces render many words in the Church service obsolete to the next generation? Is it likely that the Church Members of the Society will sanction any innovations that will be detrimental to the Christian interest in the Establishment?" B.S. Home C. J. Roberts to J. Tarn, 18 March 1805.
of editing the Bible Society's edition had been "committed

to two leading characters among the Methodists." Without
officially notifying the Bible Society of these accusations,
Gaskin sent copies of Roberts' letter to all of the Bible
Society's Vice-Presidents. This action upset influential
patrons like William Agutter and caused a great deal of
anxiety to Bishop Porteus who had cautiously supported
the Society from its inception. On Porteus' suggestion,
the Society announced that it would formally investigate the
allegations brought forward by Roberts.

Nobody at the Bible Society really took Roberts seriously.
They were generated more by bitterness towards the 'Methodist'
editors of the Bible, than by the harmless changes that
they had proposed to make in the text. Consequently,
in their report of 4 February 1805, the special inves­
tigating committee declared themselves satisfied that
Charles and his assistant had violated no standard prin­
ciple in their work; indeed, it was pointed out that
they had consulted eight editions of the Welsh Bible all
of which differed in orthography. Charles was therefore
completely exonerated.

In the meantime, authorities at the S.P.C.K. began to
question the authenticity of the 1799 Welsh edition which
Charles was editing, and announced on 4 March 1805, without
notifying the Bible Society, that they had decided to

(1) B.S. Home C.; J. Roberts to G. Gaskin, 31 Dec. 1804 (copy).
   Apparently, however, Roberts had not seen Charles' manuscript
   but was basing his accusations on "the specimens which
   I have seen in some other Welsh publications." Dealtry,
   op.cit., p.13.
(2) B.S. Home C.; W. Agutter to Bible Society, 9 Jan. 1805.
(3) B.S. Home C.; Teignmouth to J. Owen, 14 Jan. 1805.
print 20,000 Welsh Bibles of their own from the edition of 1746. The Bible Society found out about this decision from one of its own members, Zachary Macaulay, who also pointed out to John Owen that according to the Act of Uniformity, no edition of the Welsh Bible could be printed until it had the approval of four Welsh Bishops and the Bishop of Hereford, or a majority of three of them. Not wanting to press the matter formally before an ecclesiastical court, and desiring only to live at peace with the S.P.C.K., the Bible Society decided, after conferring with the Cambridge University Press, to conform to the S.P.C.K. decision and also print from the 1746 edition. Thomas Charles now had to recommence his editorial task. But within a matter of days, the S.P.C.K. had again changed its mind. Apparently, Thomas Beynon, the prominent Welsh scholar, had advised the S.P.C.K. that the 1752 edition of the Welsh Bible was even more accurate than the one for 1746. Accordingly the S.P.C.K. decided, again without notifying the Bible Society, that it would print from this edition. Tired perhaps of the S.P.C.K.'s fickleness on the matter, and following up on Macaulay's earlier advice, Lord Teignmouth finally asked John Fisher, the Bishop of St Davids, to sanction one edition of the Welsh Bible or the other, according to the provisions of the Act of Uniformity. Consequently, after a conference of the Welsh Bishops and the Bishop of Hereford on 30 November 1805, the Bible Society was told that the 1752 edition had been approved by them. But by this point, understandably, there

(2) B.S. Home C.: T. Charles to J. Tarn, 5 April 1805.
were a few dissidents in the Bible Society who were unwilling even to accept the Bishops' decision. They believed that the edition of 1746 was by far the purest translation, and since the Bible Society had already printed a large number of editions from this source at great expense, they sponsored a motion to continue its production even in the face of prelatical disapproval. But they were defeated in committee and the Bishops' decision was finally accepted. Here matters finally rested.

The controversy obviously had some unfortunate effects on the Bible Society. Letters poured in from the provinces prompted by rumours, largely spread by the newspapers, that the Bible Society was publishing its Welsh Bible from an irregular text. To answer these queries, the Society had to assure its patrons "that the liberties supposed to have been taken, were with the orthography of the text, & not with the text itself." The controversy had one beneficial effect however; it forced the Society to make a very important addition to its constitution. Sometime before March 1805, Thomas Sikes, the High Church Vicar of Guilsborough, published a very acrimonious attack on the Bible Society, which questioned whether the purity of the Society's translations could be maintained when entrusted to 'sectaries' like Thomas Charles. John Owen responded to this accusation in April by pointing out to Sikes that "it has already been stated

(1) B.S. Minutes of the Subcommittee(1804-1810), 4 Dec. 1805. Charles pointed out that the errors of the 1799 edition were based on the impure one of 1752.
(2) B.S. Minutes of the Subcommittee(1804-1810), 9 Dec. 1805.
(3) Cited from B.S. Home C.: J. Hughes to G. Simcox, 14 May 1806 (copy). Simcox was Secretary of the Birmingham auxiliary.
(4) T. Sikes, An Address to Lord Teignmouth (1805), p. 32 f.
that the Society is restrained to editing and distributing
the versions, printed by authority," and was therefore 1
protected against irregular or heretical translations.
Owen had forgotten, however, that the original principle
of the Society, drawn up in 1803, and insisting that
translations could only be based on those established by
public authority, had inadvertently been left out of the
Society's constitution in 1804. If Owen was not aware of this
oversight in April, another critic, William Van Mildert,
the future Bishop of Durham, brought it to his attention.
To Owen's claim that the Bible Society was protected against
the pitfalls prophesied by Sikes, Van Mildert responded,
"I do not find any such restriction as this in the Society's
first printed list of laws and regulations; and if any
restriction has been made since the publication of those laws,
it is probably in consequence of the alarm which has been
given on the subject from a very respectable quarter." In
fact the force of these criticisms had so alarmed Bishop
Porteus, that he asked John Owen for a clarification of the
Society's fundamental principle. As a result, at the Society's
first anniversary, the constitution was revised to read:

The designation of this Society shall be 'The British and
Foreign Bible Society;' the sole object of which shall be,
to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures:
The only copies in the languages of the United Kingdom to
be circulated by the Society, shall be the authorized version,
without note or comment.

Armed with a revised constitution and a 'fundamental

(1) J. Owen, A Letter to a Country Clergyman occasioned by his
Address to Lord Teignmouth (1805), p. 55.
(2) W. Van Mildert, A Letter to the Society for promoting
Christian Knowledge (1805), p. 42.
(3) Owen, Bible Society Origins, I, p. 72. I am grateful to
Kathleen Cann, Archivist of the Bible Society, for drawing
my attention to this point.
(4) B.S. Minutes of General Meetings, 1 May 1805.
principle' which now finally seemed impregnable to further criticism, the Bible Society felt secure in its position. The Welsh Bible debacle and the attacks that flowed from it, however, were only a foretaste of what was soon to come. In fact it mattered little how simple and pure its motives were, High Churchmen felt threatened by the mere fact that the Bible Society was evangelical and interdenominational and worst of all, successful. As the Bible Society expanded in size and in the scope of its activities, it inevitably faced even more serious criticisms from its enemies.

II. The Controversy with High Churchmen

1 (1) Introduction

The early controversy with the S.P.C.K. over Welsh Bibles only lasted one year, but it portended future conflict. Most High Churchmen hoped that the Bible Society was a feeble body which would collapse, but with the advent of the auxiliary system in 1809 and the successful recruitment of Evangelical and non-evangelical churchmen alike, they began to fear that perhaps the Bible Society was more formidable an enemy than they had thought.

The controversy which we shall examine now represented a struggle between two conflicting philosophies. The evangelicals held that the responsibility for the conversion of sinners was so paramount that it dwarfed in comparison all considerations of church polity: in the great mission to bring the Gospel to all people, churchmen and Dissenters should fight

(1) The core of Highchurchmanship were members of the Hackney Phalanx. The term 'High Churchman' (then as now) was not easily defined. See A.B. Webster, Joshua Watson (1954), passim.
side by side in the common cause. By contrast, High Churchmen sensed that such cooperation implied an abandonment of any distinctive Anglican ecclesiology, impugning the claim of the Church of England to be a true branch of the historic Church catholic, by virtue of its episcopal order, apostolic succession and valid sacraments. The very existence of the Bible Society, with its promiscuous association of Anglicans and Dissenters, seemed to impugn the idea of a single national, established church, an idea long held on grounds of utility but—thanks to laymen like Burke and churchmen like Daubeny—now pressed strongly again on grounds of high ecclesiological principle. It was a constant nightmare of High Churchmen that the Evangelical party in the Church of England was a 'Trojan Horse' within the citadel of the establishment. It was feared that Church Evangelicals, despite their protestations of Anglican loyalty, were Dissenters in disguise, or at least were unconsciously helping Non-conformity by breaking down the distinctive doctrines and order of the Church. High Churchmen were determined to warn unwary Anglican members of the Bible Society that—whether they knew it or not—they were encouraging the dissidence of Dissent and wounding the 'Mother Church.' If they could succeed in inducing Anglicans to withdraw their patronage from the Society, its future would be bleak.

At each thrust from the High Churchmen in the controversy that we shall examine, the Bible Society recoiled, tightened its constitution, ordered its more zealous advocates in far away auxiliaries to insure that its original and official aims were still being pursued, and then counter-attacked. In the long run, of course, the High Churchmen were not
successful; the Bible Society weathered adversity and still exists today. But indirectly, the continual reappraisal of its aims, the process of institutional introspection, and the tightening of internal controls necessitated by incessant harassment, caused a great deal of internal damage to the Society. The internal controversies that we shall examine in another chapter, were the indirect result of seventeen years of controversy with the High Churchmen.

After the Welsh Bible controversy there was an uncomfortable peace between the High Churchmen and the Bible Society which lasted only four years. A plan to found an auxiliary at Colchester in 1810, however, unloosed a new spate of controversy that lasted many years. Colchester was perhaps singled out as an issue by the High Churchmen for three reasons. In the first place, by 1810 the Bible Society had nine large auxiliaries and six more were being planned. It was obviously growing faster than its enemies had expected and would continue to do so unless stopped. Secondly, the architects of the Colchester auxiliary were not merely interested in recruiting evangelicals. Indeed, they had the audacity to ask Randolph the Bishop of London (Porteus had recently died) a known High Churchman, to become their patron as the bishop of the diocese. Other Anglicans with strong S.P.C.K. ties were also approached, the most notable being Christopher Wordsworth, then domestic chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Randolph, of course, turned the invitation down and let it be known in no uncertain terms that he was hostile to the Bible Society and all of its works. As a result,

(1) B.S. General Committee Minutes, 19 Feb. 1810; Owen, *Bible Society Origins*, I, p. 471.
the Society decided to postpone founding an auxiliary in Colchester until conditions were more favourable. Before this could happen, an irate Christopher Wordsworth, obviously concerned about the 'sheep stealing' zeal of the Bible Society in attempting to recruit known S.P.C.K. devotees like himself, published a bitter anti-Bible Society pamphlet which represented (as we shall see) a widely held point of view. In the preface to this pamphlet, Wordsworth said that he had published at "the request of a much respected friend." That friend may well have been the Archbishop of Canterbury himself.

There was a third reason for a fresh attack on the Bible Society especially after 1811. That year had seen the defeat of Lord Sidmouth's bill in Parliament which, had it been successful, would have restricted Nonconformist itinerant preaching. Since the Bill had been defeated by a coalition of Nonconformist and Anglican M.P.s, High Churchmen saw propaganda-value in the affair and turned it against the Bible Society. It was suggested that this successful 'sectarian' conspiracy in Parliament was linked to the formation of Bible Society auxiliaries throughout Britain. Wordsworth's pamphlet, supported by another from Thomas Sikes, drew replies from Lord Teignmouth, William Ward, the Rector of Myland, and William Dealtry, then professor of mathematics at the East India College in Haileybury.

Colchester was only the excuse for renewed controversy. High Churchmen had made serious accusations against the

---

(1) C. Wordsworth, Reasons for declining to become a subscriber to the British and Foreign Bible Society (1810), advertisement. The letter was sent from Lambeth Palace.
(2) Papers occasioned by attempts to form auxiliary Bible Societies in various parts of the Kingdom (1812), p. 25.
Bible Society which far transcended the immediate danger at Colchester. The question was not whether the auxiliary at Colchester would survive, or even whether the auxiliary system would continue to make inroads all over Britain, but whether the pan-evangelical spirit itself would survive the attacks of its adversaries.

Cambridge was destined to be the next battlefield. The University was important to both groups not only because the formation of its auxiliary followed close on the heels of Colchester, but because Cambridge, especially before the building of Anglican theological colleges, was crucially important as an Anglican seminary. If Cambridge could spawn a Bible Society auxiliary, then Oxford could also; if evangelical 'enthusiasm' gained ground among the ordinands at the Universities, there was no telling what parish would be safe.

For the confrontation at Cambridge, Evangelicals and High Churchmen brought out their heavy artillery. No less a person than Herbert Marsh, the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and future Bishop of Llandaff, led the High Church cause, supported by Edward Maltby, the future Bishop of Durham. As champions of the Bible Society cause came William Dealtry of Colchester fame, Nicholas Vansittart, M.P. for East Grinsland in 1812, William Otter, Rector of Chetwynd in Shropshire, John William Cunningham, Vicar of Harrow, Edward Daniel Clark, Professor of Mineralogy, Isaac Milner, President of Queens, and Charles Simeon of Holy Trinity. The epic story of the battle for Cambridge has been told elsewhere so it does not merit repetition here, but the

victory clearly went to the Evangelicals. Inundated by pamphlet after pamphlet from Bible Society advocates, Herbert Marsh finally gave up the fight, complaining in 1813, that "when an institution is supported with all the fervour of religious enthusiasm...an attempt to oppose it, is like attempting to oppose a torrent of burning lava from Etna or Vesuvius."

After the decisive Bible Society victory at Cambridge, the High Churchmen faced the prospect of fighting a losing battle; as a result, their pamphlets became more desperate, also more voluminous, running sometimes into hundreds of pages. As predicted, an auxiliary was formed at Oxford in 1812, but without the fracas at Cambridge. In 1814, the formation of an auxiliary at Hackney introduced to the controversy the bitter pen of Henry Handley Norris, the Curate of St. John's Chapel in that area and Chaplain to the Earl of Shaftesbury. Norris inherited Marsh's role as the High Churchmen's major advocate. By 1815, even two Bishops, George Pretyman-Tomline of Lincoln and George Henry Law of Chester, had publicly taken a stand against the Bible Society. By 1816, the controversy had spread to Ireland, creating a major dilemma for the Hibernian Bible Society which we shall discuss later. It would be unnecessary to record the publications between 1816 and 1822, when the controversy unofficially ended with Norris' A Respectable

---

(2) Owen, Bible Society Origins, III, p. 140 f. They were followed in 1816 by Samuel Goodenough, Bishop of Carlisle and Edward Bowyer, Bishop of Ely in 1817. For remarks of the Bishop of Lincoln, see Bodl. MSS Eng. Misc. d 32, f.17.
Letter to the Earl of Liverpool, because the charges brought against the Bible Society were simply variations on old themes written at greater length and in much more detail. In all, over 170 pamphlets and books were contributed to the controversy between 1805 and 1822. This number would probably triple if we could examine the materials that flowed from provincial areas.

The controversy was fought on three fronts. The first involved the immediate clash of the S.P.C.K. and the Bible Society. As the S.P.C.K. was the first in the Bible-distributing field, it not unnaturally considered itself the official Bible outlet for Anglican parishes all over Britain, and strongly resented its competitor. The Bible Society was also compelled to defend itself as a pan-evangelical institution. It seemed only too obvious to many High Churchmen that the 'unnatural coalition' of churchmen and Dissenters would soon give way to a sectarian predominance on the Society's board of directors; when this happened, many of them feared that churchmen might unwittingly be used to undermine their own establishment. They saw in the Bible Society an incipient sectarian 'conspiracy' against the alliance of Church and State. Arguments were marshalled to discredit not only the 'promiscuous' relationship between churchmen and Dissenter in the Bible Society, but the whole evangelical movement itself.

The battle also raged around the sensitive issue of church order. If it could also be shown to Bible Society Anglicans, that by associating with Dissenters in a conventicle atmosphere, they had abrogated their sacred responsibility to Church and State, then the Anglican base
of the Society would be seriously weakened. If this argument wore thin over the years, there were others to take its place. For example, did a clergyman not seriously compromise his trust as a member of the national establishment by neglecting to circulate the Prayer Book with the Bible?

The Bible Society had answers to all these charges, but throughout the controversy we are left with the impression that it was not answers that High Churchmen wanted; their aim was to damage and then destroy the Bible Society.

(ii) The Bible Society and the S.P.C.K.

One of the Bible Society's first official actions in 1804, was to send a communiqué to the S.P.C.K. expressing "that respect and esteem which the Committee cannot but feel for a Society which has so long and successfully exerted itself in disseminating the knowledge of divine truth." The S.P.C.K. never bothered to make a response; indeed, it was only when Thomas Charles' Welsh Bible project was commenced that the S.P.C.K. officially recognized the Bible Society, but in a way that was hardly congenial. Many High Churchmen felt that the Bible Society had deliberately decided to publish a Welsh Bible "at a time when the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, in conjunction with the University of Oxford, were preparing as large an edition as could be wanted..."; and even though the Bible Society showed that it had planned its edition several months before the S.P.C.K. version had even been announced, it was still

charged with duplicity in the matter.

The Welsh Bible aside, there were plenty of other S.P.C.K. accusations against the Bible Society. In 1805, William Van Mildert had feared that the Bible Society would attract subscriptions away from the S.P.C.K. Seven years later, Herbert Marsh observed that while churchmen who belonged to both societies only gave the S.P.C.K. one guinea, they would often give up to fifty guineas to the Bible Society. To charges of this kind, William Dealtry replied that though both societies had been subjected to financial fluctuations, statistics demonstrated that S.P.C.K. subscriptions had indeed increased on the whole after the Bible Society was founded, an increase which he attributed to the healthy rivalry between the two societies. The Bible Society was also accused of hampering the S.P.C.K.'s sale of Anglican Prayer Books. Herbert Marsh claimed that since the formation of the Bible Society the number of Prayer Books published by the Cambridge University Press had been seriously reduced in order to fill Bible Society orders for Testaments. The inference was that the S.P.C.K. was thereby unable to supply the growing demand for Prayer

---

(1) See J.H. Spry, *An Enquiry into the Claims of the British and Foreign Bible Society to the countenance and support of members of the Established Church* (1810), p. 18 f.
(4) Dealtry, *Vindication*, p. 108 f. Dealtry attributed the S.P.C.K.'s financial condition to its reluctance to campaign for money. See *ibid.*, p. 246. He also believed that people had subscribed to the S.P.C.K. in consequence of their becoming members of the Bible Society. See W. Dealtry, *A Letter addressed to the Rev. Dr. Wordsworth, in reply to his Reasons for declining to become a Subscriber to the British and Foreign Bible Society* (1810), p. 17.
Books by loyal churchmen. This accusation was subsequently refuted by William Otter and Charles Simeon who pointed out that the overall production of Prayer Books between 1809 and 1812 had actually increased due to increased Prayer Book production at Oxford, and that the S.P.C.K. was actually circulating more Prayer Books than ever before.

The Bible Society had their own complaints against the S.P.C.K. For one thing, the S.P.C.K. was a closed Society. By the end of the eighteenth century it was apparently very difficult for Evangelical clergymen to gain admission into it. Thus Charles Simeon who had at one time been a member of the S.P.C.K. and then withdrew, could not, in 1792, get back in. No doubt his evangelical activities at Holy Trinity, Cambridge, prejudiced his reapplication. His only alternative therefore, was to join the Bible Society when it was founded, though he let it be known that he still wished to be a member of the S.P.C.K. Other evangelical clergymen probably faced a similar dilemma. The evangelicals could have levelled other charges against the S.P.C.K. It was well known that the S.P.C.K., through its lethargy, had failed to supply many Anglican parishes, especially in Wales, with Bibles. Many Anglicans did not even know that the S.P.C.K. existed. But the Bible Society did not press the S.P.C.K.

---

(1) W. Otter, *An Examination of Dr. Marsh's Answer to all arguments in favour of the British and Foreign Bible Society* (1812), p. 17 f.
(2) C. Simeon, *The Excellency of the Liturgy...to which is prefixed an answer to Dr. Marsh's inquiry respecting The Neglecting to give the Prayer-Book with the Bible* (1812), p. 48 f
(3) Ibid. p. 51 fn.
(4) Nicholas Vansittart pointed out that though there were upwards to 11,000 parishes in England in 1812, only 2,900 clergymen belonged to the S.P.C.K. See N. Vansittart, *Three Letters on the subject of the British and Foreign*
on these very sensitive issues; indeed, it wished only
to live at peace with its adversary. William Ward, himself
a member of both societies, felt that the demand for Bibles
was so great that both societies were needed to publish and
circulate them. He even thought of the 'new' Bible Society
1 as an auxiliary of the 'old.' Conversely there were one
or two members of the S.P.C.K. who wanted peace, but on
terms that would never have been accepted by the evangelicals.
William Van Mildert suggested for example, that if the
Bible Society restricted its operations to the Dissenters,
there would be no objection to its existence on the part
of the S.P.C.K. Thomas Sikes even suggested to Bishop
Porteus in 1806, a compromise plan whereby the Bible Society
would restrict its operations to the Continent, leaving
3 Britain to the S.P.C.K. Porteus thought this to be fair
and suggested the compromise to Lord Teignmouth, but
Teignmouth doubted whether the compromise would really abate
the High Church animus against his society. Other compromises
were suggested, but by 1810 the Bible Society had expanded

Footnote Contd.

Bible Society addressed to the Rev. Dr. Marsh and John
Coker Esq., (1812) p. 54. Dealtry claimed that Teignmouth
did not know that the S.P.C.K. existed until 1804. See
(1) W. Ward, A Letter on the subject of the British and Foreign
Bible Society addressed to the Rev. Dr. Gaskin (1810), p. 2 ff.
(3) Bodl. MS 133e723(1*), p. 14: "Minutes of a Conversation
with Bishop Porteus by Thomas Sikes."
(4) B.S. Teignmouth Letters, f. 138: B. Porteus to Teignmouth,
29 Sept. 1806.
(5) Dealtry, for example, suggested that since the Bible Society
concentrated on circulating Bibles, the S.P.C.K. would be
free to employ its capital elsewhere. See Dealtry, Letter
to Wordsworth, p. 16.
to such a degree, that talk of compromise, especially when it was to the disadvantage of the Bible Society would only have inhibited its further growth.

(iii) The Bible Society as a Pan-Evangelical Organization

Much of the High Church animus against the Bible Society derived from a very real fear of the Dissenters. Thomas Sikes recorded a vivid dialogue with Bishop Porteus:

His Lordship said it seemed as if I considered the Dissenters as wolves & tigers. 'My Lord I do,' 'Wolves & tigers!' said he. 'Yes,' I replied, 'so far wolves & tigers as to be always, not so much in a religious way, as in a hostile party spirit seeking to devour the Church of this Country.' 'But wolves & tigers, Mr. S., you would hunt down and destroy,' said the Bishop. 'No, there I stop my Lord. I would not persecute & kill them. I would be on my guard against their claws & teeth, & would endeavour to convert them.'

As an organization in which churchmen and Dissenters fraternized, the Bible Society was a natural lightning-conductor for such fears. In the first place, it conjured up frightening images of the Commonwealth and the Puritan 'rape' of the established church. Henry Handley Norris reminded his readers that a Bible society formed in the reign of Charles I, was comprised of all the Puritans in the Kingdom. Thomas Sikes, who thanked heaven in 1805 that "the gates of Nonconformity have never, since the grand rebellion, prevailed against the Church," nevertheless feared that if churchmen like Lord Teignmouth gave their "unexampled zeal and exertion" to the Dissenters of the present day, they would "raise their memory to the halcyon days of 1648, and fill their beating bosoms, with

(1) Bodl. MS 133e723(1*). p. 14: "Minutes of a Conversation with Bishop Porteus by Thomas Sikes."
(2) H.H. Norris, A Practical Exposition of the tendency and proceedings of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1814), p. 382 fn. Norris says he is quoting from Milner's History.
(3) T. Sikes, An Address to Lord Teignmouth, President of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1805), p. 21.
well-grounded hopes of once more realizing those scenes, which, but for your Lordship, and a few other liberal men, they little expected to see." So too, Herbert Marsh traced the devious steps by which, under the Commonwealth, the Liturgy had been abolished by zealous Puritans manipulating unwary Anglican prelates, and warned that the same thing could be repeated with the repeal of the Test Act which was then being pressed by the Dissenting Deputies.

The very organization of the Bible Society conjured up images of a seditious organization planning to overthrow the establishment. As we have seen, its direction was entrusted to thirty-six laymen: fifteen Anglicans, fifteen Dissenters and six foreigners. Thomas Sikes and others, however, pointed out that control was really biased in favour of the Dissenters since the six foreigners were not Anglicans. Even conceding that its government was balanced, many feared that "the common room, of this Society will be the theater of perpetual squabbles for the pre-eminence... until one had fairly beaten the other out of the field, and the vanquished minority finds, that it has nothing to do with the Society, but to sanction its proceedings, and contribute to the support of its funds."

(1) Ibid., p. 24; A similar criticism was levelled against Bishop Porteus. See T. Sikes, An Fumble Remonstrance to the Lord Bishop of London (1806), p. 9 f.
(2) H. Marsh, An Inquiry into the Consequences of neglecting to give the Prayer-Book with the Bible (1812), pp. 33 f, 49.
(3) T. Sikes, Address to Teignmouth, p. 22f; Cf. J. Owen, A Letter to a Country Clergyman occasioned by his Address to Lord Teignmouth (1805), p. 44 f.
The greatest criticism, however, was directed at the ministerial vote in committee meetings. According to the Society's constitution, all ministers and clergymen who contributed one guinea or more each year, would be entitled a vote. Critics of the Society were sure that the Dissenters would pack Bible Society meetings and vote against the Anglicans en bloc. This point conjured up fears that Society churchmen would be outnumbered and outvoted by "coal-heaving ministers, bird-catching ministers, Baptist ministers of all trades, those of the Roman Catholic communion, together with the green-aproned female ministers of the Friends."

Finally, High Churchmen saw in the Bible Society the sworn enemies of the establishment. Thomas Sikes said that the Society was originally set on foot by "a number of leading Dissenters and Methodists with the assistance of a few false brethren, and some worthy and unsuspecting members of the Church." Van Mildert saw in the list of Bible Society patrons many who were "notoriously hostile both to the doctrine and discipline of the Church, and abetting with all their might, the cause of Heterodoxy and Schism."

Because these "secret foes" and "treacherous familiar friends"

(1) T. Sikes, Address to Teignmouth, p. 22 ff; One critic pointed out in 1812, that the Branch Society formed at Dedham in Essex was composed entirely of Dissenters. See Twenty Facts in addition to Twenty Reasons for not supporting the Bible Society (1812), p. 12.
(2) T. Sikes, Humble Remonstrance to Porteus, p. 50.
(4) W. Van Mildert, Letter to the S.P.C.K., p. 27.
would predominate over the Anglican directors, the Society would naturally promote the cause of the establishment's adversaries.

The failure to check the Cambridge auxiliary with the time-honoured cry of 'Church in Danger' induced some High Churchmen to use cruder propaganda appeals: 'Nation in Danger' was now the cry. Andrew O'Callaghan, the Master of the College at Kilkenny, for example, told alarming stories of subversion, of the secret tribunal in Westphalia, the Illuminati in Germany, the conspirators in the Masonic lodges in France, Jacobin clubs in Britain and the Irish Executive Directory. "What were they all," he asked, "or their power, or their influence, compared to the Bible Society and its might means, which stations its spiritual garrisons in every village?" Complaining about the ease by which admission was gained into the Bible Society, Thomas Sikes told Lord Teignmouth that "T. Paine might (for aught I can perceive) as easily have been admitted into your Lordship's society as any of the Bench of Bishops." Even Bishop Pretyman-Tomline could draw a parallel between religious associations like the Bible Society which fostered "false doctrines" and "notorious heresies" and subversive political organizations that furnished arms "to the exciters of sedition, abettors of privy conspiracy, and promoters of rebellion."

The Bible Society was labelled a Jacobin organization

(1) T. Sikes, Address to Teignmouth, p. 11 f.
(2) A. O'Callaghan, The Bible Society against Church and State (1817), p. 7.
(3) T. Sikes, Second Letter to Teignmouth, p. 45.
both because of its foreign and domestic operations, H.H. Norris asserted that the Bible Society, through its agent C.F. Steinkopf, had sent a mission to Napoleon in the hope of getting from him a subsidy for their French Bible, and that Steinkopf had publicly acknowledged, when he was in Paris, the right of Napoleon to the French throne. The Society was said to have inserted into the title page of its French Bible "An. XIII de la République Française." Here was proof of Jacobinical complicity in the Society's foreign operations.

The charge of Jacobinism at home was perhaps more serious. In 1818, another pamphleteer pointed an accusing finger at the Bible Society's Southwark Auxiliary which had subdivided its territory into districts for the purpose of "gaining converts, and obtaining pecuniary aid;" if the Southwark system spread, he feared that the country would be divided into departments, in which houses would be numbered and inhabitants registered; a blueprint for systematic subversive propaganda on the lines of the radical Corresponding Societies. "The whole system," it was said, "is like one of those diplomatic documents, in which the secret views of the parties interested, are concealed, till they are developed by the event." The methods of Charles Dudley, the former Quaker (now Anglican) organizer of the Southwark system were compared to those of the Illuminati.

(1) H.H. Norris, Practical Exposition, p. 289 f.
(2) J. Scholefield, A Second Letter to the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Liverpool...In reply to that from the Rev. H.H. Norris (1822), p. 17 f.
(3) An Address to the Committee of the Bible Society in Horsham and its Neighborhood (1818) pp. 28, 29.
(4) H.H. Norris, A Respectful Letter to the Earl of Liverpool occasioned by the speech imputed to his Lordship at the
The coordinated and centralized nature of the Bible Society with its intricate network of auxiliaries which cut across the Church's parochial system, frightened clergymen, the more so since the Church of England was still decentralized, without synods or Convocation.

Anglicans feared that "other objects, inimical to the Church" would issue from it even though the professed design of its charter was only to circulate Bibles without note or comment. Paradoxically, even Bibles circulated in this simple form came under severe criticism from High Churchmen. Thomas Sikes for one, feared that by passing the purest Bible through the noxious hands of "Papist, and Puritan, the Socinian, and Calvinist, the Baptist, and Quaker, all appealing to the Bible for the truth of their principles," the Scriptures would inevitably be used as weapons against the establishment. Edward Maltby and others were also concerned about what would happen when Bibles, unattended by note or comment, were put in the hands of simple people. "Is it...not too much to presume," he asked, "that if those parts of Scripture, which are allowed to be the most difficult of interpretation, and the most liable to misconception, be so generally put into the hands of the

Footnote Contd.

Isle of Thanet Bible Society Meeting (1822), p. 41 fn. Norris also said that the 'Irish Union,' and before that the 'Puritan Committees,' furnished the models upon which the auxiliary system of the Bible Society was based. See H.H. Norris, Practical Exposition, p. 483; Cf. W. Dealtry, A Review of Mr. Norris's Attack upon the British and Foreign Bible Society (1815), p. 55.

(1) H. Marsh, An Address to the Members of the Senate of the University of Cambridge occasioned by the proposal to introduce in this place an Auxiliary Bible Society (1811), p. 3.
(2) T. Sikes, Address to Teignmouth, p. 12 f.
illiterate, it is...likely...that they will form an erroneous conclusion as a right one?" The solution to these problems was all too obvious. J.H. Spry and Herbert Marsh both pointed to the necessity of employing a 'mediator' or 'interpreter' through which Bibles would be circulated and the orthodox (Anglican) doctrines contained therein, expounded for the benefit of the uneducated. Maltby suggested that the 'mediator' should be none other than an Anglican clergyman who alone was "learned, intelligent, and conscientious" enough to instruct the illiterate or misinformed in the doctrines of the Church as found in the Scriptures. If an Anglican clergyman was not available, the least that could be done for those who had neither the "leisure, or the inclination, or the ability, to weigh the arguments for religious opinion," would be to circulate the Bible with the Anglican Prayer Book as "a safeguard against the delusions of false interpretation." Here some Anglicans seemed to be approaching dangerously near the Roman Catholic practice of restricting Bible circulation.

(1) E. Maltby, Thoughts on the utility and expediency of the plans proposed by the British and Foreign Bible Society (1812), p. 22. Cf. J.W. Cunningham, Observations designed as a reply to the 'Thoughts' of Dr. Maltby, on the dangers of circulating the whole of the Scriptures among the lower orders (1812), p. 4.

(2) J.H. Spry, Further Observations on the British and Foreign Bible Society (1812), p. 8 f; H. Marsh, Inquiry into the Consequences of neglecting to give the Prayer-Book, p. 69.

(3) E. Maltby, Thoughts, p. 30. To this Cunningham said that "if the illiterate sometimes do not see far enough, the learned often see too far!" J.W. Cunningham, Observations, p. 29.

(4) H. Marsh, Inquiry into consequences of neglecting to give the Prayer Book, pp. 5, 11.
to its priests, or requiring an interpretation of doctrine to be appended to it. John Owen quickly pointed out to Sikes in 1805, that the dangers which agitated High Churchmen were precisely those which disturbed the Papists: they "were matters of constant anxiety to the Papal bosom." In 1812, Herbert Marsh received a very embarrassing "congratulatory letter" from Peter Gandolphy, a Roman Catholic Priest who, acknowledging Marsh's theory that "true religion cannot be found in the Bible alone," said that his work was "a coup de grace to the old principle of the Reformers." Though the Bible Society made good propaganda use of Gandolphy's letter, the whole affair pointed to a basic difference in the High Churchmen and evangelical's view of the Scriptures. Evangelicals like Isaac Milner believed, as the Reformers did, that if the Bible was delivered to Christians in its purest form, and "if all persons who receive the word of God in sincerity... did not but read and study their Bibles more constantly... Christians of every denomination, without exception, would approach much closer to one another than they do now..."

High Churchmen like Herbert Marsh, on the other hand, believed that Bibles given without interpretation would encourage sectarianism and anarchy like that which preceded the destruction of the Church of England in the mid-seventeenth

(1) J. Owen, Letter to a Country Clergyman, p. 27.
(2) P. Gandolphy, A Congratulatory Letter to the Rev. Herbert Marsh (1812), pp. 5-17. Cf. H. Marsh, A Letter to the Reverend Peter Gandolphy in confutation of the opinion that the vital principle of the Reformation has been lately conceded to the Church of Rome (1813), passim.
(3) See for example W. Dealtry, An Examination of Dr Marsh's 'inquiry'...in a series of letters to the Rev. Dr. E.D. Clarke (1812), passim.
Furthermore, would not the entrusting of Bible translations to 'sectaries and heretics' result in impure Bibles? As evidence that the Bible Society had already debauched their Bibles by employing Nonconformist translators, the history of the Welsh Bible controversy was again revived. In 1810, Christopher Wordsworth repeated earlier charges that the Bible Society's Welsh edition had been entrusted "to a noted leader of the sectaries" in Wales. The reference, of course, was to Thomas Charles of Bala. In 1822, H.H. Norris depicted Charles as a "renegado Clergyman, heading at the time one of the wildest casts of methodism designated the Jumpers!" Other charges against Bible Society translations were also current. The Rev. James McQuige, editor of the Society's Irish Bible, was said to have been driven to seek a livelihood translating and correcting Bibles "in consequence of mal-practices which had drawn down upon him, first the suspension of his functions as a Methodist Preacher - and subsequently irrevocable degredation from his ministry;" he was also "exceedingly defective in his knowledge of Irish [and] generally ignorant in other respects."

As the controversy progressed still more charges were mounted against the Bible Society. Thomas Sikes claimed in 1805 that the distribution of tracts as well as Bibles

(1) Marsh wrote: "For though in the spirit of true Protestant­ism [the S.P.C.K.] acknowledges the Bible as the only fountain of religious truth, yet, it knows from the experience of all ages, that the waters of that fountain will be clear or turbid, according to the channel into which they are drawn." H. Marsh, Address to the Senate, p. 1.
(2) Cited in Dealtry, Vindication, p. 24 f.
(4) Ibid. p. 185.
was included in the Society's original plan, and that this scheme was proposed by a zealous adversary of the establishment. Herbert Marsh hinted that Calvinistic clergymen had replaced the liturgy with Calvinistic tracts when circulating the Bible. He also averred that a Socinian Vice-President of the Uxbridge Bible Society auxiliary, had pasted obnoxious tracts into Society Bibles. And if sectaries did not circulate their tracts directly, it was certain that they would underline in ink the passages that supported their beliefs.

This obsession with tracts naturally associated the Bible Society with the Tract Society and other pan-evangelical enterprises. Thomas Sikes pointed out in 1806 and again in 1810, that one of the secretaries of the Bible Society was also a secretary of the Tract Society, "which publishes tracts to recommend fanatical preachers and meeting houses, and to inculcate enthusiastic doctrines of the New Birth, most repugnant to the judgment of the Church." Sikes questioned whether the above-mentioned gentleman (in fact the Baptist Joseph Hughes) would renounce the benefits of the Tract Society, and abstain from circulating tracts with Bibles simply because he was a secretary of the Bible Society. Connexions were also seen between the Bible Society and the Lancastrian School Society. In 1816, for example,

(2) H. Marsh, Inquiry into the Consequences of neglecting to give the Prayer-Book, p. 58 f.
(3) W. Dealtry, Review of Norris' Attack, p. 78.
(4) J.H. Spry, Enquiry, p. 27 f.
John Fisher 'proved' that the 'methodist supported' Lancastrian School Society was inextricably linked to the Bible Society. "Here then we have the tria juncta in uno," wrote Fisher, "most assuredly not in support of but in opposition to, the Church, the National School, and the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge."

Finally, High Churchmen charged the Bible Society with spawning dangerous theological heresies also inimical to the established Church. One accusation involved the old and ever recurring issue of Calvinism which High Churchmen believed to be a doctrine repugnant to their Church. Early in the controversy, the Bible Society was labelled by its enemies as an exclusively Calvinistic organization. John Owen quickly corrected this mistake by pointing out that Bible Society membership also included non-Calvinists like the Wesleyans, Quakers and Lutherans. Later, when Herbert Marsh claimed that Calvinistic doctrine repudiated the Articles, Homilies and Liturgy of the Church of England, Charles Simeon met his accusation by demonstrating not only that Calvinistic clergymen were faithful to the Articles of the Church, but that the Liturgy itself commanded the

(1) J. Fisher, Comparative Thoughts on the merits of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge and of the Bible Society (1816), p. 23. In 1811, several members of the Lancastrian School Society unwisely associated their organization with the Bible Society. This association, however, was denied. See W. Allen et al., To the Members of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1811), passim. This was answered by A Letter addressed to the members of the Established Church connected with the British and Foreign Bible Society on the subject of an address to that Society by the Lancastrian School Society (1812), passim.

(2) J. Owen, Letter to a Country Clergyman, p. 50.
exclusive allegiance of no one theological party. This controversy degenerated into a dog-fight over baptismal regeneration which did not immediately concern the controversy out of which it had grown.

A far more serious charge, however, and one which would have serious implications, as we shall see, for the Tests Controversy in 1830, involved Socinian membership in the Bible Society. In 1805, Sikes and Van Mildert touched on this very sensitive subject by hinting that Socinian members were set on destroying the Church of England. John Owen, however, claimed that the Socinian danger was overstated since it was questionable whether even half a dozen of them patronized the Society. William Dealtry followed up Owen's claim five years later by asserting, after making a diligent inquiry into the matter, that he could count only one or two Socinian patrons, though, as we have seen, he had to enlarge his estimate in the second edition of his Vindication published in 1811. H.H. Norris did not let Dealtry forget this miscalculation, however, and as late as 1822, pointed to the Bible Society auxiliary at Harleston in Norfolk, where the secretary and two committee men were Unitarians, as an embarrassing indication of the growing Socinian danger.

(1) C. Simeon, The Excellency of the Liturgy, pp. 9, 36; Simeon, Dr Marsh's Fact; or, a congratulatory address to the Church Members of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1813), p. 8.
(2) Cf. H. Marsh, A Letter to Charles Simeon...in vindication of the efficacy ascribed by our Church to the Sacrament of Baptism (1813); C. Simeon, Dr. Marsh's Fact (2nd Ed. 1813).
(5) See Supra, p. 164.
(iv) The Bible Society and Church Order

The High Church charge that support of the Bible Society constituted a breach of Anglican church order, was developed on three grounds. First, it was argued that the Society was irregular because it had not received the sanction of a majority of the bishops; secondly, many questioned the propriety of churchmen associating with Dissenters in an organization which (they alleged) encouraged the communal worship of both groups; finally, it was held that the failure to circulate Anglican Prayer Books together with Bibles, represented an indirect attack on the Church of England.

It was pointed out that the Bible Society had not received the sanction of the majority of the bench of bishops, and hence was an irregular institution. Neither of the English Archbishops and only a minority of the episcopal bench were patrons of the Society. Although the Bible Society tried to counter this argument by demonstrating that it was a relatively new organization which therefore could not expect the immediate approval of the entire bench of bishops, and that even so, a number of bishops and two Irish primates already either publicly or privately countenanced the Society, the objection was not silenced.

(1) See T. Sikes, Humble Remonstrance to Porteus, p. 51 f; Sikes, Second Letter to Teignmouth, pp. 5 f, 11.
(2) H. Marsh, Address to the Senate, p. 1.
(3) N. Vansittart, Three Letters, p. 53; Vansittart, Letter to the Rev. Dr Marsh...occasioned by his Address to the Senate of [Cambridge] University (1811), p. 6.
(4) W. Dealtry, Vindication, p. 249 f.
(5) One anonymous writer to the Bible Society even suggested that a conference of archbishops and bishops should be convened to determine whether or not the Bible Society should receive the united sanction of the Church. This, the writer felt, would dispel all doubts as to the propriety of churchmen either supporting or opposing the Society. B.S. Home C.: "A True Churchman" to Teignmouth, 29 March 1816, 5 Jan. 1818.
The association of churchmen with Dissenters in a religious organization also outraged the Society's opponents. Thomas Sikes asked Lord Teignmouth "how a clergyman of the Church, can attend the meeting-house, without danger to his principles, or gross indecorum towards the Church, and its spiritual superior?" Charles Daubeny told the clergy in the diocese of Sarum in 1814 that "as members of the Church of Christ, we have been cautioned by an apostle against being 'unequally yoked together with unbelievers'" and then proceeded to demonstrate all the disadvantages of associating with Dissenters in the Bible Society. The argument made by many Evangelical churchmen that the union of Christians of different denominations was commanded by Scripture, was rejected by High Churchmen. Sikes complained that while Anglicans were perpetually called upon, in the name of Christian charity and on the basis of Scriptural commandment, to throw aside prejudices and unite with Dissenters for common religious purposes, such injunctions were based on crass misinterpretation of Scripture. The 'union' enjoined in the Bible was not of 'hand and purse' but of 'heart and mind;' Christian charity only obliged Christians to be like-minded, to have one faith, one baptism, one speech and one calling. When the Bible Society reminded its critics that the Naval and Military Bible Society, presided

(1) T. Sikes, Address to Teignmouth, p. 31 f; Cf. J. Owen, Letter to a Country Clergyman, p. 52.
(2) C. Daubeny, The Substance of a Discourse delivered at the Abbey Church in Bath...Giving a Churchman's Reasons for declining a Connection with the Bible Society (1814), p. 6f.
(3) Sikes, Address to Teignmouth, p. 11; Cf. Owen, Letter to a Country Clergyman, p. 21 f.
by the Archbishop of Canterbury, admitted Dissenters, the feeble response thrown back at them was that this society's Bibles were distributed by Anglican naval chaplains to seamen who were well out of the range of heretical preachers!

Finally, the fact that the Bible Society did not circulate the Church's Liturgy with its Bibles was deemed cause in itself to question the Society's regularity. "When Churchmen, who have a liturgy," Marsh wrote in 1812, "and Dissenters who have none, agree in forming a Society, which by its constitution excludes the distribution of the Liturgy, the whole Society conforms to the principle of the Dissenters." This kind of accusation was a constant irritation to the Bible Society, especially to the Anglicans who patronized it. William Otter had to remind Marsh in bold print, that the Bible Society was not founded on the exclusion of the Liturgy. Though Churchmen only received Bibles from the Society, there was no rule that prohibited them from also distributing Prayer Books. To insure that the Bible Society would not be charged with further irregularity on this point, the Prayer Book and Homily Society was founded in 1812 by Lord Teignmouth, Lord Gambier, William Wilberforce and other Bible Society Anglicans, as a separate though complementary agency of the Bible Society. Even this did not satisfy

(1) W. Dealtry, Vindication, p. 128. He also pointed out that in the early eighteenth century, the S.P.C.K. had Nonconformist patrons. Ibid., p. 89 f.
(4) W. Otter, Examination of Marsh's Answer, p. 34 f.
(5) See J.W. Cunningham, A Sermon preached before the Prayer Book and Homily Society (1813), passim.
the critics who now asked why two separate organizations had to exist when the S.P.C.K. already performed both functions under the same roof.

III. A Sequel: Decline in the Provinces

Seventeen years of controversy was bound to affect the Bible Society in one way or another. The Society, of course, wanted its patrons to believe that through the din of controversy it had emerged stronger than before. Thomas Gisborne, Perpetual Curate of Barton-under-Needwood, reported in 1815 that with every High Church attack on the Society its revenues had dramatically increased. Yet an examination of the Society's correspondence for these years leaves us with a rather different impression. Perhaps revenues did increase as Gisborne reported, but morale within the Society itself was often low, especially near the end of the second decade of the century. In 1817, for example, John Owen wrote to John Paterson, the Society's agent in Copenhagen, "Our Ark is in danger; and division...seems all that it wanted to bring it into the greatest jeopardy..." Later that year, Owen once again reported to Paterson that it would be necessary to "administer stimulants to the tardy & reanimation to those whose spirits may be found to have declined." "Times," he concluded, "will not allow of langour." Owen

(1) H. Marsh, Letter to Vansittart, p. 44 f.
(2) T. Gisborne, A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Gloucester on the subject of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1815), p. 32.
(3) B.S. Paterson Letters, II, f. 12: J. Owen to J. Paterson, 10 May 1817.
was referring to an alarming increase in the number of Anglican resignations during this period, traceable directly to the controversy with the High Churchmen, and the threat of more in the future. As the controversy escalated, and strident High Church tracts continued to warn fellow Anglicans in increasingly exaggerated terms of the dangers inherent in their irregular collusion with sectaries, heretics, and even Jacobins, not a few clergymen began to have second thoughts about their involvement in the Society's activities especially when, as we shall see in the next chapter, some of the High Church accusations proved to be true. But there were perhaps more immediate reasons for the decline in Anglican patronage at this time. Many of the more timid Evangelical clergymen were afraid that continued involvement in the Bible Society might provoke the displeasure of their bishop, especially if he happened to be a High Churchman. Charles Mules of Marwood, for example, the only clergymen in his neighborhood to patronize the Branstable Branch Society when it was founded, was alarmed that the Bishop of Ely, a professed enemy of the Society, would get wind of his activities, and in consequence, force him to reside upon his living at Stapleford in Cambridgeshire; his friends feared that this would "in all probability shorten his days as he is quite an invalid." Fears of this kind were not unfounded. John Owen found himself dismissed from the Rectorship of Paglesham because Bishop

(1) B.S. Home C.: H.W. Gardiner to C.F. Steinkopf, 25 April 1822. Gardiner was hoping to keep Mules by not having his name printed on auxiliary circulars.
Randolph disapproved of his activities as the Bible Society Secretary. Many Bible Society Anglicans began to feel pangs of guilt about neglecting the S.P.C.K. and consequently rejoined it. Defections of this kind had devastating effects on rural auxiliaries where there was often only one clergyman in residence. In 1815, for example, the Branch Society at Walsall had to dissolve because its Anglican patrons all decided to join the S.P.C.K. instead. The background of radical agitation from the Luddite Riots onwards, no doubt exacerbated the tensions in the minds of the Evangelical Anglicans who wished to be friendly to Nonconformists: in this period, when Ultra Toryism was on the ascendent, it seemed proper that all friends of national establishments should rally to their cause, disassociating themselves from their critics.

Though the High Church party lost almost every battle in its attempt to crush the auxiliary system, the long term effects of the controversy, coupled with the fears generated by radical political movements, began to wear away the Society's internal cohesion. John Noble Coleman of Sherborne and future Perpetual Curate at Ventnor, the Isle of Wight, told John Owen in 1818 that at the Yeovil Auxiliary anniversary, there had been unhappy dissensions between Dissenters and clergymen which he feared had greatly

(1) B.S. Paterson Letters, I, f. 105: C.F. Steinkopf to J. Paterson, 16 Aug. 1813. See also J. Leifchild, Memoir of the late Rev. J. Hughes (1835), p. 253. The D.N.B. is incorrect in saying that Bishop Randolph required Owen to reside at Paglesham, and that Owen's inability to comply forced him to relinquish his living.

(2) B.S. Home C.: T. Gleadow to J. Tarn, 30 March 1815.
weakened the Bible cause in his area. In the same year, Thomas Jones of Denbigh claimed that in Wales the decline of his auxiliary had been caused not only by economic depression, but far more by "the desertion of a few of our Gentry and Clergy, who had once put their hands to the work." Two years later, Roger Carus Wilson, the Vicar of Preston, threatened to resign because of the "violent party feelings...even where both sides approve of the cause of the British and Foreign Bible Society." It was not surprising that in some areas, totally Nonconformist auxiliaries were prevalent; Anglican supporters did not exist. Under such circumstances it was impossible to carry through the expectation that auxiliary committees should be evenly divided between Church and Dissent.

An index to the dearth of Anglican patronage can be found in the astonishing number of urgent requests for the presence of John Owen, the Anglican Secretary, at anniversary meetings. Auxiliaries that lacked Anglican patronage wished at least to keep up the appearance of enjoying Church support. Owen could not be in a hundred different places at the same time, so he often asked his co-secretaries Joseph Hughes or C.F. Steinkopf to stand in for him, but it was not a Dissenting secretary that the provincial auxiliaries needed. When R. Burlingham of Evesham was told that Joseph Hughes would attend the anniversary of his auxiliary instead of Owen, as originally requested, he pleaded with the parent

---

(1) B.S. Home C.: J. Coleman to J. Owen, 30 July 1818.
(2) B.S. Home C.: T. Jones Sr. to J. Tarn, 13 June 1818.
(3) B.S. Home C.: R.C. Wilson to J. Tarn, 10 April 1820.
society to send a clergyman. "It is not that the abilities of [Hughes] are questioned by anyone," Burlingham apologetically told the parent society, "but...unless we can hold expectation of a distinguished member of the establishment attending, we fear the meeting will not be respectfully [sic] held..."

Of course, many auxiliaries were relatively unaffected by the controversy. In areas with a high density of Evangelical clergymen, solidarity and sheer force of numbers, could act as an insulation against High Church attacks. But in areas where a solitary Evangelical clergyman belonged to a predominantly Nonconformist auxiliary, the social pressures applied by High Church colleagues in the area often proved effective.

(1) B.S. Home C.: R. Burlingham to R. Cockle, 11 Aug. 1820; Cf. B.S. Home C.: T. Clubbe(Chester) to H. Dobbs, 29 March 1817 and many more. Burlingham, a Quaker, was Secretary of the Evesham auxiliary.
Chapter Eight: The Internal Relations (I)

I. Introduction

If most of the High Church accusations against the Bible Society were not true, some were, and these disturbed Anglican patrons who could justify their continued patronage of the Society only as long as it strictly maintained the purity of its original purpose: to circulate the Bible without note or comment. It was extremely embarrassing to them when stories leaked out about auxiliaries engaged in activities of a partisan or irregular nature.

Before the auxiliaries existed, Society policy on matters relating to the 'fundamental principle' was virtually dictated by an interdenominational group of prominent laymen, ministers and clergy, centered in London. Anglican directors in particular, jealously guarded the Society's constitution; and if it was in any way violated, offenders were immediately disciplined and order was restored. Paradoxically, the evolution of auxiliaries after 1809 created somewhat of a dilemma for these men. The existence of auxiliaries entailed some decentralization of decision making from London to the provinces, where each auxiliary was responsible for its own affairs. Consequently, in many cases the authority to raise and dispose of money was delegated to a large number of semi-autonomous committees, which the parent society in London, and the Anglicans that dominated it, could not always control. Unfortunately, many of these auxiliaries, controlled as they often were by Dissenters, did not always interpret the Society's laws in the same way as the parent society, and in an age of increasing denominational self-consciousness, exemplified by the
Baptist and Congregational Unions, party concerns were often confused with Bible Society activities. Thus many auxiliaries would contribute Society money to denominational missions or to Sunday Schools and even open their business meetings to debate on party or political issues which had nothing to do with Bible distribution. These irregularities were well publicized by the Society's critics.

To counter these violations of the Society's laws, and to bring erring auxiliaries back into line with Society policy as it was understood in London, the parent committee began to assert its control over auxiliary affairs. But this action had two undesirable effects. In Scotland in particular, many people resented the authoritarian way in which the parent society in London seemed to dictate auxiliary policy without consulting those concerned. Resentment was further exacerbated when London often failed to adhere to its own decisions. As we shall see in the next chapter, this resentment did much to precipitate the Apocrypha Controversy in 1825 which brought about the Society's first schism. In other parts of Britain, on the other hand, the inability of the parent society to purge its more zealous auxiliaries of 'irregularities' led many churchmen to believe High Church accusations and consequently to try to purge the Society themselves. As we shall see in the Tests Controversy, the result of this unilateral action was to pit churchmen against Dissenters, leading to a second schism in 1831. The primary purpose of this chapter therefore, will be to examine the tensions in both Scotland and England, following many years of controversy with High Churchmen, which gave rise to controversy in later years.
II. Tensions in Scotland

(1) Society Auxiliaries: The Issue of Autonomy

The innovation of the auxiliary system was a spontaneous development for which the parent society in London had made little constitutional provision. Fortunately, most of the auxiliaries established themselves on the London plan, thus restricting their activities to the circulation of Bibles only. Much to the embarrassment of the parent society, however, a number of auxiliaries combined the distribution of Bibles with more sectarian activities and as a result, the parent society decided to enforce on all auxiliaries strict adherence to the simple laws of the Society professed in London. However, many auxiliaries, especially those in Scotland, resented being told by a 'foreign' authority how to manage its own affairs. The Fife and Kinrosshire Auxiliary was but one case in point.

In the winter of 1812, Joseph Hughes wrote to the committee of this auxiliary complaining about its decision to vote £75 to the Baptist mission at Serampore, which that year had lost several buildings in a major fire. The auxiliary, however, felt that the parent society's complaint was not only unjustified but an infringement on its autonomy; in any case, they claimed only to be following the precedent of the Edinburgh Bible Society which had on many previous occasions contributed considerable sums of money to similar institutions. Why should they not help a group of Baptists who had after all been engaged in

(1) See Supra p. 166 f.
translating and disseminating Bibles for the Society itself? Here matters rested until the autumn of 1813.

In September 1813, the auxiliary advised London that it intended to make a £50 grant to the Hibernian Society and its Sunday School programme in Ireland. Accompanying this letter was a subscription of £200 with instructions to the parent society to keep £150 for itself and pass the other £50 on to the Hibernian Society. This action provoked the parent society again to explain in no uncertain terms why it disapproved of the Scots' decision. Hughes informed the Scottish auxiliary that to avoid criticism, the parent society was anxious that its auxiliaries should maintain the 'simplicity' which "binds all the auxiliaries intimately and exclusively together around the Parent Institution." The Hibernian, Hughes said, was a "miscellaneous Society proposing a variety of objects" which, if associated with the Bible Society, might lead critics to suspect the simplicity of the latters motives. "The eyes of millions are upon our proceedings,"

(1) B.S. Home C.: J. Martin(Kirkcaldy) to (Teignmouth), 16 Feb. 1813. The Edinburgh Bible Society, founded in 1809, considered itself an 'independent' auxiliary of the Bible Society. In conjunction with the Edinburgh Missionary Society, it had probably given money to the Serampore Baptists in 1812. It is also important to note that at this time the parent society had its own problems with the Serampore Baptists who were rendering the word 'Baptizo' to read 'immerse' in Society Bibles. This controversy continued for many years leading to a schism in 1840, but the criticism that it attracted from Society critics created a great deal of ill-will between the Baptists and the parent society. To what degree this ill-will affected the above-mentioned controversy is uncertain.

(2) B.S. Home C.: J. Martin to J. Tarn, 16 Sept. 1813. For the history of the Hibernian Society, see E.M. 1806, p. 87 f.

(3) B.S. Minutes, 4 Oct. 1813. Ironically, Hughes was a member of the Hibernian's committee.
Hughes warned, "and there are not wanting men of keen capacity who would be as zealous in proclaiming a flaw, as they are dextrous in finding it."

After several refusals to comply, the Fife auxiliary reluctantly agreed to a compromise whereby its grants to the Hibernian Society would be in Bibles. Yet we sense that a great deal of resentment was generated in Scotland against the 'unreasonable' way in which London seemed to dictate policy. As a result London became very cautious about the way it handled Scottish affairs. In October 1817, for example, J.W. Cunningham, the influential Vicar of Harrow, expressed concern that unless legislation was passed further to restrict the activities of 'hybrid' auxiliaries in both England and Scotland, the Society would lose even more order-minded Anglican patrons. But when he tried to introduce a resolution "declaring that the Bible Society cannot consider any society as an affiliated society which deviates from its original principle and object," he met stiff opposition from Hughes himself, and the resolution was vetoed. Referring no doubt to financially important auxiliaries like the Edinburgh Bible Society, which jealously guarded its right to dispose of funds as it saw fit, Hughes feared that "so sweeping a principle will wound many kind friends - and perhaps cause a separation." He believed that informal pressure would be more effective in the Scottish case, than any hard and fast law.

(1) B.S. Home C.: J. Hughes to J. Martin, 12 Oct. 1813 (copy).
(2) B.S. Home C.: J. Martin to J. Hughes, 18 Oct. 1813; B.S. Minute Book, VI, 6 Dec. 1813.
(4) Loc. Cit.
After the Bible Society had belatedly installed the so-called 'fundamental principle' into its constitution, it faced the recurrent task of interpreting the seemingly straight-forward phase, "the Authorized Version without Note or Comment." By this rule, it would have appeared explicitly to forbid extraneous matter such as notes, prefaces, or tracts, from being introduced into or circulated with Bibles. But there were difficult borderline cases. In 1804, for example, one Society patron suggested that since many secular publications benefited from a preparatory foreword, it might be useful to preface Society Bibles with a word or two from Bishop Porteus, or if that was impossible, to at least include in the appendix a brief exposition "of the tricks and cruelties of the Church of Rome..." It was obvious that this suggestion, if implemented, would have been a violation of the Society's fundamental principle and no further notice was taken of it. It also appeared obvious that Society Bibles should not be circulated with tracts appended to them. There was, of course, great temptation to do this, since many of the Society's directors also patronized the Tract Society. Teignmouth was concerned in 1812 about a footnote in one of the Society's reports in which a correspondent returned thanks "for Bibles sent & 'for other books.'" Such a violation of the rules could well have been perpetrated by men like Robert Hawker, the

(1) I would like to express my appreciation to Kathleen Cann for her help with this section.
(2) B.S. Home C.: J. Peacock to Bible Society, 8 March 1804.
Vicar of Charles near Plymouth who in the early days often tucked a Tract Society pamphlet into the pockets of those who had just received a Society Bible. As long as it was clear that tracts were not bought with Bible Society money, there was nothing illegal about this practice, but when the distinction between Bible and Tract Society activities became more obviously blurred, there were often strong protests. Joseph John Gurney, the well-known Quaker reformer heard through a correspondent that when the parent committee met, "tracts are laid upon the table & recommended for dispersion..." This was obviously a violation of the spirit of the Society's fundamental principle, and if the rumor was true, the practice does not seem to have been continued.

Not so obvious, however, was the place of marginal references and metrical psalms in Society Bibles. In 1804, Granville Sharp felt that the addition of marginal cross-references would not "be deemed a breach of the limitation fixed by our society for the publishing of Bibles only," because the English authorized version had always included them. Besides, the demand for Marginal Reference Bibles by clergymen was too great to be disregarded. On 5 February 1810, therefore, the parent society decided to print its first Bible with marginal readings and references.

Just as marginal references were considered in England to be as truly authorized as the Authorized Version, Metrical Psalms were considered a proper addendum in Scotland and

(2) B.S. Home C.: J. J. Gurney to J. Tarn, 26 Feb. 1812
(3) B.S. Miscellaneous Book I, p. 27 f; G. Sharp to Bible Society, 8 Aug. 1804.
(4) B.S. Minutes, 5 Feb. 1810.
Ireland. Although there had been a long-standing feud between the Edinburgh printers and the English Universities over the legality of the Scots printing Bibles with Metrical Psalms for circulation in England, the Bible Society had almost certainly provided its Scottish auxiliaries with Metrical Psalm Bibles prior to 1811. By 1811, however, the parent society's position on Metrical Psalms had apparently changed. In the previous year, the Bristol auxiliary discovered that the German Bible Society in Nuremburg, to the complete ignorance of the parent society, had printed a New Testament with explanatory notes attached. Fearing protests from its own auxiliaries and High Church critics, the Parent Society quickly altered the 'fundamental principle' in 1811, by transferring the phrase 'without note or comment' to the first clause of the Society's constitution "with a view to render it more perspicuous and explicit." This had two implications. In the first place, it meant a reaffirmation of the law which ruled that matters of an extraneous nature like notes, introductions, tracts, and as far as Scotland was concerned, Metrical Psalms, were to be eliminated completely from all Society Bibles.

(1) In 1815, for example, Samuel Alcorn of Newry asked the parent society to send Metrical Psalms "bound as formerly." This would seem to indicate that the Society did provide Scottish and Irish auxiliaries with Metrical Psalm Bibles before 1811. See B.S. Home C.: S. Alcorn to J. Tarn, 26 Dec, 1815. The following minute was also passed by the Subcommittee on Scots Versions: "[They] are of the opinion that the B.& F. Bible Society cannot legally distribute or sell Scotch editions of the Bible in England, but that the society are not precluded from selling or distributing Scotch Bibles in Foreign Countries..." See B.S. Home C.: J. Butterworth, T. Pellatt, R. Philips to Committee, 7 July 1810. Whether Scotland was considered a 'foreign' country is not clear.
Marginal references, on the other hand, were still permitted since they were considered, in England at least, part of the Authorized version. We have no evidence to suggest that Metrical Psalms were officially banned by the Society at this time, but if we compare the number of Scottish requests for Metrical Psalm Bibles that were never filled, with the number of English requests for Marginal Reference Bibles that were filled after 1811, we can only assume that the parent society was no longer supplying Scotland with the kind of Bible its countrymen needed.

Some of the requests for Metrical Psalm Bibles after 1811 illustrate the adverse effect of the new regulation on Scottish and Irish auxiliaries. Lewis Grant of Inverness, for example, was anxious in 1815, that "the Psalms in Metre used in Scotland should be added to the Bibles and New Testaments, as they are constantly read & sung in our churches & private families," but apparently the Society refused to supply his need. Samuel Alcorn of Newry complained that he had been refused accommodation by two Presbyterian clergymen, the principal reason being that the Bibles he distributed for the Society contained no singing Psalms. At the Elgin and Morayshire Bible Society, Neil McNeil and John Russell asked the parent society at least to send Bibles to Scotland in sheets so that they could bind in the Metrical Psalms themselves and at their own expense. In the light of future events, it would not be too much to

(1) B.S. Home C.: L. Grant to J. Tarn, c.13 Nov. 1815.
(2) B.S. Home C.: S. Alcorn to J. Tarn, 26 Dec. 1815.
suggest that the Scottish auxiliaries resented the parent society's unilateral and inconsistent decision to ban Metrical Psalms in Scotland while still countenancing Marginal Reference Bibles in England.

By 1818, tensions between London and Edinburgh reached a crisis. Though the parent society had commissioned a Marginal Reference Bible in 1810 for general distribution in England, it had never made too much of the matter, especially in its correspondence with the Scottish auxiliaries. However in January 1818, George Burder passed on to the parent society a letter from William Milne of Malacca who was preparing the Chinese version of the Bible for the Society under the auspices of the L.M.S. Milne wished the Bible Society to clarify what it meant by 'note or comment' since he had to prepare his edition from scratch. Specifically, Milne enquired whether he could include in his edition things like marginal references, explanations of difficult Western concepts and chapter contents. The Printing Subcommittee gave him a virtual carte blanche to do whatever "may be deemed necessary to render the version of the Sacred Original intelligible and perpicuous." Furthermore, he was told to use as a mode for his Chinese edition none other than the English Authorized Version with marginal references included, because it afforded "a correct example of that sort and degree of explanation which it may be permitted to introduce into...the Bible." But when this advice was made public in the Monthly Extracts for February 1818, the

(2) B.S. Minutes of Printing Subcommittee, 19 Jan. 1818.
(3) The Monthly Extracts were instituted in 1817 as an attempt to maintain a semblance of communication with the provinces.
Edinburgh Bible Society registered a vigorous protest. Having been told several years before that Metrical Psalms were to be banned from Scottish Testaments, the Edinburgh Bible Society angrily passed a resolution on 16 March 1818 condemning the parent society for hypocritically violating its own fundamental principle by allowing Milne to 'tamper' with the text in whatsoever way he saw fit. If the parent society did not retract its instructions to Milne, the Scottish auxiliary warned, it could only fear for the "prosperity, the harmony, and even the existence" of the Bible Society. When a similar protest was registered by the Birmingham auxiliary, the Printing Subcommittee finally decided to retract its instructions. This would hardly be the last time that the Edinburgh Bible Society would threaten dire consequences if London did not mend its ways; but the tension created prefigured the confrontation of 1825 over Apocryphal Bibles which, as we shall see, had much more serious consequences.

Violations of the fundamental principle and the tensions that resulted were not restricted to Scotland. Indeed, compared to the irregularities of some of the Society's English and Irish auxiliaries, the Scottish indiscretions were relatively insignificant. For an examination of the Bible Society's

---

(1) B.S. Home C.: C. Anderson to Bible Society, 26 March 1818.
(2) B.S. Home C.: E. Burn to J. Owen, 23 April 1818.
(3) B.S. Minutes of the Printing Subcommittee, 1 May 1818.
(4) For example, two Bibles with the Apocrypha attached published by the King's Printer found their way to Edinburgh in April 1818, and caused a minor uproar. In fairness to the parent society, however, it did not know about this error and immediately passed legislation to insure that it would not happen again. See B.S. Home C.: J. Muir to J. Hughes, 10 April 1818; B.S. Correspondence Book, X, p.140., 23 April 1818.
internal relations at yet another level therefore, we must look to England and then to Ireland.

III. Tensions in England and Ireland

(i) Society Activities: The Issue of Sectaries

It was not surprising that the parent society became interested in women's Bible associations in about 1817. These had existed in one form or another as early as 1811, but they did not attract much attention until later. After ten years of controversy, however, and faced with a period of financial depression, the Bible Society needed to exploit all its resources and was glad to avail itself of willing female support. The women felt that their associations, if given the chance and allowed to expand, could save the Society from financial ruin. To C.S. Dudley of Southwark fame, was given the task of organizing women's associations on a national scale. By the end of 1817, twenty-eight women's associations were established followed by seventy new ones in the following year:

Female emancipation was never a popular ideal in the early nineteenth century. The woman's place was at home, and even in religious activities she took a second place to the male. When the Bible Society saw need to exploit the energies of its evangelical women and permit near equal participation with the men in fund-raising and Bible

(1) See B.S. Home C.: C.S. Dudley to Bible Society, 14 May 1817. Women's Bible associations actually started in a spontaneous fashion circa 1811. But it was the publication of Dudley's plan for the Southwark system which facilitated the founding of women's associations on the same basis in 1814. See C.F. Dudley, *An analysis of the system of the Bible Society* (1821), pp. 365, 370. Dudley (1780-1862) a Dublin born merchant, was, after 1819, in charge of the Society's home organization.
distribution activities, there was some vigorous protest. One writer reported that some ladies associated with a Bible association threatened that they would leave their husbands rather than leave their Bible associations. He feared that "with the zeal and spirit, the forwardness and intrusive boldness of an active member of a Ladies' Bible Association, how is it possible to retain the softened diffidence and virgin modesty which form the greatest charm of the female bosom [sic]." Some more prurient minds saw perverted, surrogate sexuality behind this enterprise. A London paper claimed that Olinthus Gregory, Baptist layman and mathematical master of the Royal Military Academy, once told the Woman's Bible Association at Hertford "that God would be their lover" if they distributed Bibles for the Society!

The major complaint against women's associations, however, did not involve the issue of women's rights. Charles Dudley already had a reputation among High Churchmen for organizing the Southwark Auxiliary along potentially seditious lines; there was, therefore, grave speculation that Dudley's women might clandestinely infiltrate neighbourhoods and report back to Jacobin conspirators everything they had seen.

The women's associations by their zeal brought this kind of speculation on themselves because they were engaged in far more than Bible distribution. Some bold spirits itinerated without invitation in the parishes of the

(1) A Letter to the Church members of the Auxiliary Society, Liverpool (1819), p. 18 f.
(2) Ibid. p. 21.
very clergymen who opposed the Society, distributed their Bibles with a short sermon, and then made enquiry into the spiritual state of the recipients. From a modern perspective, we can understand that the women's associations provided one of the few outlets through which middle class nineteenth century women would direct their creative energies; their over-enthusiasm was a sad commentary on the colourless and restricted lives they otherwise lived. To Bible Society Anglicans, however, their zeal appeared extremely irregular; to High Churchmen it bordered on sedition. Their fervour sometimes did more harm than good to the evangelical cause. William Conybeare complained that one group of zealots forced their way into the kitchen of a conscientious clergyman, and prosleytized so vigorously among his household that they reawakened prejudices against the evangelical cause which might otherwise have faded away.

The Ladies Association at Henley aroused especial anxiety. In 1817, R.B. Fisher, the Evangelical Vicar of Basildon, and Secretary of the Wallingford Auxiliary Bible Society, complained that Dudley's zealous women in Henley were handing out moral instruction as well as Bibles and questioning the recipients about their spiritual state. This might seem unexceptionable but what was to prevent non-evangelicals or Jacobins from similar tactics? Perhaps, wrote Fisher

some Socinian or antinomian agents may have been propagating the peculiarities of their respective creeds? In short, what security can you give the friends of the society that it will

(1) Bodl. MSS Montagu d. 12, II, f. 131: W. Conybeare to Mrs. Hodge, n.d.
(2) B.S. Home C.: R.B. Fisher to J. Hughes, 18 March 1817.
not be the instrument of...errors? What security can you give the Government that it will not be perverted to political purposes?

The location of the meetings was also a stumbling block to many conscientious clergymen. As Fisher later complained to Lord Teignmouth, meetings are frequently held in barns and assembled in opposition to the Clergyman of the Parish. The clergy in general do not attend, thinking the place derogatory to the dignity of their profession...and consequently the office of instructing the poor in the use and contents of the Bible must devolve in general on Dissenting ministers.

Under the threat of several clerical resignations over this matter, the issue was discussed by the parent committee in May and June of 1817, and proposals were passed to prohibit the delivery of public addresses directed at Bible recipients. In November further steps were taken, not only to purge the women's associations of irregularities, but to prohibit the use of devotional exercises at the opening and conclusion of their business meetings. But enforcement was not always easy. Charles Dudley unabashedly continued to itinerate on behalf of the Society, evoking the displeasure of not a few clergymen, one of whom complained indignantly that

(1) B.S. Home C. R.B. Fisher to Teignmouth, 22 April 1817.
(2) For example, Henry Brooke of Wells, threatened to resign from the Society because he saw in Dudley's plan a plot to divide the parishes into subdivisions, to canvass the neighborhood so as to ascertain its state and to use all of this information in the overthrow of the Establishment. B.S. Home C. H. Brooke to J. Cwen, 19 Sept. 1817.
(3) B.S. Minutes, 19 May 1817; Cf. J. Scholefield, A Second Letter to the Right Hon. the Earl of Liverpool (1822), p.65 f.
(4) B.S. Minutes, 17 Nov. 1817. Though this legislation was passed to satisfy Anglican protests, dissident clergymen during the Tests Controversy of 1831 demanded that prayers be instituted at Society business meetings as a test to exclude undesirables.
(5) This clergyman was J.B. Stuart, Rector of Grappenhall, Cheshire in 1808.
Dudley, an intruder into his parish and a layman at that, had preached in the local Lancastrian School during church hours, and had brazenly invited his own Sunday School teachers to attend the lectures without previous approval. Was it, this clergyman angrily asked, "of no consequence whether a person hear the Gospel in a Church or a barn, from the lips of a clergyman or an itinerant layman?" The inability of the Society to control some of its own agents raised suspicions in the minds of not a few Bible Society Anglicans that sectarianism had penetrated the very leadership of the Society.

(ii) Society Meetings: The Issue of Order

These were not the only threats to the homogeneity of the Society. Some auxiliaries acted as though they were merely agencies of the local denomination which happened to control the lion's share of the membership. Cavalierly, they encouraged prayers and sermons at business and anniversary meetings, they met in churches and chapels instead of secular meeting places, and indulged in discussion of religious topics unconnected with the simple business of Bible distribution. Joseph John Gurney, upset by the lack of "sufficient simplicity" in many of the auxiliary meetings that he had visited, warned the parent society that American Quakers had been reluctant to support the Bible Society largely because its meetings had developed into "opportunities for religious services, I mean for prayer & preaching."

(1) B.S. Home C., J.B. Stuart to J. Owen, 30 Jan. 1822. Stuart was also jealous that Dudley, a layman, was receiving more pay than "laborious clergymen, educated at the Universities."
Gurney implied that if such practices continued in England, the Society might well find itself without Quaker patronage. So too, John Langley of Shrewsbury complained to the parent society that after a meeting of his auxiliary, several preachers present gave notice that a revival meeting would be held afterwards in the committee room. It was not that Langley opposed revivals, but he felt that since there was an "absolute necessity of adhering most rigidly to the simple principle of the Bible Society," the local churches would perhaps have been a more appropriate place for religious meetings. The great age of denominational competition was beginning to gain momentum after 1810 and it was scarcely surprising that many auxiliary societies often subordinated the fundamental principles of the Bible Society to their own denominational concerns.

Another problem which particularly irked the Anglican patrons of the Society, was the practice of holding meetings in religious buildings, especially Nonconformist chapels. Robert Gray, Rector of Sunderland, complained to Lord Teignmouth in 1818 of a plan to move the annual meeting of the Sunderland Auxiliary Bible Society from the public assembly room where it had always been held, either to an Anglican church or a Nonconformist meeting house; to each place he, like his diocesan bishop, had "insuperable objections" since such business use diminished the veneration for a 'House of God', and gave the society which assembled there

(1) B.S. Home C. & J.J. Gurney to Bible Society, 31 May 1817.
(2) Possibly the John Langley who was Rector of St. Leonards and St. Marys Wallingford from 1829. See J. Foster, Index Ecclesiasticus (1890).
(3) B.S. Home C. & J. Langley to J. Tarn, 17 March 1821.
an undesirable denominational appearance. George White, a Dissenter, expressed apprehension that if his auxiliary at Chatham met at Ebenezer chapel, the Anglican patrons might walk out in force.

Finally, the Society was plagued by meetings which did not always adhere to the simple business of Bible distribution. One High Church critic told of the "orators" and the "advocates" of the Society, who "hurried from one quarter of the kingdom to the other, and with the same speeches in their mouths, e-la-mode of the itinerant preachers of the day, astonish the minds of their hearers with an enthusiastic burst, inflame them with spiritual raptures, and leave them in the enjoyment of Emmanuel Swedenborg's invisible world; until, evaporation gradually taking place, a few days calm their sensibilities, and restore them to their sober senses." Under the pressure of such criticisms, John Owen counselled auxiliary secretaries "recommend to your speakers to be brief, to speak to the question and to spurn controversy," but this advice was not always followed. Edward Burn, Curate of St. Mary's Chapel Birmingham told Joseph Hughes that at an auxiliary meeting in Workington, the chairman of the meeting, the Independent Spedding Curwen, in an effusion which lasted over three quarters of an hour, brought up "the Catholic Question, the Mischiefs of Religious

(1) B.S. Teignmouth Letters, f. 72: R. Gray to Teignmouth, 16 August 1819.
(2) B.S. Home C.; G. White to J. Tarn, 16 March 1820.
(3) A Letter to the Right Reverend the Bishop of Gloucester in vindication of His Lordship's refusal to accept a vice-presidency of an Auxiliary Bible society at Gloucester (1813), p. 17 fn.
(4) Bodl. MSS Montagu, d. 9, f. 72: J. Owen to W. Bicheno, 17 Dec. 1814.
Establishments; the example of America, that does so well without them etc.," and did not stop until Burn "touched him gently on the irrelevancy of such matters..." However hard it tried, the parent society could not always control these irregularities.

Of the various problems and crises which troubled the Society, the most shattering in its effects was the 'Hibernian Crisis' of 1821. The Hibernian Bible Society of Dublin had always been independent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, though (like that in Edinburgh) it received Bibles from London at reduced prices. As early as 1815 apparently, proposals were introduced to bring the Irish and London societies closer together. One member of the Hibernian, objecting to this proposal, grumbled that such a union was desired by London because the Bible Society "coveted our list of Patrons and vice Patrons, of Archbishops and Bishops, the dignified subscribers of the Institution, whose names would no doubt have looked well at the head of their own report." The attempt at union broke down apparently because an Irish archbishop threatened to withdraw his support if it were carried through. Nevertheless ties were so strong between London and Dublin that the Hibernian, for all practical purposes, was considered an auxiliary of the Bible Society.

The Hibernian, however, tended to emulate some of the more irregular practices of the Bible Society's English auxiliaries. Its business meetings introduced subjects

(1) B.S. Home C.: E. Burn to J. Hughes, 12 Oct. 1819.
(2) J.E. Jackson, Reasons for Withdrawing from the Hibernian Bible Society (1822), p. 16; Cf. T.L. O'Beirne, A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Meath (1816), p. 31.
(3) Jackson, op.cit. p. 16.
of a non-business-like nature, and canvassed religious topics not immediately concerned with Bible distribution. In a country where Anglican-Nonconformist relations blew hot or cold depending on the seriousness of the Roman Catholic threat, this practice soon had its results. On 14 July 1821, the Archbishop of Armagh resigned, protesting that the Society's constitution had gradually changed since its original formation. The Society's meetings, he went on, "consist of a number of persons whose religious opinions are at variance with each other, and each person has a right to express, without check or control, his own religious opinions in his own language." These indiscretions were injurious to the established Church and offensive to its members. James Carlile, Secretary of the Hibernian, assured John Owen that in fact, no change had been introduced into the Society's constitution, and that in public meetings, no improper topics had been introduced that were injurious to the establishment; nevertheless, the parent society in London was alarmed. The loss of an archbishop at a time of general crisis, even in a society that was only informally associated with London would, it was feared, have serious

(1) B.S. Correspondence Book, XI, p. 73; Archbishop of Armagh to P. Sadleir, 14 July 1821 (copy); Cf. H.H. Norris, Respectful Letter to the Earl of Liverpool, p. 5. Carlile added several others reasons for the Archbishop's resignation, namely, that he did not approve of churchmen uniting with Dissenters for the promotion of religious objects, that he now preferred associating with the Association for Discountenancing Vice because it gave the Prayer Book with Bibles, and that he could receive cheaper Bibles from the last-mentioned society. See B.S. Home C.: J. Carlile to J. Owen, 26 Oct. 1821.

repercussions on Anglican patronage in England. Owen therefore advised the Hibernian to maintain strict silence on the matter, especially since the Archbishop of Dublin and the Bishop of Kildare resigned shortly afterwards. Yet before this could happen, rumours were rapidly spreading in England, that the Bible Society had lost all its support from the Anglican hierarchy. Benjamin Scott, the Curate of Great Harboro, for example, heard from the Vicar of St. Mary's Warwick at an auxiliary meeting "that most of the Dignitaries in Church & State who had once countenanced the Society have withdrawn their support from it." This statement was printed in the Coventry papers. "The whole of this," Scott warned London, "is producing a lamentable effect & must be immediately counteracted." Matters were so critical in England by November, that Owen, who was very ill, even proposed a visit to Tunbridge Wells to seek the counsel of Lord Teignmouth. But by December, Owen was able to tell John Paterson, that though the controversy continued to rage in the Irish press, no positive injury, for the time being at least, had been felt in England.

In the long run, as we shall see, this controversy and others like it, had a far reaching effect on the Bible Society. That Irish bishops and archbishops had left the Society over the matter was serious enough; but that there was now, if not before, a very vocal minority of dissident

(1) B.S. Home C.: J. Owen to J. Carlile, 5 Nov. 1821 (copy).
(3) B.S. Home C.: B. Scott to J. Hughes, 11 Oct. 1821.
(4) B.S. Home C.: J. Owen to J. Tarn, 6 Nov. 1821.
Anglicans within the Society who were protesting these irregularities, portended even more serious confrontations. Nor did the tone of business meetings improve much after 1821. In 1822, William Carus Wilson, Rector of Tunstall Lancs complained of the "methodistical ranting" that took place at auxiliary meetings which upset the Quakers as much as the Anglicans. In 1825, Thomas Tyndale, the Rector of Holton, complained that he had just heard "a Dissenting minister make a most injudicious attack on the speech of a pious clergyman...and detain the company for half an hour on purpose to support the dissenting interest..."

If we remember that the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts was only three years away, and that the issue of disestablishment was much discussed by the Dissenters at this time, we can well understand why these irregularities at Bible Society meetings irritated Anglicans. John Dale Wawn, an Anglican from Derby, informed John Owen that a joint stock company, composed almost exclusively of Dissenters, had offered to build a new meeting room for his auxiliary, but that he objected to this proposal because, by mutual agreement, the building would also have been used for 'political meetings' by "our dissenting friends [who] are very violent in Derby." If these political meetings involved either the Dissenting Deputies or the Protestant Society, two Nonconformist organizations agitating for

(2) B.S. Home C.; T. Tyndale to(A.Brandram) 18 Nov. 1825.
(3) B.S. Home C.; J.D. Wawn to J. Owen, 9 Jan. 1822.
Repeal at this time, we can well understand why Bible Society Anglicans were becoming increasingly suspicious of their Nonconformist colleagues and why perhaps, a 'test' was proposed in 1831 to exclude the more threatening and radical elements like the Unitarians, from Society membership. For the time being, however, it is important to understand, that there was a growing Anglican dissatisfaction with the inability of the parent society to regulate and control the heterodox activities of some of its more irregular auxiliaries.
Chapter Nine: The Internal Relations (II)

I. Introduction

The third decade of the nineteenth century marked a watershed in the history of the Bible Society. By 1822, the controversy with High Churchmen had largely run its course, but it had sown many doubts in the minds of patrons, doubts which seemed validated by the behaviour of some auxiliaries. Attempts by the London committee to reassert its control over wayward auxiliaries in Scotland and England were largely unsuccessful. The Scots resented the way in which London meddled in their affairs; English Anglicans were unhappy with the failure to discipline irregularity. This led to two further controversies that we must next examine.

The reaction in Scotland was complex. In part, the so-called Apocrypha Controversy was precipitated by the unreasonable and inconsistent way London had managed its Scottish affairs. Later, however, it became apparent that the Presbyterian aversion to Apocryphal Bibles was rooted in an almost neurotic fear of Roman Catholicism. These factors, together with the discussion of Catholic Emancipation before Parliament, caused a secession of the Scottish auxiliaries from the parent society in 1825 although, for the most part, the Scottish Dissenters remained faithful to London. In England, on the other hand, dissident Anglicans within the Society, fearful of the sectarian dangers previously proclaimed by the Society's High Church critics, and inflamed by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, saw need to force a 'test' on the Society itself in the hope of weeding out not only the Unitarians, but other unorthodox
'sectaries' who they felt were dangerous to the establishment. The Society's refusal to accede to these demands forced a second secession in 1831.

Although the Bible Society survived these controversies, it was evident by 1830, that the pan-evangelical movement had been seriously weakened, and if the Bible Society, with its simple constitution, found it difficult to weather denominational and theological internecine warfare, the future of evangelical unity appeared bleak.

II. Tensions in Scotland: The Apocrypha Controversy

(1) The Early Controversy

It was never the intention of the Bible Society in its earlier years to circulate Apocryphal Bibles. This was certainly always true of the Bibles circulated in Britain, but even on the Continent where Roman Catholics in particular considered the Apocrypha an integral part of the canon, the Society explicitly disapproved of its circulation. Unfortunately, however, many Continental societies circulated Apocryphal Bibles in the Society's name though almost certainly without London's knowledge or sanction. By 1812, if not before, the Society faced a perplexing situation. Increasingly, many Continental agents were complaining that Society Bibles did not sell because they lacked the Apocrypha. Even C.F. Steinkopf, the Society's Foreign Secretary, sent to the Continent in 1812

(1) Though several Anglican patrons of the Society complained early on that the Apocrypha was excluded from Society Bibles, the Bible Society never annexed the Apocrypha to its English editions. Cf. B.S. Home C.; E. Burn to Bible Society, 1 May 1806. Unfortunately, one English Apocryphal edition got through the press in 1817, but this was a printers mistake. See Supra p. 221 fn.
to impress upon the Continental societies the importance of adhering strictly to London's rules, returned to England declaring that unless the parent society was rather more flexible about issuing Apocryphal Bibles, it would lose a great deal of its Continental patronage. On 7 June 1813, therefore, it was decided in committee "that the manner of printing the Holy Scripture by the Foreign societies, be left to their discretion, provided they be printed without note or comment." This resolution was very tactfully phrased, because even though nothing was directly said about Apocryphal Bibles, their circulation was to be permitted by implication. The parent society did not wish this to be publicised and told its provincial auxiliaries nothing of the decision.

By 1821, however, rumours were beginning to circulate that the parent society had illegally countenanced the circulation of Apocryphal Bibles without the general approval of its members. With the Society's regulation on Metrical Psalms still fresh in their memories, these rumours must have been particularly irritating to the Scots. In fact it was a Scotsman, Robert Haldane, founder of the Continental Society and patron of the Society's Montauban Bible, who first exposed London's duplicity in the matter. As Haldane tells the story, he had left the Society's offices at Earl Street in London one August morning in 1821, but forgetting his umbrella, returned to the committee room the next day only to overhear the directors discussing with Dr. John Pinkerton, one of the Society's foreign agents, the addition of the Apocrypha to the Society's Toulouse edition.

(1) B.S. Minutes, 7 June 1813.
of the Bible. Upon further investigation, Haldane also learned to his amazement, that the French Bible edited at Montauban and financed largely with his own money, had undergone the same "contamination" even though the directors had repeatedly assured him that it would contain nothing but the "pure Word of God." The result of Haldane's investigations into the "secret" affairs of the Society was a strong letter of protest written on 6 October 1821, in which he warned the parent society that if the practice of circulating Apocryphal Bibles was persevered in, "a very general secession of auxiliary societies & subscribers will take place." Haldane's words were indeed prophetic.

Because Haldane was not a director of the Society, the mantle of what would soon be called the 'Anti-Apocrypha Party' fell on the shoulders of the Irish clergyman William Thorpe, former chaplain at the Lock Hospital in London and now Secretary of the Hibernian Society in Dublin who served the parent society with a notice that at their next meeting he would press for anti-Apocrypha legislation. But when Thorpe presented his resolution on 22 July 1822 which, had it been accepted, would have banned the circulation of Society-funded Apocryphal Bibles on the Continent, he was opposed by an Anglican pressure group within the parent society (later to be known as the 'Philo-Apocrypha Party') who feared that the resolution would result in the unhappy resignation of many Anglican patrons in England, and the possible loss

(1) A. Haldane, The Lives of Robert Haldane...and his Brother James Alexander Haldane (1855), p. 485. Apparently, these revelations were as startling to Lord Teignmouth as they had been to Haldane himself.
(2) B.S. Home C., R. Haldane to J. Hughes, 6 Oct. 1821.
(3) B.S. Minutes, 15 July 1822.
(4) B.S. Minutes, 22 July 1822.
of the Society's entire Continental patronage. Consequently Thorpe's resolution failed in committee.

Because of mounting protests from provincial auxiliaries over the matter, the Scots' claim could not be easily overlooked. The parent committee decided that some sort of compromise was in order, and accepted a resolution drawn up by Lord Teignmouth on 9 August 1822, making it an invariable rule of the Society to finance only those books of the Bible which were generally received as canonical in Britain, but with the important proviso that the Continental societies would remain at liberty to apply their own funds to the printing and circulating of Apocryphal Bibles "in whatever way" they saw fit. In other words, the Apocrypha could still be appended to or interspersed with Society Bibles as long as the Continental societies financed the Apocrypha themselves.

Though the August 1822 resolution temporarily ended the first phase of the Apocrypha Controversy, it was an unhappy compromise. In the first place, the Continental societies were still at liberty to circulate the Apocrypha and though there was an informal agreement that Society money would only be spent on the canon, the Scots knew very well that this agreement would be impossible to enforce. Furthermore, London had underestimated the Scottish aversion to the Apocrypha. The Scots had felt all along that the Apocrypha was a dangerous book loaded with 'Romish errors' and even though Society money would technically not be used to

(2) B.S. Minutes, 9, 19 Aug. 1822.
publish it, the Apocrypha would still appear as before in Continental editions under the imprint of the British and Foreign Bible Society. These grievances were probably stoked by the resentment lingering from the Metric Psalm affair. The Apocrypha indiscretion provided an excellent opportunity for the Scots to even the score.

Two years of relative calm passed before the Scots could find an issue worthy of renewed agitation. They found this issue in Leander Van Ess, a Roman Catholic priest who served as a Society agent in Germany. Van Ess had complained that the non-Apocrypha Bibles he was receiving from the Bible Society were not selling because the Roman Catholic population in his area thought them to be Lutheran Testaments. He therefore requested permission to purchase 8,000 copies of the Bible in sheets to which, at his own expense, he would bind in the Apocrypha. Since Van Ess' request seemed to be legal under the resolution of August 1822, it was acceded to in committee without debate, and Van Ess was voted £500 for his project. Unfortunately, the Scottish

(1) Teignmouth sensed this himself. He told Steinkopf, when the August 1822 resolution was being drafted, that "whatever decision may be formed, the consequences must be, I fear, most injurious to the Society." B.S. Home C.: Teignmouth to C.G. Steinkopf, 5 August 1822. Many years later, after the Edinburgh Bible Society had separated from the parent society, it asked in a controversial circular: "How can we rely on them...They are to circulate the Holy Scriptures in Britain and Ireland without note or comment. Having broken through this law, as we thought, in their answers to Mr. Milne's queries in 1818, we remonstrated with them on the subject, and they agreed to rescind the resolution which authorized marginal renderings and references. And yet they publish Bibles with arguments at the beginning of each chapter, and references along the margin." T. Davidson et al Second Statement of the Committee of the Edinburgh Bible Society (1826), p. 132 f.

(2) For biography of Van Ess, see E.M. 1825, p. 89 ff.

(3) B.S. Minutes, 2 Aug. 1824.
Anti-Apocryphist Edward Craig, minister of St. James Episcopal Chapel in Edinburgh, who had attended the meeting, returned to Scotland with the news, which ignited strong protests. What kind of Bible had the Society been committed to? "Let us suppose," William Thorpe wrote to Teignmouth, "this Bible of Professor Leander Van Ess completed and let us suppose it laid on the table of our committee-room. On taking it up, it is found to contain the Apocryphal books, as well as the Holy Scriptures; nay, to have the former intermixed with the latter, in such a manner as that the story of Bel and the Dragon appears as one of the chapters in Daniel's prophecy. A member of the Society, on observing this, remarks, 'here is a violation of one of our fundamental laws.' 'Oh no,' replies the committee, turning to one side of the leaf which contains the word of God, 'We paid for this, some other person, we know not who, paid for that.'

If the parent society continued to publish Apocryphal Bibles, Thorpe concluded, the Society would face "consequences of the most disastrous description." James F. Gordon, also of the Edinburgh Bible Society, hinted that unless Van Ess' grant was rescinded, "you will find the B&F Bible Society will lose all Scotland, both auxiliaries & also private subscribers."

To head off impending disaster, a resolution was rushed through committee rescinding Van Ess' grant. Teignmouth hoped that this action would appease the Scots and that the August 1822 resolution would still authorize the committee at least to assist in the circulation of Bibles with the Apocrypha appended, but he also feared that the Anti-Apocryphists would make a second attempt either to abolish the resolution

(2) B.S. Home C.: W. Thorpe to Teignmouth, 14 Aug. 1824.
(3) Ibid.

Gordon, a lawyer, was related to Robert Haldane by marriage.
of August 1822 or alter it in such a way that the Society would be prohibited from circulating Apocryphal Bibles in any form. If this was attempted, Teignmouth told Andrew Brandram (John Owen's successor as the Anglican Secretary), it would have to be resisted at all costs. In the first place, a resolution condemning the Apocrypha wholesale would go further than Teignmouth and most of the Society's Anglican patrons could permit, for while the Church of England never regarded the Apocrypha as canonical, it did permit the circulation of the Bible with the Apocrypha appended to it; lessons from the Apocrypha were periodically read in Anglican worship. If the Anti-Apocryphists succeeded in boycotting Continental societies who were willing to append privately financed Apocryphas at the end of Society Bibles, Teignmouth feared that the great evangelical mission to Europe "would be brought within very restricted limits." 

As predicted, on 6 December 1824, William Thorpe again introduced a resolution to prohibit the circulation of any Society Bible that contained the Apocrypha. But in the face of stiff opposition from Teignmouth, he backed down and accepted another compromise drawn up by the Society's President. This, agreed on December 20th, stated that Society grants would not aid in the printing of any Bible in which the Apocrypha was mixed or interspersed, but that it would continue to aid societies which appended the Apocrypha separately at the end of the Bible, on the understanding

(1) B.S. Home C.: Teignmouth to A. Brandram, 4 Sept 1824.
(2) B.S. Minutes, 6 Dec.1824. Apparently Thorpe was pressured by the parent society to postpone his motion. But this only provoked him more. See B.S. Home C.: W. Thorpe to J. Tarn, 20 Nov. 1824.
that this would be done at their own expense. Though George Gorham, Curate of the parish church at Clapham, who seemed to represent the moderate Anti-Apocryphist position, felt this to be a fair compromise, it still did not satisfy the more militant Anti-Apocryphists in Scotland who were tired of compromise. On 17 January 1825, therefore, the Edinburgh Bible Society sent a communique to London which not only reiterated all of its old complaints, but also protested that the primary object of Teignmouth's December 1824 compromise resolution was merely to "administer a salvo to the consciences of objectors at home; whilst abroad the evil remains exactly the same as ever."

Meanwhile in England, a Philo-Apocrypha reaction, supported by Anglicans headed by Andrew Brandram, the Society's Anglican Secretary, began to agitate for a return to what seemed in Scotland at least, to be pro-Apocrypha rules. In fact these Anglicans scarcely approved of the Apocrypha any more than the Scots. What they desired was a rule which encouraged the circulation of non-Apocryphal Bibles on the Continent, but which also permitted the Society to circulate Apocryphal Bibles appended or interspersed in areas that would receive nothing else. Ironically, the

(1) B.S. Minutes, 20 Dec. 1824.
(2) G.C. Gorham, A statement submitted to the Members of the British and Foreign Bible Society on the unlawfulness of circulating the Apocryphal Books indiscriminately mingled with the Inspired Writings (2nd ed. 1825), p. 33.
(4) Thomas Biddulph, for example, had suffered ecclesiastical censure for refusing to read the Apocrypha in worship. Yet he was a Philo. See B.S. Home C. (A.P. A.12); T. Biddulph et. al. to Committee, 15 April 1825.
Philo-Apocryphists based their argument on the same foundation that the Scots had been using against the circulation of Apocryphal Bibles, namely that it would be a violation of the Society's fundamental principle, which united all Christians in one common enterprise, to "cut off some of the largest & most promising branches of the Society's labour - by giving up, in some quarters the only way in which any part of the word of God can be circulated..." The result of this opposition, was a resolution in committee on 7 March 1825 which rescinded all previous Apocrypha legislation.

The Anti-Apocryphist reaction to this new development was predictably hostile. They first attempted to reverse the rescinded motion in committee, and when this failed, flooded the parent society with anti-Apocrypha petitions and letters of protest. To bide time, it was decided to appoint a 'Special Subcommittee' to consider more possible compromises. Significantly, even though this committee included Anti-Apocryphists like Henry Drummond and Alexander

---

(1) B.S. Home C. (A.P. A.6.): J. Lamb et al. to Bible Society, 11 Feb. 1825. This petition was initially signed by William Parish, Charles Simeon, Legh Richmond, Henry Venn Elliott, George Milner, Baptist Noel, T.P. Platt, William Cecil and others. Richmond later withdrew his name because there was no provision to circulate the Apocrypha "marked and distinguished as such." See B.S. Home C. (A.P. A.63): L. Richmond to J. Tarn, 22 Sept. 1825.
(2) B.S. Minutes, 7 March 1825.
(3) B.S. Minutes, 21 March 1825.
(4) For example, Henry Drummond, Alexander Waugh, William Thorpe, Zachary Macaulay, George Gorham, J.E. Gordon and others met in special caucus to sign a petition denying the claim that Continental societies would withdraw their patronage if not allowed to circulate the Apocrypha. See B.S. Home C. (A.P. A.9.): H. Drummond et al. to Secretaries, 20 March 1825.
Waugh, it was dominated by the Philos, and the Philos eventually got what they wanted. On 22 April 1825, the Special Subcommitteee recommended a position vaguely reminiscent of past resolutions viz that the Society should encourage the circulation of non-Apocryphal Bibles, but not interfere with Continental societies who refused to give up the Apocrypha. This proposed resolution was again totally unsatisfactory to the Anti-Apocryphists. Consequently, the Edinburgh Bible Society decided to take unilateral action and discontinue remittances to the parent society as long as it continued to countenance the circulation of Apocryphal Bibles in any form.

The impact of the Edinburgh decision on auxiliaries was catastrophic. Not only did several auxiliaries in Scotland follow suit by also cutting off their funds, but so did some in England. Slowly, English auxiliaries not originally involved in the controversy began to feel its adverse effects. Much of this agitation was provoked by the private

(1) B.S. Minutes, 4 April 1825.
(2) B.S. Minutes, 22 April 1825.
(3) T. Davidson et al. Statement by the Committee of the Edinburgh Bible Society, relative to the circulation of the Apocrypha by the British and Foreign Bible Society (1825), passim.
(4) In Scotland, besides the E.B.S., the Leith, Ayrshire and Haddington auxiliaries refused to remit money. In England, the Newcastle and Surrey auxiliaries did the same. The latter, significantly, was Drummond's auxiliary.
(5) Thus James Carr of Darlington complained in July 1825, that the principal reason why the Darlington anniversary had been delayed, was because a protracted dispute had erupted between Pro and Anti-Apocrypha factions in the committee. See B.S. Home C.: J. Carr to J. Tarn, 23 July 1825. George Richardson, the Newcastle Quaker, likewise reported that his committee was much irritated over the issue and that several directors were "irreconcilable" to the Society's connection with Apocryphal Bibles. See B.S. Home C.: G. Richardson to J. Tarn, 6 Aug. 1825.
circulation in England of pro and anti-Apocrypha pamphlets. Joseph Hughes complained that Charles Simeon was circulating a pro-Apocrypha pamphlet which he feared would be deemed semi-official and elicit a charge of partiality against the parent committee. William Morgan, Vicar of Christ Church, Bradford in Yorkshire, likewise deplored the arrival of "two packets of pamphlets, one for & another against the Apocrypha," which aroused an unhealthy interest in a controversy which did not really concern his auxiliary.

Under mounting pressures from Scotland, and now even from England, the parent society appointed a second Special Subcommittee, this time composed entirely of the Philos. After much deliberation, it was finally decided on 21 November 1825 that the Society would apply its funds (and make grants) exclusively to the printing and circulation of the canonical Books, and that all Bibles printed in England for circulation on the Continent, would be issued bound (i.e. not sent in sheets) thus making it impossible for the Apocrypha to be introduced.

The new resolution again elicited largely unfavourable responses from both parties. The Philos, represented by Simeon, complained that the November 1825 resolution was in "direct opposition to the moral bearing & general spirit of God's word," because it abandoned "the eternal interests of millions of their fellow creatures" on the Continent.

(1) B.S. Home C.: J. Hughes to J. Tarn, 29 July 1825.
(2) B.S. Home C.: W. Morgan to J. Tarn, 8 Oct. 1825.
(3) This motion was proposed by Josiah Pratt. It was opposed by Andrew Brandram representing the Philos and William Thorpe representing the Anti-Apocryphists. See B.S. Minutes, 31 Oct., 15 Nov., 21 Nov., 1825.
The Anti-Apocrypha Party on the other hand, felt that even though Society money could now only be spent on canonical books that were issued bound, the foreign societies would perforce, spend the whole of their own funds on circulating the Apocrypha. They felt, therefore, that the parent society should go even further and give grants of money and Bibles only to Continental societies that professed to circulate the canon and the canon only. While many auxiliaries in England and even in Scotland supported the November 1825 resolution, there was still a great deal of dissatisfaction, not only from the Edinburgh Bible Society, but now from the Presbytery of Glasgow in whose hands rested the future of the Glasgow Bible Society, which hitherto had maintained a judicious silence in the whole affair.

(ii) Parties to the Dispute: A Digression

By 1825, if indeed not before, Bible Society evangelicals were beginning to polarize over the Apocrypha Controversy. At first glance, there seemed to be two parties in the dispute. The so-called Anti-Apocryphists appeared to represent all the Scottish evangelicals, most of the English evangelical Dissenters and a large number of English churchmen. The Philo-Apocryphists, on the other hand, seemed in the beginning at least, to be headed largely by Clapham Sect Evangelicals who dominated the parent society and, of course, representatives of the foreign churches like C.F. Steinkopf. But in fact, the lines of division were

much more complex than this. In the first place, most British evangelicals opposed the Apocrypha, though in different degrees. Scottish Presbyterians had social and theological reasons to oppose its circulation; not only was the Apocrypha condemned by the Westminster Confession but it symbolized the continuing Scottish fear of Roman Catholicism. English Evangelical churchmen also discouraged the use of the Apocrypha, though unlike their Northern brethren, they shared neither the same aversion to Apocryphal Bibles, nor quite the same intensity of anti-Papacy emotion. Consequently, they were willing to circulate Apocryphal Bibles in countries that would accept nothing else. Non-conformists in Scotland and England were also, for the most part, Anti-Apocryphists, but though the Apocrypha had no place in their Bibles, they too did not completely share the Presbyterian anti-Catholic neurosis.

The polarization of Society evangelicals into Anti and Philo-Apocrypha factions was really determined by the degree to which each group was willing to go in abolishing the Apocrypha from Society Bibles. By 1825 there were at least three parties to the Controversy. The Anti-Apocryphists, represented mostly by evangelicals of the Scottish establishment and a 'lunatic fringe' consisting of the Haldanes, Edward Irving, Henry Drummond and Andrew Thomson, wanted

(1) According to David Brown, Robert Haldane held a grudge against the Society for two reasons: because of the Montauban Bible episode, and because his friend Ebenezer Henderson had been removed from his station as one of the Society's foreign agents. See D. Brown, Letters in Defence of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1826), p. 3.

(2) Thomson, the leading evangelical in the Church of Scotland, wrote against the Society in the Edinburgh Christian Instructor.
the Apocrypha banned by the Society even if this action meant sacrificing Continental patronage. This feeling was so strong, that they were willing to leave the Society unless their demands were met. The extremists were especially important because they did much to precipitate the schism which lost the Society most of its Scottish auxiliaries.

The Philo-Apocrypha Party of Anglicans, foreigners and others, were not prepared to forfeit Continental support by banning the Apocrypha and were willing to countenance Apocryphal Bibles when Continental societies would receive nothing else. The Philos had their own fanatics on the Eclectic Review edited by the Dissenter Josiah Conder which pushed the Philos' argument to extremes. It argued for instance, that the founding fathers of the Society had never included the Apocrypha under the category of 'note or comment,' but permitted its circulation as part of the English Authorized version. It came dangerously close to suggesting that there was no authoritative catalogue of canonical Books excluding the Apocrypha. While most of the Philos would have been willing to support the former claim, they would never have agreed to the latter; to them the circulation of Apocryphal Bibles was only a matter of expediency.

---

(1) The Eclectic Review was jointly founded in 1805 by evangelical Dissenters and churchmen. Its proceeds were to be given to the Bible Society. Robert Hall's hostile review of James Bean's Zeal without Innovation in 1810, led many Anglicans to denounce the magazine. Consequently by 1814, the magazine was under the exclusive management of Dissenters. Samuel Greatheed was its first editor. See F.E. Mineka, The Dissidence of Dissent (1944), p. 67.
By far the vast majority of British evangelicals fell into neither extreme camp at least in the beginning of 1825. If anything, they tended to side with the Anti-Apocryphists, but when the Anti-Apocryphists became intransigent and separation seemed imminent, the moderates tended more and more to back the parent society. The moderate position was perhaps best represented by George Gorham and the Christian Guardian to which he contributed. Gorham - later made famous by the Gorham Judgment - was Curate at Clapham. Like most evangelicals of his day, he opposed the circulation of Apocryphal Bibles as a violation of the Society's agreed policy. But though supporting the Scots, he was not willing to follow them into schism. He grudgingly favoured the compromise resolution of December 1824 which permitted the circulation of privately financed Apocrypha even though he relentlessly continued to press for more comprehensive anti-Apocryphal legislation. When asked how he could justify his anti-Apocryphal position while still favouring compromise, he reluctantly admitted that he did not consider it "justifiable to withhold the Word of God from those who at their own expense, chose to add the Apocrypha." This statement did much to alienate Gorham and most of the moderates from the militant Anti-Apocryphists. By the end of 1825, therefore, the moderates began to sound more like the Philos than the Scottish Anti-Apocryphists.

(1) Both William Roby and Samuel Hope said that Gorham was the spokesman for the moderates. See B.S. Home C.: W. Roby to (J. Tarn), 12 Sept. 1825; B.S. Home C. (A.P. A. 49.): S. Hope to J. Hughes, 27 August 1825.
(2) G.C. Gorham, Statement, p. 40 f.
(4) T. Davidson et.al.: Second Statement to the Edinburgh Bible Society, p. 41 ff.
(iii) The Later Controversy

Edinburgh's decision to withhold its funds portended a schism, and this the parent society wanted to avoid if at all possible. On 2 January 1826, an assurance was despatched to the Scots, that the Apocrypha would never again be circulated with Society Bibles, but the parent society was not prepared to give in to Edinburgh's demand that support be withdrawn from all Continental societies which still chose to print Apocryphal Bibles at their own expense. A deputation was subsequently sent to Scotland to negotiate, but with limited success. That all Apocryphal Bibles should be removed from the stock, and the plates used for their printing should be destroyed, were demands that were readily accepted. But the delegation dug in its heels when it came to the demand for public repentance by the directors for breaches of the fundamental principle: still more when the Scots insisted on the severance of relations with Continental societies that still circulated Apocryphal Bibles at their own expense, and finally on the removal of the Philos from the direction in London. These were demands that the deputation had no authority to meet.

The parent society was hardly prepared to demand the resignations of its three secretaries and Lord Teignmouth.

---

(1) B.S. Minutes, 2 Jan. 1826. The following communication was sent to the Continental societies: "Whilst the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society have adopted this regulation [of November 1825] for their own guidance, nothing is further from their intention than to interfere in the smallest degree with the religious views and opinions, or with the rites and usages of Foreign Churches."

(2) B.S. Minutes, 20 March 1826.

(3) B.S. Home C.: W. Arnot to Bible Society, 4 April 1826.

(4) Teignmouth and Brandram were prepared to resign if doing so would bring peace. Teignmouth, however, was restrained by Nicholas Vansittart because of the "practical difficulties which would result from it." See C.J. Shore, Memoir of the
In any event, it was the opinion of the returning deputation that nothing short of total acquiescence to Edinburgh's demands would prevent a schism. Resigned to the fact that Edinburgh was probably a lost cause, the Society passed a series of resolutions between April and May 1826, which only reiterated more definitely the resolution of November 1825. The result, as expected, was Edinburgh's final withdrawal. It was followed some months later by that of the Glasgow society.

The Edinburgh and Glasgow separations left many Scottish moderates in a very difficult position. The Eclectic Review, for example, pointed out to Scottish Episcopalians, that if they separated from the Bible Society on terms that banned the Apocrypha from the Bible ("the Bible as it exists - horribile dictu - on the reading desks of Episcopal churches") they were impugning the traditions of their own communion. Neither Gorham in England, nor Thorpe, Craig and most of the other Episcopalians in Scotland, were willing to go this far. Most of the Scottish Baptists and Independents and even several members of the United Secession Church were

Footnote Contd.

Life and Correspondence of John Lord Teignmouth (1843), II, p. 497. Brandram, who was willing to admit that the Scots had some justice on their side, later changed his mind, fearing that his resignation would have a disastrous effect on the provinces. See B.S. Home C. (Outward f. 83.): A. Brandram to R. Wardlaw, 11 Feb. 1826.

(1) B.S. Home C.: J. Hughes to A. Brandram, 12 April 1826.
(2) B.S. Minutes, 21, 25 April 1826, 1 May 1826.
(4) Eclectic Review, April 1826, p. 372.
also unwilling to follow their brethren in the Church of Scotland into schism. Therefore, in June of 1827, a group of Scottish dissidents seceded from the Edinburgh and Glasgow societies and formed new auxiliaries in each city still connected with the parent society in London.

The Edinburgh and Glasgow schisms and the adverse publicity that followed, had a disastrous effect in Scotland and on the Continent. Of the forty-eight Scottish auxiliaries contributing to the parent society in 1825, only eight continued to do so three years later. Though the schism shook many of the English auxiliaries, most of them hung

---

(1) As Robert Steven pointed out in 1826 when on tour for the Bible Society in Glasgow; over the issue of separation at the Glasgow Bible Society, the Nonconformists were unitedly opposed. See B.S. Home C.; R. Steven to J. Tarn, 27 July 1826. There were, perhaps, several reasons why the Scottish Dissenters did not follow the churchmen into schism. Scottish Congregationalists and Baptists were strongly tied to their respective unions in England, and the policy of both unions was to support the parent society. So too, both denominations distrusted the Haldanes. The Congregationalists remembered the bitter dispute between Greville Ewing and Robert Haldane in 1808 over the administration of Scottish Independent seminaries. Haldane's subsequent decision to become a Baptist only hardened relations. The Baptists, on the other hand, were probably suspicious of Haldane's unorthodox beliefs as he associated with Irving at this time. It is not clear why most of the Presbyterian Dissenters did not follow their brethren in the Church of Scotland into separation from the Bible Society. They certainly shared with them the same anti-Catholic neurosis. But it is possible that the tensions in Church-State relations at the time which resulted from the so-called 'Voluntary Controversy' over church patronage, affected the issue by diverting sectarian attention away from the issue of Rome towards that of the establishment.

(2) Cf. B.S. Home C.; H. Grey to J. Tarn, 22 June 1827. The dissidents included the Baptists Christopher Anderson and William Innes and the Congregationalists Greville Ewing, Ralph Wardlaw and John Aikman. Alexander Haldane decided to remain a member of the Society, but this later turned out to be more of a curse than a blessing. See B.S. Home C.; A. Haldane to A. Brandram, 10 May 1826; Cf. H. Grey, View of the character, position, and prospects of the Edinburgh Bible Society (1827), passim.

(3) Based on comparison of Annual Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society of 1825 with that of 1828.
together. But the same could not be said about many of the Continental societies. The Prussian and Rostock Bible societies felt that the new resolutions banning the Apocrypha would be very injurious to their activities. The Danish and Swedish societies simply refused to recognize the resolutions and continued to circulate Apocryphal Bibles. Matters were so critical by 1827, that John Pinkerton, acting Foreign Secretary after Steinkopf had resigned, and R. Waldo Sibthorp, were sent to the Continent to resolve the crisis as best they could. Nevertheless, the Society weathered adversity and continued on its way as a major pan-evangelical institution though greatly weakened financially from its loss of generous Scottish patrons. Before it could completely recover, however, it had to face a second major test of its ability to survive.


(1) The Early Controversy

Just as the Apocrypha agitation began to calm down, the Bible Society had to face a second disruption known as the Socinian or Tests Controversy, in which some members desired a test of faith that would weed out Socinians and other 'unorthodox' members. Accusations that the Society harboured unorthodox elements were hardly new. High Churchmen had pointed not only at the Society's small number of Unitarian patrons, but at otherwise orthodox Dissenters who were

(1) B.S. Minutes, 5 June 1826.
(2) B.S. Minutes, 20 July 1826.
allegedly plotting to undermine the Establishment. By the beginning of the third decade of the nineteenth century, a small group of evangelicals, mostly belonging to the Church of England, were beginning to believe that there was perhaps some truth to these accusations. The number of so-called 'hybrid' auxiliaries that existed in Scotland and England, the highly irregular activities of the women's associations and the 'indiscretions' propagated by Dissenters at auxiliary meetings, led not a few order-minded Anglicans either to question the propriety of their continued patronage, or to contemplate a purge of dangerous groups. Most Evangelical churchmen, of course, did not regard orthodox Dissent at large as dangerous. Past experience, at least in the parent committee, had demonstrated that Nonconformist directors were mild and accommodating. As Joseph Hughes was always overshadowed by John Owen and later Andrew Brandram, so too the other Nonconformist directors were generally content to follow the lead of their Anglican colleagues. But the inability of the parent society to control irregularity in the provinces gave many Anglicans second thoughts about co-partnership with the heterodox or radical elements in the alliance.

A further development confirmed these fears. The second decade of the nineteenth century witnessed (as we have seen in the L.M.S.) a revival of Nonconformist self-identification which greatly modified the traditional political relationship between Church and Dissent. In the first place, evangelical Congregationalists and Baptists had, by 1812, experimented with their first denominational unions. With their increasing numbers, Dissenters also discovered that they possessed
greater political leverage, and the realization gave renewed vitality to the Repeal movement. The Dissenting Deputies and the recently formed Protestant Association began to entertain hopes for the immediate repeal of Nonconformist disabilities. Many Evangelical churchmen now found themselves in a difficult position. Repeal, many believed, was only the first step to disestablishment; and while Repeal itself might be supported by churchmen, disestablishment would naturally have to be opposed. At the same time, Evangelical Anglicans still felt far more spiritual affinity with evangelical Dissenters than with their High Church colleagues. The Bible Society itself, of course, had done much to build bridges between Church and Dissent. The problem then, was how to fend off political Dissent without weakening the pan-evangelical cause.

A small number of Anglican Evangelicals (like most High Churchmen) felt that the only solution was to cease from any kind of cooperation with Dissenters. One of these was Richard Lloyd, the Vicar of St. Dunstan-in-the-West in London who feared that continuing fraternization would "divest the clergy of their relative ascendancy in the realm" forcing upon the Church "a Latitudinarian indifference to Christianity itself." Others saw a simpler solution to the 'sectarian' problem; the dangerous elements in the Society would be located and ejected, making cooperation

(1) R. Lloyd, Two Letters addressed to a Young Clergyman illustrative of his clerical duties in these times of innovation and schism. With an Appendix containing an account of a recent attempt to institute an Auxiliary to the British and Foreign Bible Society...in Midhurst (1818), p. 43; Cf. J. Bennett, The History of Dissenters during the last thirty years from 1808 to 1838 (1839), p. 222.
with the more respectable orthodox Dissenters altogether safer and more straightforward. Not surprisingly, the alien group was found in the prominent party of the Repeal movement— the Unitarians.

The Unitarians, of course, were well cast for the role. Though never a major force in Britain's ecclesiastical life after the eighteenth century they had, nevertheless, enjoyed a minor theological revival in the 1820s through the works of Thomas Belsham and Robert Aspland and in the recently formed British and Foreign Unitarian Association, which since 1825 bound them together for the first time into a denomination. The idea of a united Unitarian movement immediately conjured up old fears of 'rational Dissent' in its most dangerous form. Therefore the small number of Unitarians who patronized the Bible Society became the scapegoats for a growing anti-Dissent hostility among not a few Evangelical clergymen. This hostility was inflamed, needless to say, by the harsh High Church accusations of the previous decade. After reading Norris on the subject, for example, Hugh Rogers, Rector of Camborne in Cornwall, wanted to know in 1822 exactly how many Unitarians actually belonged to the Society. But Rogers was only one among many who were asking the same question. Robert Haldane increased the number of inquiries by reporting in 1825 that "from one end of the Continent to another, Christians have very little weight in the several

Bible Society committees which, in general, are wholly under the direction of Freethinkers;...many Arians and Socinians are the sole governors of several societies abroad."  In 1826, another Anglican patron of the Society added that "Unitarian teachers...were systematically embraced and hugged [by the Society's] Secretaries at home."

In the beginning, agitation to exclude Unitarians from the Society came only from one or two individuals. In 1813, William Williams, Curate of Dunsfold in Surrey, resigned from his auxiliary because of what he believed were certain "deviations" in the various departments of the Society's administration and in 1820 published a series of letters addressed to Isaac Milner entitled The Truth Exhibited between extremes and the progress of error in the British and Foreign Bible Society. Williams complained about the "sinful and evil consequences of a religious alliance with Socinians." Before its publication, he had circulated an anti-Socinian petition among the Society's directors as they entered the 1820 anniversary meeting at Free Masons Hall. This tactic brought few results, so he rejoined the Society to effect reform internally. In 1826, Williams decided to confront the parent committee directly at a meeting at Earl Street where he proposed an

(1) R. Haldane, Review of the conduct of the Directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society relative to the Apocrypha and to their administration on the continent (1825) passim.
(2) W. Williams, The Pretensions of Socinians to the privilege of partnership in the British and Foreign Bible Society proved to have been properly precluded by the fundamental rules and prospectus of that Institution in a series of letters addressed to C.F.A. Steinkopf (1826), p. xxiii.
(3) Ibid. p. i f.
anti-Socinian resolution, following this up with a public
meeting at which he then "conducted himself in such a
manner as to induce a general opinion that he was insane." 1
Undaunted, he continued to itinerate as late as 1828,
intruding himself upon patrons of the Society, and promoting
"discord & disunion, under the idea of not admitting
Unitarians into the membership." 2

Aided by the Anti-Socinian accusations from High Churchmen,
Williams' propaganda campaign began to take effect. In the
spring of 1828, several members demanded the institution
of prayers at business meetings and anniversaries; prayers,
needless to say, designed to repel Unitarians. Most threaten­
ing of all, however, were threats of resignation from some
of the Society's more influential Anglicans. Thus John
Dampier threatened to leave the Society unless Williams'
charges were disproven publicly before an open meeting of the
Society. In the meantime, extremists who had terrorized
the Society during the Apocrypha Controversy, collaborated
in refounding a newspaper entitled the Record, which was
later edited by Edward Irving, Henry Drummond, Robert Haldane,

(1) B.S. Home C. (Outward f.9L)i J. Tarrl to W. Jackson, 17
April 1828.
(2) B.S. Home C.: W. Jackson to J. Tarn, 29 March 1828.
(3) Cf. B.S. Teignmouth Letters, f. 86.: J. Hughes to Teignmouth,
17 March 1828. Hughes wrote a long letter on the subject
for Teignmouth to use as a reply to a Mr. Greatbach, one
of the early members agitating for a prayer. See C.J. Shore,
Memoir of the Life and Correspondence of John Lord Teignmouth
(1843), II, p. 519. This letter was subsequently incor­
porated in J. Hughes, The Subject of Prayer at meetings of
the British and Foreign Bible Society considered in a
letter to the Right Hon. Lord Teignmouth (1830).
(4) Dampier's letter of 1829 is missing from the Society's
archives; but its contents are recorded in the calendar
of correspondence. See also B.S. Home C.(Outward f. 142.),
A.Brandram to J. Dampier where Brandram writes:"I can only
say that it is a gross falsehood that Unitarian teachers
are systematically embraced and hugged by its secretaries
at home." (letter dated 7 May 1829).
Lord Mandeville and others. As Irving told his wife, the 
Record was to be a "truly Christian paper, adopting jure 
divino doctrine with respect to Church and State at home, 
and Protestant principles with respect to our foreign 
affairs, such as Cromwell taught Papal Europe to fear."  
The Record became the semi-official voice of the so-called 
'Pro-Test Party' within the Bible Society, the English 
equivalent of Andrew Thomson's Edinburgh Christian Instructor 
during the Apocrypha Controversy. The animus of this group 
against Unitarians was intense: its members, one observer 
noted, were obsessional, "under the influence of a mono-
mania, which prevents their reasoning coolly and impartially."  

By the early spring of 1830, the Pro-Test party of the 
Bible Society which consisted primarily of members of the 
Presbyterian and Anglican established churches together with 
Haldane and his friends on the Record, formally announced 
their intention to propose, at the May anniversary, that 
committee meetings be opened by a special prayer. The 

(1) For the refounding of the Record, see M.O.W. Oliphant, 
The Life of Edward Irving (1862), II, p. 45 f. These 
men were also meeting at Drummond's home at Albury in 
Surrey and with Lewis Way in 1826 to discuss the pre-
millennial ideas of Irving. According to A.L. Drummond, 
nineteen Anglicans, two Dissenters and four Scottish 
churchmen attended the early meetings. They included 
besides Drummond, Irving and Way; Robert Haldane, Hugh 
McNeil, Daniel Wilson, Joseph Wolff and Spencer Perceval 
Jr. See A.L. Drummond, Edward Irving and his Circle (1938), 
p. 133. Joseph Wolff adds Lord Mandeville, James Haldane 
Stewart, John Cunningham and others. See Joseph Wolff, 
1860), I, p. 337 f. Many of these men led the schism of 
1831. 

(2) Cited in Oliphant, op.cit. II, p. 45. 

(3) J. Fletcher, The Constitution of the Bible Society defended 
(1831), p. 20. 

(4) B.S. Minutes, 1 March 1830. Much of the agitation for 
prayers in the Bible Society grew out of James Haldane 
Stewart's prayer movement of the 1820s. Cf. J.H. Stewart, 
Thoughts on the importance of special prayer for the
parent society, unwilling to enforce a "modern act of 1
Uniformity" on its members was well prepared for this new attack; they ignored it.

Some of the militants now decided to take action of their own. The Derby auxiliary announced that it would institute prayers at business meetings, not necessarily as a test to exclude Socinians, but because the Society as a whole was "chargeable with the guilt of living without 3 prayer." The Guernsey auxiliary followed suit several days later with reasons less professedly devout, openly admitting that their aim was to exclude Socinians. Similar resolutions followed at Rugby, Hereford and Hastings. But when the Rugby auxiliary asked the parent society "to declare those, who deny the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to be inadmissible to vote at any meeting...or to take part in the management of the society's affairs," it replied that it had no power to alter the Society's fundamental law which admitted into membership all Christians who paid their dues. The parent society probably knew that the issue

Footnote Contd.

general outpouring of the Holy Spirit (1821). Stewart pointed out that though the various societies had done much, the need was so great, that man alone could not achieve the evangelical goal except by the intervention of the Holy Spirit. From 1825 on, Stewart began to adopt pre-millennial views and attended the Albury Conferences. See D.D. Stewart, Memoir of the Life of the Rev. James Haldane Stewart (2nd ed. 1857).

(1) J. Hughes, The Subject of Prayer at meetings of the British and Foreign Bible Society considered (1830), p. 9.
(3) B.S. Home C.: J. Cox to Bible Society, 9 Sept. 1830.
(4) B.S. Minutes, 20 Sept. 1830.
(5) B.S. Home C.: J.H.C. Moor (Rugby) to A. Brandram, 17 Sept. 1830; William Brackenbury (Witney) to J. Tarn, 17 Sept. 1830; W. Davis (Hastings) to Bible Society, 28 Oct. 1830.
(7) B.S. Minutes, 20 Sept. 1830.
of prayer was not a truly popular one. Even the auxiliaries that had passed prayer regulations, excited opposition. For instance, when Henry Drummond's Surrey auxiliary voted to institute audible prayer at its business meetings, the branch society at Kingston disowned the decision, and separated to form an auxiliary of its own where prayer was to be excluded as before, and all Christians were to be admitted into membership.

On November first, the Society implored its delinquent auxiliaries to return to the simplicity of the Society's constitution, but of those that had instituted the prayer test, only the Hastings auxiliary decided under protest to conform. Meanwhile, many more, largely those which relied on Anglican support, passed anti-Socinian laws.

By the spring of 1831, the parent society was understandably anxious. The approaching anniversary in May portended another confrontation which could not be easily evaded. To head it off, the parent committee invited the Pro-Test agitators to attend a conference in April at which, it was hoped, they could be induced to retract their demands. At the same time, hoping that the majority of provincial auxiliaries were against prayers and tests, it circulated an 'unofficial' statement which presented the case for opposing a change in the Society's constitution; this was signed by thirty-two of the parent committee's thirty-six directors, a clear indication of their unity in the affair. In addition

(2) B.S. Minutes, 1 Nov. 1830.
(3) B.S. Home C.: W. Davis to Bible Society, 15 Nov. 1830.
(4) B.S. Home C.(Outward f. 242.): A. Brandram to E.H. Hoare, 6 April 1831.
to the arguments from constitutionality and Christian
tolerance, they suggested that prayer tests would create
insurmountable difficulties. Who would offer up the prayer
at Society meetings, clergymen or Dissenters? Would the
prayer be extemporaneous or precomposed? If prayers were
allotted on a rota system, would this not lead to squabbling?
"One petitioner will be distrusted as not evangelical; a
second as not spiritual; a third as not educated; a fourth
as not discreet; and a fifth as not harmonious with his
brethren." If prayer was only to be offered up by a
clergyman (as the Pro-Test faction later suggested) it was
very doubtful that the general body of orthodox Dissenters
would acquiesce.

There was fear that tests established to exclude
Socinians might be extended to exclude other undesirable
groups. As the Christian Guardian pointed out in 1831,
the same arguments could be used to expel those who did
not subscribe to the Reformed theology held by most - but
by no means all - of the members. Not only Roman Catholics but
Quakers and even Wesleyans might be debarred. As J.D.
Macbride, Principal of Magdalen Hall Oxford told Joseph
Hughes

I am ready to concede that none depart further from orthodoxy
than the modern Socinian, but if an erroneous creed is to
exclude him, where is the line to be drawn, and who is
to draw it? Probably no denomination has done more for our
society in proportion to its members and its means than...

(1) J. Hughes, The Subject of Prayer (1830), p. 11.
(2) See J. Pratt Jr., Memoir of the Rev. Josiah Pratt (1849),
p. 284 f.
(4) B.S. Communications, p. 295 f.; J.D. Macbride to J. Tarn
19 April 1831.
the Friends, and yet viewing them not as Christian philanthropists, but as theologians, who out of their own communion, will defend their rejection of both Sacraments; many would hold no intercourse with a Roman Catholic even upon a Bible Platform; several regard the Methodists as schismatics in separating from a church, the doctrines of which they retain; and there are not a few who would exclude all but members of their own denomination.

James Haldane Stewart, an Anglican, argued that the undue deference paid to Quakers was "a very bad symptom of the modern profession of Christianity..." Robert Haldane repeatedly attacked the admission of Arminians into the government of the Society: these, he considered, were as much the bane of the Continental Bible societies as the heterodox 'neologians.' That an excuse to winkle out Roman Catholics would delight many members was well known; some even argued that the Romans were as anti-Trinitarian in their ways as the Socinians. Furthermore, how were Socinians to be identified? They existed not only in the churches professedly Unitarian, but - more covertly - in other churches. There were known to be individual Socinians in the Scots Kirk and in the Church of England; were they too to be hunted out?

The crisis again raised the familiar question whether the Bible Society was primarily a business organization that distributed Bibles, or a religious organization that propagated a particular brand of Christianity. If the Society was the latter, as most Pro-Test people claimed, then it

(1) (J.H. Stewart), Letter to a Friend in answer to the question 'ought religious societies to commence their meetings for business with prayer.' By Antipas (1830), p. 5.
(3) J. Hughes, op.cit. p. 38; Cf. A Letter Addressed to the Hon. Baptist W. Noel...By Fiat Justitia (1831), pp. 14 ff; 35 f.
was only natural to exclude unbelievers and heretics as other religious institutions did; if it was the former, as the Anti-Test party claimed, then a test of orthodoxy was not only irrelevant, but a needless brake on the Society's activities. The parent society argued that while the activities of the Society were religious to the extent that it distributed a religious book, it could not be considered a church institution for several reasons: its members did not come together in church fellowship, it did not possess its own churches, ministers, liturgies, synods or convocations, and, of course, it did not administer the sacraments. Since prayer was regarded as "the most solemn act in which a rational being can be engaged" its place was in the temple and private closet, not in "annual assemblages promiscuously drawn together to hear the business done and the money raised ... and expended." The Pro-Test party, on the other hand, argued that from its inception, the Bible Society had considered itself a religious organization for orthodox Christians only. This was the inference drawn by men like George Washington Philips, Oxford educated South Carolinian and Vicar of Wendy, from the Society's ninth article, which stated that the committee must be composed of laymen professing the Christian religion and the thirteenth article which granted the privilege of Society membership only to Christian ministers. In other words, both articles excluded men not belonging to the established Church or an orthodox Nonconformist denomination.

(1) J. Hughes, op.cit. p. 27 f.
(2) B.S. Communications, p. 302 f; Letter from the Scarborough Auxiliary to Bible Society, 30 April 1831.
Since Unitarians were not considered a Christian denomination, at least by Philips, they were constitutionally excluded from any kind of participation in the Society's activities, save the privilege of contributing money. The Pro-Test party, therefore, professed to make explicit what they held to be already implied in the Society's laws.

On 4 May 1831 at Exeter Hall, the much dreaded confrontation between Pro and Anti-Test factions finally took place. After Andrew Brandram read an abstract of the Society's annual report which included the anti-test resolution of November 1830, J.E. Gordon, the Irish M.P. from Dundalk, proposed the following resolution before the report was entered into the minutes *viz* "that the British and Foreign Bible Society is preeminently a religious and Christian institution" and therefore "no person rejecting the doctrine of a triune Jehovah can be considered a member..." This motion was seconded by Philips.

Gordon's arguments were already familiar to his hearers, and the prolixity with which he deployed them exasperated many. Several times he was rebuked for interpreting Scriptural doctrine, in itself a violation of the Society's constitution. Harassed not only by the great Daniel Wilson, Vicar of Islington, who was in the chair, but also by

---

(1) G.W. Philips, *An Appeal to the Members of the British and Foreign Bible Society* (1831), pp. 2 f, 11. According to Philips, until the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Unitarians were not considered to be a Dissenting denomination by the civil authorities. See B.S. Home C.: W. Wickes to Bible Society, 12 August 1831. This was refuted by J. Fletcher, *The Constitution of the Bible Society defended* (1831), p. 58.

(2) The following material is taken from the *Monthly Extracts* 31 May 1831, no. 166.
Henry Drummond, who finally asked Gordon to sit down, Gordon concluded his discourse by an unnecessary allusion to the Apocrypha Controversy of past times. "I say again," Gordon concluded amidst heckles from the crowd, "that the effect of this system in practice, is to cast a doubt on the Bible, and to invest the Bible with an Apocryphal character."

After Gordon's motion was rejected, the Rev. Lundy Foot, Rector of Long Bredy in Dorset, proposed a compromise resolution that would bar Socinians from the Society's governing body only. But when Luke Howard, a Quaker, threatened to resign if Foot's resolution was carried, it too was quickly vetoed. Consequently, the committee's annual report with the November 1830 anti-test resolution was voted on and entered into the minutes, and the Society's Anti-Test party won the day by a majority, some observers said, of six to one.

(11) Parties to the Dispute: A Digression

Party lines were much more clearly drawn in the Tests Controversy than they had ever been in the Apocrypha Controversy Essentially, there were two parties this time. The Anti-Test party included many Evangelical Anglicans and with one or two exceptions, virtually all of the evangelical Dissenters.

(1) See C.J. Shore, Memoir of the Life and Correspondence of John Lord Teignmouth (1843), II, p. 547. According to the same source, of the recipients of a questionnaire sent to all of the Society's auxiliaries, 272 opposed a test while only 18 favoured it. Ibid. p. 547 fn. Responses can be found in "Communications from Auxiliary and Branch Societies and Associations Relative to the Constitution of the British and Foreign Bible Society" in the Society archives.

The Pro-Test party, almost to a man, belonged either to the English or Scottish establishments. Nonconformist opposition to the test was so strong, that it seemed in the provinces not as a contest between Pro and Anti-Test factions within the Society, but between churchmen and Dissenters. Needless to say, this had a very divisive effect on provincial auxiliaries where only a few Anglicans actually favoured tests and prayers. When the Sackville Street Provisional Committee was formed in 1832, as a lobby to press the parent society for pro-test legislation, one of its members had to report that two of the Dissenters that he had unsuccessfully solicited for support were disposed to make the question a party question as between Churchman and Dissenter, and not between Trinitarian and Anti-Trinitarian. They seem determined to look upon the discussion as originating with a party in the Church, who are disposed to cast off all connection with the Dissenters as a body whether Independents, Baptists, Methodists, etc.

Likewise George Lewis reported from Wrexham that the Dissenters in his neighborhood had been so outraged by the test proposals, that they abused the establishment's creeds, formularies, and ministers "in the most unmeasured terms..." No doubt much of this anti-establishment hostility was provoked by the decision of both the Congregational and Baptist Unions unanimously to condemn the test proposals.

The Pro-Test party itself was composed of two factions. There was the same lunatic fringe of extremists who had

(1) See infra, p. 271.
(2) Extracts from the Correspondence...of the Provisional Committee, Sept. 1831, no. II, 19 Oct. 1831. Filed with Trinitarian Bible Society pamphlets in Bible Society archives.
plagued the Society during the Apocrypha Controversy. In the beginning at least, these men felt the same way that most Pro-Test evangelicals felt about Roman Catholics and Socinians. They believed, as Edward Irving did, that "the purity of the national faith was the safeguard of its life, and the ark of national safety was in danger the moment unhallowed hands touched or approached it." Their mission, therefore, was to purge the Society of dangerous sectaries and heretics. But a far larger degree of irrationality separated the radicals from the more orthodox Pro-Test evangelicals. As early as July 1831 it was reported that Henry Drummond had written to a clergyman that because it was "the sign of the coming of the Son of God" that the Bible Society was "breaking up," it was his duty to destroy rather than to purify and reform it. Whether or not this story was true, the pre-millennialist eccentricities of the Irvingites alarmed many Pro-Test evangelicals almost as much as the heretical Socinian doctrines they were all supposed to be combating.

The moderate Pro-Test evangelicals had more rational, or at least, more political reasons for their opposition to Socinians and Roman Catholics. The Test Controversy somewhat resembled the controversy with High Churchmen played over again, except that the protagonists were now Evangelical clergymen. The parallels between the two controversies were

(2) B.S. Home C.: W. Brackenbury to J. Tarn, 23 July 1831.
(3) As J. Jowett of Sleaford pointed out to William Cockle in reference to past times, "tis the old story over again - only now told by those whom we thought friends." B.S. Home C.: J. Jowett to W. Cockle, 25 May 1831. William Dealtry made the same observation at the Exeter Hall debate in 1831. See Monthly Extracts, 31 May 1831, no. 166, p. 497.
close. Like the High Churchmen who had pointed to the defeat of Sidmouth's Bill as a sign that the Church was in danger, these men saw the repeal of the Test Acts and Catholic Emancipation as similarly prophetic of the demise of the established Church: where High Churchmen feared that Bibles circulated by sectaries would be used to propagate heretical beliefs, these evangelicals now feared that Bibles distributed by Socinians would have the same effect. The cry of 'Church in Danger' was re-echoed in many Evangelical party journals at the beginning of the 1830s.

The crisis in Church-State relations in 1828-9, the Reform Bill crisis, and the fear of a Whig assault on some of the remnants of the Church establishment, greatly exacerbated the crisis in the affairs of the Bible Society. It is significant that the Pro-Test party were called 'Ultras' by their opponents in the parent committee.

Most Anglican Evangelicals seem to have felt the conflict of two emotions during these critical years. On the one hand, they were hesitant to condemn their Nonconformist brethren en bloc as enemies and subversives; on the other hand they could not help absorbing some of the panic fears for the future of the national Church which were widespread during this troubled time. It may be that the attack on Socinians represented a means of reconciling these conflicting emotions by projecting onto a small, well-defined and easily

(1) See for example, J. Scott, Trinitarian Bible Society. A Letter addressed to the editor of the Record newspaper on the proceedings at the formation of the above institution (1832), p. 10 f.
(3) See Canton, Bible Society Hist., I, p. 354.
(4) B.S. Communications, p. 304 f.; J. Sheppard to A. Brandram, 30 April 1831.
identified group of 'radical' Nonconformists the generalized but only half-formulated suspicions they sometimes harboured against Nonconformity as a whole, but struggled to suppress. Thus Edward Irving said in 1828, that orthodox Dissenters were loyal subjects of the realm as long as they consented to be deprived of the offices contemplated in the Test Acts; but when they joined "the Unitarians, and Deists, and Infidels" to repeal Nonconformist disabilities, they were by association unfaithful servants of the King. After Repeal was an accomplished fact, many Evangelical clergymen expressed sorrow that their colleagues, the evangelical Dissenters, "could unite with others so opposite in their religious principles." The fact that almost all of the Pro-Test agitators were against Repeal and Emancipation, while generally speaking their colleagues on the parent committee were in favour of them, did much to precipitate test legislation in the Bible Society.

(iii) The Later Controversy

The Pro-Test party did not take their defeat at Exeter Hall gracefully. Indeed, J.E. Gordon complained later, that the meeting was packed with "infidels and blasphemers who held up not only one, but in many instances both hands against

(1) E. Irving, A Letter to the King on the repeal of the Test and Corporation Laws (1828), p. 8.
(2) W. Williams, The Pretensions of Socinians (1826), p. 9.
(3) There were of course exceptions. Spencer Perceval Jr. and George Sinclair who were members of the Pro-Test party in 1831, had voted for Repeal in 1829. Conversely, Sir R.H. Inglis who was a member of the Anti-Test party voted against Repeal. During the Meath agitation, however, both Perceval and Sinclair, together with most of the Trinitarian Bible Society, presented a petition to Parliament against the grant. See Christian Guardian, Aug. 1831, p. 320.
the amendment." In retaliation the Pro-Test party aired such accusations before a number of other evangelical organizations, further inflaming an already volatile situation. They had some success: when, for example, the Pro-Test party pressed for similar legislation at the Naval and Military Bible Society on 10 May 1831, they managed to implement an anti-Socinian test.

Heartened by this victory, the Pro-Test agitators regrouped for a last attempt to force the Bible Society to alter its constitution likewise. On 16 July 1831, they formed the so-called Sackville Street Provisional Committee (named after the street in London which held the offices of the Naval and Military Bible Society, the Westminster auxiliary to which many of them belonged, and the Continental Society). Besides Pro-Test regulars like George Washington Philips and T. Pell Platt the Society's Anglican librarian, the Provisional Committee included many familiar names from the Apocrypha days including Henry Drummond and the Haldanes. With the exception perhaps of the Haldanes and one or two others, all these men were Anglicans or (to a lesser extent) members of the Church of Scotland. The Provisional Committee's

---

(1) B.S. Home C.: J.E. Gordon to A. Brandram, 18 May 1831.
(2) Namely the Irish Society and the C.M.S. See B.S. Home C. (Outward f. 243.): A. Brandram to J.E. Gordon, 13 May 1831.
(3) Naval and Military Bible Society: The Speeches Delivered at the Anniversary Meeting (1831), passim. Henry Melvill proposed the test motion and it was seconded by J.H. Stewart and G.W. Philips. It was opposed by Andrew Brandram and Lord Calthorpe.
(4) See B.S. Home C.: G.W. Philips to Bible Society, 16 July 1831. The embarrassment at the lack of Nonconformist patronage is expressed in the seventh resolution of the committee viz "that we learn with unfeigned grief that an erroneous impression has been extensively made and received, that we contemplate a dissolution of the connexion which has hitherto subsisted, in the Bible Society, between members of the Established Church and those of Dissenting denominations of Christians."
avowed purpose was to rescind, by whatever means possible, the Exeter Hall decision of the previous May. But in this they were totally unsuccessful; the parent society ignored them.

The strategy of the Provisional Committee was to invoke the dangers of Socinianism. Richard Pottinger, Anglican Secretary of the Guernsey auxiliary, for example, placed in his local newspaper a long quotation from the Unitarian preacher Robert Aspland claiming that at Exeter Hall it had been decided once and for all that Unitarians "were to be regarded as Christians with whom the orthodox might shake hands." Gordon, at the same time, spread rumours that a host of Socinians belonged to the auxiliary committees. Much more serious, however, was the claim that Socinians made frequent speeches at the public meetings of the Society in defence of their own creed, insulting the feelings of the orthodox Christians present. But the parent society had evidence to discredit these exaggerations. In the first place, even though Aspland might have thought that his denomination won a moral victory at Exeter Hall, everyone knew that when it was agreed not to expel the Socinians, not Unitarian recognition but the fundamental principle of the Society was at stake. The Bible Society, after all, never said that it did not recognize the Unitarians as a denomination of Christians though perhaps a misguided one. Furthermore, the Provisional Committee had seriously miscalculated the

---

(1) See B.S. Home C.: G.W. Philips to Bible Society, 21 May 1831.
(2) R. Pottinger et al., Appeal of the Committee of the Guernsey Bible Society (1831), p. 6 fn.
(3) B.S. Home C.(Outward f. 244.): A. Brandram to J. Brown, 18 May 1831.
number of Unitarians in the Society. Baptist Noel, minister of St. Johns Chapel, Bedford Row, calculated that of the 37,000 committee members and collectors of the Society, only thirty-two were Unitarians; Joseph John Gurney held that of the 10,000 office holders of the Society, only three were Unitarians, adding that during the twenty-seven years of its existence, not a single Unitarian had ever been a director of the parent committee. To the allegations that Socinians foisted their evil doctrines upon innocent auxiliaries, Andrew Brandram replied that in all his travels as Secretary, he had never once witnessed such a case. John King, Incumbent of Christ Church Hull, could find only three well authenticated cases in which a Socinian had obtruded his sentiments upon a meeting of the Bible Society.

The Provisional Committee's propaganda therefore, overreached itself. As the parent society felt more sure of majority support, its willingness to compromise faded away, and it brusquely rejected the Provisional Committee's demand for concession. Soon there were rumblings of an approaching schism.

The final break came in December 1832 when the Pro-Test party finally realized that it could no longer achieve a compromise. Their new organization, called (some thought unnecessarily) the Trinitarian Bible Society, numbered among

(1) B.W. Noel, An Appeal on Behalf of the British and Foreign Bible Society to those who are disposed to secede from it (1832), p. 13 f.
(2) J.J. Gurney, Terms of Union (1832), p. 23 f; This fact had been published in the Monthly Extracts, 31 May 1831, no.116, p. 490 fn.
(3) B.S. Home C. (Outward f. 244.), A. Brandram to J. Brown, 18 May 1831.
(4) King, op.cit. p. 23.
(5) G.W. Phillips et.al. Correspondence (1831), p. 5.
(6) Ibid.
its founders several M.P.s, including J.E. Gordon, Spencer Perceval Jr., George Sinclair and Alexander Fringle, together with most of the Provisional Committee. Its first resolution excluded not only Socinians, but Roman Catholics. As Philips remarked in his inaugural address on 7 December 1832, "[the Trinitarian] stands equally remote from the dark realms of Papal idolatry, and the blighted regions of Socinian infidelity..." Almost from the start, the new society ran into difficulties from its Irvingite faction, which tried to force its beliefs on the whole organization, leading not a few to suspect that they had rid themselves of one heresy only to gain another. As a result, the Edinburgh Bible Society, which otherwise had every reason to affiliate with the 'Trinitarian' withdrew its support in 1832 as did several individuals like the Noel brothers, J.E. Gordon and even the Hal-Lanes. Division within the 'Trinitarian' soon followed, and it achieved a measure of stability only when the Irvingites were forced to resign.

The ability of the Bible Society to withstand two consecutive controversies and to emerge victorious, though perhaps battle-worn, is a remarkable testimonial to the institution's tenaciousness and will to survive. From a human perspective, we must also admire the uncompromising way in which the Society's directors stood firm on the fundamental principle, thus preserving its interdenominational character for future

generations. The loss of prosperous Scottish auxiliaries in the aftermath of the Apocrypha Controversy hurt the Society financially; before it could recover, it had to face the full force of an Evangelical Anglican attack on its affairs. Fortunately, the Tests Controversy and the subsequent founding of the 'Trinitarian,' attracted away from the Society very few of its clerical patrons. Had the test issue appealed to as many Anglicans as the Apocrypha issue did to Scottish churchmen, it is doubtful whether the Society could have survived in the form we know it today. In the late 1830s, the Society faced yet a third disruption known as the 'Baptizo Controversy,' due to a disagreement with the Serampore Baptists over how to translate the word 'immerse' in Society Bibles. This led to the resignation of several prominent Baptists and the founding of the Baptist Translation Society in 1840, though, like the 'Trinitarian,' it attracted away few of its former patrons. The creation of the Evangelical Alliance in the 1840s probably gave the Society a new spiritual transfusion and a much needed rest from the previous stormy decade. Today, it happily survives in the same interdenominational form that it was founded in one hundred and seventy years ago.

(1) Literature on the 'Baptizo Controversy' is quite extensive. See E. Steane, The Baptists and the Bible Society (1840); E.B. Underhill, The Baptists and the Bible Society (1868); The Bible Society vindicated in its decision respecting the Bengalee New Testament...By Elihu (1836); The Bible Translation Society of the Baptists shown to be uncalled for and injurious...By a Baptist (1840). For the Baptist position, one must examine the Fuller letters in the Angus Library, Oxford.
BOOK FOUR

THE RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY

FEMALE MARTYRS

IN

ENGLAND

WHO WERE BURNED FOR THE TRUTH DURING THE DAYS

OF QUEEN MARY.

No. 1600.

THE reader is aware, that during the reign of queen Mary many
protestants, of all ages, and both sexes, were burned because
they refused to return to popery. The accounts of the sufferings
of several bishops, and others of note, have been published in a
variety of forms, but the histories of some females who were burned
towards the latter end of that reign are less generally known,
although their constancy and faith teach a useful lesson to every
believer in Christ. The particulars of some of these narratives
are given in the following pages, and surely they will be read with
interest by every British female.

In August, 1556, a blind woman, only twenty-two years of age,
was burned at Derby; her name was Joan Waste, she was the
daughter of a poor barber and ropemaker, and had been blind from

THE RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY, INSTITUTED 1799.
66, PATERNOSTER ROW, AND 65, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD.
Chapter Ten: The Foundations

I. Setting the Scene

Though the Bible Society was the largest and most ambitious of the great pan-evangelical organizations, and the first to really achieve pan-evangelicalism on a grand scale, it did not necessarily stand above the other pan-evangelical societies in importance. In many ways, the Religious Tract Society, the third pan-evangelical organization that we shall examine, had as influential role to play in the cause of evangelical union as the Bible Society to which it had given birth.

In the early decades of the eighteenth century Revival, tract distribution was among the more important activities engaged in by evangelicals. The Book Society of 1750, as we have seen, was an early tract distribution organization which attempted to unite the efforts of several Calvinistic denominations. Later, Hannah More's Cheap Repository Tracts and Mrs. Rebecca Wilkinson's abridged works of Anglican and Nonconformist divines, published by the Philanthropic Society, provided evangelicals with religious books and tracts near the century's end. But in the early years, the Book Society's tract

(1) Mrs. Wilkinson, for example, circulated free or at reduced prices over 211,000 books and 229,000 tracts and pocket prayer books. See W. Jones, The Jubilee Memorial of the Religious Tract Society (1850), p. 8. Charles Simeon circulated these tracts when he travelled about the country, and one of his trips to Scotland inspired John Campbell, James Haldane and his brother Robert and John Aikman, to found the Edinburgh Tract Society in 1797. See A. Haldane, The Lives of Robert Haldane...and his Brother James Alexander Haldane (1855), p. 232. According to the Evangelical Magazine there was a tract society in Edinburgh as early as 1794 called the Society for Publishing Religious Tracts, probably affiliated with the Book Society established there in 1756. See E.M. Nov. 1794, p. 473; Jones, op. cit. p. 7.
distribution was limited to the efforts of a few enterprising individuals.

By the last decade of the eighteenth century, several developments forced the evangelicals greatly to expand their concern for tract distribution and led to the foundation of a new and energetic tract society. Firstly, Hannah More had suddenly discontinued writing the Cheap Repository Tracts in 1798; the task had proved too burdensome and expensive for one person working alone. Many evangelicals admired the way that her tracts had counteracted the ungodly influence of the low chap-books and half penny ballads hawked to the lower classes and a new organization was deemed necessary to fill a role now left largely vacant. Secondly, by the late 1790s, the Sunday School movement had done much to create a literate British public that now craved for reading material on a scale which could not easily be catered for by a few individuals. While it would probably be overstating the case to claim that the Tract Society grew directly out of the Sunday School movement, it cannot be denied that by increasing the demand for religious literature, the Sunday Schools had done much to advertise the need for an evangelical publishing house. Finally, the movement for foreign missions increased the realization that Britain itself was a mission field, which still possessed a mass of 'heathens' crying out for the Gospel. The famine for the Word in Wales, as we have seen, directed attention to the distribution of Bibles, but England

(2) See for example W.H. Watson, The First Fifty Years of the Sunday School (1873), p. 40 f; Jones, Memorial of the Tract Society, p. 12.
too had its 'dark' counties and 'unregenerate' parishes, and by 1796, evangelicals were busy establishing a network of village itinerancy societies and county unions to spread the Word of God in every city, village and hamlet. In part, the Tract Society was designed to be a subsidiary organization for these local institutions, producing tracts and pamphlets for circulation by itinerant ministers as they toured the country in search of converts, but it was also born out of the hope that while itinerants could reach only a limited number of people, books, tracts, and pamphlets, produced in large quantities and at popular prices, and placed in the right hands, might themselves convert a larger cross-section of the heathen population than the itinerants. The Tract Society, therefore, was intended to be far more than a merely supportive organization; through its literature it became itself an important agent of conversion, playing a primary role with the Bible Society in the great tide of domestic mission now breaking over Great Britain. As Joseph Hughes, the Tract Society's first Secretary wrote, "while the various Missionary Societies are laudably aiming to promote the salvation of the Heathen abroad, our particular object is to watch for the souls of our fellow sinners at home." We shall see, however, that it was not long before the Tract Society also supplied the Continent with evangelical literature. Consequently, like the L.M.S. before it and the

(2) Cf. C. Buck, The Close of the Eighteenth Century improved (1816), p. 31 fn. This was a reprint of a sermon preached in 1800 in which Buck remarked, hopefully, that the French would be receptive to evangelical tracts because they had "a strong partiality...for English publications."
Bible Society after, the Tract Society also developed as an international institution.

II. George Burder and the Founding Fathers

To George Burder, the Independent minister of the Fetter Lane Chapel in London, must go a great deal of credit for founding the Religious Tract Society. Born in London to parents who had been converted by George Whitefield, Burder became in 1778 pastor of the Independent chapel in Lancaster but spent most of his time itinerating. Later, as the Independent minister in Coventry where he founded the first Sunday School in the city, and then in London at Fetter Lane, he was involved in a number of pan-evangelical institutions including the L.M.S. of which he was a Secretary and the Bible Society. He was also editor of the *Evangelical Magazine* after 1803 in succession to John Eyre. But Burder's most important contribution to the pan-evangelical movement was his involvement in the founding of the Tract Society.

Burder's concern with tracts can be traced back to 1781 when he wrote a pamphlet entitled "The Good Old Way," in which the fall and recovery of man was proved by Scripture and confirmed by quotations from the Articles and Liturgy of the Church of England. An admirer of Hannah More, Burder only regretted that her tracts did not contain a more comprehensive statement of the evangelical principles of religion. He was

---
(1) For a biography of Burder, see S.G. Green, *George Burder* (1888)
(2) Burder hardly intended to write a pro-Establishment tract, but he was delighted that Anglican churchwardens, without reading his piece, believed it to be a polemic against Methodists and Dissenters, and thus gave it away at the church door. See Jones, *Memorial of the Tract Society*, p. 12 f.
quick to appreciate the urgent need for religious literature created by the new itinerant societies and county unions. Unfortunately, when he and Samuel Greatheed, the founder of the Bedfordshire Union of Christians, set out in 1796 to write and publish a series of village tracts, the project quickly fell into bankruptcy in the hands of an incompetent London book-seller. This failure forced the realization that only a general tract depository on a much larger and more comprehensive scale could cope with the growing demand for inexpensive, popular, evangelical literature for the huge home market.

As a distinguished member of the L.M.S., Burder saw in the Society's May 1799 anniversary an excellent opportunity to try out his idea for a tract society on an interdenominational gathering of evangelicals. Scheduled to preach the Society's anniversary sermon at Surrey Chapel, Burder asked Rowland Hill for permission to outline his project before the congregation and to call for a meeting afterwards. Hill, needless to say, was enthusiastic about any new evangelical enterprise, and readily agreed to Burder's request. Therefore on 8 May, after announcing his plan to a large and eager crowd, Burder asked the ministers present to adjourn to the school room behind the pulpit, where further discussions took place. Those present at this meeting unanimously agreed that Burder's plan should be immediately implemented, and a plenary planning meeting was convened for the next two days at St. Paul's Coffee House.

(1) Jones, _op.cit._ p. 13.
These meetings were noteworthy not so much for their discussions as for their participants. It has been often claimed that the Tract Society, and not the Bible Society, was the first institution in Britain to achieve pan-evangelicalism on a large scale after the abortive attempt of the L.M.S. several years before. This belief rests on the assumption that the Society's founders, and later its chief supporters, represented the entire evangelical family (Baptists, Wesleyans, and 'regular' churchmen included). In fact, the R.T.S. was at first scarcely more representative denominationally than the L.M.S. Among its founding members it claimed most of the Calvinists who founded the L.M.S., together with a group of influential Baptists. On the first committee in 1799, for example, sat Joseph Hughes, who we have already met in the Bible Society who later became the Tract Society's first Secretary; William Newman, the Baptist minister at the Old Ford meeting in Middlesex, and John Ryland, Baptist minister at Broadmead Chapel in Bristol. But the Wesleyans and 'regular'...
evangelical clergymen were not in evidence in the new society in 1799. Indeed, only several years after the Bible Society was founded, did these groups support the Tract Society, providing it with some of its more illustrious leaders.

III. Building a Society: The Missing Denominations and the Fundamental Principle

(1) The Missing Denominations

There were two major reasons why these two denominations, missing from the R.T.S. in 1799, finally consented to help it. Both hinged on precedents set by the newly formed Bible Society in 1804. At first the Tract Society seemed resigned to no wider support than that given to the L.M.S. Though Baptists rallied to the R.T.S. from the start, there was no reason to believe that the Wesleyans and the 'regular' Anglicans would follow suit, though their help was no doubt eagerly sought. But this situation was radically changed when the R.T.S. rapidly fell into debt. In 1800 it could only manage to raise the meagre sum of £167 in subscriptions. The missionary societies seemed at first far more able to capture the public's imagination than an organization which less dramatically published tracts for domestic use, and as a result they threatened the Society's existence by their competition for funds. The Society encountered a number of financial difficulties during its early years, and it was

(1) In 1801, the Tract Society appealed through the Evangelical Magazine for provincial support. E.M. Jan.1801, p. 40 f. This led to the formation of an auxiliary association in Darlington which almost immediately collapsed. R.T.S. Minutes, 3 March 1801; Cf. E.M. April 1801, p. 174.
one of the recurrent financial crises in 1809 that forced the Society to copy the auxiliary system newly instituted by the Bible Society and through it, to make more extensive appeals for financial aid.

The Bible Society by setting the precedent for large-scale pan-evangelical cooperation in 1804, encouraged other societies to follow. Before 1804, the Wesleyans had probably withheld their support from the R.T.S. not only because they already has a tract organization of their own, but because it was still too closely associated in their minds with the L.M.S. and its Calvinistic directors. After fraternizing with the Calvinists in the Bible Society, the Wesleyans were far more willing to go into similar enterprises.

Most Anglican Evangelicals were at first reluctant to patronize the Tract Society for similar reasons. The C.M.S. had been founded a month before the Tract Society had been established, partly to provide a foreign mission which could command the respect of churchmen suspicious of the L.M.S. and its undenominational mission churches. In 1799, the R.T.S. still seemed as suspect as its parent body, the L.M.S., and

---

(1) R.T.S. Minutes, 21 Feb. 1809; Cf. E.M. April 1809, p. 171 f. By 1815, there were 124 auxiliary Tract Societies throughout Great Britain. See M.J. Quinlan, Victorian Prelude (1941), p. 125.

(2) The Wesleyan society was founded in 1782. See A. Stevens, The History of... Methodism (1878), II, p. 2 fn; Methodist Magazine, March 1847, p. 269 f. Apparently it was always in financial difficulty giving the Wesleyans another reason to join the R.T.S. See R.T.S. Minutes 12 Dec. 1827.

(3) In 1806, for example, the London committee of the Wesleyan Connexion "referred the consideration of society tracts to Mr. Rodda of Hoxton with a view to promote the circulation among that extensive connexion." See R.T.S. Minutes, 15 April 1806. One year later, calf-bound editions of the Society's tracts were presented as a gift to Adam Clarke. R.T.S. Minutes, 12 Nov. 1807. Christopher Sundius, a layman, however, had been a director as early as 1801.

too closely associated with itinerant preaching societies which were thrusting themselves into hundreds of Anglican parishes, provoking a loud out cry from angry incumbents, who feared the home missionaries as crypto-Jacobins. Apart from Rowland Hill - scarcely to be cited as a respectable example - there were virtually no clergymen on the Tract Society's board until John Eyre became a director in 1802, and he was as irregular as Hill. In fact, the clergymen who supported the Tract Society during its early years, were the same 'left wing' Anglicans who had patronized the L.M.S. since 1795. Not until 1808 did the R.T.S. capture its first 'regular' clergymen as a director.

Anglican laymen, however, were less discriminating. Samuel Mills, an Evangelical leather merchant, was one of the Society's founders; Zachary Macaulay became a director in 1800 and attended meetings with regularity. It may have been these promising precedents, allied to the success of cooperation in the Bible Society, which encouraged the R.T.S. to court 'regular' clergymen and for these to respond.

The Tract Society won over some clerical good will by convincing prominent Evangelicals to produce tracts for it. Thus between 1799 and 1808 men of the stature of John Newton, Thomas Biddulph, Legh Richmond, Charles Simeon and Richard Cecil, all agreed to have their tracts printed and circulated by the R.T.S. By 1808, William Fancourt, Headmaster of St. Saviours Grammar School, and Thomas Webster

(1) Thomas Charles and Robert Hawker, two other 'left wing' Anglicans, actively supported the Society shortly after it was founded, but neither men were directors of the parent society.
Fellow of Queens College Cambridge, had both agreed to be Tract Society directors and they were followed in 1809 by William Gurney, Rector of St. Clement Dane in London, and John Wilcox, Rector of Little Stonham and in 1810 by William Goode, Rector of the combined parishes of St. Andrew's-by-the Wardrobe and St. Ann's Blackfriars in London. Such conquests brought further rewards as a number of Anglican churches now opened their doors to collection sermons and Tract Society anniversaries.

The next step was to find a clergyman willing to share the secretaryship with Joseph Hughes (the Society's only Secretary since 1799) and C.F. Steinkopf (who became Foreign Secretary in 1808). The R.T.S. eventually settled on Legh Richmond, the Rector of Turvey. Richmond was an admirable choice, not least because he himself had been converted by the reading of a tract - Wilberforce's *Practical View* - and had already contributed a number of tracts for the Society's use. The first of these was published by the Tract Society in 1802, but his greatest contribution was the classic *Dairyman's Daughter* which he allowed the Society to publish in 1811. In that year, Richmond also chaired the Society's anniversary in London.

When Richmond was first asked to be the Tract Society's

---

(1) After William Gurney and John Wilcox joined the directors in 1809, St. Clement Dane fell open to the 1809 anniversary. R.T.S. Minutes, 4 April 1809, 16 May 1809. Before this, most Anglican churches had been closed to the Society. See for example R.T.S. Minutes 2 Dec. 1800, 8 March 1808.
(3) R.T.S. Minutes, 2 March 1802
(4) R.T.S. Minutes, 19 Feb. 1811, 2 April 1811.
(5) R.T.S. Minutes, 14 May 1811; *E.M.* May 1811, p. 199.
Anglican Secretary is uncertain, but by 1812 he had accepted the invitation. At first he had reservations about managing a society that was supported almost exclusively by Dissenters, but he took comfort in the fact that several 'regular' clergymen had already preceded him, and was conscious that the objectives of the Society, the circulation of tracts and "the revival of the doctrines of the Reformation," lay near his heart. But Richmond only consented to fill the secretaryship if the Nonconformists guaranteed that Society tracts would contain no remarks hostile to the Church of England. When this promise was given, Richmond was installed in office and remained there until his death in 1827.

Richmond was perfect for the post. His credentials as a 'regular' churchman, were impeccable. Though perhaps somewhat prejudiced against the Baptists, he looked favourably upon the Wesleyans, and the Society needed Wesleyan patronage as badly as Church patronage. When Curate of Brading and Yaverland on the Isle of Wight, Richmond had many happy associations with the Wesleyans who lived in his parish, and who were employed in his household as servants; indeed, the heroine of The Dairyman's Daughter was Elizabeth Wallbridge, a member of the local Wesleyan chapel.

The accession of Anglican directors by 1809 forced the Tract Society to make two important constitutional modifications.

(1) It should also be pointed out that Richmond's best friend, Thomas Fry, had been the Anglican Secretary of the London Society since 1810. See Infra. p. 338.
(2) Grimshawe, op. cit. p. 309 f.
(3) J.B. Dyson, Methodism in the Isle of Wight (1865), pp. 209, 227, 237.
In 1807, the committee of the Society consisted of six ministers and twelve laymen, but since there were no clerical members and only a few Anglican laymen, it was thought unnecessary (indeed, it was impossible) to divide the control equally between Church and Dissent as in the Bible Society. Once clergymen sat among the directors, however, provision of this kind had to be made. In 1810, the Society faced a very embarrassing situation. According to its by-laws, one third of the directors who least attended meetings were required to retire, and were replaced by new candidates. Unfortunately, William Gurney and Thomas Wilcox, the only clerical members in 1809, were required to retire as a result of their infrequent attendance, leaving the Society again without Anglican representation. The Society quickly passed a resolution requiring that at least one of the directors always had to be a clergyman, and as a result, Joseph Ivimey, pastor of Eagle Street Baptist meeting, was forced to give way to William Goode even though Ivimey's record of attendance qualified him for another term as director. The only reason that the Baptists were singled out for the sacrifice, was because in that year they were a majority among the directors.

There was a second constitutional modification in 1816, when, to encourage more Anglican support, it was decided to divide control of the Society equally between Church and Dissent. Legh Richmond opposed this decision as legalistic, fearing that it might inhibit the choice of suitable committee.

(1) R.T.S. Minutes 5 May 1807.
(2) R.T.S. Minutes 1 May 1810.
members, but the resolution was passed in May 1816, and the Tract Society became constitutionally almost a copy of the Bible Society.

(ii) Towards a Fundamental Principle

Unlike the L.M.S. before it, or the Bible Society after, the Tract Society did not draft a fundamental principle on the basis of which the various denominations could cooperate. The Society's aim was simply taken for granted. David Bogue came close to putting the basic aim of the Society into words when he remarked in a sermon at the Society's first anniversary:

"It will be justly considered as a recommendation by not a few, that it is not the undertaking of a party; nor designed to condemn or applaud any particular sect...There is nothing in its tracts to recommend or to satirize episcopacy, presbytery, independency, methodism, paedobaptism or anti-paedobaptism. Nor is it the design to take a part in the nice distinctions, or peculiar notions, or discriminating opinions of high-flying individuals, or puny sects. The object is to hold forth to view those grand doctrinal and practical truths which have in every age been mighty through God, in converting, sanctifying, and comforting souls.

The same spirit was reflected in Tract One, also written by Bogue, and called by many the Tract Society's 'Act of Parliament.' Speaking of the kind of tract that the Society existed to produce, Bogue argued that there should be "nothing in it of the shibboleth of a sect; nothing to recommend one denomination, or to throw odium on another; nothing of the acrimony of contending parties against those that differ from them..." How this principle worked out in practice we will soon see.

Several years later, the Tract Society found it necessary to codify intentions which had originally been tacitly understood,

(1) Hewitt, op.cit. p. 42; Jones, Memorial of the Tract Society, P. 75.
(2) D. Bogue, The Diffusion of the Truth (1800), p. 44.
(3) Jones, op.cit. p. 18.
since in too many instances the Society's goals seemed to have been misinterpreted not only by its critics but by its own members. In 1820, an influential patron asked the Society to publish a tract on the 'late conspiracy,' (no doubt Cato Street) and while it had always been tacitly understood that political issues were to be avoided, the understanding was now made quite explicit for the patron was told that "this society avoid [s] publishing any article on political subjects." However, it often remained difficult to decide whether a tract was political or religious, so the Society had to define its principles more precisely. During the Catholic Emancipation debates in Parliament, only two years after its decision on political tracts, the Society published an anti-Catholic broadsheet which brought upon it severe criticism for some of its subscribers. Incidents of this nature compelled the R.T.S. to make in 1825 the first comprehensive statement of its fundamental aim:

that at the present period, this meeting considers it most important fully to recognize the principles upon which this Society has hitherto proceeded; namely, 'the evangelical principles of the Reformation in which Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer were agreed,' and trust, that without reference to points of a secular or merely controversial nature, the Committee will ever consider 'the Luthers, the Melanchthons, the Tindals, the Cranmers, the Latimers, and the Bradfords of former days, as their patterns in sound doctrine and active exertion.

Practical ground rules were slowly hammered out. It was at first decided that the Society would not issue a tract unless it was approved at a meeting of the General Committee by two-thirds of the directors present, though as the volume

(1) R.T.S. Minutes, 8 March 1820.
(2) Jones, op.cit. p. 141.
of projected tracts increased, the process of selection was simplified by appointing an interdenominational subcommittee to sift tracts before they reached the General Committee for final approval, and to weed out those which appeared unsuitable or offensive. Thereafter, each tract was examined by every member of the General Committee. Comments and revisions were inscribed in the tract's margin if it offended denominational or theological sensibilities; unless rejected outright, the revised proofs were then candidly discussed by the General Committee as a body. Since the names of authors were always concealed to avoid prejudice, those committee members who submitted tracts of their own, often had silently to suffer severe criticism at the hands of friends and colleagues. This was often a difficult exercise in humility and self-restraint; indeed, it was almost a miracle that so few friendships broke up at selection committee meetings. If the views of the author contradicted "Scriptural truth taught by our reformers," the tract would be rejected. Only when this rigorous scrutiny had been accomplished, and emendations generally agreed upon, could a tract win approval. Heresy, denominational

(1) R.T.S. Minutes, 27 May 1800. Members of the first committee included Joseph Tarn and Matthew Wilks (Calvinistic Methodists), Zachary Macaulay (Anglican), Joseph Hughes (Baptist), and Thomas Saddington (Independent?).

(2) See Hewitt, op.cit. p. 27 f.

(3) See Jones, op.cit. p. 117.

(4) Rowland Hill, for example, who had written 'Thomas Steady and John Wild' was criticized for a reference made to an Anglican clergyman which some thought gave a sectarian appearance to his tract. Somewhat offended by this criticism, Hill made the following revision: "But then everyone says you have a very good minister at the meeting. Our minister and he are quite thick with each other." "There," said Hill to the committee, "no one can find fault with it now." Cited in ibid., p. 27 f.
bias and stylistic infelicities were all purged away.

Even this tight filter failed sometimes to prevent embarrassments, most of them arising from incidents beyond the committee's control. In 1808, for example, the manager of the Tract Society's depository, under whose name Society tracts were published, circulated a tract at his own expense entitled "Popular objections to the Established Church." Needless to say, this created a minor scandal, since subscribers, especially Anglicans, believed that the tract was issued officially by the R.T.S. The manager was reprimanded for breaking a contract which allowed him only to publish Society tracts, and the mistake did not occur again. But other violations of the fundamental principle slipped past the committee. In 1815, the following letter was written by William McGavin, an Anti-Burgher minister in Glasgow with a complaint which merits quotation at some length:

There is another objection that has occurred to myself, and has been mentioned by others, i.e. there is rather too much of the Church of England in your tracts for our northern climate. An instance occurs, - but as I have not the Tract by me I cannot give the precise words; they are descriptive of the character of a very worthy man of whom something like this is said, 'He would never endure the thought of separating from the Established Church.' Now though we admit it to be the duty of every Christian to keep by the church with which he is satisfied, yet as the Church of England has no existence here except in a small chapel, and serious people don't like the doctrine usually taught there, we don't think it proper to put books into the hands of ignorant people by which they might be led to imagine that all good was confined to the Church of England, or that it would be a dreadful sin to separate from it.

(1) R.T.S. Minutes, 15 Nov. 1808.
(2) B.S. Home C.: W. McGavin to Collins, 27 June 1815. This letter is probably the only extant piece of R.T.S. home correspondence. It was preserved from the incendiary raids of the last war by being kept by mistake at the Bible Society. This error in itself shows how closely associated the two societies were.
The tract here complained about in this letter was probably published by mistake. The reading and revising of tracts was a time-consuming business from the beginning and by 1815 it was becoming a Herculean task. Though the R.T.S. correspondence was destroyed by a German air-raid, we may surmise that McGavin was probably only one among many, in the later years, who complained about the 'sectarian' tracts that had inadvertently slipped through the reviewing committee.

IV. The Society in Action

In comparison to the L.M.S. and the Bible Society, the R.T.S. was a small institution. In the early years it experienced difficulty in finding people to patronize its activities: evangelicals, it seemed, were more interested in foreign missions than they were in the publication and distribution of tracts. Consequently, the Tract Society faced a number of financial crises. The establishment of auxiliaries in 1809 saved the society from premature dissolution, and it was able to grow apace, but even after 1809, the auxiliary system of the Tract Society never approached in size the auxiliary systems of the other organizations. But if the income and size of the R.T.S. was tiny compared with the other united evangelical societies, it nevertheless reached more people with its tracts and pamphlets. By 1801, it had disposed of 800,000 tracts; two million by 1805; and four million by 1807. By the middle

(1) See E.M. June 1801, p. 252; July 1805, p. 326; June 1807, p. 284.
of the nineteenth century, the R.T.S. circulated works in 110 languages and a total of 4,363 titles appeared on its lists. The literary reach of some R.T.S. authors must have exceeded that of any contemporary novelist or poet: George Burder's tracts achieved a circulation of nearly a million in his own lifetime; Legh Richmond's reached over a million by 1850. The religious and moral influence of this immense flow of literature is difficult to estimate, but there can be little doubt that the R.T.S. became, as Maurice Quinlan observes, one of the chief sources of literature for nineteenth century readers.

The adoption of the auxiliary system in 1809 made the distribution of tracts more orderly and effective. After 1823, Loan Associations were organized whereby tracts could be lent to a family or a church and then passed on to other groups, thereby multiplying many times over the number reached by a single tract before it had worn out. With the aid of this innovation, the Society circulated the equivalent of 10,012,760 tracts in 1824 alone. With a readership this large, Society tracts had a profound impact on many of the people who read them. The Tract Society not only served as the official disseminator of evangelical propaganda, but an important agency of social control.

(1) Jones, Memorial of the Tract Society, p. 150.
(3) Ibid. Appendix 5.
(5) Jones, op. cit. p. 215 f. The loan system originated in Wem in 1818, but it took several years before the idea caught on nationally.
(6) Quinlan, op. cit. p. 124.
The scope of the tracts varied greatly. Many were intended to awaken sinners; others - like the enormously successful Cottage Sermons of George Burder, to instil the 'Gospel scheme' into the minds of readers. The works of the Reformers - especially the English Reformers - Puritans like Owen and Baxter, eighteenth century Evangelicals like Hervey and Cecil, or Dissenting fathers like Watts and Doddridge, were ransacked for suitable passages. Here, as the Committee promised in 1799, were whole "volumes...condensed into a few pages." As Burder's Tract Number One promised, they aimed to disseminate "pure truth...uncontaminated with error, undisturbed with human systems, clear as a crystal, like the river of life...pure good natured Christianity, free of the 'acrimony of contending parties.'" The First Series tracts published between 1799 and 1805, and other later items, also concerned themselves with controverting error as well as propagating truth; apologetic targets included Popery, infidelity, and Socinianism. One of these early publications, Bogue's Essay on the Inspiration of the New Testament achieved the fame of being read and marked by the captive Napoleon on St. Helena.

The market for R.T.S. publications varied. Occasionally, it concerned itself with the well-to-do and highly educated, as when 6,000 copies of Wilberforce's Practical View were distributed among the upper classes in London resulting in one or two spectacular Socinian conversions. But the chief

(1) Jones, op.cit. p. 17.
(2) Ibid. p. 18.
(3) Ibid. p. 40.
(4) Ibid. p. 201.
targets were lower down the social scale. The mass of the ignorant multitude was not seen as a very fruitful field for R.T.S. propaganda, at least not until they had been already awakened to a thirst for biblical truth: more good could be done to them by godly conversation and pastoral visiting than by any literary production, however simply or arrestingly written. The real quarry of the R.T.S. were those already 'awakened' to some extent and in search of more religious instruction, or the growing multitude of the newly literate; Sunday School scholars whose minds had been roused "to desire something beyond trash," or artisans of the type which would frequent mechanics institutes. As the nineteenth century wore on, the larger publications of the R.T.S., such as bound books which it eventually disseminated, were increasingly aimed at "the numerous masses who will not rest satisfied without more reading - who have a thirst for instruction and are often greedy for printed books." The R.T.S., as literacy levels increased, set itself to capture the same classes to which Cobbett's Political Register was aimed. Other likely targets were those whom circumstance had placed in isolated or circumscribed environments, like coastguards or paupers in the union workhouses.

The R.T.S. tracts - like those of Hannah More before - were intended to inculcate approved norms of morality as well as religious doctrines. A large proportion of the Society's tracts were concerned with social control and

(1) Ibid. p. 122.
(2) Ibid. p. 123.
(3) Ibid. pp. 122, 131.
(4) Ibid. p. 186 ff.
the upholding of exemplary patterns of behaviour for guidance and imitation. Drunkenness, sexual 'licentiousness,' theater-going, idleness, were constant targets of R.T.S. pamphlets and broadsheets. So was swearing; no single R.T.S. publication had, by 1850, a circulation comparable to the Swearer's Prayer which had by now sold a million copies. An excerpt from this tract gives an indication of the dramatic style of such works:

Swearer, this is thy prayer!!! O dreadful imprecation! O horrible, horrible, most horrible! blaspheming man! Dost thou like thy petition? Look at it. Art thou sincere in thy prayer, or art thou mocking thy maker? Dost thou wish for damnation? Art thou desirous of eternal torment? If so, swear on - swear hard. The more oaths, the more misery; and, perhaps, the sooner thou mayest be in hell.

Starting in 1805, the Society brought out its famous 'Hawkers Tract Series.' The series had a two-fold purpose. First it produced and circulated inexpensive tracts to counteract the cheap 'profane and licentious trash' that was being peddled on the streets and sold to the lower classes by hawkers. Second, it provided the hawkers themselves with material to peddle, sell, and make a profit on. The Hawkers Series had striking titles like 'The Fortune Teller's Conjuring Cap,' 'Tom Toper's Tale over a Jug of Ale,' and 'The Dairyman's Daughter.' Though less edifying than the more polite First Series Tracts, the Hawkers Series nevertheless served the same purpose by spinning out easily read morality tales on a number of topics that could be cheaply bought and easily digested. The Dairyman's Daughter, for

(1) R.T.S. Tract Number 76. This tract was probably written by the Quaker Luke Howard. See D.N.B.
example, indirectly attempted to justify the prevailing social class structure by emphasizing future rewards in heaven over the depravations of everyday life. Thus Elizabeth Wallbridge, the tract's heroine, obsequiously wrote to Legh Richmond, the tract's author:

Dear sir, I thank you for your kindness and condescension, in leaving those that are of high rank and birth in the world, to converse with me, who am but a servant here below. But when I consider what a high calling, what honour and dignity God has conferred upon me, to be called his child, to be born of his Spirit, made an heir of glory, and a joint-heir with Christ; how humble and circumspect should I be in all my ways, as a dutiful and loving child to an affectionate and loving Father! When I seriously consider these things, it fills me with love and gratitude to God, and I do not wish for any higher station, nor envy the rich.

The moral of the story after Elizabeth had died from a long and painful disease, was predictable. "My poor reader," Richmond wrote:

the Dairyman's daughter was a poor girl, and the child of a poor man. Herein thou resemblst her, but dost thou resembl her, as she resembled Christ?

A similar message was later conveyed to factory workers. In An Address to Young Persons Employed in Manufactories, the working class was told, "to your employers you owe much; they have devoted their time, talents, and fortune to business, and to that business you are indebted for your maintenance."

As the Tract Society grew in size and importance, so did the scope and variety of the tracts which it produced. In 1805, the Society began printing moral broadsheets which could be posted on the walls of cottages and factories, perhaps over one of their 'lewd' rivals. After 1809, it published books for children which not only provided Sunday

---

(1) L. Richmond, The Dairyman's Daughter (c. 1814), p. 40.
(2) Ibid., p. 152.
(3) R.T.S. Tract Number 419.
Schools with reading material, but with prizes for their scholars. Many of these works were in the established evangelical literary genre which held up holy lives and happy deaths for emulation. Children read tales like "An Account of a Woman saved from Self-Murder" and 'The Happy Death of James Steven.' By 1822, the Society had revived an earlier suggestion made by Robert Spear of Manchester in 1810, to publish hand-bills that could either be pasted on walls like the broadsheets, or circulated among crowds of people especially at races, wakes and fairs.

It is very difficult to ascertain the impact of the Tract Society on evangelical union primarily because of the paucity of evidence. Like those of the Bible Society, its minutes are bald and clinical, portraying business meetings in which resolutions were recited and passed, and in which business was transacted with a minimal amount of friction and a great deal of efficiency - hardly anything is said about the influence of interdenominational cooperation in tract selection and distribution on the evangelicals themselves. Printed sources are also unhelpful primarily because the biographies of Society directors concentrate more on their activities in foreign missions and Bible distribution than on their activities in the Tract Society. But the Society, especially in provincial areas, served as a very important agency of evangelical union. Legh Richmond lyrically compared the atmosphere of committee meetings to the concord of the Apostles at Pentecost. "Although as individuals the Committee belonged to various denominations
of Christians," he wrote in the seventeenth report
and both thought and worshipped accordingly, yet in the
common principles of vital religion, in love for the
souls of their fellow man, in a disposition to let every
lesser consideration merge in the grand effort to promote
evangelical piety throughout the world, they constituted
but one denomination. In the prosecution of their earnest
wishes to promote the temporal and spiritual welfare of
mankind, they have often met together 'all with one accord
in one place;' they have 'continued together in the apostles'
doctrine and fellowship,' and their communion with one
another has been sweet.

The great anniversaries of the R.T.S., like those of the
other religious societies, were held in the Spring and
were gala days for a host of subscribers and workers, who
met together for breakfast and devotions, sometimes in huge
numbers, like the thousand folk who sat down to the R.T.S.
anniversary breakfast at the London Tavern in 1813. These
gatherings were important occasions for inter-evangelical
fellowship and friendship, as, in a spring-like atmosphere
(to quote an R.T.S. author) the evangelical Christian was
"accustomed to meet the thousands of our British Israel,
assembled to hear of the progress of pure and undefiled
religion, and to renew to each other and to God their mutual
pledges of devotedness in the sacred cause of their divine
Redeemer." As evangelicals corresponded, conferred in committee,
wrote, edited and published for the common cause, and met
in huge and solemn anniversary assemblies, their sense of
unity in a single great endeavour was continually renewed.
It was in the work of the Tract Society that many Baptists
were first brought into the pan-evangelical cause.

(1) Cited in Jones, op.cit. p. 69.
(3) Jones, op.cit. p. 70.
association in R.T.S. work brought increased fraternization between local churches, as in Salisbury, where Baptist and Independent supporters of the Society shared a common communion table. In 1808, Blackburn Baptists let Joseph Fletcher, a prominent Independent patron of the R.T.S., and his congregation worship in their meeting while the Independent church was being enlarged. No doubt, many more examples could be cited.

Yet while the Tract Society promoted union and fraternity among evangelicals, it was not entirely immune from controversy and dissension, especially since many of the tracts that it considered for publication were highly controversial— even among evangelicals. We must therefore examine the Society from the perspective of its internal operations, bearing in mind the profound impact that it had on the church outside of its committee rooms.

(2) W.A. Abram, A Century of Independency in Blackburn (1878), p. 22 f.
Chapter Eleven: The Internal Relations

I. Introduction

Since we lack Tract Society correspondence for our period, it is difficult to determine how far the Society suffered the same external controversies that plagued the Bible Society. Of course, many charges levelled against the Bible Society by High Churchmen could also have been directed against the Tract Society. William Dealtry, for example, not only had to 'vindicate' the Bible Society in 1810 from charges of sectarianism, but he also had to refute Christopher Wordsworth's allegation that Tract Society publications were dangerous and seditious. Yet there was perhaps one important reason why the Tract Society was spared much of the High Church anger that was directed at its sister institution. Just as High Churchmen did not waste their ammunition on the L.M.S. because they considered the C.M.S. to be a much more dangerous foe, so too they preferred to attack the larger and much more thriving Bible Society instead of the R.T.S., hoping perhaps that if they destroyed the former the latter might fall as a matter of course.

Nor did the Tract Society face the degree of internal controversy that tore the Bible Society apart in the late 1820s and early 1830s. From its inception, the R.T.S. considered itself an organization composed solely of orthodox Protestant Dissenters and later, Churchmen. Its meetings, unlike the Bible Society, were opened and closed with prayer. Many of its tracts were explicitly anti-Catholic.

(1) W. Dealtry, A Vindication of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1810), p. 204 f.
(2) The R.T.S. almost always held quarterly prayer meetings, but in 1824 it was made mandatory that Society meetings be opened with prayer. R.T.S. Minutes, 13, 20 July 1824.
1 and anti-Socinian charity and the 'catholic spirit' were never extended to the Roman Church, nor to the Unitarians and other 'unorthodox' Christian denominations. Consequently, while the Bible Society was racked by the Apocrypha and Tests Controversies, the Tract Society was able to step up its production of anti-Catholic and anti-Socinian tracts with impunity. Nevertheless, the Tract Society faced several minor internal conflicts during this period. Like their counterparts in other evangelical societies, they are interesting not only for their effects on the work of the R.T.S., but as indices of fundamental obstacles to the cause of evangelical union. Religious controversies were to some extent the projection of personal differences - it was inevitable that the evangelical world, full of highly articulate, passionately committed and vigorously mission-minded characters, should generate occasional personality conflicts. But the cause of these differences often reflected important issues of principle. The three problems we shall now discuss did not arise accidently: each raised a basic issue which divided members of the 'Gospel World.' The first was the problem of the high and hyper-Calvinists, who shared the Reformed 'doctrines of grace' held by evangelicals, but pushed their predestinarian tenets beyond the point considered tolerable by the devotees of evangelical consensus. The second

(1) Jones, Memorials of the Tract Society, p. 118.
(2) G.H.C. Hewitt, Let the People Read (1949), p. 42.
(4) See R.T.S. Minutes, 13 May 1831. There were, nevertheless, several warm debates over Catholic Emancipation at the Tract Society. See W. Urwick, The Life and Letters of William Urwick (1870), p. 71 f.
was - once again - the irrepressible issue of Church versus Dissent, which we have already seen in other contexts. The third was the issue of religious politics, especially Roman Catholic politics and the stance to be taken by evangelicals on the thorny issue of Catholic Emancipation: where could one draw the line between strictly doctrinal and religious critique of Romanism which all evangelicals deemed proper, from an involvement in the politics of anti-Catholicism?

II. The Robert Hawker Controversy

Robert Hawker, Vicar of Charles near Plymouth, was as enthusiastic about the foundation of the Tract Society as he had been about the L.M.S. four years before. Born at Exeter, the son of a surgeon, Hawker, after studying medicine, became an assistant surgeon in the Royal Marines. In 1778 he entered Magdalen Hall Oxford, later becoming in 1778 the Curate of St. Martin near Looe in Cornwall and then in 1784, the Vicar of Charles, after serving under John Bedford as curate. In 1802, he founded the Great Western Society for Dispersing Tracts, but he was a patron of the Tract Society from the beginning. Hawker was something of an eccentric and his high Calvinistic beliefs which bordered on speculative Antinomianism, got him into trouble with Nonconformist and Anglican evangelicals alike. There was much in high Calvinism of the Hawker variety to alarm the mission-minded evangelical; his insistence on predestined reprobation, his belief that Christ died not for the sins of the world but only for the

elect; his almost fatalistic view of Providence: these were not easily assimilated with the normal evangelical belief in universal offers of grace. More alarming was the high Calvinist tendency to stress the 'finished work of Christ' in justification at the expense of the continuing work of sanctification: Simeon was shocked by Hawker's pronouncement that the New Testament only spoke of personal holiness because of the then infant state of the Church; in later times such incitements to holiness were unnecessary. He was always something of a bete noire in evangelical circles.

Edward Bickersteth, a secretary of the C.M.S., for example, complained that Hawker's high Calvinism had often disrupted society meetings when Hawker attended them. William Jay the Independent and Adam Clarke the Wesleyan, shared Bickersteth's opinion of Hawker's extreme theological views. William Wilberforce would not allow his children to talk to Hawker when he preached at Lock Chapel for fear that he might influence them adversely. It was only a matter of time before Hawker's extreme beliefs came into direct conflict with the more moderate views of his colleagues in the Tract Society. This was already evident as early as June 1800, when Hawker submitted a tract to the Society entitled 'Solemn Questions;' since some of its phrases were provocative, it was recommended for revision, and only after an unprecedented four meetings did the committee finally decide to publish

even the revised product. Two other tracts, one a catechism and the other a morality story, also had to be rejected; the former ostensibly because the Society did not publish catechisms, the latter was simply deemed theologically objectionable. For a Society that needed Anglican patronage as badly as the R.T.S. did, Hawker's literary indiscretions, though not enumerated specifically, must have been pretty serious. Nevertheless, Hawker continued to preach collection sermons for the Society, and could only write good things about it as late as 1803. By 1808, however, Hawker had not only separated from the L.M.S., but apparently from the Tract Society also. Why he had done this, however, was not yet made clear.

In 1824, Hawker founded the Gospel Tract Society, the design and purpose of which seemed to directly oppose the R.T.S. Of his new organization, Hawker told Henry Peto in almost predestinarian terms that "I feel a growing confidence that the thing is of the Lord; and that the Lord hath from the first ordained the formation of the Gospel Tract Society." The Tract Society, however, did not take this development lightly. At its twenty-fifth anniversary, Spedding Curwin, an Independent minister from Hull, made several caustic remarks about Hawker and his new organization which brought

(1) R.T.S. Minutes, 17 June 1800; 1,8,22 July 1800. Cf. E.M. Feb. 1799, p. 75 f. for a review of 'Solemn Questions.'
(2) R.T.S. Minutes, 9 Sept. 1800, 3 Aug. 1802.
(3) See for example R.T.S. Minutes, 10 May 1803.
(5) L.M.S. Minutes, 30 May 1808; L.M.S. Home C. (2.7.A.); H. Mends to G. Burder, 20 Aug. 1812.
(6) Bodl. Eng Misc. MSS, b.93, f.25.: R. Hawker to H. Peto, 4 July 1825.
on protests from Henry Peto and Edward Palmer, the Gospel Tract Society's two secretaries, and a demand from them for a public apology. But the matter was only further exacerbated in 1825 when the Tract Society placed a notice in its annual report, disowning any association with the Gospel Tract Society and the men who patronized it. This notice provoked Hawker not only publicly to agree that the two societies were "utterly unalike in feature, in their origin, progress, pursuits, and their proposed issue of termination," but to explain why the Gospel Tract Society had been founded in the first place.

Hawker was a Calvinist who believed - rather unfashionably in evangelical circles - that the doctrines of predestination were so explicit in the Bible that they constituted an unavoidable part of the Christian message, being essentials, not circumstantial, of the faith. As a high Calvinist, he soon found it impossible to support the calculated ambiguity over the Five Points which a pan-evangelical association like the R.T.S. demanded. Anticipating the criticisms which have been levelled against many Christian union movements (not least against the Ecumenical movement today) Hawker argued that the price of so-called union was an emasculation of important theological issues, a dangerous reluctance to preach the Gospel in all its fullness, a failure to face up to the issues which really divided professed Christians. This artificial concentration on the lowest common multiple of beliefs only diluted the strong wine of Christian truth and led to

(1) R.T.S. Minutes, 7, 14, 28 Sept. 1824.
(2) R.T.S. Minutes, 18 July 1825.
(3) Hawker, op.cit. 614.
vague and cowardly compromises. "How," he asked, "the churchman, who believes in and subscribes to the articles of the church of England, the dissenter, who from the denial of them takes his very name dissenter; and the foreigner, whose tenets for the most part differ from both - how these characters shall cordially meet for religious purposes on this large portion of common ground; these things are so enveloped in mystery, as surpasseth, I confess, my comprehension." Only a "most accommodating spirit," he felt, could remove the "acute angles" which separated one group theologically from the other; but in the long run this would "render the peculiar doctrines of each so palatable and inoffensive, as to gather the whole mass by one sweeping clause into one net." This, according to Hawker, would have a disastrous effect on one's Calvinistic principles, because an organization that claimed all mankind alike salvable, as the Tract Society must in allowing Arminians to participate in its concerns, blasphemed against the infallible authority of Scripture which considers the "chosen of God as constituting the church of God; to whom alone the invitations, promises, and blessings belong..." The difference between Hawker's society and the Tract Society, therefore, was incalculable.

The Religious Tract Society, considers all mankind as alike salvable: The Gospel Tract Society, acknowledgeth none but the election of grace. The former, conceives that the common ground which the churchman, dissenter, and foreigner jointly occupy, will bring about those evangelical principles in which all are agreed; the latter, limits according to Scripture, 'the remnant of Jacob in the midst of many people.'

The tracts of the Gospel Tract Society, therefore, were

(1) Ibid. p. 618 f.
(2) Ibid. p. 619.
(3) Ibid. p. 620.
(4) Ibid. p. 621 f.
restricted to the "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

Though Hawker's protests paralleled in time, and in many ways, the issues of similar protests against the Bible Society during the Apocrypha and Tests Controversies, its effect on the Tract Society was apparently negligible. There was no major division in the Tract Society over the issue, nor did it appear that the Society lost a large number of its patrons. What the controversy did indicate, however, was that even in the Tract Society, reaction against evangelical union which was becoming more and more evident over questions of church polity, could extend also to doctrinal issues. Hawker's secession raised an important problem which faced (and continues to face) movements for church unity: how far can one press the theories of mutual tolerance and the cheerful acceptance of 'unity in diversity'? At what point do Christians have to speak out concerning particular doctrines which they themselves hold devoutly, but whose announcement may disrupt the carefully constructed consensus of unity? Where does one draw the line between those beliefs which are of the \textit{plene esse} of Christian faith and those which pertain merely to the \textit{esse}?

III. The Milnerian Controversy

The second major controversy which confronted the Tract Society during the mid-twenties was potentially more serious because it pitted a denominational authority, the Congregational

\footnote{R. Hawker, \textit{The Glory of God in gathering His people to Himself, the first and final design of the Gospel ministry} (1889), p. 11. This was the first tract of the Gospel Tract Society.}
Board, against Anglican opinion in the Tract Society. The Milnerian Controversy, so called since it involved the propriety of an R.T.S. edition of Joseph Milner's *Church History*, began as far back as 1811, when John Sperling of Clifton suggested printing extracts of Milner's work. Though this suggestion was not carried through, in August 1825, George Stokes of Cheltenham, a wealthy Anglican patron of the Tract Society and its accountant, offered to provide the stereotype plates of Milner's history free of charge and the project was reopened. When the Congregational Board heard of this project, however, it protested vigorously. The complaint was personally presented by a deputation from the Board which, while allowing Milner's piety, took exception to the thinly disguised defence of Anglicanism and the implied rebuke to Nonconformity which ran through its pages. Though primarily an historical account of 'real' or 'vital' religion through the centuries, irrespective of its particular denominational garb, Milner's *History* was written partly during the Revolutionary period and contained much to offend the sensitive Dissenter. It defended episcopacy, infant baptism and ecclesiastical establishments; it was hard on those who separated from an unfallen Church, like the Novatians, and implied that English Nonconformity originated in unjustified schism. By contrast, it took a surprisingly tolerant attitude towards aspects of medieval religion; we should not be prejudiced against the real Church "because she then wore Roman garb." Thomas Haweis' rival *Impartial and Succinct*

(1) R.T.S. Minutes, 29 Oct. 1811
(2) R.T.S. Minutes, 9 Aug. 1825.
(3) R.T.S. Minutes, 17 Nov. 1825.
(4) R.T.S. Minutes, 22 Nov. 1825.
History of the Church of Christ, published in 1800, was intended partly to counteract Milner's apparent tendency to love some Romans more than some separatist proto-
Protestants. It was, therefore, not surprising that the Congregational Board's deputation, should urge the R.T.S. "to abandon a project which cannot be accepted by them, without violating the principles on which the Society was first established; and by a strict adherence to which its present prosperity can only be perpetuated." The R.T.S. politely refused, although it promised to allow inspection of the proofs before they went to press and (under further pressure) agreed to refer them to the arbitration of impartial outside judges. Even this compromise did not abate the Board's dislike of Milner's History, which, they still maintained, was being published in defiance of the Tract Society's avowed principles, and the issue was made public in the Congregational Magazine. The Tract Society was compelled to prepare a circular in its own defence.

In January 1826, a conciliatory R.T.S. deputation, headed by Edward Bickersteth, a secretary of the C.M.S., met the offended Congregationalists once more and listened to their detailed complaints. Milner's History, felt the Board, was too favourable to Rome and contained "details which would not

---

(2) R.T.S. Minutes, 22 Nov. 1825.
(3) Loc. cit.
(4) R.T.S. Minutes, 6 Dec. 1825.
be unworthy of the credulity of a Roman Catholic historian" praising "canonized saints of the Romish calendar" in extravagant eulogy. Worse were Milner's episcopalian asides on the heretics and separatists of church history, some of whom he clearly regarded as the ancestors of modern Dissent. Finally, asked the Board, how could the issue of such a polemical work be squared "with the avowed principles of the Religious Tract Society?" Had a similarly biased history been written by a Nonconformist and submitted to the Tract Society the Anglicans would no doubt have protested bitterly. Twenty-five years before, docile Independents would have left the criticism of Milner's History (as they did) to left wing Anglicans like Thomas Haweis or Rowland Hill; now, with a denominational authority to back them up, they could speak loudly and know that they would be listened to.

A compromise was quickly reached. It was suggested by the Congregational Board that the Society should publish, solely on its own responsibility and without Milner's name, biographical sketches rather than a church history. The inclusion of Milner's name, they felt, would only recommend to readers the unexpurgated work which advocated a particular form of church government and civil establishment. The Tract Society deputation agreed to omit Milner's name if the book was now entitled The History of the Church of Christ Previous to the Reformation, Consisting Chiefly of Sketches and the

(1) R.T.S. Minutes, 24 Jan. 1826. These arguments were used by John Yockney, John Morison, John Arundel, Joseph Brooksbank and others.
(2) Cf. T. Haweis, Impartial and Succinct History of the Church of Christ (1800); R. Hill, Journal of a Tour through the North of England and parts of Scotland (1799). Both of these works were critical of Milner's History.
Lives, and Extracts from the Writings of Christians during the Early and Middle Ages. Both parties finally agreed on this compromise.

The Milnerian Controversy might have been more serious had all the Dissenters been united in opposition to the History, but this was not the case. The Wesleyan Joseph Butterworth, the Baptist Joseph Ivimey, and even the Congregationalists John Campbell and John Clayton, favoured printing Milner's History from the very beginning. Nevertheless, the controversy demonstrated that by 1825 Non-conformist associations and unions were already forces to be reckoned with: the age of docility was over.

IV. The Anti-Catholic Broadsheets Controversy

The final cleavage was precipitated by the problem of anti-Catholic broadsheets, and echoed in some ways the Tests Controversy in the Bible Society which was raging at this time. The Tract Society generally avoided publishing political tracts, but as we have seen, the distinction between politics and religion was often hard to establish, and nowhere was this more evident than in the case of the great debate over Catholic Emancipation which the R.T.S. could not resist entering.

Its involvement in the politics of Catholicism reflected the bias of its leaders, particularly Richard Waldo Sibthorp, the Anglican minister at Percy Chapel in St. Pancras, who succeeded Legh Richmond as Secretary, as well as Baptist Noel

(2) R.T.S. Minutes, 10,17 Jan. 1826.
and James Haldane Stewart, who were also high enough in the
councils of the R.T.S. to be considered as possible secretaries
in his place. All three were strong anti-Catholics as well
as 'regular' Anglicans. During the Tests Controversy in the
Bible Society, this trio had been among the seceders who
formed the Trinitarian Bible Society, which expressly barred
Roman Catholics from membership. The Bible Society and the
R.T.S. took a very different view of the Catholic question.
The Bible Society, strongly influenced by its complement
of Parliamentary 'Saints', generally favoured Catholic
Emancipation and tried to repress anti-Catholic agitation
within its ranks; the Tract Society was far less liberal,
tending instead to the anti-Socinian and anti-Catholic side
of the evangelical political spectrum, and hence found it
hard to resist the lure of religious politics.

In 1827, when the Emancipation issue was shaking the
nation, the Tract Society issued an anti-Catholic broadsheet
entitled "Queen Mary's Days" which discussed at length and
in lurid detail the reign of Mary, featuring nine woodcuts
displaying the tortures and burnings of the Smithfield
Martyrs. Two years later, this tract was attacked in

(1) R.T.S. Minutes, 24 May 1827, 5, 8, June 1827, 31 July 1827.
Stewart's Thoughts on the importance of special prayer
for the general outpouring of the Holy Spirit was made into
a tract by the Society in 1821.
(2) Ironically, Sibthorp, at first anti-Catholic, migrated to
the Roman church many years later.
(3) Very few Broadsheets still exist, but on the cover of this
Book is a tract of this period depicting the same kind of
scene that was found on "Queen Mary's Days." The concluding
remarks of Female Martyrs are: "It is not necessary to add
any observations upon these narratives, the truth of which
cannot be denied. Be thankful that such cruelties are not
practiced now - that no one is burned on account of religion." The tract was probably written by George Stokes. See
British Museum Catalogue.
Parliament by William Joseph Denison, a millionaire pro-
Emancipationist M.P. from Surrey. Denison, who encountered
the R.T.S. broadsheet at an anti-Emancipation rally in his
neighborhood, was alarmed at the "inflammatory handbills"
which were scattered among the lower orders in such a way
as to incite them to violence. The Society jumped to its
defence, claiming that its broadsheet on "Queen Mary's Days"
never touched on secular or political questions, but merely
recorded "the faith, patience and sufferings of those who
were persecuted for their adherence to the truths of the
Gospel." They acted not as politicians but as Protestants,
compelled for conscience sake "to controvert the errors of
the Church of Rome and to expose the evil consequences arising
from its doctrines." Not all the Society's supporters were
satisfied by this excuse. John Burder of Stroud, for example,
threatened that he, and many friends, would resign if any more
"pictures of Popish cruelty" were disseminated at this time
of political unrest. Even Joseph Hughes, on tour for the
Society in Bristol, suggested that the R.T.S. should disavow
any intention of interfering with so controversial a topic,
especially since it was now being debated in Parliament, and
so maintain its professed neutrality. A number of auxiliaries
concurred, though some influential patrons like Lady Farnham
urged the R.T.S. on to greater 'Protestant militancy.'

(1) This rally could possibly have been convened by Henry Drummond
who also lived in Surrey.
(2) R.T.S. Minutes, 17 March 1829. Hansard, XX(n.s.), p. 907.
(3) R.T.S. Minutes, 11 March 1829. These sentiments were conveying
Parliament on behalf of the Society by two anti-
Emancipation M.P.s, C.N. Palmer and Sir R.H. Inglis.
(4) R.T.S. Minutes, 17 March 1829.
(5) Loc.cit.
(6) R.T.S. Minutes, 17, 24 March 1829.
(7) R.T.S. Minutes, 17 March 1829.
The danger of a disruption like that which shook the Bible Society was forestalled by yet another compromise in April 1829, restating the Society's intention to propagate the agreed doctrines of the Reformation, but adding the important proviso that "in promoting this object it is particularly desirable to avoid any methods which are not fully consonant to the spirit of the Gospel of peace and love or which may excite or strengthen prejudices in the minds of those whom we are anxious to convince." A special subcommittee was appointed to carry this through.

In its internal relations, the Tract Society had obviously learned a lot from the mistakes of the Bible Society. It tactfully avoided confrontation when matters reached a boiling point; consequently, it was better able to maintain its stability as a pan-evangelical institution, emerging in this century as the Lutterworth Press, one of Britain's most distinguished publishing houses. The same, however could not be said of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews which, of the four pan-evangelical organizations examined in this thesis, was the least successful in maintaining pan-evangelical accord. It is to the study of this society that we finally turn.

(1) R.T.S. Minutes, 10 April 1829.  
(2) R.T.S. Minutes, 20, 21 April 1829.
Lest you be wise in your own conceits, I want you to understand this mystery, brethren: a hardening has come upon part of Israel, until the full number of the Gentiles come in, and so all Israel will be saved; as it is written 'The Deliverer will come from Zion, he will banish ungodliness from Jacob'; 'and this will be my covenant with them when I take away their sins.'

Romans XI: 25-27.
Chapter Twelve: The Foundations

I. Setting the Scene

Side by side with the growing evangelical involvement in domestic missions which produced the R.T.S. in 1799, was an increasing interest in Britain's Jewish population. In part this was promoted by the home missionaries who, in their travels throughout the Kingdom to locate and convert the local heathen, often came upon Jewish communities who were impervious to their appeals. Interest in the Jewish community was also excited by at least two millennial theories current in evangelical literature. It was a common-place of prophecy that when the Gentile was converted to Christianity, the Jewish nation would, in the normal course of events, quickly follow suit. A correspondent to the *Evangelical Magazine* wrote in 1796, that "the Jews were...the natural branches of the spiritual vine; and notwithstanding, in consequence of their being broken off, the Gentiles were grafted in, yet there will arrive a time, in which all Israel shall be saved; in which there shall be one fold both of Jew and Gentile, and Christ, the great head of the church, become the shepherd of the people." According to this theory, the conversion of the Jewish people would be a consequence of the mission to the foreign and domestic heathen; the heathen therefore would be given priority. But another, though less widely held theory of the millennium was gaining currency by the end of the century: that before the heathen were converted to Christianity, a remnant of the Jewish nation would first

be brought in. The conversion of the heathen, therefore, would be the natural consequence of a mission to the Jewish people and not vice versa. According to this theory, a mission to the Jews would take priority over one to the heathen.

Because most evangelicals initially subscribed to the first theory, their response to the cry for a separate Jewish mission was slight, and this largely explains why it took so long for the evangelical London Society for the Promotion of Christianity Amongst the Jews to be founded. Yet there had already been a number of early attempts before 1809 to establish an evangelical mission to the Jewish people in Britain.

William Cooper, the minister of Lady Huntingdon's Connexion at Bury Street Chapel in London, for example, had been engaged in a very modest mission to the Jewish immigrants who lived in his neighborhood as early as 1796. This mission caught the eye of Thomas Haweis who called together a group of "respectable" London ministers to plan a more extensive evangelical witness to the Jewish people, but even then, several ministers declined to cooperate in this enterprise, ostensibly because they lacked the technical expertise and knowledge to do so effectively. Nevertheless, John Love, the Presbyterian minister at Artillery Street, drew up a syllabus of subjects for a Saturday lecture for the Jews which commenced later that year at Cooper's chapel. Later several ministers submitted to the Evangelical Magazine.

a tentative plan for a Jewish mission, but none of these projects proved to be very successful. Jews did not attend the lectures either from a lack of interest or from fear of being excommunicated by the Synagogue, and although the lectures continued for a year or two, the plan to print them for general distribution ended largely in failure. Nor was there a significant response to the _Evangelical Magazine_ article which called for the establishment of a Jewish mission. Perhaps Henry Hunter, the Scottish born minister of the Presbyterian church at London Wall represented the opinion of most evangelicals at this time when he observed "prophecy did not encourage us as yet to expect the conversion of...Jews...and success would have falsified the prediction." Indeed, evangelical interest at the turn of the century was in foreign and domestic missions aimed not at the Jewish people, but at the heathen and the Gentile. It was only when the German missionary Christian Frederick Frey unceasingly pressed on the L.M.S. the importance of the Jewish people in the over-all scheme of evangelical missions that the Jews became a more important object of evangelical interest.

---

1. E.M. Oct. 1796, p. 402. Activities would have included gathering information about the condition of the Jewish people, introducing them to the New Testament, and engaging them in serious conversation.

2. Several of these tracts were actually published. See for example, S. Greathed, _Decisive certainty of the differences of sentiment between Christians and Jews represented to be attainable and indispensable_ (1798); W. Cooper, _Christ the True Messiah_ (2nd end. 1796). Cf. _E.M._ Feb. 1798, p. 84.

3. Cited in Margoliouth, _op.cit._ 151 f.

4. Interestingly however, several L.M.S. directors favoured sending a mission to the South Seas because they believed that one of the ten tribes of Israel had been scattered there. L.M.S. Minutes, 15 Dec. 1800.
II. C.F. Frey and the L.M.S.: The Evolution of a Jewish Mission

The history of the L.M.S.'s Jewish mission between 1800 and the foundation of the London Society in 1809 is largely the history of one man, Joseph Samuel Christian Frederick Frey and his frustrated attempts to make the Jewish mission as integral a part of the evangelical movement as foreign and domestic missions. But, as Frey quickly found out, most evangelicals were not yet prepared to make a full-time commitment of money and man-power to an enterprise which at best only interested them somewhat speculatively. Millennial prophecy was discussed as much as ever, but the actual implementation of a Jewish mission was not yet regarded as an overriding concern.

Joseph Samuel Frey was born in 1771 at Mainstockheim near Kitzingen in Franconia, the son of a prominent Rabbi. It was said that at the age of six, he could read the five books of Moses in Hebrew. Intended as a teacher of the Jewish religion like his brothers, Frey earned his living tutoring in wealthy families. Several years later, in the process of seeking better employment on route from Hamburg to Schwerin, Frey met a Christian merchant who, observing his dietary habits, exclaimed "I am sorry to see you still striving to keep a law which had expired long ago." These words turned him to Christ. After receiving Christian training, Frey was baptized in 1798 in New Brandenburg, and as was the tradition on such occasions, Frey adopted two Christian names to replace the old ones; henceforth he was called Christian Frederick Frey. Some time after his baptism, he moved to Berlin where he frequented the local meeting of the Moravians. He was subsequently called to be a missionary and entered the new
academy established in Berlin by Baron Von Schirnding and Father Janicke (an institution which supplied both the L.M.S. and the C.M.S. with missionaries). In 1801, together with two other graduates of the academy, Frey left for England en route to South Africa to serve as John Vanderkempt's assistant in the L.M.S. station at Cape Town.

After a brief sojourn in London, however, Frey conveyed to the directors of the L.M.S. his intention of staying on in England to provide a mission for British Jews. His proposal was attractive enough for the Society to send him to David Bogue's academy at Gosport where he received further theological training and improved his English. Frey remained at Gosport until 1805 at which time he was finally set apart for his unique mission. An account of his life and conversion, together with a public recommendation from Dr. Bogue, was planned for general circulation.

At first, the new mission was a one man operation and not officially recognized as a part of the L.M.S. Frey simply lectured to the Jewish people wherever he could find a pulpit. But starting in July 1805, a regular lecture was established at John Ball's Calvinistic Methodist chapel in Jewry Lane, Algate, where he preached to the Jews every Saturday evening. Frey, however, was not satisfied with these humble beginnings; not only did he want the Jewish mission expanded and officially recognized by the L.M.S.,

---

(1) L.M.S. Minutes, 21 Sept. 1801. For Frey's biography, see Dictionary of American Biography; E.M. Jan. 1806, p. 3 f.
(2) L.M.S. Minutes, 1 Dec. 1801.
(3) L.M.S. Minutes, 9 April 1804.
(4) L.M.S. Minutes, 13 May 1805; Cf. E.M. Jan. 1806, p. 3 f.
(5) J.S. Frey, Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C.F. Frey, Minister of the Gospel to the Jews (1809), pp. 99-100; L.M.S. Minutes, 10 June 1805.
but he also wished that the Jews who suffered persecution from their fellows as a result of attending his lecture should receive some kind of pecuniary assistance from the Society. Frey's plan was considered by the L.M.S. several times but to no consequence. Even David Bogue, Frey's former tutor, turned down a petition to represent his case before the committee. Indeed, it seemed from the very beginning that the Jewish mission was off to a bad start.

The L.M.S. did, however, take one step in 1805 towards recognizing the mission by the creation of the Committee for Jewish Affairs, chaired by William Alers-Hankey, the London banker. The job of the Jews Committee (as it was known) was ostensibly to superintend Frey's mission and manage its finances, but in fact the committee's extreme conservatism forced it to act more as a financial watch-dog than an innovator of progress. For example, Frey planned to establish a house of industry that would provide poor Jewish workmen attending his ministry with employment and an income, but after considerable discussion at the Jews Committee, the project was postponed on the grounds that it was "impractical" and far too expensive. Realizing, however, that unless his mission was given more scope, it would die of inactivity,

(1) L.M.S. Minutes, 22 July 1805, 19, 26 Aug. 1805.
(2) L.M.S. Minutes, 13 Sept. 1805.
(4) Cf. L.M.S. Minutes, 23 Sept. 1805.
Frey, with the support of Alers-Hankey, submitted a second proposal on 24 February which, had it been accepted, would have given the Jewish mission limited autonomy from the L.M.S., but this proposal was also rejected by the committee. Already, as early as 1806, Frey's patience with the L.M.S. was beginning to wear thin.

As the months passed, the Jewish mission was plagued by yet another problem. It appeared that many Jewish people who had embraced the Christian faith after attending Frey's lectures and sermons, did so only to receive financial relief from the Society. Once reasonably solvent, the new 'convert' would apostasize and return to the synagogue. Seen from a modern perspective, this was certainly understandable; after migrating to Britain, Jews were as victimized by anti-Semitism and job discrimination as they had been on the Continent. Poverty stricken to the point of desperation, they would often suppress their pride and, like common beggars, grab at any hand that fed them even if doing so meant making a sham profession of Christianity. To the evangelicals, this practice seemed deplorably sacrilegious and hypocritical and often only confirmed their stereotypes of the guileful Jew.

The increasing number of such 'Christian apostates' once again brought up the question of pecuniary assistance at the Jews Committee. Frey and Alers-Hankey believed that the problem could be solved by giving financial aid only to

(1) L.M.S. Minutes, 24 Feb. 1806. Among other things, the proposal suggested recruiting L.M.S. directors who were knowledgeable about Jewish affairs, expanding Frey's lecture to regular Sunday services, and asking patrons of the Society whether they had jobs for the Jews under L.M.S. patronage.
Jews who agreed to separate themselves from their communities. In the case of the Society's Free School, founded in 1807 for the purpose of educating Jewish children, it was privately suggested that the children be taken away from their parents and isolated from the "anti-Christian" influence of Synagogue and family. Not willing to go this far, the Jews Committee simply reaffirmed its unofficial policy by declaring Jews ineligible for financial assistance from the Society unless after due enquiry, it could be established that they either had embraced Christianity, or were at least desirous of doing so. Frey, however, thought this solution was entirely impractical. Who, he asked, would support destitute Jews until their characters could be established? No Christian would employ such a person, Frey pointed out, until he was sure that the Jewish person concerned was trustworthy and really desired to turn Christian. Since a house of industry had yet to be established, and financial assistance could not be given to the Jews until after a thorough investigation of their characters, the L.M.S., Frey felt, had not made realistic provision for Jewish people in 'limbo.'

The Jews Committee softened Frey's complaints by allowing him to form a subcommittee of the subcommittee, with the power

(1) This school was opposed by Rabbi Solomon Hirshel of the Great London Synagogue and as a result, the school proved to be a monumental failure. See E.M. Dec. 1806, p. 572. For opposition from Hirshel and his deputation to Joseph Hardcastle, see L.M.S. Minutes, 8, 12, Jan 1807; Frey, Narrative, p. 117.
(2) L.M.S. Jews Committee MSS: L. Langton to W. Alers-Hankey, 15 April 1807.
(3) L.M.S. Minutes, 7 May 1807. An attempt was made to soften this regulation by allowing more flexibility in grants of aid, but this was overruled. L.M.S. Minutes, 20 April 1807.
to enquire into the characters of Jewish people connected with the Society and to find employment for them. This 'Auxiliary Committee' was important because it included among its list of members the very men who would later lead the schism that detached the London Society from the L.M.S. in 1809. It was also in this committee that the controversial 'Boarding School' was openly discussed for the first time.

The Auxiliary Committee's proposal for a Boarding School was first presented formally to the Jews Committee by Frey and his colleagues on 19 October 1807. In this proposal, Frey suggested that the Free School had been singularly unsuccessful because only twelve Jewish children had been "delivered from Jewish prejudices and enmity against Christ," but a boarding school might bring at least fifty or even a hundred more children to "share the same unspeakable blessings."

The problem with the Free School, Frey believed, was that it permitted Jewish children to return home each day after school to parents and Rabbi who would undo everything that they had been taught. It would therefore be much more practical to establish a boarding school on a much larger scale where Jewish children would be fed, clothed, and educated in isolation from their parents before being placed in suitable employment amongst Christians. But even though several members of the Jews Committee, including Alers-Hankey, recommended Frey's proposal to the directors of the L.M.S., predictably

(1) The Auxiliary Committee was established on 13 August 1807. It met for the first time on 2 Sept. 1807. Members included (Christian names not known) Herne, Kemp, Langton, Neale, Reed, Walker, Newth and Frey. See Frey, Narrative, p. 118 f.
(2) L.M.S. Jews Committee MSS: "Memoir on the Jewish School to the Jewish Committee," 19 Oct. 1807. Cf. Frey, Narrative, p.122f. At the same time, the Ladies Committee proposed establishing a house of industry for girls along the same lines as the boarding school. But this was also vetoed. See Frey, op.cit. p. 141.
it was rejected in committee, ostensibly because it was too expensive.

There were several subsequent attempts by Frey and Alers-Hankey to alter the Society's thinking on the Jewish mission, but all ended in failure. It seemed to not a few, that the directors were either dead to reason, or not seriously committed to the mission. Alers-Hankey again proposed forming a Jews society in partial independence from the L.M.S. This proposal, he felt, would allow the Jewish mission to raise its own funds, and to form a governing body outside of the L.M.S. When, however, this plan was vetoed, the Auxiliary Committee became discouraged and never met again. After one last attempt in February 1808 to get the Society to adopt the Boarding School project, Frey was even charged with fomenting an internal rebellion when he declared that if the L.M.S. did not take adequate steps to fortify its Jewish mission, others would. But already, Frey was preparing to establish his own mission in separation from the L.M.S.

(ii) The 'First' London Society

When relations between Frey and the directors of the L.M.S. were particularly bad, William Stevens and several other gentlemen from the defunct Auxiliary Committee captured an

---

(2) L.M.S. Minutes, 9 Nov. 1807. This last point leads us to speculate whether Frey was being pressed by 'regular' Anglicans to dissociate his mission from the L.M.S. so that they could patronize it without ecclesiastical embarrassment.
(3) L.M.S. Minutes, 23 Nov. 1807; 27 April 1808. Cf. Frey, Narrative, p. 142.
(4) Frey's proposal of 12 February 1808 is cited in Narrative, p. 142 f. For the plan of the school, see ibid. p. 144 f.
(5) Frey, Narrative, p. 149.
ailing London charitable society that had subscribers but no leadership, and renamed it 'the London Society for Visiting and Relieving the Sick and Distressed and Instructing the Ignorant Especially such as were of the Jewish Nation.' Frey was appointed the Society's president, a post that he held while still employed by the L.M.S. The London Society, as it came to be known, was created to implement Frey's proposals, which the L.M.S. had been so reluctant to carry out. In its first brochure, the new society proclaimed Frey's belief that preaching alone was not enough to bring the Jews to Christ:

'It is granted that the preaching of the Gospel is the first and greatest instrument in the conversion of sinners; yet those who are best acquainted with the situation of the Jews will freely acknowledge, that, in their conversion, other means are (humanly speaking) absolutely necessary to be added to the former. The sick should be visited, the poor should be relieved, the ignorant should be instructed.

But for the moment, the London Society was only an organization on paper. Instead of implementing immediately the programmes that it had pressed for militantly at the Jews Committee, it devoted its energies towards negotiating a compromise with the L.M.S. in which, in return for a merger of the societies, Frey would be given freedom to carry out his ideas. But negotiations between the two societies proved to be largely abortive.

The bargaining soon became acrimonious. In August 1808, Frey warned George Burder, the L.M.S. Secretary, "...if the directors mean to 'restrain' me from uniting with others, and to 'limit' my exertions for the benefit of the Jews, I shall then be under the painful necessity of leaving the Missionary

(1) Frey, Narrative, p. 159 f.
(2) An Address from the Committee of the London Society...to Friends of the Jews with a Plan of the Institution (1808), p. 2.
Society, and accept the call [at Artillery Street chapel] and be ordained as an Independent minister." David Bogue, Frey's former tutor, responded on Burder's behalf by candidly pointing out to Frey that not only was his action in forming a new society an ungrateful response to the L.M.S. which had spent well over £2000 on his education, but that his plan for a boarding school was frankly repulsive to most evangelical sensibilities:

Your plan, of setting up a boarding-school for Jewish children, and supporting every one who professed to have a regard to Christianity, I could not approve. - It is bribing people to be Christians. I do not believe the apostle Paul ever gave all Jews unconverted forty shillings to make them Christians; and it would have filled your society with hypocrites. On most points at issue, neither side was willing to be flexible. Proposals were made by one society but rejected by the other; deputations sallied back and forth, but little could be agreed on. At one point the L.M.S. declared itself willing to give Frey's mission a little more autonomy than it had before though still claiming the right to dictate mission policy, but the London Society rejected this concession, insisting that it was precisely this kind of dictatorial supervision that had impeded the mission in the first place.

(1) Frey, Narrative, p. 165. This letter specifically referred to the 'restrictive' ordination that Frey had received from the L.M.S. in June 1808 which only allowed him to preach to the Jews but not to perform the sacraments. See ibid., p. 164 fn. Frey complained bitterly that he was handicapped in his mission because of these restrictions. See ibid., p. 151. The Chapel at Artillery Street had subsequently asked Frey to become its minister. Still, Frey said that he considered his connection with the L.M.S. as "my highest honour and greatest privilege." See ibid., p. 164.

(2) Ibid, p. 169 f.

(3) Cited in ibid., p. 172. Bogue concluded this letter by warning Frey that if he made his separation from the L.M.S. permanent, his character would be ruined, and congregations all over Britain would close their doors to him. See ibid., p. 173.

Indeed, the London Society understood on good authority "that many individuals withhold their private subscriptions simply upon the ground that the Jewish affairs are under the direction of a Society either professedly or by reputation Dissenters" but that there were now "numerous Bodies of Christians who would be willing to contribute their assistance to a society formed for the purpose and upon the principles of the London Society." This point, of course, was a very sensitive one to the L.M.S, for it had not, as we have seen, succeeded in winning 'regular' Anglican patronage to pan-evangelicalism in foreign missions. Now it was being accused of inhibiting the broadly-based evangelical support for the Jewish mission. We may speculate whether the 'regular' Anglicans, who up until then had withheld their patronage from the Jewish mission because of its associations with the L.M.S., were not pressing Frey to part ways with that society so that they could also involve themselves in a mission to the Jews.

Negotiations eventually broke down when Frey once again raised the boarding school project, by now an unnegotiable plank in his programme for reform. He declared that if the boarding school was adopted by the L.M.S., and if his mission was given independent authority to solicit and spend money as it wished, there would be no need for a formal separation between the London Society and the L.M.S. But even though Alers-Hankey urged the L.M.S. to accept Frey's proposals,

they were finally rejected in committee. In January 1809,
Frey finally tendered his resignation, and the London
Society was formally incorporated one month later.

(iii) The 'Second' London Society

Needless to say, the L.M.S. did not take Frey's resignation
lightly, nor, indeed, did it have many kind things to say
about its new rival after the schism. Almost immediately,
George Burder and Charles Buck, the Scottish born London
Independent, were commissioned to draw up a rather choleric
statement outlining the issues between Frey and the L.M.S.
for circulation amongst the Society's directors. This appeared
in March 1809. When Frey received a copy, he was so incensed
with its inaccuracies, that he set out to prepare an answer of
his own which subsequently appeared as the Narrative of the
Reverend Joseph Samuel C.F. Frey, Minister of the Gospel to
the Jews. Both societies, therefore, were preparing for a
full-scale confrontation that promised to be far more bitter
and vindictive than the previous skirmishes.

Attacks on personalities were far more serious this time.
For example, George Burder who served jointly as the Secretary

(3) L.S. Minutes, 15 Feb. 1809. Cf. City of Refuge. An Address
from the Committee of the London Society... to Christian of
every Denomination (1809).
(4) Frey was formally dismissed from the L.M.S. in February 1809.
last official act was to preach at the Jews Chapel on 24
February 1809. According to Frey, six L.M.S. directors
attended this sermon "although during my ministry, for the
two preceding years, I do not recollect that two ever
attended, and not even one more than twice or three times."
Frey, op. cit. p. 219.
(5) L.M.S. Minutes, 27 Feb. 1809. The circular was entitled
Mission to the Jews and can be found in L.M.S. Scrapbook,
(6) L.M.S. Jews Committee MSS: C. Frey to G. Burder, 25 March
of the L.M.S. and the editor of the Evangelical Magazine, refused to print an advertisement announcing a public sermon to be preached by Frey even though it had been paid for.

When Joseph Fox, the London Society's first Secretary, found out about this indiscretion, he called Burder a "swindler" for taking the London Society's money in bad faith, and threatened to take him to court over the matter unless the advertisement was immediately printed. Nor could Fox resist castigating the Evangelical Magazine. "The covers of the Evangelical Magazine," Fox complained

are from time to time filled with advertisements of quack medicines to cure the effects of debauchery and restore constitutions enfeebled by foul excess. De Velno's syrup, Decoctions of the Woods and other restoratives, are to be found there advertised. The lusts of the eye may also be pampered by the cosmetics to make white hands & beautiful skins & long hair...while the insertion of our advertisement informing the public that a minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ is preaching a lecture for the benefit of a large number of ignorant, perishing souls is refused.

Burder, needless to say, was incensed at being called a "swindler" and having his magazine impugned, even though Frey later apologized for Fox's lack of diplomacy.

Several attempts were made to reconcile the two warring societies before the Jewish mission itself was totally destroyed. William Stevens invited Burder to preach the London Society's inaugural sermon at the French Church (later Jews Chapel) Spitalfields, but Burder, still smarting from

(1) Burder had actually mixed this advertisement up with another announcing Frey's forthcoming Narrative. Burder wanted the L.M.S. to see a draft of the Narrative before it was advertised to the public in his magazine. See Frey, Narrative, p. 237 f.
(4) L.M.S. Jews Committee MSS: W. Stevens to G. Burder, 24 May 1809.
Fox's abusive letter and irritated by the London Society hand-bills that had been distributed at the L.M.S.'s May anniversary, turned the invitation down with no regrets. Burder felt that an acceptance of the invitation "would imply an approbation of Mr. Frey's conduct towards the Missionary Society..." Several more attempts at reconciliation were made, but all proved equally unsuccessful. The London Society at one point, was even willing to stop the publication of Frey's Narrative, if the L.M.S. would publicly disown what it had said about Frey in its March 1809 circular letter. But the L.M.S. was not willing to budge. Consequently, on 3 October 1809, Frey submitted his Narrative in manuscript form to the L.M.S. for their inspection before its publication.

Reaction at the L.M.S. to Frey's controversial work was two-fold. Several L.M.S. directors, including John Clayton and Samuel Greatheed, thought that it might be expedient simply to recognize the London Society and live at peace with it, rather than to fight a protracted pamphlet war, since the contents of the Narrative would bring adverse publicity on both societies. Burder's reaction, on the other hand, was more heated. At first he considered bringing a libel suit against Frey, but dropped this idea as impractical.

(1) L.M.S. Jews Committee MSS: G. Burder to W. Stevens, 24 May 1809 (copy). Cf. Frey, Narrative, p. 244 f. Stevens subsequently complained that Burder had dropped the 'reverend' from Frey's name. He also pointed out that the hand-bills mentioned by Burder were meant to be circulated at the anniversary of the R.T.S. which happened to be meeting in London at the same time as the L.M.S. L.M.S. Jews Committee MSS: W. Stevens to G. Burder, 10 June 1809.


(3) L.M.S. Jews Committee MSS: S. Greatheed to G. Burder, 10 Nov. 1809; J.C. Jr. to G. Burder (n.d.).

(4) L.M.S. Jews Committee MSS: Fragment of Burder's Diary, 22 Dec. 1809. The libel referred to Fox's letter of 4 May in which Burder was called a swindler and which was later published in the Narrative.
Instead, he decided to counter the *Narrative*, when it was finally published, by a reply in the *Evangelical Magazine* and by demanding that the L.M.S. abstain from any further commerce with Frey and his organization. At this point, the controversy reached a stalemate.

Of the two societies, the L.M.S. suffered most from the controversy. As early as July 1809, one of its correspondents complained that Jewish attendance at the Society's Jews Chapel was down to five or six people as a result of competition with the London Society. Many Jewish people who could not distinguish between the two organizations apparently thought that L.M.S. tracts had been issued by the London Society, and as a result, attended the meetings of the latter. The L.M.S. tried to institute a series of lectures under the supervision of Greville Ewing, but this never proved successful. By February 1810, the L.M.S.'s Jewish mission was in such bad financial condition, that it was finally decided to discontinue the Saturday lectures for the Jews and to sell the Society's chapel. It was also in 1810, that the L.M.S. really recognized the London Society as a sister organization. In that year, the *Evangelical Magazine* began reporting London Society activities in its 'Miscellaneous' section as it had always done with the other evangelical organizations. The London Society reciprocated two years later by inviting the L.M.S. to join them in a mission to the Jews in Poland. By 1812,

(1) L.M.S. Minutes, 13 Nov. 1809. This, apparently, was never carried through.
(2) L.M.S. Minutes, 26 March 1810.
(3) L.M.S. Jews Committee MSS: T. Helman to L.M.S., 17 July 1809.
(4) L.M.S. Minutes, 13 Nov. 1809; L.M.S. Jews Committee MSS: G. Ewing to G. Burder, 4 Nov. 1809.
(5) L.M.S. Minutes, 26 Feb. 1810.
(6) *E.M.* 1810, p. 334.
(7) *L.S.* Minutes, 22 Sept. 1812.
therefore, the London Society was recognized by all evangelicals as the official evangelical mission to the Jews.

III. Building a Society: The Missing Denominations and the Fundamental Principle

(1) The Missing Denominations

Because the Jewish mission, prior to 1809, had been under the management of the L.M.S., many evangelicals refused to patronize its activities. Indeed, it was partially for this reason that Frey and his colleagues wanted their mission to be institutionally separate from the L.M.S. 'Regular' churchmen would not patronize the Jewish mission for the same reasons they had refused to support the L.M.S. and, (initially at least) the Tract Society. Baptists and Wesleyans on the other hand, had probably stayed away for theological reasons. But once separation was completed in 1809, all these enthusiastically patronized the new organization. In the Baptist camp for example, a number of men took part in the activities of the Society after 1809. They included Andrew Fuller, minister of the Baptist meeting at Kettering, John Ryland, minister of Broadmead Chapel in Bristol, Robert Hall, minister at Harvey Lane Baptist church Leicester and James Hinton, the prominent Baptist minister in Oxford. Though the Wesleyans never joined the Society in large numbers, their chapels, nevertheless, were opened to London Society preachers. Even several Independents and Presbyterians who had originally patronized the L.M.S.'s Jewish mission, rallied to the support of the London Society

(1) Cf. L.S. Minutes 29 Dec. 1812.
when the Jews Chapel was sold in 1810. They included men like John Pye Smith, theological tutor at Homerton College, Thomas Raffles, Independent minister at George Yard Chapel Hammersmith, and Alexander Fletcher, Scottish born Presbyterian minister at Miles Lane Chapel London Bridge.

The most important recruits after the separation were the Anglicans. As early as 1806, the Christian Observer had called upon Evangelical churchmen to repair the "evil effects" of past indifference, and show a more active interest in the Jews. "Why should the Church of England," the Observer asked, "be the last to engage in this 'work of faith and labour of love'?" But for reasons of church order, the Anglicans would not patronize the L.M.S.'s Jewish mission, though behind the scenes, they may have helped to bring about the schism of 1809. Thereafter, however, prominent churchmen like Thomas Scott, Charles Simeon, Melvill Horne, Legh Richmond, William Marsh and Charles Sleech Hawtrey served the Society in one capacity or another. The London Society was equally successful in winning the patronage of Anglican nobility, politicians and prelates. In 1810 its Vice-Presidents included the Earl of Crawford and Lindsay and Lord Calthorpe. The second President of the Society, after Frey had voluntarily resigned the position in March

(1) There were, however, several evangelicals who opposed the Jewish mission for reasons quite independent of the dispute with the L.M.S. One such was William Jay eventhough his patronage was solicited by the London Society. L.S. Minutes, 5 June 1810; C. Jay, Recollections of William Jay (1859), p. 143.

(2) Christian Observer, April 1806, p. 254. It is difficult to say why Anglicans suddenly became interested in Jewish missions. One possible explanation might be the influence that men like William "Millennial" Marsh had on Anglican thinking. Marsh claimed that the heathen would be converted to Christianity after the Jews. See also J. Pratt, Eclectic Notes (2nd edn. 1865), p. 452.
1809, was Lord Barham to be followed in 1815 by Sir Thomas Baring. In 1813, the Duke of Kent became the Society's first royal patron. Prominent Anglican laymen and politicians included William Wilberforce, Thomas Babington and Lewis Way.

The attracting of episcopal support proved rather more difficult. In April 1809, the Archbishop of Canterbury was approached but with no apparent success. The Society then tried the Bishop of London who procrastinated for several years until 1814, when he could express himself friendly to the objects of the Society but did not openly subscribe to its activities, not surprisingly, since Randolph was a High Churchman who had previously opposed the Bible Society. By 1810, however, the Irish Bishop of Waterford agreed to become a subscriber, though it was not until 1813 that a Bishop, the Irish Bishop of Cloyne, actually became a Vice-President. Significantly, the Society had to wait until 1816, by which time it had fallen completely into Anglican hands, before an English or Welsh Bishop would accept the position of Vice-President.

The London Society's auxiliary system, like the auxiliary system of the Tract Society, was an innovation borrowed from the Bible Society in 1810 and it explains why Society patronage increased substantially after that year. But unlike the Bible or Tract Societies, several of the key London

---

(1) T. Halstead, Our Missions: History of the Principle Missionary Transactions of the London Society (1866), Appendix B.
(2) L.S. Minutes, 1 April 1809.
(4) L.S. Minutes, 2 Oct. 1810.
(5) Halstead, op.cit. Appendix B. One year later, the Bishops of Durham, Norwich and St. Davids consented to the use of their names in the dedication of the Society's Hebrew New Testament. L.S. Minutes, 14 Feb. 1814.
(6) Namely Dudley Ryder and Thomas Burgess.
Society auxiliaries were sectarian in makeup from the very start. For example, the Society's first auxiliary, established at Olney in 1810, was composed entirely of churchmen. On the other hand, when the Society's second auxiliary was formed later that year in the City of Westminster, London, it was composed almost exclusively of Dissenters. Already the Society was beginning to polarize into separate Anglican and Nonconformist camps. The parent society, on the other hand, was fairly well balanced between Church and Dissent. At first, Joseph Fox and then Judah Uzielli (representing the foreign churches) were the only secretaries of the Society, but in 1810, they were joined by Thomas Fry, Rector of Emberton, as the first Anglican Secretary. On Fox and Uzielli's retirement in 1812, the post of Foreign Secretary was abolished, but William Bengo Collyer, Independent minister at Hanover Chapel assumed the position as Secretary for the Dissenters. From 1810 to 1815, therefore, the secretariship of the London Society was evenly divided between the establishment and Dissent.

The first ten directors of the London Society in 1809 were all Nonconformist laymen with the exception of Frey, whose ordination was of questionable validity having been

(1) The Olney auxiliary was planned as early as 17 Nov. 1809, but did not come into existence until 9 Jan. 1810. L.S. Minutes, 17 Nov. 1809, 12 Jan. 1810. Its members included John Ousby, Thomas Fry, Legh Richmond, J.M. Longmire and T.S. Grimshawe.


(3) For example, when an 'auxiliary' was formed in Cambridge (known as the Foreign Corresponding Committee) its members were all churchmen. They included Jowett, Parish and Simeon. L.S. Minutes, 26 March 1811.

performed by the directors of the L.M.S. in an unusual ceremony, with a formula which permitted Frey to preach the Word but not administer the sacraments. The number of directors gradually increased, however, until 1812 when there were thirty-six members: twelve ministers and clergymen and twenty-four laymen. As far as we can tell, the clerical directors were also fairly well divided between Church and Dissent.

(ii) The Fundamental Principle

As with the Tract Society, a fundamental principle around which the various denominations could unite, was developed in stages by the London Society. The germ of such a principle was already evident in the Society's first half-yearly report, in which the founders "thought it proper and suitable, to the glory of God, to establish a Society for the SOLE purpose of exciting the attention of the Jews to the words of eternal salvation...and it is our earnest desire that the word denomination may be lost in that of Christianity, in support of an institution of such great importance." This declaration of policy was reiterated several months later at the founding of the Olney auxiliary, when Thomas Fry pledged to his Anglican colleagues that the London Society "...would confine themselves to the promotion of Christianity among the Jews, unconnected with any other object & that they would not give unnecessary offence to the Established Church." Consequently, when several different evangelical causes sought its support, they were usually turned away.

(1) See L.S. Minutes, 21 May 1812, 7 May 1813, 6 May 1814.
(2) Cited in Gidney, London Society Hist, p. 36.
(3) L.S. Minutes, 2, 12 Jan. 1810.
(4) As, for example, the Soup Committee in Spitalfields in 1810 and the Hoxton Friend in Need Society two years later. See L.S. Minutes, 6 March 1810, 23 June 1812.
Unlike the Missionary and Bible Societies, but like the Tract Society, the London Society never actually codified its fundamental principle in one document or in one form. Rather, the principle evolved over the years from the first simple statements of intent, into a more comprehensive declaration. Though Henry Handley Norris, a High Churchman, was hardly a friend of the Society, he was perhaps better able than most of its members to express the Society's principle in one cogent sentence. He thus summarized the Society's first and third reports:

...as it was the simple object of the Bible Society to circulate the Bible without note or comment, and thus enlist under their banners all who receive the Bible as the Word of God; so was it the object of the London Society...to limit themselves to the simple object that Jesus is Messiah, the Saviour of the world; leaving them, when thus instructed, to search the Scriptures and judge for themselves respecting all inferior points on which Christians themselves were not agreed; such being 'the Catholic spirit' indulged amongst themselves, 'that they should equally rejoice in the conversion of a Jew, whether within or without the pale of their own regular establishment.'

This principle was interpreted in different ways by different denominations. For example, G.B. Mitchell, Vicar of St. Mary Leicester, was obviously already concerned about the charge of irregularity which might be levelled against the Society when he told an assembly in 1813, "did this society interfere, in the slightest degree, with the sentiments of religion which the Jew might adopt when he embraced Christianity, I, for one, would cease to be a member of it; but being fully convinced from observation, that it takes no part in endeavouring to persuade the Jews to join one or the other Society of Christians - that it leaves

the matter entirely to themselves, I can cordially as a churchman unite with this society." On the other hand, a Quaker from Huntingdon, equally concerned about the role that his denomination would play in converting Jews, told a similar assembly one year later, "if the Episcopalian, by his outward and visible sign, can cause the poor Jew to see the need he has to be clothed in the inward and spiritual grace - if the Baptist, by his water, can cause the Jew to see the need he has of being washed in the laver of Regeneration - if we, by our internal light, can bring them to the knowledge, that the Lord's ear is ever open to the cry of the poor and the destitute, to revive the spirit of the humble - if by any means, and by any instrument, they are brought to the heaven of rest, we do rejoice, and we will rejoice."

The Society's fundamental principle, however, contained the seeds of its own destruction, rather as the fundamental principle of the L.M.S. had proved unworkable, especially for the Anglicans. The L.M.S. and the London Society were interdenominational missionary organizations (unlike the Bible and Tract Societies which were basically publishing houses) and as such, their objectives were similar. The L.M.S., as we have seen, hoped to establish undenominational mission stations to which the various evangelical denominations in Britain would send missionaries and financial support, but as an experiment in cooperation, this plan proved unworkable for 'regular' Anglicans, Wesleyans and Baptists.

(1) Ibid. p. 25 fn.
(2) Ibid. p. 25 f.
In theory, the London Society was based on the same undenom­
inational missionary principle. The Jews who were gathered
in and converted would decide for themselves the denominat­/ion to which they would affiliate. But in reality, the
London Society faced the same problems that the L.M.S.
had faced ten years before. On what denominational principle,
for example, would the Society's chapel in London be established?
By what theological formula would Jewish converts be nurtured
in Christian doctrine? By whom and in what mode would they
be baptized? Finally, how would they decide which denomination
to choose? Anglicans again became suspicious, as we shall
see, of the irregularities inherent in such a programme
when actually put into practice. The London Society had
learned nothing from the L.M.S.: its fundamental principle, for
almost identical reasons, was to prove untenable.

IV. The Society in Action

Since most of the London Society's early energies were
sapped by the controversy with the L.M.S., its programmes
were slow to start, but when it was properly launched, its
activities were carried on in four main areas.

From the beginning, the Society provided weekly lectures
and a sermon every Sunday for interested Jews and recent
converts, first at Thomas Beck's Calvinistic Methodist
meeting at Bury Street, and later at the Jews Chapel in
Spitalfields, bought by the Society in 1809. The Jews Chapel,
however, almost immediately caused problems for the Society's

---

(1) See Frey, Narrative, p. 267 f. For purchase of the Jews
Chapel (formerly the French Church) in Spitalfields, see
L.S. Minutes, 29 April 1809, 12 May 1809.
Anglican patrons portending an eventual schism. The problem was, of course, "'how the chapel could be conducted upon the [undenominational] principles held out to the public' since 'ministers of the Established Church could not consistently officiate with the Protestant Dissenters in the same place of worship.'" As a result, the Society was forced to establish two lectures; one given by the Dissenters at the Jews Chapel, and the other given by churchmen in various Anglican strongholds in London, until an episcopal chapel was acquired.

The second area of activity involved the controversial problem of Jewish education. Shortly after the Jews Chapel was opened, a 'general Free School' enrolling between 300 and 400 children was opened by the Society on the Lancastrian plan. It was hoped that by mixing Jewish with Christian children in the same school, Jewish parents would see social benefit in the attendance of their children. But the school appears to have been singularly unsuccessful. The Society then fulfilled an old promise, and opened its controversial Boarding School where Jewish children were to be fed, clothed and educated in isolation from home and community, and then bound apprentices to a Christian house of industry when their education was completed. According to Frey, twenty-four Jewish children were registered in the first year. Two other schools, a seminary under the superintendence of Thomas Fry, and a

(1) Norris, Origin of the London Society, p. 29 f.
(2) L.S. Minutes, 2 June 1809.
(3) Frey, Narrative, p. 271.
(4) Norris, op.cit. p. 38.
(5) Frey, op.cit. p. 270 f.
Sunday School was also established. The former was designed to provide missionary training for Jewish converts who would then carry on the Jewish mission amongst their own people; the latter was established to provide schooling for Jewish adults.

The third level of activity involved another controversial programme which had often been debated at the L.M.S. in former years; this was the establishment of a House of Industry for poor Jewish labourers. The House of Industry was founded "for poor Jews whose minds should become open to Christianity," to serve as an asylum from 'the persecutions of their unbelieving brethren,' and the prejudices entertained against them 'in uninformed Christian Society'; to provide them with the means 'of earning their bread,' and thus to render them, 'instead of being burthensome, profitable to the institution.'" For a time, Jewish labourers were employed in the House of Industry to manufacture candle-wicks and baskets; but the project did not pay, and it had to be terminated. A sister project to the House of Industry was an asylum "for the reception and employment of Jewesses,"

(1) Regarding Jewish missionaries, Thomas Babington said at the Society's sixth anniversary in 1815, "the Jews were the first missionaries, and it was more than probable that they were intended to be the last, since their dispersion into every nation of the earth seemed peculiarly to fit them for that service, when they should be converted to the faith of the Gospel." Cited in Christian Observer, 1815, p. 343. Cf. Norris, op.cit. p. 40 f; L.S. Minutes, 29 May 1810. Likewise, Charles Simeon believed that the Jews would perhaps be more effective than Christian missionaries, in converting the heathen nations to Christianity. See A.W. Brown, Recollections (1863), p. 304.
(2) L.S. Minutes, 9 Oct. 1810.
(3) Cited in Norris, op.cit. p. 41 f.
but it too proved to be financially unfeasible and had to be closed. Only a printing office, established by the Society to print its tracts and Bibles, provided stable employment for Jewish employees, though it too was forced to close down in 1818.

The fourth area of activity involved Society publications. Tracts, of course, had always been circulated by the Society. Later on, Hebrew Bibles and grammars were also printed on the Society press. A house journal called the Instructor was soon established, but like so many of the other projects, it quickly proved to be a financial failure. Its place was taken in 1813 by the Jewish Repository which thereafter served as a monthly periodical which communicated to Society patrons news about the Jewish people in general, and the proceedings of the Society in particular. In 1811, a library was established consisting of standard works in Hebrew literature and various tracts concerning past Jewish-Christian controversies.

With the opening of Palestine Place on 16 July 1814, all these activities were centralized in one large complex of buildings. Palestine Place at Bethnal Green consisted of a chapel for Christian Jews, an 'Operative Jewish Convert's Institution,' a chaplain's residence and a school. As we shall see, the management and financial support of Palestine Place proved to be the undoing of Anglican-Nonconformist cooperation in the London Society and led to schism in 1815. As might have been anticipated, the conflict was over the chapel which, when it was licensed by the Bishop of London

(1) Norris, op.cit. p. 43 f.
(2) Gidney, op.cit. p. 40 f.
(3) Ibid. p. 41 f.
could only be used by Anglican clergy.

There was much about the London Society that was admirable: its House of Industry, for example, provided employment for Jewish labourers who otherwise might have starved. But some of the methods used by the Society to convert the Jewish people upset even its most missionary-minded patrons. One of its critics left the following account of the methods used by Frey and his associates to bribe Jewish children away from their parents:

The mode of introducing themselves among these fruit and silk merchants was, first by purchasing some article to the value of a few pence and leaving a dollar or seven shilling piece for it, to the delight and astonishment of the youth, who returned thanks to the God of Israel for such a fortunate event; the same benevolent deed was acted again and again, when, at length, the snare-laid youth humbly solicits to know to whom he is indebted for such mighty goodness. The answer is - My dear child, this is nothing at all; I mean to make your fortune, if you take the FRIENDLY advise I shall give you, - accompanying the last words with a guinea or two. Before the youth has time to recover himself from his surprise, he is informed that such a lovely fine lad would look handsome in a new suit of clothes, and that if he will come next Sunday to hear Mr. Frey preach, he shall have as fine a suit as can be made.

These methods seemed uncomfortably reminiscent of days of persecution, when Roman Catholics had forcibly removed Jewish children from their parents to educate them as Christians. Though the London Society had no power of physical coercion, yet, as another critic pointed out, "...they know the power of money, and therefore...they TEMPT the Jew, by the offer of gratis maintenance and education, to do violence to their consciences by delivering up their children to them, to be fed the food forbidden by the Jewish nation, and educated as Christians."

Though many sincere evangelicals who patronized the London Society were motivated by Christian love for their poor Jewish brethren, there were, nevertheless, not a few who, by modern standards, treated the Jewish proselytes with insensitivity. They forced recently converted Jews, for example, to wear, as a badge of conversion, their native costumes instead of civilian clothes. This kind of activity brought on the Society well deserved criticism.

Unlike the other pan-evangelical institutions that we have examined, the London Society did not make a significant contribution to the field of interdenominational relations; rather it acted as a force in the opposite direction. Almost from its inception, Society meetings were the scenes of squabbling and tension between churchmen and Dissenters, causing it to dissolve as a pan-evangelical institution after only six years, and doing considerable damage to the wider Church-Dissent field of evangelical cooperation in the process.

(1) Sailman, op.cit. p. 45 f.
(2) Cf. E.M. Foster, Marianne Thornton (1956), pp. 82, 122 f.
Chapter Thirteen: The Internal Relations

From 1809 the London Society faced a number of serious internal problems, and if the case of C.F. Frey's ordination was in any way prophetic of future events, the Society was heading towards a confrontation between its Anglican and Nonconformist patrons even before its programmes had been established on a sound footing. Frey had received ordination in 1808 from the directors of the L.M.S., but, as we have seen, it was an ordination fraught with many difficulties. In the first place, it limited Frey's ministry only to the Jews; even then, he was not allowed to administer the sacraments. But more seriously, many people questioned the validity of an ordination sanctioned by a society that was not officially a church.

When the new London Society was founded in 1809, therefore, Frey once again pressed the issue of his ordination. The Society procrastinated over the matter for two years before any action was taken. It was not easy for the Society to decide into which denomination Frey should be ordained.

At first it was hoped that if Frey were ordained a Lutheran, it would be difficult to complain that favouritism had been shown to either the Dissenters or the Anglicans, but for some reason, even this compromise proved untenable. The Society stalled over the issue for another three years. In 1814, Charles Simeon, as the chairman of the subcommittee for management, recommended (probably under pressure from

---

(1) L.S. Minutes, 28 Nov. 1809.
(2) L.S. Minutes, 22 Jan. 1811.
(3) L.S. Minutes, 16, 19 Feb. 1811.
(4) According to William Dealtry, Frey made repeated applications at this time to the Bishop of Durham and the Archbishop of Canterbury for episcopal ordination, but without success. See W. Dealtry, Vindication, p. 198 f.
Frey himself) that Frey should receive Congregational ordination from Drs. Nichol and Collyer and four other Dissenters: but less than a year later the Society fell into Anglican hands and Frey was once again robbed of the ordination that he so much wanted and needed. After the schism that we will presently discuss, attempts were made to secure Anglican ordination for Frey, but this was refused by the Bishop of London ostensibly because Frey had not received a university education. By this time Frey had already fallen out of the Society's trust because of his sexual irregularities. He was rapidly 'banished' to America before he became a public embarrassment. The whole affair, however, only indicated how intractable denominational concerns were to a professedly undenominational society.

But there were far more significant issues around which Dissenters and Anglicans divided. At first these primarily concerned the Jews Chapel. In 1809, a subcommittee composed of the Anglican Thomas Fry, the Baptist Andrew Fuller and the

(1) L.S. Minutes, 29 Nov. 1814.
(2) L.S. Minutes, 1 March 1815.
(3) L.S. Minutes, 23 March 1815, 26 Dec. 1815.
(4) L.S. Minutes, 28 May 1816. The minute only talks about Frey's "gross improprieties." Even Norris was reluctant to mention the reason for Frey's fall from grace. See Norris, Origin of the London Society, p. 65. But the whole sordid story about Frey's adulterous affairs with Jewish converts is told in M. Sailman, The Mystery unfolded (1817) p. 45 ff. Frey had earlier been accused of carrying on an affair with a Mrs. Smith, the wife of an evangelical patron of the L.M.S.; but he was completely exonerated. See L.M.S. Jews Committee MSS: "Committee for Jews - Minutes," 15 Jan. 1807, L.M.S. Minutes, 19 Jan. 1807.
(5) L.S. Minutes, 25 June 1816. Frey later established the American Society for Improving the Conditions of the Jews in 1820. In 1827, he was finally ordained (a Baptist), and after a sojourn to the Continent, returned to the States to become an instructor of Hebrew at the University of Michigan. See J. Rumyanek, "Early Conversionist Activities in London: A Missing Chapter in Anglo-Jewish History," The Jewish Guardian, 29 May 1931, p. 8 f.
Independent Samuel Greatheed, were charged with the responsibility of deciding not only by what rite Frey was to be ordained, but also in what ways the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist would be administered at the Jews Chapel. We do not know what they finally recommended, but it was decided that only by conforming to the usages of the Church of England, would the chapel be consecrated by the Bishop of London. The directors of the Society must have been set back somewhat, however, when the Bishop of London refused to license the chapel, and it was necessary to secure a second chapel for the exclusive use of churchmen. From 1810 on, therefore, the Dissenters lectured at the Jews Chapel and the Anglicans either at Ely Chapel or other Anglican churches in rotation. Later, the general meetings of the Society were held alternately at both chapels.

Needless to say, some Dissenters did not like this development. The Westminster auxiliary, composed as it was of Dissenters, protested that if the Anglicans were allowed to hold lectures in the West End of London, they should be allowed to do likewise in their own chapels instead of being restricted to the Jews Chapel. Though we do not know what the parent society decided on this matter, the protest only underlined a general dissatisfaction amongst influential Dissenters with the way in which Anglicans seemed to dictate the Society's policy.

(1) L.S. Minutes, 28 Nov. 1809. Cf. A.L. Williams, Missions to the Jews (1897), p. 49 f.
(2) For application to bishop, see L.S. Minutes, 26 Jan. 1810.
(4) L.S. Minutes, 22 Oct. 1811.
(5) L.S. Minutes, 30 Oct. 1810.
(6) See for example L.S. Minutes, 20 Aug. 1811, 12 Nov. 1811.
In the meantime, several resolutions were passed by the parent society which probably only exacerbated an already tense situation. In December 1810, a resolution was carried in committee requiring students in the Society's schools to be provided with Anglican Prayer Books. Then in January 1811, another resolution was adopted confirming previous Society policy which required that public worship at the now Nonconformist Jews Chapel should still adhere strictly to the forms of the established Church. In other words, the Dissenters were required to conform to the usages of the Church of England in their own chapel even though the Anglicans worshipped elsewhere. Needless to say, not a few Dissenters began to question whether the Society's original intentions had not been violated.

In order to relieve the financial liability for two separate chapels, plans had been under way, as we have seen, as early as February 1811 to build a large complex in which all Society activities, including worship, would be centralized. The chapel of Palestine Place was opened by the Duke of Kent on 7 April 1814. It was subsequently licensed by the Bishop of London as an Anglican chapel and the Society immediately solicited clergymen throughout Britain to contribute to its upkeep. The only problem was, that the terms of the Bishop's license would not permit the Dissenters to officiate there.

(1) L.S. Minutes, 4 Dec. 1810; Cf. L.S. Minutes 26 April 1814.
(2) L.S. Minutes, 22 Jan. 1811.
(3) L.S. Minutes, 27 Feb. 1811.
(4) See Norris, Origin of the London Society, p. 76 fn.
(5) L.S. Minutes, 26 April 1814.
(6) L.S. Minutes, 31 May 1814.
(7) The chapel, along with the Palestine Place complex, was consecrated on 16 July 1814. L.S. Minutes, 28 June 1814. It was officially licensed under William Marsh's name. L.S. Minutes, 28 June 1814. Charles Sleech Hawtrey subsequently became the first chaplain. L.S. Minutes 30 Aug. 1814.
even though the chapel was originally intended to be used by all denominations.

The Society also faced financial problems, and here emerged the second important issue between Dissenters and Anglicans. The Society had faced serious financial difficulties from the beginning, but the construction of Palestine Place only thrust it deeper into debt. Because churchmen could not advocate the Society's cause in Dissenting pulpits nor the Dissenters in Anglican churches, it was decided on 31 May 1814, that for the purposes of taking collections and obtaining places of worship, there would be two subcommittees; one consisting of churchmen and the other of Dissenters. Though the two subcommittees were soon afterwards brought back together again as the Committee of Ways and Means, here was the first definite sign that schism was imminent.

By December 1814, not a few Anglican directors were unhappy about the way their Nonconformist colleagues seemed to financially impede the Society. The Society was in debt, they felt, primarily because the poorer Nonconformist churches that patronized it would not give it sufficient support. Consequently, a petition signed by the "Clergy of the Eclectic Society at Bristol" and drafted by Thomas Biddulph, Incumbent of St. James, strongly urged that the property and concerns

(1) Apparently there was an attempt to phase the Jews Chapel out of existence once Palestine Place was opened. But this was vetoed in committee. L.S. Minutes, 17 May 1814, 27 Sept. 1814, 25 Oct. 1814.
(2) See Norris, op. cit. p. 89 f.
(4) L.S. Minutes, 31 May 1814. The Church committee consisted of Basil Woodd, William Goode and William Gurney and later David Ruel, the Dissenter's committee of Alexander Fletcher, Joshua Webb and Henry Cox.
of the Society be divided between the C.M.S. and, ironically, the L.M.S. This plan was immediately disowned by the Anglican directors, but four days later, Charles Simeon proposed a modification of the Bristol Plan which, had it been accepted, would have divided the "spiritual concerns" of the Society between the Anglicans and the Dissenters in such a way that the Episcopal Chapel and school at Bethnal Green would be managed by the Anglicans, while the Jews Chapel and its school would be managed by the Dissenters. The printing office, House of Industry, and Female Asylum, on the other hand, would be jointly managed by a committee representing both groups. The debts of the Society would then be paid off, two-thirds by the Anglicans and the rest by the Dissenters. This plan was postponed and subsequently rejected, but it was finally decided to create two sub-committees, one composed of churchmen and the other of Dissenters, to take immediate steps in liquidating the Society's debts.

Behind the scenes, however, the Anglicans were doing everything they could to encourage the Dissenters 'voluntarily' to withdraw from the Society. Accordingly, the Anglican directors, backed up by a large grant of money from Lewis Way, offered to assume the entire debt, if the Dissenters would retire. The Dissenters met in caucus on 6 and 14 February, and reluctantly decided to accept the offer.

(1) L.S. Minutes, 23 Dec. 1814.
(2) L.S. Minutes, 27 Dec. 1814.
(3) L.S. Minutes, 31 Jan. 1815.
After the Dissenters had withdrawn, the Society's constitution was modified so that children under its patronage would be "instructed in the principles and according to the formularies of the United Church of England and Ireland" and public worship would be "conducted in strict conformity to the liturgy, and formularies of the Church of England as by law established." The Jews, however, did not have to profess episcopacy in order to receive Society patronage. As a kind of olive branch to the Dissenters, Dr. Collyer and the other Nonconformists on the old committee were offered honorary life memberships in the Society, but this they would not accept. From 1815 on, therefore, the evangelical mission to the Jews was an Anglican enterprise.

The London Society's fall into denominationalism portended the sectarian spirit that was mounting and later threatened the Bible Society and, less so, the Tract Society. The London Society remained an Anglican organization through the years and exists today as the Church's Ministry Among the Jews. There was an attempt in the mid 1820s to refound an interdenominational Jewish mission, but it did not meet with much success. The Philo-Judean Society was founded in 1826 by Henry Drummond and the same pre-millennialists who founded the Trinitarian Bible Society, but though it claimed interdenominational

(1) L.S. Minutes, 28 Feb. 1815.
(2) Loc. cit.
(3) L.S. Minutes, 25 April 1815.

Unlike the London Society, the Philo-Judean subordinated proselytizing activities to the business of fighting for the removal of Jewish civil disabilities in Parliament. See B.S. Home C.; J. Brown (Secretary of the Philo-Judean) to Bible Society, 6 Oct. 1826 for the enclosed circular of the Society. Significantly, Brown was asking only for Old Testaments. See also, The First Report of the Philo-Judean Society (1827), p. 9. Apparently, the London Society
support, it was, in fact, populated by the same Anglicans who led the schism from the Bible Society six years later.

Footnote Contd.

and the Philo-Judean were on friendly terms with each other. See L.S. Minutes, 16 Jan. 1827.
Epilogue

The pan-evangelical impulse was not dying by 1830. Though the London Society had emerged as an Anglican organization by 1815, and the L.M.S., for all practical purposes as a Congregational one three years later, the Tract and Bible Societies continued to expand. In 1825 the total annual receipts of the R.T.S. were a little over £10,000; by 1830, they had doubled to almost £25,000 and by 1840, had doubled again to £59,000. The Bible Society also grew. Though hurt financially by the Apocrypha and Tests Controversies, it nevertheless managed to circulate over 280,000 Bibles in 1825, 434,000 in 1830 and 776,000 in 1840. Both societies continued to function as a major unitive force in British ecclesiastical life. As auxiliaries expanded, they drew into the pan-evangelical movement larger numbers of people linking them and the religious bodies they represented and creating a network of formal and informal liaisons that by 1840 could be found operating in virtually every city and town and in many villages in Britain. The central committees of the various Tract and Bible Society auxiliaries like the parent committees in London, with their elected and appointed officials representing almost every denomination, were also linked to each other by way of a sophisticated system of interlocking directorates making each separate auxiliary part of one grand movement for church unity. Patronage of one society usually implied patronage of the other.

There were, of course, many other societies, and they played an equally important role in the continuing surge

(1) W. Jones, Memorials of the Tract Society, Appendix One.
(2) Browne, Bible Society Hist. II, p. 544.
of pan-evangelicalism. The range and variety of these insti-
tutions was phenomenal. As Sir James Stephen aptly put it:

Ours is the age of societies. For the redress of every
oppression that is done under the sun, there is a public
meeting. For the cure of every sorrow by which our land
or our race can be visited, there are patrons, vice-presidents
and secretaries. For the diffusion of every blessing of which
mankind can partake in common, there is a committee.

The proliferation of fund-raisers, each soliciting sub-
scriptions for his or her respective organization, became
so oppressive, that a pamphlet had to be written, instructing
would be targets of the fund-raiser's trade, how to evade
their hard (and not easily resisted) salesmanship.

Smaller interdenominational organizations like the
Sunday Schools continued to grow apace, and many new ones
appeared. Some, like the British Society for Promoting
the Religious Principles of the Reformation and the Young
Men's Christian Association, resembled the Tract and Bible
Societies in their avoidance of theological issues, choosing
as their agreed points of cooperation concerns that would
not offend denominational sensibilities. Others, like the
Association for Promoting Rational Humanity towards the
Animal Creation and the British and Foreign Temperance
Society, cooperated in issues that were entirely secular
in nature. For the most part, interdenominational societies
for religious purposes, in which evangelicals often worshipped
side by side, ceased to appear after the London Society and
the L.M.S. fell into denominational hands. This in itself
was significant, for though the spirit of evangelical union
continued into the nineteenth century, it lacked the kind

(2) See for example, The Art of Evading Charitable Subscription
by Nabal Junior (1815).
of idealism so characteristic of men like Samuel Greatheed and David Bogue and the early pan-evangelical organizations that they had been instrumental in founding. Indeed, by 1808, only ten years after Greatheed published his General Union Recommended, (the great manifesto of the pan-evangelical idealists) he was compelled to warn the interdenominational Devon Union against the rising tide of denominationalism.

Beware lest selfish and interested motives pollute, in the smallest degree, the measures that you use for the benefit of others... Are you displeased when your brethren differ from you in opinion concerning the steps by which your common object is to be pursued?... Is it only in proportion as converts are added to your religious party, or as the numbers of your own congregations increase, that you are gratified?... Examine yourselves, my brethren...

Seven years later, Greatheed's own Bedfordshire Union was plagued by a schism of several prominent Baptist patrons.

By 1830, most evangelicals were agreed, the early fervour of their 'idealistic' forefathers for union had waned.

Looking back in 1834 on the halcyon days of the L.M.S. when "the very union of Christians... excited the attention of the religious public," Richard Cope, a former L.M.S. director, lamented that the fading of the old fraternal spirit had led to a deterioration in evangelical spirituality as a whole. "Since that period," he wrote, "the zeal of Christians has generally declined; ordinary and extraordinary Prayer Meetings have no longer an attractive influence; our places of worship are but thinly attended [and] the number of communicants at the Lord's Table is comparatively few..." That same year

(1) S. Greatheed, The regard which we owe to the concerns of others (1808), p. 34 f.
the Evangelical Magazine declared its intention to adhere to "the true principles of catholic and comprehensive piety," in which the Magazine originated, but added that "in that adherence it will be impossible...to overlook the spirit of the age." That the 'realists' of pan-evangelical union had triumphed, there could be no doubt. Even James Bennett, friend and co-author of the classic history of Nonconformity, with David Bogue, the man who had declared in 1795 that bigotry was dead, wrote in 1839

> The perfection of union is...not to be hoped for, but by the perfection of holiness in heaven... There never was... and never will be, on earth, and, perhaps we may add, heaven too, any union among Christians, but that of affection.

How can one account for the decline not only of pan-evangelical 'idealism,' but of the urge towards associational cooperation between evangelicals, so powerful a few decades before? One answer lies in the troubled political state of the nation by 1830, not least in the politics of churchmanship. In a few years, the old ecclesiastical constitution of England changed drastically, and seemed on the brink of yet more drastic re-modelling. In 1828 Dissenters were freed from one of the symbols of their second-class citizenship, the disabilities imposed upon them by the Test Acts. Many Anglican Evangelicals approved of the repeal of the Tests, but not all; to some Ultras this seemed a step towards disestablishment and the laicization of government. Far more divisive was the issue of Catholic Emancipation which reached its climax in 1829. Evangelicals, anti-Romans to a man, fell apart over the Catholic question. There was a sharp division

---

(1) E.M. Preface, 1834, p. iv.
(2) J. Bennett, The History of the Dissenters during the last thirty years from 1808 to 1838 (1839), p. 379.
among Anglican Evangelicals as Wilberforce's parliamentary 'Saints' (for the most part) supported Catholic relief on the grounds of charitableness and political necessity, and Ultras like Sir Robert Inglis (and a large number of 1 Evangelical clergymen) opposed it. Nor were evangelical Dissenters more of one mind: middle class Nonconformists tended to take a liberal line, seeing an analogy between the Catholic and the Dissenting campaigns for greater religious equality: their lower class colleagues, including most Methodists, opposed it vehemently in an outburst of no-Popery hysteria. We have already seen the repercussions of this tension in the affairs of the Bible and Tract Societies, but it continued to bedevil relations between Nonconformists. Over Emancipation, Wesleyan Methodists were ranged against their more liberal Dissenting brethren; but even in the Dissenting camp, there was violent disagreement over the propriety of sponsoring the bill. As J.H. Hexter points out, "the Three Denominations...in Parliament favoured Catholic relief, while the rank and file they were supposed to lead marched in the opposite direction."

The issue of Parliamentary reform also had its repercussion on evangelical relations. The 'Saints', represented by the Christian Observer, supported the extension of the franchise to wider sections of the middle class, believing that in these lay the hearers of the great 'religious public' which had loyally abetted so many moral reform campaigns;

(3) Ibid, p. 316.
their inclusion in the political nation would only strengthen the cause of godliness and morality in English government. Evangelical Tories, especially among the clergy, tended to fear the new leverage given to the enemies of the Anglican establishment, understandably since the Reform Bill crisis had given new vehemence to critics of the state church. In the '30s, it seemed as though the establishment might fall beneath the attack of a motley army of would-be reformers: Utilitarians demanding a more practical and educational use of church endowments, Chartists calling for "more pigs and fewer parsons," Irish Catholics unwilling to pay tithes to a Protestant establishment, and above all, Nonconformist radicals — most of them good evangelicals. The alarming increase of Dissenting militancy disturbed many Anglican exponents of evangelical union. Though many Wesleyans still saw themselves as half way between Church and Dissent and kept aloof from the campaigns for disestablishment, many Quakers, Baptists and Congregationalists, waxed bellicose against the enormities of a state church. Few were more fiery than Thomas Binney, John Clayton's successor at King's Weigh House Chapel, who declared in 1833 that "it is with me, I confess, a matter of deep, serious, religious, conviction, that the Established Church is a great national evil; that it is an obstacle to the progress of truth and godliness in the land; that it destroys more souls than it saves; and that, therefore, its end is most devoutly to be wished by every lover of God and man." Comments like these provoked

the Evangelical clergyman Josiah Pratt, once a fervent supporter of interdenominational cooperation, to warn his colleagues one year later

The Dissenters are suffering as a religious body, irrecoverable injury, from having submitted themselves to the guidance of a few ambitious men among them. It is no longer Dissent for conscience sake, with the thankfulness for the quiet enjoyment of the privilege of worshipping and preaching according to their own judgment; but it is a claim to be placed on equal footing with the Church, and to have the Church separated from the State.

William Urwick, the Irish evangelical, lamented the havoc created by these divisions to the cause of evangelical fraternization. "The consequence has been, in one respect, distressing," he wrote to a friend in 1833, "it has, in many instances, caused a rupture between ministers of the Establishment and those of Dissenting communities, who had previously been in habits of cordial Christian friendship."

In the long run, theology was a more powerful solvent than politics of the early 'idealist' attitude towards evangelical union. Behind the pan-evangelical spirit lay, as we have often seen, the assumption that the essential doctrines of the Gospel were few, held by all the regenerate, and distinguishable from truths more peripheral which pertained (perhaps) to the fulness but not the kernel of the Christian faith. The movement was based on the idea of consensus; that issues divisive to unity could be suppressed or relegated to the outer margins. But could they? It seemed to some that enforced moderation and compromise was sometimes purchased at too high a price. Even the 'idealists' felt this from time to time. In 1808, for example, at a time when the L.M.S.

(2) W. Urwick, The Life and Letters of William Urwick (1870) p. 144.
and the Bedfordshire Union were passing through a period of tension, David Bogue spoke of the "reprehensibility" of those evangelicals who fell out over trifles, yet added significantly that there was an opposite extreme of doctrinal vagueness and flabbiness which was equally culpable. "When men yield, for the sake of peace, to impositions against which conscience revolts and which conscience condemns as sinful," he wrote, "they merit at least an equal degree of blame..." In the same year, the Christian Observer wrote feelingly "what we dislike above all things, is an association of abundant profession with scanty performance; - a junction of exact notions on general doctrine, with an indifferent judgment as to particular points of duty and of conduct." There seemed a danger that the glib, shallow platitudinous popular evangelicalism - the cheapened, trivialised Gospel of which many were beginning to complain - might be a legacy of too much interdenominationalism and the reduction of the Gospel to its minimal bones. Great and comprehensive religious systems like that of historic Calvinism, seemed to have been shrunken and disfigured by the demands of organizational amity. This, as we have seen, is why Hawker left the R.T.S.: his action was 'condoned; long afterwards, from a very different quarter, when R.W. Dale wrote of the Moderate Calvinists

They thought that while preserving the strong foundations of the Calvinistic theology and its method, they could modify some of the Calvinistic doctrines, which in their rigid form had become incredible to them. But they were attempting an impossible task, and doing an injustice to the constructive genius of their great master. They had not learnt that

(1) D. Bogue and J. Bennett, History of the Dissenters (1808-), I, p. 289 f.
(2) Christian Observer, Nov. 1808, p. 737.
theologians who begin with Calvin must end with Calvin. 'Moderate Calvinism' was Calvinism in decay.

The critique of pan-evangelicalism was here very similar to that levelled at American revivalists in the age of Moody and Sankey.

Another threat to the cause of evangelical unity lay, as we have seen continually, in the growing power of denominationalism. The Congregationalists had established a denominational union in 1806, but it had quickly collapsed when influential Independents refused to support it. Critics still believed that if there was to be a union, it should be one that comprehended all Protestant Dissenters; Presbyterians, Baptists, as well as Independents. The L.M.S., of course, helped to serve this function. By the '30s, however, feelings had changed. As the older ministers died or retired, their younger successors, in reaction to a brand of pan-evangelicalism that seemed to negate denominational tradition and heritage, repudiated the lofty 'catholic' ideals of their fathers, and supported the denominational movement with enthusiasm. The formation of denominational magazines to supplement or replace the *Evangelical Magazine* - the *Baptist Magazine* refounded in 1812 and the *Congregational Magazine* established in 1818 - set off a chain reaction which fed the movement to establish the Baptist and Congregational Unions in 1832. As the denominations expanded, they acquired their bureaucracies, official and unofficial, and competed energetically for membership according to the canons of Free Trade to which

(2) See A. Peel, *These Hundred Years* (1931), p. 12 f.
their members generally subscribed (the anti-state church movement rested its case partly on the way an established Church of England denied the law of 'free competition'). Historical interest (tinged by romanticism) revived in the Puritan past of the Dissenting denominations; consequently the peculiarities of each denomination seemed something to prize and accentuate. Throughout the course of the movement for evangelical unity, there had, as we have seen, been reactions against the submerging of heritage and tradition in the interests of consensus and unity. The Scots Presbyterian and English Anglicans were restive in the Apocrypha and Tests Controversies at the Bible Society; the Congregationalists uneasy in the Tract Society altercation over Milner's Church History. A correspondent of the Baptist Magazine, expressed this pride in denominational identity when he wrote in 1832, "I would yield to no man in affectionate regards for the interests of other religious communities, but I love my own denomination with strong attachment, and would not sacrifice my designation as a Baptist at any shrine." By this time the alarming reductio ad absurdum of the principle of Christian union seemed to have been reached by Broad Churchmen like Thomas Arnold, whose project for unity would (as J.H. Overton disapprovingly wrote) "have made the church so wide as to admit within its pale Dissenters of all kinds - Roman Catholics, Quakers and Unitarians excepted - without any compromise of principle on either side."

The period after 1830 then, saw growth for many charitable

---

(1) Baptist Magazine, March 1832, p. 100 f.
(2) J.H. Overton, The English Church in the Nineteenth Century (1894), p. 121.
and some religious organizations in which evangelicals of all kinds cooperated fraternally. But much of the bloom of the initial impulse seemed to have faded. Nothing, perhaps, mirrored this more than the Evangelical Alliance of 1845. The spirit of men like Greatheed, Bogue and Haweis had been positive, optimistic, mission-minded; that of the Alliance was defensive and anxious, even in some ways negative. It rested on hostility to the growth of Roman Catholicism and the Tractarian movement, whose Rome-ward tendencies, mirrored in the secession of Newman in 1845, were alarming. The Alliance was designed, as one of its circulars stated, to "associate and concentrate the strength of an enlightened Protestantism against the encroachments of Popery and Puseyism." Though the Alliance made, in many respects, an important contribution to church unity, its base was far narrower and more exclusive than its predecessors. Andrew Reed, an early patron of the Alliance, complained that though it "declared itself a Christian alliance it adopted a Protestant platform." Catholics, of course, were to be excluded, but so were the Quakers and Unitarians. Wesleyans and Baptists, though included, were sceptical about patronizing the Alliance for many of the same reasons which had led them to withhold support from the L.M.S. fifty years before.

So began a new movement in evangelical unity, but one that resembled little the pan-evangelical impulse of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

(2) A. Reed, Memoirs of the life and philanthropic labours of Andrew Reed (2nd edn. 1853), p. 228.
It will be apparent that the history of evangelical union movements before 1830 has implications for the ecumenical movement today. The controversies which this thesis has described at length may appear to be barren, but they often raise important problems which could be profitably studied by the architects of ecumenicalism, if the same pitfalls are to be avoided. The first problem involves the recurring issue of church polity and government. Will it ever be possible to find common ground upon which Christian denominations can join organically as one unified and undenominational Christian church? Can we close our eyes to the fact that not only there are basic differences between denominations, but that in Britain at least, Free Churches and National Establishments are based on different principles? The L.M.S. and the London Society unsuccessfully tried to overlook these differences either by regarding them as unimportant, or by pushing them into the background, hoping that in the general enthusiasm to convert the heathen and the Jew to Christianity, denominational peculiarities would pale into insignificance and Christians would be of one mind in their common mission. For English Independents and Presbyterians and Calvinistic Methodists, of course, this is exactly what happened. Anglicans, however, refused to patronize the L.M.S. because it ranked the national church as only one denomination among many and threatened to involve them in the founding and management of highly irregular undenominational mission churches which, by no stretch of the imagination, could be regarded as episcopally sanctioned. The London Society faced the same problem: its Anglican patrons demurred from supporting, and worshipping in, an episcopally unconsecrated chapel. Only
by cooperating in enterprises that avoided denominational issues - like the distribution of tracts and Bibles - could all denominations successfully cooperate with each other. But even then, the Tract and Bible Societies functioned under the continual fear that their simple alliance might break up over issues of polity and church government, as indeed almost happened during the Milnerian Controversy at the Tract Society.

The second problem involves the issue of theology. To what degree can the ecumenical movement base itself on a theology of consensus; that is, a theology that is so qualified that it offends no sensibilities? The reason why the L.M.S. functioned so successfully as a pan-evangelical organization, was because most of its patrons were Calvinists and paedobaptists, and the views of L.M.S. missionaries and directors did not have to be muffled. The situation at the Bible and Tract societies was radically different: here, opinions likely to cause discord were suppressed. Nevertheless, some began to question whether cooperation was worth the sacrifice of principles held to be sacred and important. Many committed Christians, as we have seen, were lost to the pan-evangelical movement because in it they saw the dangers of an emerging theological liberalism that required little belief or commitment.

Finally there was (and still is) the crucial problem of what church union implied. Was the association of evangelicals in their great societies to be an end in itself, leading to cooperation and fraternization, but no more? Or was this activity merely a prelude to organic union at some future date, in which evangelicals were to come together in one
great church, as Greethecd and other 'idealists' envisaged? Was the union brought about in evangelical-inspired societies intended to bring in merely those who shared the evangelical consensus, or to bring in those far beyond it? In adopting the latter tactic, the Bible Society enjoyed a remarkable degree of success - but faced a large degree of internal strife as a result of its inclusion of Quakers, Unitarians, and Roman Catholics. Many saw this as intolerable. 'Ecclesiastical anarchy', Socinianism, and Romanism, were three undesirable systems to most evangelicals. Who could predict what kind of harmful influence they might have on Protestant orthodoxy? Of course many evangelicals, especially the type of Anglican associated with the Clapham Sect, would have argued that the inclusion of non-evangelicals in the alliance might predispose them in favour of evangelical principles. Here 'union' might be seen as a concealed agency of proselytism, an organ of evangelical 'imperialism.' This aspect of some movements towards church unity has aroused criticism from modern opponents of ecumenicalism, Ian Henderson, for example, in his Power without Glory (1967), has viewed the ecumenical movement in Britain as a cloak for an Anglican take-over of other denominations. The same fears found expression in our period, as alarmed High Church Anglicans warned their Evangelical colleagues of the cloth that they were being lured away from the national, episcopal Church towards interdenominationalism which abandoned the apostolic order and was Dissent in disguise. Concurrently, some Dissenters, viewing the large degree of control exerted by Anglicans in the affairs of the societies, saw them as Trojan horses of the establishment. For all its carefully planned and well-
publicized equality, the pan-evangelical societies (with the exception, perhaps, of the L.M.S.) were in reality always dominated by the Anglicans who on a number of occasions—and the London Society is the best example—imposed their system on docile Dissenters who blindly submitted.

The ecumenical movement has not solved, perhaps may never solve, the problem of choice between the idea of organic unity and its alternatives of diversity-in-unity, or mere fraternization. Many would incline to Zinzendorf's conception, and cheerfully accept the benefits of pluralism within a framework of Christian amity. All, no doubt, would support the maxim attributed to Baxter and often quoted by the exponents of pan-evangelicalism

In things essential, unity; in things non-essential, liberty; in all things, charity.

APPENDIX A

Pan-Evangelical County Unions and Itinerant Societies between 1795 and 1799.

The Societas Evangelica (refounded in 1796), Village Itinerancy Society (1796) and London Itinerancy Society (1797) were all established (primarily by the same men) as interdenominational home missionary organizations. Though undenominational in design and opened to all evangelicals, they were patronized principally by the Calvinists. Itinerant preachers were employed by the societies to provide ministries for 'dark' country parishes as yet untouched by the Evangelical Revival. They engaged in open air preaching, distributed tracts and pamphlets, established Sunday Schools and even built chapels. Itinerancies were modeled on the system used by the Wesleyans and Lady Huntingdon's Connexion. See T.G. Crippen, "The London Itinerancy Society," Tr. Cong. Hist. Soc. VII (1918), p. 310; E.M. March 1796, p. 119; T. Timpson, British Ecclesiastical History (1838), pp. 553, 652; A. Reed, Memoirs of the Life and Philanthropic Labours of Andrew Reed (2nd ed. 1863), p. 17 fn; J. Waddington, Congregational History 1800-1850 (1878), p. 68. For a parallel Baptist development, see J. Ivimey, A History of the English Baptists (1830) IV, p. 68. MS minutes and correspondence of the Village Itinerancy Society and minutes of the Societas Evangelica are deposited at New College, London University.

The Bedfordshire Union of Christians was founded in 1797 by Samuel Gretheed to "restore the universal church of Christ to some measure of its primitive harmony," and to "spread more effectively the knowledge of the Gospel among mankind in general." See S. Gretheed, General Union Recommended (1798), p. xvii. Though meant to include all evangelical denominations, it was patronized primarily by Baptists and Independents. Still, several churchmen and Wesleyans supported it. See E.M. June, 1798, p. 256. Because there were so many open communion churches in Bedfordshire, the union worked especially well. For further details, see H.C. Tibbutt, Bunyan Meeting Bedford (1969); J. Brown, The History of the Bedfordshire Union of Christians (1946). MS minutes of the Union are deposited with Mr. Horace Gale, 2 Albany Rd, Bedford.

Other Pan-Evangelical Unions and Itinerancy Societies between 1795 and 1799 included:

The County Union in Cambridge. See E.M. June 1795, p. 257.


Union of Independent and Baptist Ministers in the Western Division of Kent. See E.M. Oct. 1798, p. 424.

The Society for the Propagating of the Gospel at Home. See E.M. 1798, p. 73; A. Haldane, The Lives of Robert... and his Brother James Alexander Haldane (1855), p. 177 f; R. Haldane, Address to the Public Concerning Political Opinions (1800), p. 64 f; and Appendix No. II, p. 6 f.


The Surrey Mission Society was founded by James Boden of Tooting in 1797 to "propagate the Gospel in the rural areas of England." It was composed of "Independents, Baptists and others..." See A.P.F. Sell, Congregationalism at Worpleston (1972), p. 3 f; T.G. Crippen, "The Surrey Mission," Tr.Cong.Hist.Soc. VI(1915), p. 297 f.

APPENDIX B

Location of L.M.S. Directors 1795-1830

* Each point represents one man. Cities with more than ten directors included London (223), Dublin (26), Edinburgh (19), Glasgow (16), Bristol (16), Manchester (12) and Paisley (11).
APPENDIX C

Biographies*

EDWARD BICKERSTETH (1786-1850)
After being employed in a number of occupations, Bickersteth settled down in 1806 to the work of a solicitor's clerk. He was also active at this time in the administration of the Widows' Friend and Spitalfield Benevolent Societies. In 1812, he entered into partnership with his brother-in-law as a solicitor in Norwich, but gave the legal profession up after three years to receive deacon's orders in the Church of England and to serve in Sierra Leone as an agent of the C.M.S. After his return to England, Bickersteth was engaged by the C.M.S. as one of its secretaries and travelled throughout Britain in its service. When he was in London, which was very rarely, he was assistant minister at Wheler Episcopal Chapel. In 1830, Bickersteth resigned the C.M.S. secretaryship and accepted the living at Watton Herts though he continued to travel as a C.M.S. agent. He provided the same service for the Tract and Jews Societies. A strong millenarian who had attended the Albury Conferences with Edward Irving, Bickersteth supported the Pro-Test Party during the Tests Controversy at the Bible Society, but he did not leave it in 1832. Instead, he patronized both the older society and the Trinitarian Bible Society. Prominent in the Evangelical Alliance of 1845, Bickersteth was a militant anti-Tractarian. He was a director of the R.T.S. from 1816 to 1825.

THOMAS TREGENNA BIDDULPH (1763-1838)
Born at Claines in Worcestershire, Biddulph spent his early life in Padstow Cornwall where his father was vicar of the local parish church. He was educated at the Truro Grammar School and at Queens College Oxford from which he graduated in 1784. Ordained deacon one year later for the Curacy of Padstow, Biddulph became in 1793 the Incumbent at Bengeworth near Evesham and from 1799 until his death, Rector of St. James's Bristol where he became famous as an Evangelical preacher. In 1798 he established the Zion’s Trumpet which later evolved into the Christian Guardian. Biddulph was a strong advocate of both the Bible and the Jews Societies.

DAVID BOGUE (1750-1825)
Bogue was born at Hallydown Berwickshire and educated at the University of Edinburgh. After a number of ministerial positions, he became the Independent minister at Gosport where, in 1780, he opened an academy for Independent ministers. Active in many pan-evangelical enterprises, Bogue was a founding father of the L.M.S. and a director from 1795 to 1825. His academy was later used by the L.M.S. as a seminary for its missionaries.

* The biographies of well-known evangelicals have not been included in this section. Unless otherwise indicated, these men appear in the D.N.B. All were patrons of the Bible Society.
ANDREW BRANDRAM (d. 1850)
Brandram was educated at Oriel College Oxford from which he graduated in 1813 to become Curate of Beckenham in Kent. Following John Owen's death in 1822, he was the Anglican Secretary of the Bible Society. See W. Canton, *Bible Society Hist.* I, p. 333.

GEORGE BURDER (1752-1832)
Born in London to parents who had been converted by George Whitefield, Burder was early interested in art and subsequently took drawing lessons from Isaac Taylor, the famous line engraver. After studying at the Royal Academy, however, he was converted by the sermons of Romaine and Whitefield and with the encouragement of Fletcher of Madeley, became an evangelical preacher. In 1778, Burder was ordained pastor of the Independent chapel in Lancaster, but spent most of his time itinerating. He later removed to West Orchard Chapel in Coventry where, in 1785, he established the first Sunday School in the area. Burder was also instrumental in founding in 1793, the Warwickshire Association of Ministers for the Spread of the Gospel at Home and Abroad. After moving to London as minister of Fetter Lane Independent Church, he became involved in a number of pan-evangelical activities. He was a founding father of the L.M.S. serving as one of its secretaries from 1803 to 1827. He was also editor of the *Evangelical Magazine* in 1803 in succession to John Eyre, and the founder of the R.T.S. which he also served as a director from 1803 to 1806.

JOSEPH BUTTERWORTH (1770-1826)
The son of a Baptist minister in Coventry, Butterworth at an early age went to London where he founded a large and lucrative book-selling business on Fleet Street. His home was a central meeting place for the leading evangelical philanthropists of the day and it was here that some of the early Bible Society meetings took place. Butterworth was M.P. for Coventry from 1812 to 1818 and then for Dover from 1820 to 1826. A convert to Methodism, he was General Treasurer of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society from 1819 until his death. Butterworth was also prominent along with Adam Clarke, his brother-in-law, in Bible and Tract Societies activities.

JOHN CAMPBELL (1766-1840)
A school-mate of Sir Walter Scott in Edinburgh where he was born, Campbell was a founder of the Edinburgh Tract Society in 1793 and also an early advocate of Sunday Schools in Scotland. It said that he and James Haldane once established sixty Sunday Schools in one week. At first an itinerant preacher, Campbell was later ordained to become in 1802 the Independent minister at Kingsland Chapel in London. Two times (1812-1814 and 1819-1821) he served the L.M.S. as an agent in South Africa, travelling over four thousand miles in its service. He was a director of the L.M.S. from 1796 and of the Tract Society from 1804.
ADAM CLARKE (1762-1832)
Born in Northern Ireland, Clarke was educated at Wesley's Kingswood School near Bristol. In 1778 he became a Methodist passing through the stages of local to regular preacher without much formal education. He was appointed to his first circuit in Wiltshire in 1782. A great admirer of Wesley, Clarke was also on very friendly terms with a number of prominent Anglicans. He was a popular preacher and three times (1806, 1814, 1822) filled the presidential chair at Conference. Clarke was also a noted scholar of Oriental languages and could read Hebrew, Syriac, Persian, Sanskrit and several other Eastern tongues with great facility. He was so valuable to the Bible Society as a translator, that his denomination took the unprecedented action of allowing him to stay permanently in London. Clarke's most important literary achievement was his commentary on the Bible in which he maintained, among other things, that Eve was tempted by a baboon rather than a snake and that Judas Iscariot was saved. Though he maintained the divinity of Christ, he denied the eternal sonship.

WILLIAM BENGO COLLYER (1782-1854)
Educated at Homerton College in 1798, Collyer became minister of a small Independent church in Peckham in 1800 which was subsequently rebuilt and reopened as Hanover Chapel in honour of the monarch. A close friend of the royal family, he was the Nonconformist Secretary of the London Society and a director of the L.M.S. from 1802 to 1829. In later years he also occupied the pulpit at Salters' Hall.

WILLIAM DEALTRY (1775-1847)
Dealtry was educated at Trinity College Cambridge where he became a Fellow in 1798. He served as a professor of mathematics at the East India College in Haileybury between 1805 and 1813 later succeeding John Venn as the Rector of Clapham which he served from 1813 to 1843. Dealtry was Chancellor of the Diocese of Winchester from 1830 to 1835 and the Archdeacon of Surrey from 1845 until his death. He was an advocate of the Bible Society and defended it from High Church attacks in several important pamphlets.

GREVILLE EWING (1767-1841)
Born in Edinburgh and educated at the university there, Ewing was licensed in 1793 as assistant minister in one of Lady Glenorchy's chapels. He took an active part in the founding of the Edinburgh Missionary Society becoming its first Secretary in 1796. Ewing also served as editor of the Missionary Magazine. In 1798, he resigned his position in the Scottish establishment to become minister of the first Independent church in Glasgow, a position that he held until 1836. Ewing was tutor of the Glasgow Theological Academy from its foundation in 1809 until 1836 and in 1812 helped to form the Congregational Union of Scotland.

JOHN EYRE (1754-1803)
Eyre was born at Bodmin in Cornwall and educated at the Bodmin Grammar School. He was apprenticed a clothier in Tavistock when fifteen but soon afterwards became an itinerant preacher in the town. After receiving further education at Trevecca College, he itinerated for Lady Huntingdon. In 1778 Eyre entered Emmanuel College Cambridge and was shortly afterwards
ordained a priest by Bishop Thurlow. In 1799 he was Curate of Weston, then in 1781 Curate to Cecil at Lewes before moving to St. Giles Reading where he served under W.B. Cadogan. From 1785 until his death, Eyre was minister at Ham's Chapel in Homerton where he was involved in a number of pan-evangelical activities including the Village Itinerancy Society which he founded in 1796, the L.M.S. of which he was a director and Secretary from 1795 to 1802, and the Tract Society which he served as a director from 1799 until shortly before his death. He was also a founder of the Evangelical Magazine and its editor from 1793 until 1802.

THOMAS FRY (1775-1860)
Born in Somerset, Fry was educated at Oriel College Oxford from which he graduated in 1796. He later became a Fellow of Lincoln College Oxford before being elected in 1803 Chaplain of the Lock Hospital in London in succession to Thomas Scott. Here he met Legh Richmond, his lifelong friend. In 1804 he was instituted on his own presentation Rector of Emerton near Olney, but with the aid of a curate, continued his London chaplaincy. Fry was the Anglican Secretary of the London Society from 1810 until 1814. See J. Foster, Alum. Oxon.

WILLIAM GOODE (1762-1816)
Goode was born in Buckingham and received his education at the Newport Pagnell Academy and from Magdalen Hall Oxford from which he graduated in 1784. He was Curate of Abbots Langley and then Kings Langley in Herts before moving to London in 1786 as the Curate to William Romaine at St. Andrews. When Romaine died in 1795, Goode became the rector. He was Secretary of the Society for the Relief of Poor Pious Clergymen of the Establishment Residing in the Country in 1795 and a director of the R.T.S. from 1810 to 1814.

SAMUEL GREATHEED (d. 1823)
Born in London, Greatheed spent the early years of his life as a military engineer in Canada before studying for the ministry at the Newport Pagnell Academy in 1784. After a brief ministry in Woburn, he returned to Newport Pagnell to become minister of the local Independent church and to teach at the Academy. Greatheed was the founder of the Bedfordshire Union of Christians in 1797 and the first Editor of the Eclectic Review in 1805. He was a director of the L.M.S. from 1795 until 1821. See J. Morison, Fathers and Founders, II, p. 287 ff.

JOSEPH JOHN GURNEY (1788-1847)
Gurney was born at Earlham Hall near Norwich, the son of John Gurney the well known Quaker banker. He studied in Oxford under the tuition of a private tutor though he never became a member of the University because he was a Dissenter. In 1816 he was called to be a minister among the Friends and commenced his evangelical activities. Gurney was involved in prison reform with his sister Elizabeth Fry and in the anti-slavery movement with Granville Sharp and William Wilberforce. On a tour of the United States many years later, he was invited
to speak before the House of Representatives after which he was greeted by President Van Buren. A director of the Tract Society from 1829, Gurney was perhaps best known in evangelical circles for his patronage of the Bible Society.

ROBERT HALDANE (1764-1842)
Born in London of wealthy parents, Haldane began his education at the University of Edinburgh, but failing to complete his course of study, went to sea as a midshipman in the navy. After his tour of duty was over, he came under the influence of David Bogue who convinced him to return to the university to finish his theological studies, but after two sessions at Edinburgh followed by a 'grand tour' of the Continent, he settled down to the life of a country gentleman on his ancestral estate at Airthrey. With the outbreak of Revolution in France, Haldane, along with Bogue and several other evangelicals, made some unfortunate political statements which discredited him in the eyes of Evangelical churchmen and ruined his bid in 1796 to establish a mission in India under the auspices of the East India Company. In 1799, Haldane left the Church of Scotland to become an Independent and to organize with his brother James, chapels on the Whitefieldite model throughout Scotland. To provide pastors for his chapel, he founded a seminary which he maintained at his own expense. In 1808, Haldane became a Baptist precipitating a bitter controversy between himself and his former colleague Greville Ewing several years later. In 1816, he moved to Geneva where he launched an evangelical campaign on the Continent largely aimed against the Socinians. The next year he moved to Montauban where, under Bible Society auspices, he published at his own expense, an edition of the Bible in French. Haldane returned to Scotland and his new estate at Auchingray Lanarkshire in 1819 and played a key role in both the Apocrypha and Tests Controversies at the Bible Society. He was a director of the L.M.S. from 1796 to 1804.

ROBERT HALL (1764-1831)
Hall was born at Arnesby the youngest of fourteen children. A precocious youth, it was said that before he was nine, he had written several hymns and that at eleven he preached at a religious meeting in the house of Beeby Wallis of Kettering. In 1776, Hall studied at Northampton under the tuition of John Collett Ryland entering two years later the Baptist Academy in Bristol then under the supervision of Caleb Evans. He was subsequently set apart for the ministry in 1780 but continued his education at Kings College Aberdeen from which he graduated in 1784. One year later he was back in Bristol as Evan's assistant at Broadmead Chapel but resigned in 1790 to succeed Robert Robinson in Cambridge. Because of bad health (reported to be touches of insanity that was treated with opium), Hall removed to Harvey Lane Baptist meeting in Leicester in 1807 where ten years later he preached his famous sermon on the death of Princess Charlotte. In 1826 he moved once again to Bristol to succeed John Ryland at Broadmead where he died five years later of heart disease. Hall, perhaps one of the most catholic-minded Baptists, patronized the London Society, Bible Society and R.T.S.
WILLIAM ALERS-HANKEY (d. 1859)
Educated at the University of Edinburgh from which he graduated in 1789, Alers-Hankey moved to London to establish a banking house on Fenchurch Street. A member of the Stepney Independent Church of which he was a deacon in 1801, he was also actively engaged in several pan-evangelical enterprises. He was a director of the L.M.S. from 1801 to 1828 serving as its Secretary after 1816. He was chairman of the Committee for Jewish Affairs but later patronized the London Society after its separation in 1809 forced the L.M.S. to discontinue its mission to the Jews. A director of the Tract Society from 1801 to 1813, Alers-Hankey also attended the founding meeting of the Bible Society. See J. Kennedy, A Sermon preached on occasion of the death of William Alers-Hankey (1859).

JOSEPH HARDCASTLE (1752-1819)
A merchant by profession, Hardcastle was a member of the Independent chapel at Bury Street in London though he often communicated in the Church of England. He was a friend of Clarkson and the Anti-Slavery Society often met at 'Hatcham' his country home. Hardcastle was a close friend of many Clapham Sect Evangelicals, a position which earned him an appointment in the Sierra Leone Company as one of the only non-Anglican directors. The Missionary, Tract and Bible Societies, of which he was a director, all met for a time at his business premises in London. Hardcastle was Treasurer of the L.M.S. and the Village Itinerancy Society. See J. Morison, Fathers and Founders, I, p. 29ff.

THOMAS HAWEIS (1734-1820)
Haweis was born in Redruth Cornwall and educated at the Truro Grammer School. His university career was spent first at Christ Church Oxford and then Magdalen Hall from which he graduated in 1755. In 1757 he was appointed Chaplain to the Earl of Peterborough and Curate of St. Mary Magdalen Oxford but was removed from the latter because of his Methodist sympathies. He was subsequently Martin Madin's assistant at the Lock Chapel in London and then from 1764 until his death, Rector of Aldwinckle in Northamptonshire. Haweis was also Chaplain to the Countess of Huntingdon and a Trustee of her connexion from 1791. He was a founding father of the L.M.S. and a director from 1795 to 1819.

ROBERT HAWKER (1753-1827)
Born in Exeter, the son of a surgeon, Hawker became an assistant surgeon in the Royal Marines after studying medicine. In 1778 he entered Magdalen Hall Oxford becoming the same year the Curate of St. Martin near Looe in Cornwall and then in 1784, Vicar of Charles near Plymouth after a period there as curate to John Bedford. In 1802, Hawker founded the Great Western Society for Dispersing Tracts among the Poor but he was also a patron of the Tract Society from its founding until about 1808. Hawker was also a director of the L.M.S. from 1802 to 1808.
ROWLAND HILL (1744-1833)
Educated at Eton and St. John's College Cambridge from which he graduated with honours in 1769, Hill was refused ordination by six bishops in succession before he was finally ordained in 1773 to deacon's orders as Curate of Kingston in Somerset. But he never became a priest. An itinerant preacher much of his life, Surrey Chapel was erected for him in 1783 where he remained until his death. Hill was a proponent of Sunday Schools, thirteen of which were connected with his chapel. He was a director of the L.M.S. from 1795 and of the R.T.S. from 1799 to 1804.

JOSEPH HUGHES (1769-1838)
Hughes was educated at Aberdeen University where he founded the first Sunday School in the district. For a time a tutor at the Baptist college in Bristol, he subsequently moved to London as the Baptist pastor in Battersea where he was close friends with many Clapham Sect Evangelicals. Hughes was Secretary of both the Tract and Bible Societies. See J. Leifchild, Memoir of the late Rev. J. Hughes (1835).

WILLIAM JAY (1769-1853)
A pupil of Cornelius Winter of Marlborough, Jay, at the tender age of nineteen, preached a series of discourses for Rowland Hill at Surrey Chapel in 1788 which brought him some fame. For a time he was a minister at Christian Malford near Chippenham and at Hotwells where he officiated in Lady Maxwell's Hope Chapel, but moved in 1791 to Bath where he was ordained the Independent minister of Argyle Chapel. Jay remained in Bath for the rest of his life though for a time he supplied Surrey Chapel six weeks during the year. He was a director of the L.M.S. from 1812.

JOHN LOVE (1757-1825)
Educated at the University of Glasgow, Love served as a minister in Paisley, Rutherglen, and Greenock before accepting a call to the Artillery Street Presbyterian chapel in London. He was subsequently one of the first secretaries of the L.M.S. before moving back to Scotland to serve as minister of the Clyde Street chapel in Anderston in 1800. Love was later Secretary of the Glasgow Missionary Society.

CHARLES MIDDILTON, LORD BARHAM (1726-1813)
Middleton was born in Leith Scotland. A sailor by profession, he won many honours while the captain of several warships. In 1778 he was appointed comptroller of the Navy, an office he held until 1790. He was created a Baronet in 1781, and after being elected an M.P. for Rochester, was promoted to the rank of Rear Admiral in 1787, Vice Admiral in 1793 and Admiral in 1795. From 1794 to 1795, Middleton was one of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty under the Earl of Chatham. After the resignation in 1805 of Lord Melville, a near relative, he was appointed First Lord of the Admiralty and raised to a peerage. Lord Barham was second President of the London Society from 1810 to 1811.
SAMUEL MILLS
Mills was a leather merchant who resided at Russell Square in London. He subsequently sold his business to Robert Steven. Mills was the only Anglican founder of the R.T.S. which he served as director from 1799 to 1809. He was also a founding father of the Bible Society and drafted its first plan in 1803 when it was being discussed at the Tract Society. In 1810, he was elected a director of the L.M.S. See J. Morison, Fathers and Founders, II, p. 577.

WILLIAM NEWMAN (1773-1837)

JOHN OWEN (1766-1822)
A graduate of Corpus Christi College Cambridge in 1788, Owen was appointed Curate of Fulham in Middlesex by Bishop Porteus in 1795 after a tour on the Continent which, significantly, brought him into contact with religious conditions in revolutionary France. He later served as Rector of Pagglesham in Essex in 1808 afterwards becoming minister of the Park Street Chapel in Chelsea when Bishop Randolph deprived him of his living for being Secretary of the Bible Society.

LEGH RICHMOND (1772-1827)
Richmond was born in Liverpool and educated at Trinity College Cambridge from which he graduated in 1794. After a short residence in Cambridge, he was ordained Curate of Brading and Yaverland on the Isle of Wight where, shortly afterwards, he was converted to evangelical principles by reading Wilberforce's Practical View. It was also here that Richmond collected material for his famous Dairyman's Daughter which was subsequently published by the R.T.S. In 1805, Richmond was appointed a chaplain of the Lock Hospital in London where he became close friends with Thomas Fry, future Secretary of the London Society. He then moved to Bedfordshire as Rector of Turvey in succession to Erasmus Middleton and stayed there until his death. Richmond was the first Anglican Secretary of the R.T.S.

JOHN SHORE, LORD TEIGNMOUTH (1751-1834)
Educated at Harrow, Shore went to India in 1768 as a writer in the East India Company. After holding several important offices, he gained the confidence of Lord Hastings and subsequently became in 1793 the Governor General. In 1798 he moved back to England where he was created Baron Teignmouth. Teignmouth was a member of the Board of Control and Privy Council, but he devoted most of his time to the Bible Society which he served as President. A recognized scholar of Persian and the Indian dialects, Teignmouth made several important contributions to Bible Society translations.
WILLIAM SHRUBSOLE (1759-1829)
Apprenticed to a shipwright in Sheerness, Shrubsole came to London in 1785 as a clerk in the Bank of England. He subsequently became Secretary of the Committee of the Treasury. An occasional communicant at Blackfriar's parish church, Shrubsole became a member of Whitefield's Tabernacle in 1791 where he was close friends with Matthew Wilks, the minister. He was a director of the L.M.S. from 1798 to 1829 serving as one of its secretaries, and a director of the Tract Society from 1800 to 1819.

RICHARD WALDO SIBTHORP (1792-1879)
Born at Canwick Hall near Lincoln, the son of Colonel Humphrey Waldo Sibthorp, M.P. for Lincoln, Richard was educated at the Westminster School and Magdalen College Oxford. Attracted from youth to the Roman faith, he spent a university term in Wolverhampton with Bishop Milner with the intention of entering its communion, but he was forcibly prevented from doing this by his family who sent him back to Oxford. After graduating in 1813, Sibthorp was appointed Curate of Waddington and Harmston in Lincolnshire and three years later, Curate to John Scott at St. Mary's Hull. In 1818 he was elected Fellow of his college and one year later received the living at Tattersall in Lincolnshire. In 1825 Sibthorp was appointed minister of Percy Chapel in London which he served simultaneously with an evening lectureship at St. John's Chapel Bedford Row then under the ministration of Baptist Noel. In 1829 he gave up his connection with the London chapels to reside on his Fellowship at Magdalen College Oxford. From then until 1841 he was also the incumbent at St. James' Church Ryde on the Isle of Wight. Between 1841 and his death, Sibthorp entered the Roman Church twice: the first time in 1841 as a priest at the Cathedral Church of St. Chad in Birmingham and the second time in 1865 at the Cathedral of St. Barnabas in Nottingham. However he was buried in Lincoln Cathedral according to the rites of the Church of England. Sibthorp was an agent for the Bible Society following the Apocrypha Controversy and inspected the Continental societies. He was also Secretary of the Tract Society in succession to Legh Richmond.

ROBERT STEVEN (1754-1827)
Steven was born in Glasgow where he attended the university for a time before joining his father's business as a tanner. In 1775 he moved to London where he established his own leather business after buying the factory owned by Samuel Mills, his future colleague in a number of pan-evangelical activities. Steven was brought to evangelical principles under the ministry of James Knight, the Independent pastor at Collier's Rent. He then became a member of George Clayton's Independent chapel at Walworth. Steven was an intimate friend of a number of Evangelicals including Richard Cecil, John Newton and Thomas Scott and knew most of the prominent evangelical Nonconformists of the day. A founder of the Hibernian Society, he was also involved in the L.M.S. of which he was a director from 1795 to 1825, and the R.T.S. which he served in a similar capacity from 1804 to 1818. Steven was also a frequent agent of the Bible Society especially during the Apocrypha Controversy. See J. Morison, Founders and Fathers, II, p. 575.
C.F. STEINKOPF (1773-1859)
Born at Ludwigsburg in Germany, Steinkopf was educated at the Evangelical Theological Seminary at Tübingen which he entered in 1790. In 1795, he was appointed Secretary of the Christian Society in Basel which was a central clearing house for a number of evangelical enterprises. In 1801, Steinkopf came to London as Pastor of the German Lutheran congregation assembling in the Savoy. He was engaged in many evangelical activities and at one time served simultaneously as the Foreign Secretary of the Missionary, Tract and Bible Societies. See W. Canton, Bible Society Hist. I, p. 43.

CHRISTOPHER SUNDIUS (d. 1835)
Sundius was born at Allerum in Sweden, the son of the rector of the local parish church. After a period of study at the University of Lund, he entered the naval college at Carlskrona as a naval cadet. During the War of American Independence, Sundius fought on the British side but resigned from the Swedish navy in 1780 when ordered to transfer his services to France in that country's war against Britain. He subsequently became a British citizen and served as the Government Translator to the Board of the Admiralty, a position he held until 1829 while engaged in a number of private commercial ventures. Sundius was converted by Wesley circa 1780 and became a Wesleyan shortly afterwards. He later married Jane Vazeille, Wesley's step granddaughter and played a very influential role in the Methodist Conference. A director of the L.M.S. from 1797 to 1802 and of the R.T.S. from 1801 to 1806, Sundius was also present at the founding meetings of the Bible Society in 1804 and later received an appointment as Honorary Governor for Life. See Wesleyan Methodist Magazine, March 1904, p. 215 f.

JOSEPH TARN (1766-1837)
A convert of Cecil, Tarn was a lay trustee of the Spa Fields Chapel and numbered himself a Calvinistic Methodist. He was a founder in 1800 of the Society for Distributing Evangelical Tracts Gratis which merged that year with the R.T.S. Tarn was the Accountant of the Bible Society and its Assistant Secretary from 1804 until his death. He was also a director of the Tract Society from 1800 to 1820 and of the L.M.S. from 1802. When he moved to Islington, Tarn joined the undenominational Union Chapel where he served as a deacon. See E.M. May 1837, p. 212 f.

JOHN TOWNSEND (1757-1826)
Townsend was educated at Christ's Hospital in London and Trevecca College. In 1781 he was ordained pastor of the Independent Church at Kingston in Surrey before moving to Bermondsey where, with the assistance of H.C. Mason, the local rector, he founded the London Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb in 1792. Townsend was a director of the L.M.S. from 1796 to 1825 and of the R.T.S. from 1800 to 1819.
ALEXANDER WAUGH (1754-1827)
Waugh was born at East Gordon in Berwickshire and educated at the Universities of Edinburgh and Aberdeen. Minister of the parish church at Melrose in 1780, he received a call to the Wells Street Presbyterian Chapel in London two years later. Waugh was a director of the L.M.S. from 1795 to 1827 and of the R.T.S. in 1799.

MATTHEW WILKS (1746-1828)
Born in Gibraltar, the son of an army officer, Wilks was converted to evangelical principles by the Rev. W. Percy, the Rector of Bromwich. After receiving his theological training at Trevecca College, he accepted a call to Whitefield's Tabernacle in London. He was a founder of many evangelical enterprises including the Evangelical Magazine the catholic principle of which was adopted at his suggestion. Wilks was a director of the L.M.S. from 1795 to 1828 and of the R.T.S. from 1799 to 1807.

BASIL WOODD (1760-1831)
Woodd was born at Richmond in Surrey and educated at Trinity College Oxford from which he graduated in 1783. He was Lecturer at St. Peter's Cornhill in 1784 and Morning Preacher at Bentinck Chapel one year later. Bentinck was a proprietary chapel and Woodd purchased its lease in 1793. In 1808 he was instituted Rector of Drayton Beauchamp in Buckinghamshire. A patron of the Bible Society, he was Secretary of the London Society in succession to Thomas Fry.
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Dear Sir:

Please note that my book, Evangelicals United, which is based on my Oxford D.Phil. thesis is now in print. It can be purchased through Bailey Brothers and Swinfen, Ltd., Warner House, Folkestone, Kent CT19 6PH.

I bring this to your attention because one chapter of the book is on the early history of an organization called 'The Church's Ministry Among the Jews' the MSS of which are now deposited in the Bodleian Library. I hope that you might pass this information on to whomever at the Bodleian is in charge of acquisitions.

Sincerely,

Roger H. Martin
Associate Dean
Abstract

"The Pan-Evangelical Impulse in Britain 1795-1830: with special reference to four London societies."

The fifty years or so between the last decade of the eighteenth century and the third decade of the nineteenth - wedged in as they were between the Evangelical Revival on one side and the Oxford movement on the other - have unfortunately received little attention from British church historians and students of the ecumenical movement. Yet it was during these years that British Christians - churchmen and Dissenters alike - participated together for the first time in an interdenominational movement or impulse that made an important contribution to the ecumenical movement of our own era. This thesis is an attempt to study the so-called 'Pan-Evangelical Impulse' of 1795 to 1830 from the vantage point of its four major institutional embodiments - the London Missionary Society, the Religious Tract Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews - in the light of contemporary theological, social, and political developments. The thesis deals with three major issues, viz the forces that brought the pan-evangelical impulse into being, the success and failure of the impulse in bringing Christians together not only in the four societies studied, but also in the church at large, and the reasons for its decline by the third decade of the nineteenth century. The thesis is original for two reasons: firstly, it examines a much neglected and misunderstood but extremely important period in British ecclesiastical history; secondly, it is based on manuscript and printed sources hitherto unexamined by the historian.
Evangelines United: Ecumenical Stirrings in Pre-Victorian Britain, 1795-1830
by Roger H. Martin
(Studies in Evangelicalism, No. 4)
244 pages 1983 LC: 82-10784 ISBN 0-8108-1586-9 $17.50

Evangelines United examines the Evangelical Movement in Britain from the death of John Wesley to the Oxford Movement. It does this from the perspective of four London-based, interdenominational missionary societies: The London Missionary Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Religious Tract Society and the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews. Together, these organizations represented perhaps the earliest large-scale experiment in ecumenical cooperation between Christians representing many different denominations and religious groups.

The book is essential reading for scholars and general readers interested not only in the tap-roots of the modern-day ecumenical movement, but more generally in the development of early 19th-century British evangelicalism and the impact of this development on Anglican, Congregational, Baptist, Presbyterian and Methodist (both Wesleyan and Calvinistic) groups. By examining in some depth the ways in which evangelical members of these various denominations successfully (and sometimes unsuccessfully) worked together in the various pan-evangelical missionary associations they patronized, we have a better understanding of and appreciation for the complexity and richness of the early evangelical movement.

Subsidiary topics covered in the book include the early domestic histories of evangelical missions in Britain, evangelical-Jewish relations, the role of politics—especially the politics of Roman Catholic Emancipation, Repeal and Disestablishment—in the evangelical movement, and the development of early 19th-century evangelical literature. Non-evangelical groups dealt with include Roman Catholics and Unitarians.
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