

Charles Simeon
and the
Evangelical Anglican Missionary Movement

A Study of Voluntaryism
and
Church-Mission Tensions

By
John C. Bennett

A Thesis Submitted
for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Edinburgh

June 12, 1992



Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis has been prepared by myself, that this thesis has not been submitted in any previous application for a degree, that the work of which it is a record has been done by myself under the guidance of a supervisor, that all quotations of three lines or less have been denoted by double quotation marks, that quotations of more than three lines have been indented, and that sources of information, in both cases, have been specifically acknowledged.

John C. Bennett

Abstract of Thesis

The historical reputation associated with Charles Simeon [1759-1836] is one of evangelicalism and churchmanship. As the vicar of Holy Trinity Church, Cambridge, and a Fellow of King's College, Simeon was the foremost evangelical clergyman in the Church of England during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Simeon also became known for his efforts to call evangelicals in the Established Church to observe the discipline and order of the Church. Simultaneous with his emphasis on proper Anglican churchmanship, Simeon also contributed significantly to the development of the nineteenth century British missionary movement, a markedly voluntary phenomenon. While Simeon's involvement in the missionary movement was compatible with his evangelical theology, the voluntarism of the evangelical missionary societies conflicted with his dedication to regular Anglican churchmanship.

The paradox in Simeon's missionary agenda becomes apparent when his role in the formation of the Society for Missions to Africa and the East [later the Church Missionary Society] is considered. These tensions -- between Simeon's evangelicalism and his churchmanship -- are resolved through an understanding of his world-view. His evangelicalism predisposed Simeon in favour of the missionary movement, thus he affirmed the validity of missionary voluntarism within the context of the Established Church. He reconciled his voluntary activities with his churchmanship through a commitment to general order in society, of which ecclesiastical order was a subset. If voluntary activity was carried on in a way that did not produce social disorder, and -- for Anglicans -- did not violate Church order unnecessarily, then voluntary activity was not harmful. Through the application of these values Charles Simeon was able to play a major role in the founding of the Church Missionary Society [CMS] in 1799.

Subsequent to his efforts to establish the CMS, Simeon's involvement with the Society waned. The estrangement between Simeon and the CMS was caused by interpersonal conflict with some of the Society's leaders, their disenchantment with certain of Simeon's ideas and efforts vis-à-vis the CMS, and what Simeon perceived to be unnecessary violations of Church order by the Society. These factors, combined with his desire to serve as a mentor and patron to Cambridge University students, stimulated Simeon to forward his missionary agenda by other means after 1804. The main alternative channel employed by Simeon was a partnership with Charles Grant [senior] in sending evangelical Anglicans to Asia as chaplains of the East India Company [EIC]. Twenty-two of Simeon's students became EIC chaplains during the course of his life, far exceeding the number of men recruited by Simeon for the CMS.

Simeon's thought and work illustrates the inherent tensions between church structures and mission structures. Although the context of Christian mission has evolved since he began his labours, Simeon's involvement in the British missionary movement demonstrates that twentieth century conflicts between the 'church agenda' and the 'mission agenda' have historical precedent. That these tensions can be mediated is also evident from the same history.

Acknowledgements

The notion that a thesis should be strictly the work of its author is badly discredited by this dissertation. So many people over the past five years have been of indispensable help that words really cannot do justice to them.

On the academic front, foremost thanks are due to Professor Andrew Walls for his dedication as a mentor and supervisor. The breadth of his knowledge and experience, his commitment to scholarly excellence, and the warmth of his friendship have been mainstays for me over the years. I am particularly grateful for his insights into the character and potential of postgraduate students. I came to Edinburgh to consider 'church-mission tensions' theologically. Early on, however, I was gently guided toward an historical approach. I am glad to admit that the work of an historian is a much better 'fit' to my analytical nature. This transition in my own thinking is a measure of Professor Walls' skills as a mentor. I can only hope that my work -- here and in the future -- does justice to his instincts.

Appreciation is due to many others at New College as well. Dr. Murray Simpson and the staff of New College Library, especially at the circulation desk, deserve endless thanks for their help with over two hundred inter-library loans and requests for material from the closed stackrooms. The staff of the Centre for the Study of Christianity in the Non-Western World [CSCNWW] -- in particular Miss Margaret Acton, Mrs. Anne Fernon, Dr. A. Christopher Smith, and Mrs. Doreen Walls -- have been a regular source of personal encouragement and coffee breaks. I am also grateful to my fellow postgraduates in the CSCNWW for their camaraderie along the way. I will also be ever thankful to Mrs. Linda Stupart, Secretary to the Dean, and to Mrs. Julie McCormack at Reception for their friendship and help on so many occasions.

A special word of thanks is owed to Mr. David Wright, Dean of the Faculty, and to Dr. Peter Hayman, Senior Lecturer in Old Testament and -- until recently -- Convener of the Faculty Equipment and Computing Committee. The opportunity afforded to me by Mr. Wright and Dr. Hayman, to serve as Faculty Computing Officer during the second half of my work at New College, was a stimulating assignment and provided some much-needed financial assistance. Designing and implementing the New College Local Area Network with Dr. Hayman, Dr. David Mealand of the New Testament department, Mr. Jeff Phillips of Edinburgh University Computing Service [EUCS], and the late Mr. Bill Watson of EUCS was a personal privilege.

I also want to acknowledge the assistance of the many people who were helpful and hospitable during periods of research away from Edinburgh. These include the Rev. Canon Hugo de Waal and the staff of Ridley Hall, Cambridge; the staff and residents of Tyndale House, Cambridge; Mrs. Rosemary Keen of the Church Missionary Society, London; the Rev. John Cooper of the Henry Martyn Trust, Cambridge; the Rev. R. Michael Rees of Simeon's Trustees, Chislehurst, Kent; the Rev. Canon Hugh Evan Hopkins of Cambridge; Dr. Michael A. Halls of King's College Library, Cambridge; Mr. Alan Kucia of Trinity College Library,

Cambridge; Dr. H.R.L. Beadle of St. John's College Library, Cambridge; and Miss C.L. Penney of the University Library at Birmingham.

Let me also take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the Board of Directors of the Association of Church Missions Committees [ACMC] in Chicago for the leave of absence and stipend that made possible our residence in Edinburgh. I am also deeply grateful to the Overseas Council for Theological Education and Missions in Indianapolis for the generous freedom to complete my thesis while in my current post. May the unselfishness of these two organizations be amply rewarded. The moral and material support of friends and family in the States was also a significant encouragement.

Of course, no one deserves greater acknowledgement than my wife. Gail willingly gave up house, home, possessions, financial security, friendships, and her own profession when we left Chicago for Edinburgh in 1987. Moreover, she had to cope with a husband who was new to the discipline of academic research and, therefore, often preoccupied with it. Without her sacrifices, which I can never fully appreciate, this study would never have been undertaken, let alone completed. This is nothing less than the measure of her love. I am unable to repay such a debt, but I can try to return the love. Thanks are also due to my wonderful children, Sara and Justin, for their amazing patience with a dad who frequently gave evenings and weekends to something called "a thesis." [What's a thesis, dad?]

Finally, these acknowledgements would not be complete without mention of the many friends we left behind in Edinburgh and Midlothian when we returned to the States in 1990. The company, love, and friendship of Gail's sister and her husband, Ames and Jacqueline Broen, was a special and unexpected gift. Ames' decision to undertake his doctoral work at Aberdeen was made without reference to our decision to come to Edinburgh, but employment for Jacqueline in the Scottish capital meant that we were able to enjoy three wonderful years together in the same place. Our regret is that had to leave Scotland just as Scott, Elizabeth, and Lisa joined their [our] family. We also can never forget the welcome we found in the village of Pathhead and the many close friends we now have in the parish of Cranstoun, Crichton, and Ford. We would return in a moment.

These brief words of acknowledgement remind me that while this thesis may be associated with my name -- and certainly the errors and deficiencies in it are totally my own -- there are many who rightfully share the accomplishment of this moment. Thank you to each one.

Indianapolis
October, 1991

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem of First Impressions	2
The White Knight of Evangelicalism?	5
In Search of Charles Simeon	8
The Paradoxical Churchman	20
Simeon's Missionary Agenda	24
From Introduction to Substance	30
PART ONE -- THE WORLD-VIEW OF CHARLES SIMEON	33
Chapter One: Convergence of Faith and Duty	34
Simeon's Eclectic Theology	35
The Evangelical State of Affairs from 1759	37
Questions of Puritan Influence	39
Sources for Simeon's Evangelicalism	44
Challenges to Simeon's Theology	51
Rationalist Leaven	58
The Evangelical and the Anglican in Charles Simeon	61
Chapter Two: Order in Church and Society	64
Churchmanship or Evangelicalism?	66
Evangelicals and the Social Order in England	68
The Irregular Simeon	74
Simeon's Appeal to Fundamental Order	83
An Affirmation of Social Order	88
A Hierarchy of Authorities	94
Resolving the Tension	106
Plurality in the Wider Church	112
The Apostle of Order in Church and Society	119
Chapter Three: The Influence of a Mentor	122
Simeon's Christian Formation	123
The Character of Evangelical Clergy	130
A Third Component of Simeon's World-view	148
Malaise in the Anglican Parish	149
Matters of "Before" and "After" the University	153
The Clerical Societies	154
Ecclesiastical Patronage	156
The Mentor at Work at Cambridge	162
The Legacy of the Mentor	169

PART TWO -- SIMEON AND THE MISSIONARY MOVEMENT	171
Chapter Four: Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain	172
Historical Precedents for Voluntaryism	176
Philosophical Foundations for Voluntaryism	187
The Voluntaryism of the 'Clapham Saints'	194
The Impetus of Evangelical Ecumenism	199
Criticisms of Anglican Voluntaryism	201
The Voluntary Movement in Perspective	207
Chapter Five: The Strange Case of Charles Simeon and the CMS	209
Sources of Simeon's Missionary Agenda	210
First Effort: The "1787 Plan"	220
The Interlude of 1789-1794	226
Simeon's Role in the Formation of the CMS	229
Shifting Patterns in Simeon's Relationship with the Society	241
Problem with First Principles?	242
Simeon and the CMS's First Setback	250
The Collapse of the "Catechist Plan"	253
Chaplains or Missionaries?	259
Recruiting for the Society	261
Another Henry Martyn?	264
Appeals for Agra	268
Simeon's Further Efforts for the Society	272
Assessing Simeon's Impact on the Growth of the CMS	276
Simeon and the Ecclesiastical Crises of the CMS	278
Conflict with the Indian Episcopate	279
Tensions over the Auxiliary Structures	284
Simeon's Lingering Concerns	290
The Need for Another Course	293
Chapter Six: The Missionary Agenda By Other Means	295
The Influence of Charles Grant	300
"The Chaplaincy Business"	312
Searching for Useful Men	314
Crises of Uncertainty	318
Productive Efforts at Last	325
The "Pious Chaplains"	330
David Brown	331
Claudius Buchanan	335
Henry Martyn	345
Daniel Corrie	356
Thomas Thomason	366
The End of an Era for Simeon	376
The Jewish Alternative	378
Agenda Achieved	384

CONCLUSION	386
The Consequences of a Finished Agenda	390
The Priority of Leadership Development	391
Resolving Church-Mission Tensions	394
The Legacy of Charles Simeon	400
APPENDIX I -- Simeon's East India Company Chaplains	402
BIBLIOGRAPHY	407
Manuscript Sources	407
Works By Charles Simeon	409
Contemporary Accounts of Simeon's Life and Thought	412
Secondary Sources on Simeon	413
Other Primary Sources	415
Other Autobiographies, Memoirs, and Personal Accounts	431
Other Secondary Sources [Except Journal Articles]	433
Journal Articles	445

INTRODUCTION

Students of the Evangelical Revival labour under an unavoidable constraint, a burden created by the very nature of a popular religious movement: The Revival had much more to do with personalities than with events or ideas. As a consequence its history must be people-oriented.

In an intellectual sense the Revival was a contemporary application of earlier concepts. Calvinism, Puritanism, and Pietism found new expression in British evangelicalism. Its focus was the personal experience of "real Christianity" and the "religion of Jesus."¹ However, evangelicalism in eighteenth and early nineteenth century Britain was not primarily a function of ideas. It was a social and religious movement that had expression in the day-to-day affairs of people.

For this reason the history of the Revival has traditionally been told in terms of the lives and labours of the men and women who were revived. Every recollection seems to turn on names: the Wesleys, Whitefield, Venn, Newton, the Countess of Huntingdon. Moreover, the lasting value of the Revival is not contained in the thoughts and writings of these first-generation evangelicals. What endures is the sense of their influence on people. They made disciples. They passed the torch to a second generation that, in turn, passed it to a third. Thus,

¹ Wilberforce, W., *A practical view of the prevailing religious system of professed Christians in the higher and middle classes in this country contrasted with real Christianity*, 1797, 6th edition, Glasgow, 1837: 95.

above all else, the Evangelical Revival is a story of people, "a history of personalities."²

The Problem of First Impressions

Personality-oriented history shares a weakness inherent in all attempts to understand people: the problem of first impressions. As in everyday encounters, readers and writers of history are tempted to base their opinions of historical characters upon the immediately apparent. The history of the Evangelical Revival also suffered from this tyranny of the obvious.

For example, first- and second-generation evangelicals in the Church of England were invariably branded as Methodists by the Establishment. The confusion is understandable given the Wesleys' Anglican roots and the religious 'enthusiasm' that was common to evangelical Churchmen and Dissenters.³ However, High Church critics failed to recognize the basic commitment of evangelical Anglicans to the disciplines of the Established Church. This misconception was also perpetuated as the history of the Revival was originally written.

² Smyth, C.H.E., *Simeon and church order: A study of the origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the eighteenth century*, The Birkbeck Lectures for 1937-1938, Cambridge, 1940: 6.

³ In the mid-seventeenth century enthusiasm referred to the "inner light" associated with the mysticism of such as the early Quakers, the Muggletonians, and the Fifth Monarchy Men. By the time of the Evangelical Revival and on into the nineteenth century, enthusiasm had become a pejorative reference to evangelicalism's insistence on the personal experience of religion. [Abbey, C.J., and J.H. Overton, *The English Church in the eighteenth century*, new edition, London, 1887: 226ff.]

Many early chroniclers of the Revival accepted the opinions of its critics at face value. Sir James Stephen's "The evangelical succession" [1849], the earliest serious account of the Revival, simply credits the first evangelical Anglicans to Whitefield's ministry.⁴ Gladstone's "The evangelical movement" [1879] relies heavily on Stephen's work, thus treating evangelical Churchmen as one with Wesley's and Whitefield's followers.⁵ Despite J.H. Overton's efforts at the end of the century to present evangelicalism in the Church of England as a movement distinct from Methodism,⁶ Halévy's *The birth of Methodism* [1906] attributed the Wesleyan movement and the so-called "evangelical party" in the Church of England to the same origins.⁷ Halévy's conclusion is made explicit in *England in 1815* [1949]. This important work is flawed by the author's attempt to label evangelical Churchmen as the "rear-guard" left by John Wesley when Methodism

⁴ Stephen, J., *Essays in ecclesiastical biography*, 1849, 2nd edition, London, 1853: vol.2, 99f.

⁵ For example: Gladstone believed that William Law had exerted very little influence on the development of evangelicalism. He based this conclusion on John Wesley's rejection of Law's mysticism, a decision taken by Wesley before establishing his Connexion. On this basis Gladstone argued that Law's influence on evangelicalism had been extremely limited. [Gladstone, W.E., "The evangelical movement: its parentage, progress and issue," *Gleanings from past years*, London, 1879: vol.7, 206f.]

In addition to understating Law's impact on the Wesleys, Gladstone did not recognize the popularity of Law's *Serious call to a devout and holy life* [1729]. It was read with great effect by many evangelical Churchmen. Gladstone failed to allow for the possibility that Law's influence on first-generation evangelical Anglicans might have been exerted through a channel [i.e., a literary one] that was unaffected by the break between Law and the Oxford "Holy Club."

⁶ Abbey, C.J., and J.H. Overton, *The English Church in the eighteenth century*, new edition, London, 1887: 315ff.; and Overton, J.H., *The English Church in the nineteenth century*, London, [1894]: 54ff.

⁷ Halévy, E., *The birth of Methodism in England*, Paris, 1906, translated and edited by Bernard Semmel, Chicago, 1971: 51f.

exited from the Church of England.⁸ Halévy's position and its antecedents were not firmly rejected [i.e., in favour of Overton's model] until the work of Elliott-Binns and Smyth in the middle of the present century.⁹ Nevertheless, vestiges of the old fallacy have appeared as recently as 1968.¹⁰

These observations on the history of the Evangelical Revival reveal how difficult it is to dispel first impressions, especially if they are in print. Historical interpretations of people and their efforts can acquire a longevity disproportionate to accuracy. Furthermore, portrayals of historical characters tend to accumulate and integrate. Dissecting the resulting composites is an arduous task, thus exposing historical personalities to the risk of becoming lost in their own 'history'.

⁸ Halévy, E., *England in 1815*, A history of the English people in the nineteenth century, vol.1, London, 1949: 433f.

⁹ Elliott-Binns, L., *The evangelical movement in the English Church*, The faiths: Varieties of Christian expression, edited by L.P. Jacks, London, 1928: 10f.; and Smyth, C.H.E., *Simeon and church order: A study of the origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the eighteenth century*, The Birkbeck Lectures for 1937-1938, Cambridge, 1940: 255ff.

¹⁰ I.J. Gash's study of the missionary policy of the East India Company suggests collusion between Charles Grant [senior], an influential Company officer and evangelical Churchman, and Thomas Coke. As early Methodism's chief missionary advocate and a close associate of John Wesley, Coke had written to Grant in January 1786 to urge him in Wesley's name to discard plans for the patronage of missionary work in India by the Establishment. This was the course eventually taken with the 1813 renewal of the India Company's charter. However, Gash contends that Grant took Coke's advice and proceeded to make arrangements for voluntary missionary efforts by Baptists and Methodists. [Gash, I.J., *An historical survey and assessment of the ecclesiastical and missionary policy of the East India Company*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1968: 259.]

Gash overstated the affinity between Grant's evangelicalism and Coke's Methodism. Grant declined to assist Coke in securing licences for Dissenting missionaries and continued to labour for an evangelical and Anglican 'missionary establishment'. Grant conceded the necessity of voluntary effort only as a last resort. Grant's role vis-à-vis Christian mission in India is considered in greater detail in chapters five and six.

For a well-travelled subject like the British missionary movement and a well-known character such as Charles Simeon of Cambridge, the problem of first impressions is not insignificant.

The White Knight of Evangelicalism?

In the one and a half centuries since his death in 1836, Charles Simeon has been the central subject of a host of funeral sermons, one memoir, two full biographies, more than ten 'remembrances' or limited biographies, and at least five thematic assessments.¹¹ In the course of these publications, Simeon remains untouched by the confusion between Methodism and evangelicalism. Although a few contemporary critics branded the young Simeon as a Methodist, this was not the general reputation associated with the most famous vicar of Holy Trinity Church, Cambridge.¹² On the contrary, the first impression dogging Simeon's name is a profound loyalty to the Church of England.

Simeon's reputation as an evangelical and a Churchman figured prominently in first-hand accounts. William Carus, Simeon's hand-picked successor at Holy Trinity Church and editor of the *Memoirs* [1847], testified with Daniel Wilson to Simeon's "'ardent, marked, and avowed attachment to the doctrine and discipline

¹¹ See the bibliography for a summary of these works.

¹² Simeon himself noted that his evening lecture, a parochial innovation when it was instituted in 1791, was perceived by his critics as "Methodistical." [Carus, W., *Memoirs of the life of the Rev. Charles Simeon, M.A., Late Senior Fellow of King's College and Minister of Trinity Church, Cambridge*, 1847, 3rd edition, London, 1848: 69; hereafter referred to as "Carus."] The practice was, in fact, widely used by Methodists and Dissenters.

of our Apostolical Church [of England]."¹³ Abner Brown, one of Simeon's students at Cambridge in the late 1820s, summarized the ambitions of Charles Simeon as a minister of the Established Church in his *Recollections* of Simeon [1863]:

Simeon's aim as a Minister ... and his heart's desire was to do what he could towards resuscitating the vitality of the religious world at large, and especially to arouse the Church of England to return actively to the sound Reformation principles [then much overlooked] which, he used to say, breathe in every line of her Prayer Book and Articles.¹⁴

Brown's characterization of Simeon as the archetypical "Church-man" and "Gospel-man"¹⁵ has been formative for later church historians and students of Simeon.

At the end of the century, H.C.G. Moule echoed Carus and Brown in his biographical work, *Charles Simeon* [1892]:

[Simeon] greatly desired to see, not merely more energy in individual Christians, but more life and power in the English Church as such.¹⁶

¹³ Daniel Wilson's "Recollections of the Rev. Chas. Simeon," dated from Calcutta, 1837, and included in Carus: 597.

¹⁴ Brown, A.W., *Recollections of the conversation parties of the Rev. Charles Simeon, M.A., Senior Fellow of King's College, and Perpetual Curate of Trinity Church, Cambridge*, London, 1863: 60; hereafter referred to as "Brown."

¹⁵ Brown: 11.

¹⁶ Moule, H.C.G., *Charles Simeon, Leaders of Religion*, edited by H.C. Beeching, London, 1892: 260.

Moule, as a Victorian student of the Revival, was not alone in declaring Simeon to have been "decidedly and thoughtfully a Churchman" and an evangelical.¹⁷

Overton argued the same point in noting Bishop Charles Wordsworth's recognition of Simeon's care for Church ordinances. Although no friend to evangelicalism, Wordsworth [1806-1892] acknowledged the ecclesiastical regularity of Simeon in comparing him to J.H. Newman.¹⁸

Smyth's *Simeon and church order* [1940], the definitive work to date on his churchmanship, speaks of Simeon's "steadying influence" on evangelicalism in the Established Church. According to Smyth, Simeon addressed the two most significant internal problems confronting evangelical Anglicans at the outset of the nineteenth century: the need for adherence to Church order and the means for continuity in parish leadership.¹⁹ Simeon applied himself to the former issue by tutoring his Cambridge students in conformity to Church discipline. He attended to the latter concern through his innovations in clerical patronage. Elliott-Binns, in *The early evangelicals* [1953], seconded Smyth in noting the "parochial terms" in which Simeon expressed his evangelicalism.²⁰ Even Ford K. Brown, in *Fathers*

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ As quoted from Wordsworth's *Annals of my early life* in Overton, J.H., *The English Church in the nineteenth century*, London, [1894]: 54.

¹⁹ Smyth, C.H.E., *Simeon and church order: A study of the origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the eighteenth century*, The Birkbeck Lectures for 1937-1938, Cambridge, 1940: 250, 255.

²⁰ Elliott-Binns, L., *The early evangelicals: A religious and social study*, Lutterworth Library, vol.41, London, 1953: 284.

of the Victorians [1961], acknowledged the quality of Simeon's churchmanship despite the author's disaffection with the evangelical agenda.²¹

With the weight of a century of uniform historical opinion pressing upon them, Pollard and Hennell concluded in 1964 that Charles Simeon, more than any other, was instrumental in retaining the commitment of second- and third-generation evangelicals to the Church of England.²² This was Charles Simeon, "the complete Anglican"²³ who emerges from British ecclesiastical history as the white knight of evangelical Churchmen.

In Search of Charles Simeon

To label Charles Simeon of Cambridge as an evangelical and a Churchman cannot be incorrect. It is, however, an incomplete description of the man, his world-view, and his work. Simeon was a much more complicated person than first impressions might suggest. His complexity becomes especially apparent when his involvement in the British missionary movement is considered.

Understanding the attitudes of second-generation evangelical Anglicans toward the then developing missionary movement requires the consideration of five

²¹ Brown, F.K., *Fathers of the Victorians: The age of Wilberforce*, Cambridge, 1961: 289. Ford Brown was highly critical of what he perceived as subversive efforts by "evangelical missionaries to the Gentile world in England," viz., the 'proselyting' of orthodox Anglican laity into the evangelical camp. [Op.cit.: 271.]

²² Pollard, A., and M. Hennell, eds., *Charles Simeon [1759-1836]: Essays written in commemoration of his bicentenary by members of the Evangelical Fellowship for Theological Literature*, Great Anglicans, London, 1964: 26.

²³ Hopkins, H.E., *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*, London, 1977: 181.

factors: the theology of evangelical Churchmen, their philosophy of Christian experience, their notions of religious effort, their social views, and their methods for exerting influence on church and society. Any examination of Simeon's impact on the missionary movement must take into account these aspects of his world-view.

Evangelical Theology: With only rare exceptions, evangelical Anglicans shared a common theological foundation. They embraced three chief tenets in their doctrine: human depravity, justification by faith alone, and holy living as an evidence of faith. These beliefs were often denoted by evangelicals as the Gospel's "peculiar" doctrines. Simeon frequently adverted to this terminology in his sermons.²⁴ The Calvinist roots of evangelical theology are readily apparent, but the source was moderate Calvinism. For example, evangelical Anglicans generally affirmed single predestination in their views of election. So it was with Simeon.²⁵ The grace of God is universal; all men and women are free to respond to the Gospel of Christ through conversion. As a consequence, Simeon joined the majority of evangelical Churchmen in conceiving of Christian mission as the medium through which the universal grace of God would be declared and received: "May we engage in missionary labours, assured that God will fulfil his own word

²⁴ For example, see Simeon, C., *The Gospel message: A sermon preached before the University, November 13, 1796: To which are annexed four skeletons of sermons upon the same text, ... with a view to illustrate all Mr. Claude's rules of composition ...*, 6th edition, Cambridge, 1798: 2.

²⁵ For example, see Simeon, C., *Horae homileticae: or, Discourses digested into one continued series, and forming a commentary upon every book of the Old and New Testament ...*, London, 1833, 7th edition, with indexes by T.H. Horne, London, 1845: Sermon 2379, "Offices of the Holy Trinity," vol.20, 131-2.

N.B. The *Horae homileticae*, hereafter referred to as "Horae," is the most valuable printed primary source on Simeon. All 2,536 sermon outlines were written and edited by the author. Simeon also read and approved the indexes prepared by T.H. Horne. [Simeon to Horne, January 28, 1834, British Library Western MSS, Add.46844A, f.11.]

[in calling the nations to Christian faith], and crown our endeavours with success."²⁶

Christian Experience: Evangelical Anglicans were also known for their intensely pragmatic philosophy of Christian experience. Christian faith was thought to be meaningless if it was limited to theoretical knowledge or formal practices. In a sermon before the University of Cambridge in March 1811, Simeon did not hesitate to declare the bankruptcy of nominal faith:

Many, because they are born and educated in a Christian land, are ready to take for granted that they are instructed in [true Christian faith]. But there is almost as much ignorance of it prevailing amongst Christians as amongst the heathen themselves.²⁷

In a later sermon outline on the same subject Simeon appears to continue the address:

Persons of this description hardly ever entertain a doubt or a fear, but that all will issue well with them at the last. But they will find themselves awfully mistaken as soon as they ever go hence.²⁸

Simeon believed that formal religion made itself worthless in supposing that God is placed under a redemptive obligation by the performance of external duties and forms.

²⁶ Horae: Sermon 608, "Calling of the Gentiles prayed for," vol.5, 492.

²⁷ Simeon, C., "Christ Crucified, or evangelical religion described," *Let wisdom judge: University addresses and sermon outlines by Charles Simeon*, edited with an introduction by A. Pollard, London, 1959: 113.

²⁸ Horae: Sermon 784, "The way of salvation misconceived," vol.7, 136.

Simeon related the value of religious behaviour to the faith underlying it.²⁹ As inheritors of Puritan and Pietistic distinctives, Simeon and the evangelicals in the Church of England stressed personal religious experience. Evangelical piety began with spiritual conversion and continued through the Christian's progressive, albeit incomplete sanctification.³⁰ The evangelical missionary movement, therefore, became identified with the conversion of 'heathen' societies. Simeon fully expected these nations to experience radical social and religious change as a result of the evangelical conversion of the population.³¹ These ideals solidified broad evangelical support for missionary activity.

Simeon's theology and philosophy of Christian experience was typical of evangelicals. Moderate Calvinism and pragmatism predisposed evangelicals such as Simeon in favour of Christian mission. Numerous modern studies of the emergence of the British missionary movement have confirmed this point.³² However, the true nature and extent of Simeon's impact on the missionary

²⁹ Horae: Sermon 584, "Spiritual obedience preferred before sacrifice," vol.5, 381-2.

³⁰ Simeon, C., *The Churchman's confession: or, An appeal to the Liturgy: Being a sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, December 1, 1805*, Cambridge, [1805]: 15-7, 21-3.

³¹ Horae: Sermon 1251, "The connexion between the conversion of Jews and Gentiles," vol.10, 489; and sermon 2010, "The future conversion of the Jews," vol.16, 472.

³² Important works on the origins of the evangelical missionary movement in Britain include: van den Berg, J., *Constrained by Jesus' love: An enquiry into the motives of the missionary awakening in Great Britain in the period between 1698 and 1815*, Kampen, 1956; de Jong, J.A., *As the waters cover the sea: Millennial expectations in the rise of Anglo-American missions, 1640-1810*, Kampen, 1970; Piggin, S., *Making evangelical missionaries, 1789-1858, Evangelicals and society from 1750*, vol.2, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, 1984; and Rooy, S.H., *The theology of missions in the Puritan tradition: A study of representative Puritans: Richard Sibbes, Richard Baxter, John Eliot, Cotton Mather, and Jonathan Edwards*, Delft, 1965. All four sources are agreed upon the crucial influence of moderate Calvinism, moderate millennialism, and unyielding pragmatism in the development of the missionary movement.

movement becomes apparent when the remaining three aspects of his world-view are examined.

Simeon's concept of religious effort, his social views, and his strategy for the exercise of public influence were highly developed, perhaps more so than for any of his evangelical contemporaries. These three components of Simeon's *Weltanschauung* profoundly affected his life and work. In particular, they led him to make a number of unique and significant contributions to the origin and first half-century of the British missionary movement. Moreover, these subjects have received little attention in previous studies of Simeon's impact on the missionary movement.

Religious Effort: Although Charles Simeon inherited an evangelical theology and view of Christian experience, the moral rationalism of High Church Anglicanism was also a formative influence on Simeon. These two streams, cultures in themselves, merged to produce a world-view that emphasized moral duty, personal activism, and structural voluntarism.

Simeon advocated the planned use of concerted human effort to accomplish moral reform and enhance the progress of the Gospel in society. These outcomes typified Christian duty.³³ However, the 'experimental religion' of his evangelicalism required such efforts to be undertaken in dependence upon God. The importance of submitting human activity to divine superintendence was of paramount concern to Simeon. Simeon's desire to trust in God in the midst of

³³ Simeon identified Christian duty, in general, with loving good and hating evil. Such duty is expressed in belief and practice. [Horae: Sermon 1908, "Christian duties to God and man explained," vol.15, 488.]

human effort was artfully stated in a letter to a friend experiencing discouragement over the practice of her faith:

There are two errors which are common to persons in your state; first, the using of means, as though by the use of them they could prevail; and secondly, the not using them, because they have so long been used in vain. The error consists in putting the means too much in the place of Christ, and in expecting from exertion what is only gained by affiance.³⁴

The transition from religious activism to true voluntaryism was enabled by Simeon's theology and pragmatism. The Gospel demanded its propagation by the Christian church. This 'evangelical mandate' also transcended Church order in importance and made provision for voluntary initiative, independent from the Established Church when necessary. Simeon thus undertook itinerant preaching tours in England and Scotland. He introduced an evening lecture at Holy Trinity Church. A parochial society was formed in his parish that was not unlike the Methodist variety.³⁵ He instituted and supported the formation of clerical societies to encourage evangelical Anglican ministers in their work. Simeon contributed to the formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society [BFBS], the Church Missionary Society [CMS], Cambridge auxiliaries for both, and the reorganization of the London Society for Propagating Christianity Amongst the Jews [LSPCJ]. These efforts were firmly centred in the evangelical camp and they allied him with the moguls of voluntaryism, the Clapham Saints. Nevertheless, Simeon's activism was also motivated by the sense of moral duty imparted to

³⁴ Carus: 537.

³⁵ Simeon's parochial societies differed from Wesley's in one significant factor: Simeon insisted that he or his curate be present at all meetings. Simeon did not advocate lay clergy. [Carus 243-4.]

evangelical Churchmen through their historic connection with traditional Anglican values.

Social Theory: Simeon joined fellow Anglicans, evangelical or not, in an uncritical acceptance of the distinctions between rich and poor. Simeon believed that the economic ordering of society is a natural consequence of civilization and, therefore, normative. Consistent with this assumption, he considered charity [i.e., without reference to social reform] to be the chief duty of the wealthy.³⁶ This conviction reveals Simeon's essentially static view of society. Further, Simeon did not believe the maintenance of order -- religious or secular -- to be merely an accommodation to reality. It is a matter of preserving what ought to be. According to Simeon, God had instituted Britain's social hierarchy in order to "bind all the classes of men together by the ties of mutual usefulness and discipline."³⁷ An order to things is intrinsically good.

Consequently, the establishment and maintenance of church order figured prominently in Simeon's understanding of Christian mission. Church order was not merely an expedient, as it was for Wilberforce and the Clapham Saints, nor was it only a function of Simeon's Anglican traditions. For Charles Simeon, ecclesiastical regularity was an essential component of missionary activity, as it was for parish ministry. However, as is later demonstrated, Simeon's concern for proper ecclesiastical order in the propagation of Christianity led to tensions with

³⁶ Horae: Sermon 208, "The duty of charity enforced," vol.2, 367.

Simeon's views were comparable with William Wilberforce's notion of a "Christian nation": A society in which all people "discharge the duties of their station in life," religious and otherwise, "without breaking in on the rights of others." [Wilberforce, W., *A practical view of the prevailing religious system of professed Christians in the higher and middle classes in this country contrasted with real Christianity*, 1797, 6th edition, Glasgow, 1837: 374.]

³⁷ Horae: Op.cit.

the leaders of the Church Missionary Society, especially with respect to the relationship of the Society's Indian missionaries with the Bishop of Calcutta.

For his own part, Simeon's well-known concern for ecclesiastical regularity stood in contrast to his voluntary sympathies. Consider, for example, Simeon's response to the shortage of clerical volunteers for missionary service with the CMS in its early years. In 1799, echoing the sentiments of a discussion with Wilberforce two years earlier, Simeon encouraged the General Committee of the Society to send catechists [i.e., trained laity] as their initial missionaries, if necessary.³⁸ The idea was received enthusiastically by John Venn and the Clapham founders of the CMS. The "catechist plan" figured prominently in Venn's *Account* [1799] of the formation and intentions of the Society.³⁹ The warm reception of Simeon's pragmatism by the founders of the CMS can be attributed to two factors: the common value placed on expediency and the preoccupation of Thomas Scott and John Venn with a recovery of the methodology of the early church.⁴⁰ Simeon's suggestion, offered as an expedient, was received by the clerical founders of the CMS as a means of recovering the spirit of the days when catechists served as the missionary pioneers of the early church.

³⁸ Pratt, J.H., ed., *Eclectic notes: or, Notes of discussions on religious topics at the meetings of the Eclectic Society, London, during the years 1798-1814*, 2nd edition, London, 1865: 99f.; Carus: 124-6.

³⁹ Hole, C., *The early history of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1896: 44.

⁴⁰ For example, see Scott, T., *The force of truth*, The works of the Late Rev. Thomas Scott, vol.1, edited by J. Scott, London, 1823: 63 and passim; and Venn, J., *Annals of a clerical family: Being some account of the family and descendants of William Venn, Vicar of Otterton, Devon, 1600-1621*, Cambridge, 1904: 132f.

The ambiguities in churchmanship inherent in the CMS's plan were not overlooked by the Anglican hierarchy.⁴¹ Nor were they missed by some evangelical Churchmen. Clapham's voluntarism, and Simeon's, was criticized by a number of noted evangelical Anglicans. In 1801, for example, the catechist plan nearly cost the CMS the support of John Newton. He rejected the policy as irregular and ill-judged.⁴² Likewise, in an 1802 letter to CMS Secretary Thomas Scott, Thomas Robinson [senior] took Scott, the Clapham Saints, and the likes of Simeon to task for the ambiguous churchmanship he perceived in the initial operation of the Society.⁴³ Simeon's activism on behalf of Christian mission was fruitful, but it also confused his churchmanship in the eyes of critics and colleagues.

Influence on Church and Society: The channels through which Simeon chose to exercise his influence as priest and pastor are surprising in light of his churchmanship and voluntarism. One would have expected Simeon the Churchman to work for evangelical renaissance in the Church of England by aspiring to higher Church office. On the other hand, it is reasonable to presume that Simeon the activist would have chosen to labour through the agency of voluntary societies at least as much as through the parochial structure. Both hypotheses suggest an institutional approach to the exercise of personal and public influence. This was not the case. Simeon never sought nor achieved a position of

⁴¹ Archbishop Moore's reply to Venn's *Account*, given to Wilberforce on July 24, 1800, was noncommittal. The CMS's voluntary nature earned it the benign neglect of the Church's dignitaries for almost half a century. [Hole, op.cit.: 58-9.]

⁴² Newton to Thomas Scott, January 29, 1801, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3; also cited in Hole, op.cit.: 65.

⁴³ Robinson to Scott, April 26, 1802, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3; also cited in Hole, op.cit.: 54.

formal authority in the hierarchy of the Established Church. Similarly, for all of his efforts in aid of the formation of various societies, Simeon never held a continuing position of responsibility in the governing body of a voluntary structure. Simeon's energies were not given to institutions, except incidentally. Charles Simeon gave himself to people. By mentoring a select group of men, many of whom later occupied significant positions in Church hierarchy and voluntary societies, Simeon's influence greatly exceeded expectations for a college Fellow and parish priest.⁴⁴ Simeon's Cambridge parish and college rooms became an evangelical hothouse from which scores of his disciples were sent forth into "spheres" of ministry.⁴⁵

In no context is Simeon's work as a mentor more clear, or his influence on Christian mission more pronounced, than in his relationship to the East India Company [EIC] and its chaplaincies. From 1785 to 1820, Simeon actively sought chaplaincies in Asia for forty of his Cambridge students. Through his relationship with Charles Grant [senior], a member and sometimes chairman of the EIC Court

⁴⁴ No account of Simeon is complete without reference to Thomas Babington Macaulay's famous epitaph on Simeon, taken from an 1844 letter to one of his sisters:

As to Simeon, if you knew what his authority and influence were, and how they extended from Cambridge to the most remote corners of England, you would allow that his real sway in the Church was far greater than that of any prelate.

[Trevelyan, G.O., *Life and letters of Lord Macaulay*, 2nd edition, London, 1877: vol.1, 69 note.]

⁴⁵ Appointing men to choice "spheres" of activity was the purpose behind Simeon's experiments in church patronage. This objective is evident in Simeon's correspondence with the trustees of the Thornton Trust and those of his own: Simeon to Rev. Mr. Richardson [Thornton trustee], August 2, 1814, and Simeon to Rev. Mr. Irwin [Simeon trustee], August 8, 1836, Simeon Trust MSS, Cambridge University Library, Add.8293, box 3; also cited in Carus: 270 and 549, respectively.

of Directors, twenty-one of Simeon's students secured a post.⁴⁶ The most famous of all of Simeon's disciples were the so-called "pious chaplains" of British India: David Brown, Claudius Buchanan, Daniel Corrie, Henry Martyn, and Thomas Thomason. Their impact on India from 1786 to 1835 was an indirect but important achievement for Simeon.

Simeon's work as a mentor enabled him to significantly contribute to the missionary movement. Nevertheless, these efforts also earned him criticism from within and without the evangelical camp. Simeon's exercise of patronage in England and India brought forth criticisms of "kingdom building" from traditional Anglicans and a few evangelical Churchmen as well. Simeon's connection with the Thornton Trust includes just such an incident.

In 1790 Simeon had been named as an alternate trustee for the patronage trust created by John Thornton.⁴⁷ In February of 1822 Simeon was shocked to learn of Samuel Thornton's plans to sell the Trust's livings. The three original trustees had long since died and the list of alternates had been exhausted. The final three, including Simeon, were then serving as trustees. Samuel Thornton interpreted the situation as an indication of the impending extinction of the Trust. Under its terms, title to the livings would then revert to John Thornton's heir,

⁴⁶ Simeon's relationship with Grant and their collaboration on the appointment of chaplains is revealed in a series of letters between the two men, dating from 1805 to 1815. [Simeon/Grant correspondence, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.] Findings from these letters are one of the subjects of chapter six. The appendix provides a summary of Simeon's efforts to recruit EIC chaplains.

⁴⁷ Henry Thornton to Simeon, December 3, 1790, Simeon Trust MSS, Cambridge University Library, Add.8293, box 4.

namely Samuel Thornton. Thornton made plans to offer the Trust's holdings to the highest bidder.⁴⁸

Simeon panicked at the thought of losing the patronage so badly needed by evangelical clergymen. He made an offer to purchase the Trust, subject to a proper valuation, in order to augment the patronage already under his control.⁴⁹ When the valuation came in at £9,707 -- a sum beyond his means -- Simeon asked to be relieved of his obligation to complete the purchase. Thornton was not so inclined. Simeon's ambitions had led him to make an ill-advised offer, but this was no reason for Thornton to relieve the Cambridge minister from his commitment.⁵⁰ As a result of binding arbitration by William Wilberforce, Lord Teignmouth, and James Stephen [senior], Thornton released Simeon from the contract, but Simeon's reputation had been coloured in some evangelical eyes by an excessive zeal for controlling patronage.

Despite the occasional setback or difficulty, such as the episode with Thornton, Simeon's work as mentor was eminently successful. Wesley Balda has documented Simeon's achievements as a clerical patron in England,⁵¹ and this study will demonstrate his fruitfulness in sending men to India. On occasion Simeon the mentor may have been too aggressive for his own good, but his efforts did not fail to achieve the intended outcome.

⁴⁸ Samuel Thornton to Simeon, February 12, 1822, *ibid.*

⁴⁹ Simeon to Samuel Thornton, February 18, 1822, *ibid.*

⁵⁰ Samuel Thornton to Simeon, March 4, March 7, and March 15, 1822, *ibid.*

⁵¹ See Balda, W.D., *"Spheres of Influence": Simeon's Trust and its implications for Evangelical patronage*, Cambridge University, Ph.D. thesis, 1981.

The Paradoxical Churchman

The first impressions usually associated with Charles Simeon -- simple evangelicalism and strict churchmanship -- conflict to some extent with the three other components of his world-view: his notions of religious effort, his social views, and his methodology for exerting personal and public influence. The paradoxical interaction of these characteristics reveal the complexity of Simeon's life and work, especially with respect to the missionary movement.

Simeon was remarkably tolerant of contradiction. D.M. Rosman, in her study of evangelical culture, observed that a tolerance of paradox was a mark of nineteenth century evangelicals in general.⁵² This dynamic might be attributed to evangelicalism's reliance on expedient means; e.g., Simeon's affirmations of loyalty to the Established Church concurrent with voluntary effort. This is a valid argument but it is an incomplete explanation for Simeon's paradoxical ambiguities. As is demonstrated here and in chapter one, Simeon's ability to embrace contrasting values developed from more than expediency. Simeon genuinely believed that the Scriptures affirmed principles that appeared to be contradictory. For this reason he did not fear to do the same.

⁵² Rosman, D.M., *Evangelicals and culture in England, 1790-1833*, Keele University, Ph.D. thesis, 1979: 19.

One paradox in particular stands out in connection with Simeon's name. Simeon spoke of himself as a Calvinist, as an Arminian, and as neither of these. Consider his 1825 letter to a clerical friend:

Sometimes I am a high Calvinist, at other times a low Arminian, so that if extremes will please you, I am your man; only remember, it is not one extreme that we are to go to, but *both* extremes.⁵³

In contrast, Simeon's biblicism allowed him to reject both labels:

If I were asked, "Are you a Calvinist?" I should answer, "No." "Are you an Arminian?" "No." "What then are you?" I should answer, "A Bible Christian ...," and if any tell me, "You are wrong," I reply, "Tell Paul so, and Peter so, for I am misled by them."⁵⁴

Simeon found evidence in the Scriptures for the principles of Calvinism and Arminianism. He therefore affirmed the substance of both theologies, labelled their intersection as biblical faith, but criticized the dogmatic nature of both systems:

The Calvinist wishes for some texts to be expunged from Scripture; the Arminian wishes the same as to others ... I wish for all the Bible to remain as it is; ... [thus] I believe in predestination as fully as possible. It is entirely of God's free grace that any soul is saved ... Yet I as explicitly believe also in freewill, and so does every candid man in his heart ... The elect are saved by the agency of faith and obedience ... Faith and works are not separable.⁵⁵

⁵³ Simeon to "Rev. Mr. T-----," July 9, 1825, in Carus: 419-20.

⁵⁴ Simeon to Miss Evans, Derbyshire, undated, as quoted in Pollard, A., and M. Hennell, eds., *Charles Simeon [1759-1836]: Essays written in commemoration of his bicentenary by members of the Evangelical Fellowship for Theological Literature*, Great Anglicans, London, 1964: 32.

⁵⁵ Brown: 274.

Simeon's tolerance of paradox enabled him to meet John Wesley in the mid-1780s, query the founder of Methodism on his soteriology, and conclude: "This is all my Calvinism."⁵⁶

Simeon did not naively believe that he and Wesley shared an identical understanding of salvation's dependence upon divine grace. Nor did his opinion of Wesley contradict his own moderate Calvinism. What lay behind Simeon's ambiguity was a desire to influence the mainstream of the Church of England. By finding truth and error in Calvinism and Arminianism, and by rejecting a systematic approach to biblical truth, Simeon hoped to broaden the appeal of evangelicalism.

Equivocations such as "Calvinism and Arminianism are equally true if rightly applied and equally false if pressed to extremes"⁵⁷ or "Both of them are right in all they affirm and wrong in all they deny"⁵⁸ stemmed from Simeon's biblicism. Moreover, such statements were expedient. Simeon's equivocal position on the chief intra-evangelical conflict of the day was an attempt to make evangelicalism broadly palatable to Churchmen. It also served to keep Simeon out

⁵⁶ Simeon's account of their meeting is included in the preface to the *Horae homileticae* [vol.1, xviiiff.]

The date of the meeting is unclear. Wesley's *Journal* refers to two meetings with Simeon -- December 20, 1784, and October 30, 1787 -- but neither entry gives an indication of the substance of their discussions. [Wesley, J., *An extract of the Rev. Mr. John Wesley's journal*, London, 1794: vol.20, 78-9; and vol.21, 83.] Carus omitted all references to the meetings in the *Memoirs*, perhaps wishing to avoid criticism of his mentor at a time [the 1840s] when the Establishment was under attack from Nonconformist and Anglo-Catholic sides. This was an unfortunate omission by Carus. The tone of Simeon's account suggests that the encounter with the leading figure of the eighteenth century Revival was a distinct honour for the Cambridge minister.

⁵⁷ Simeon to a clergyman, July 2, 1833, in Carus: 511.

⁵⁸ Brown: 267.

of a useless theological fray. Although the latter outcome was achieved to a greater extent than the former, Simeon's paradoxical statements on election illustrate his willingness to embrace opposing traditions in order to forward his agenda.

Simeon's tolerance of ambiguity with respect to theological matters has been noted in the relevant literature.⁵⁹ It is surprising, however, that the wider operation of this dynamic in Simeon's life and work has not received equal attention. A host of contradictions is implied by Simeon's concern for social order, his simultaneous activism and voluntarism, and his concurrent dependence upon non-institutional mechanisms for religious influence. Resolution is needed for three dilemmas in particular.

First, in Simeon we have an Anglican clergyman with a fundamental concern for ecclesiastical order. Nevertheless, Simeon championed the formation of a voluntary missionary society, i.e., the CMS. Moreover, Simeon knew that the CMS would be governed exclusively by evangelical Churchmen, that it would operate independently of the hierarchy of the Established Church, and that it would compete with the Church's existing missionary societies.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ E.g., Smyth, C.H.E., *Simeon and church order: A study of the origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the eighteenth century*, The Birkbeck Lectures for 1937-1938, Cambridge, 1940: xiif.; Pollard, A., and M. Hennell, eds., *Charles Simeon [1759-1836]: Essays written in commemoration of his bicentenary by members of the Evangelical Fellowship for Theological Literature*, Great Anglicans, London, 1964: 32f.; and Hopkins, H.E., *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*, London, 1977: 175f.

⁶⁰ A chief complaint against the CMS was its inherent competition with the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge [SPCK] and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts [SPG]. This matter is taken up in some detail in chapter five.

Second, in Simeon we have an evangelical clergyman and founder of a evangelical missionary society who insisted on the submission of that society and its missionaries to the hierarchy of the Established Church. Simeon urged the CMS to subject itself to the Church of England despite the fact that its power structure had become known for its ambivalence, if not opposition to the missionary agenda.

Third, in Simeon we have a university figure who endeavoured to impart missionary vision to the Established Church, aided the creation of voluntary missionary societies for Churchmen, but failed to direct a sizable number of students toward missionary service through either channel. Rather, Simeon consistently encouraged large numbers of 'his' missionary candidates to seek employment with a secular trading concern -- the East India Company -- that was primarily driven by profit motives.

These interconnected and contradictory developments were not the product of traditional evangelicalism and Anglican churchmanship. Such conflicting outcomes were made possible by Simeon's tolerance for paradox. The closer one looks at Charles Simeon and his missionary agenda, the less predictable he appears.

Simeon's Missionary Agenda

Charles Simeon's distinctive world-view and tolerance of ambiguity merged in their effect on the British missionary movement. The net result was the creation of an agenda for promoting Christian mission with three independent centres of gravity: churchmanship, voluntaryism, and individualism. The Churchman in Simeon, the activist in Simeon, and the mentor in Simeon found appropriate roles in the missionary movement. True to paradoxical form, Simeon also argued for the

supremacy of each aspect of his work. The interplay between the three facets of Simeon's missionary agenda is apparent in a brief chronology of his chief mission-related efforts.

1787: From the outset of his ministry Charles Simeon had championed Christian mission as the appointed means for the global proclamation of the universal grace of God in Christ. An opportunity to apply his theoretical support for missionary work arose in 1787. In that year Simeon willingly undertook the promotion of a "missionary establishment" in Bengal under East India Company patronage.⁶¹ However, Simeon was surprised and disappointed by the opposition of the Company and Parliament to the plan.

1797: By this point in time Simeon was openly encouraging voluntary effort for Christian mission. However, he had discovered that he could not expect Anglicans to support the "undenominational" [London] Missionary Society [LMS], and he would not ask his evangelical colleagues to limit their backing to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. An alternative society for evangelical Churchmen had become necessary.

1799: For two years Simeon had crisscrossed half of England, from the Midlands to Cornwall, in support of an evangelical missionary society for the Established Church. During his travels to numerous clerical meetings Simeon had become impatient with the reluctance of his evangelical colleagues to take

⁶¹ I.e., the September 1787 "Plan for a missionary establishment in Bengal and Behar," as proposed from Calcutta by David Brown, William Chambers, Charles Grant, and George Udny. [Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.]

definitive action. Consider Simeon's plea to the Eclectic Society at its meeting on March 18:

What can we do? -- When shall we do it? -- How shall we do it? ... We cannot join the [London] Missionary Society; yet I bless God that they have stood forth. We must now stand forth. We require something more than resolutions -- something ostensible -- something held up to the public. Many draw back because we do not stand forth. -- When shall we do it? Directly: not a moment to be lost. We have been dreaming these four years, while all England, all Europe has been awake.⁶²

Simeon's spirits were greatly lifted by the creation of the Church Missionary Society [CMS] in the following month.

1800: With the founding of the CMS, Simeon's concerns turned to recruiting candidates for missionary service. Simeon discouraged volunteers per se, i.e., those who stepped forward from personal enthusiasm or vocational despair:

When a man asks me about a call to be a Missionary, I answer very differently from many others. I tell him that if he feels his mind to be strongly bent on it, he ought to take that as a reason for suspecting and carefully examining whether it is not self rather than God which is leading him to the work. The man that does good as a Missionary is he who ... says, "Here am I; do what seemeth good unto thee: send me."⁶³

Simeon advocated a sending strategy in which God, via a mentor, discovers missionary potential, shapes it, and channels the candidate toward a "sphere" of activity, perhaps one in the gift of the mentor.

⁶² Carus: 125-6; see also Pratt, J.H., ed., *Eclectic Notes ...*, 2nd edition, London, 1865: 99.

⁶³ Brown: 208.

1804: By the end of the CMS's first half-decade, Simeon had become concerned over the unwillingness of most university students to consider missionary service.⁶⁴ Owing to the pioneering work of the Dissenting societies [e.g., the Baptists and the LMS], missionaries had developed a reputation as artisans and school teachers. University graduates found little to recommend these vocations.⁶⁵ Moreover, Simeon had become frustrated with the Establishment's restrictions on missionary work in India. His relationship with the CMS also became strained by his inability to recruit missionaries for the Society. Simeon began to search for alternatives to missionary service with a voluntary society. His connection with David Brown and Charles Grant, dating back to 1787, proved to be formative for Simeon.

1805: Simeon gave serious thought to an alternative channel for missionary activity. East India Company chaplaincies -- a respectable vocation for university graduates -- would allow Simeon to send his best students to India while avoiding the Establishment's restrictions on missionaries per se. From 1805 to 1820, Simeon encouraged more than three dozen of his students to apply for India Company chaplaincies. With the support of Grant, twenty-one of Simeon's disciples made successful applications. It is significant that more than half of this activity occurred after the 1813 renewal of the India Company's charter lifted most of the restrictions on missionary access to India. Simeon's indirect influence in India, through 'his' chaplains, extended far beyond his death in 1836.

⁶⁴ "... not one of them says, 'Here I am, send me.'" [Simeon to Thomas Scott, August 22, 1800, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3; also cited in Hole, C., *The early history of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1896: 62.]

⁶⁵ This problem had become apparent to Melville Horne a decade earlier. See Horne's *Letters on missions addressed to the Protestant ministers of the British churches*, London, 1794, reprint, Andover, 1815: 32 and passim.

1809: Simeon began to give serious attention to a moderate form of millenarianism. As a result he developed an enthusiasm for the conversion of the Jewish people. He came to believe that Jewish converts would become a strategic means to evangelize traditionally non-Christian societies. This conviction, combined with continued difficulties in recruiting and placing missionaries, motivated Simeon to participate in the work of the London Society for Propagating Christianity Amongst the Jews [LSPCJ].⁶⁶ Simeon's most significant contribution to the LSPCJ was its reorganization in 1814 as a society governed by Churchmen.

1814: With the creation of the Calcutta episcopate in 1813, Charles Simeon had anticipated a close and profitable relationship between the CMS and the Bishop of Calcutta. However, Simeon became concerned for the CMS's commitment to Church order when the Society balked at the submission of its missionaries in India to the new bishop. The General Committee of the Society had become suspicious of T.F. Middleton from the first notice of his appointment in 1814. Middleton was no evangelical. The Society would not instruct its missionaries to submit to the bishop until he licensed them. In turn, Middleton refused to license the missionaries because he was unsure of their loyalty.⁶⁷ Problems of this sort plagued the CMS's work in India until the 1840s. In contrast, Simeon consistently urged proper cooperation between the CMS and the

⁶⁶ For a complete summary of Simeon's efforts in aid of Jewish evangelism, see Cartwright, J.B., *Love to the Jewish nation: A sermon preached at the Episcopal Jews' Chapel, Bethnal Green, London, on Sunday morning, November 27th, 1836, on the occasion of the death of the Rev. Charles Simeon*, 2nd edition, London, 1836: 31-43.

⁶⁷ The most common explanation for Middleton's refusal is ambiguity in his letters patent. His unwillingness to license the SPCK's missionaries, as well as those of the CMS, supports this theory. There is evidence to suggest that Middleton refrained from licensing any missionaries until he could license all of them, and that more than a legal technicality hindered him vis-à-vis the CMS. This important example of church-mission tension is considered in some detail in chapters four and five.

Bishop of Calcutta. Simeon's influence in the matter was also indirectly exerted through his former students who were then chaplains in India.

1818: Although the CMS's ecclesiastical policies and practices troubled Simeon and strained his relationship with the Society, he did not abandon the CMS. He regularly encouraged his Cambridge congregation to subscribe to the Society.⁶⁸ Moreover, Simeon supported the development of auxiliary Church Missionary Associations [CMAs] from the inception of the plan in 1813. However, Simeon delayed his backing for the Cambridge association until 1818. He had deferred his support for a local CMS auxiliary because of continued trouble between the Society and Middleton and the residual tensions in the town from the founding of the Bible Society's auxiliary in 1812.

The 1820's: During the closing decade and a half of his life, Simeon did not fail to continue to mentor and influence second- and third-generation leaders for the evangelical Anglican missionary movement. Consider, for example, his relationship with Henry Venn [junior], the distinguished Honorary Secretary of the CMS, and Daniel Wilson, the evangelical Bishop of Calcutta. By means of his influence on the two men, Simeon indirectly helped the CMS to strike a balance between its ecclesiastical and missionary priorities. Venn and Wilson made the peace between the Society and the Calcutta episcopate in 1838.⁶⁹ In turn, their

⁶⁸ For example, the first parochial collection on behalf of the CMS was taken at Holy Trinity Church in 1804. [Hole, C., *The early history of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1896: 96.]

⁶⁹ In 1836, Daniel Wilson proposed four "rules" to guide the Bishop of Calcutta in his relationship with the CMS's clerical missionaries in India. Wilson suggested that the diocesan should [1] determine the missionary's fitness for licensing, [2] approve the stationing of the missionary, [3] superintend his ecclesiastical work [versus his missionary work], but [4] receive regular reports from the Society on the missionary work of the clergyman. [Wilson to the CMS General Committee, June 9, 1836, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I1/O 8/4.]

"Appendix II" to the thirty-ninth *Report* of the CMS, drafted by Henry Venn in 1838, reflected the
(continued...)

success made it possible for the hierarchy of the Church of England to support the work of the Society. The bishops of the Church were, at last, induced to patronize the CMS.

Charles Simeon is owed some of the credit for the achievement of the "Concordat" between the CMS and the Bishop of Calcutta. Although it was at best an indirect product of his efforts, it serves as a fitting reminder of the evangelical Anglican who strove for balance between churchmanship, voluntarism, and individualism in the first decades of the British missionary movement.

From Introduction to Substance

Having laid out the broad sweep of this study, it now remains to document carefully the arguments introduced.

Chapters one through three consider the formation of Charles Simeon's world-view. Emphasis in these chapters is placed on the aspects of Simeon's *Weltanschauung* that were formative for his influence on the missionary movement. Chapter one deals with Simeon's concept of religious effort as it developed out of his theological roots and understanding of Christian experience. Chapter two

⁶⁹(...continued)

acceptance of Wilson's proposal. These principles were formalized in Venn's "Concordat" of July, 1841, incorporating them into "Law 32" of the Society. With the publication of the new regulations, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London finally consented to serve the CMS as vice-patrons. [Shenk, W., *Henry Venn as missionary theorist and administrator*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1978: 242-53.]

addresses Simeon's social views and their impact on his churchmanship. Chapter three considers Simeon's approaches to exerting influence on church and society.

Chapters four through six trace the influence of Charles Simeon on the eighteenth and nineteenth century British missionary movement. The connection between Simeon's world-view and his emphases on churchmanship, voluntaryism, and individualism is demonstrated. The fourth chapter provides a frame of reference for the second part of this study by examining the voluntary nature of the missionary movement of Simeon's day. Building upon this foundation, chapter five explores the relationship between Charles Simeon and the Society for Missions to Africa and the East -- the CMS -- from its origins until the beginning of Henry Venn's secretariat.

Chapter six continues the theme of the previous chapter in a different but related context. This chapter examines Simeon's alternative approach to Christian mission, i.e., his efforts to recruit chaplains for the East India Company. Simeon's involvement with the LSPCJ also receives attention in chapter six. Simeon's notions of churchmanship, voluntaryism, and individualism are shown to be equally essential to these aspects of his missionary agenda.

In the concluding chapter the legacy of Charles Simeon and his vision of a missionary Church of England is considered. How did Simeon's life and work affect the British missionary movement as it approached the Victorian era? What impact did Simeon have on the third and subsequent generations of evangelical Churchmen, with particular reference to their missionary agendas? Further, what relevance does Simeon's churchmanship, voluntaryism, and individualism have for evangelical Christian mission in the twenty-first century? Is the Church of Jesus Christ today in any sense better able to declare Good News to captives because of the work of an idiosyncratic and unpredictable Cambridge minister in the early

nineteenth century? Some of these questions foreshadow further research, especially if thorough answers are to be found, but these matters can be addressed initially from the data at hand. It is one thing to describe who Simeon was and what he did. It is also necessary to ask, "So what?"

Writing shortly after Simeon's death, Sir James Stephen commented on the eccentricities of Charles Simeon:

Here, they said, was a man beset by difficulties enough to have baffled the whole school of Athens ... by inveterate affectations, by the want of learning, by the want of social talents, by the want of general ability of any kind, by the want of interest in the pursuit of his neighbours, by their want of sympathy in his pursuits, by the want of their goodwill, nay, by the want of their decided and hearty animosity ... To a casual acquaintance he must frequently have appeared like some truant from the green room, studying in clerical costume for the part of Mercutio, and doing it scandalously ill.⁷⁰

Contrary to the expectations that might be created by such a description, Sir James proceeded to grant to Simeon a significant place of honour among second-generation evangelicals. He deemed the accomplishments of Simeon's fifty-four years of public ministry to have been extraordinarily significant to the "evangelical succession" in Great Britain.

A similar dilemma is presented here. Is this study is correct in crediting Simeon with a profound contribution to Christian mission, or was Charles Simeon merely as predictable as first impressions of him suggest?

⁷⁰ Stephen, J., *Essays in ecclesiastical biography*, 1849, 3rd edition, London, 1853: vol.2, 370

PART ONE

THE WORLD-VIEW OF CHARLES SIMEON

Chapter One

Convergence of Faith and Duty

Charles Simeon's contributions to the origins of the British missionary movement are essentially nineteenth century phenomena. They occurred during the decades of social change in Great Britain and Europe that unfolded following the profound events of 1789. What must not be lost is the fact that Simeon's world-view was the product of eighteenth century events and perceptions. In order to comprehend Simeon's activity on behalf of Christian mission in the new century, it is necessary to trace the development of his *Weltanschauung* in the old.

In laying the foundation for his study of the approach of the British missionary movement to India, Allan Davidson briefly introduces the notion of an "evangelical world-view," with John Newton and William Wilberforce as its archetypes.¹ Davidson suggests that the central element to this value system is individual spiritual conversion. Simeon shared Newton and Wilberforce's values. In the introduction to *Helps to composition*, Simeon discusses the publication's purpose, viz., "To humble the sinner ... To exalt the Saviour ... To promote

¹ Davidson, A.K., *The development and influence of the British missionary movement's attitudes towards India, 1786-1830*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1973: 31.

holiness"² These phrases restate Wilberforce's "peculiar doctrines" of Christianity, the marks of faith that set apart "real" Christians from unbelievers.³

Although evangelical distinctives and an 'experimental' view of Christian faith figured prominently in Simeon's personal values, there were other components to his world-view. The *Weltanschauung* of Charles Simeon was a complex mixture of evangelical theology, joint dependence on God's grace and human means for Christian living, a profound appreciation for social order, and a mentoring framework for exerting personal and public influence. Each of these aspects of Simeon's world-view demands attention. In this chapter the effect of Simeon's theology on his perception of religious effort receives consideration.

Simeon's Eclectic Theology

[Christian] duty and privilege go hand in hand ... God elects us to holiness *as the means*, as well as to glory *as the end*: He elects us *to the end by the means*; so that the end can never be secured but by the means prescribed.⁴

Charles Simeon visualized an indissoluble link between evangelical conversion and the duty of Christians to work for the progress of the kingdom of God. In making conversion central to his theology Simeon reflected the influences

² Simeon, C., *Helps to composition: or, Five hundred skeletons of sermons, several being the substance of sermons preached before the University*, 4 parts in 2 vols., Cambridge, 1801: xi.

³ Wilberforce, W., *A practical view of the prevailing religious system of professed Christians in the higher and middle classes in this country contrasted with real Christianity*, 6th edition, Glasgow, 1837: 92ff.

⁴ Horae: Sermon 2420, "Making our calling and election sure," vol.20, 301-2.

of Puritanism and Pietism on evangelicalism. What is intriguing, however, is the evidence of High Church rationalism in Simeon's value system. His attention to diligence in moral duty is an example. How did these various aspects of his world-view evolve?

Simeon was an evangelical and an Anglican. His outlook on life reflected both perspectives. As has been indicated in the introduction, the blending of divergent streams of Christian perspective was not uncommon for Simeon. For example, with respect to the Calvinist-Arminian controversy, he advised an acquaintance to adopt an integrative solution:

... my brother, I am unfortunate: I formerly read Aristotle, and liked him much: I have since read Paul, and caught somewhat of his strange notions *oscillating* [not vacillating] from pole to pole. Sometimes I am a high Calvinist, at other times a low Arminian, so that if extremes will please you, I am your man; only remember, it is not *one* extreme that we are to go to, but *both* extremes.⁵

Despite the ambiguity inherent in such advice, it is important to recall that Simeon truly was a moderate Calvinist. Like most evangelical Churchmen, he embraced the sublapsarian theology that underlay the Thirty-Nine Articles.⁶ As discussed previously, Simeon declined to embrace the dogma of hyper-Calvinism or Arminianism in favour of a position that would be broadly palatable to

⁵ Carus: 420. Simeon did not escape censure for his equivocal views, as illustrated in his running debate with fellow Cambridge don Edward Pearson from 1806 to 1810. See pp.55ff. in the current chapter.

⁶Simeon was no more vague on predestination than is Article 17 itself. The historical development of the Articles is efficiently reviewed in the SPCK's *Subscription and assent to the Thirty-nine Articles*, London, 1968.

Churchmen.⁷ The historical context for Simeon's eclectic theology is worth a brief review. Attention must be given to evangelical and traditional Anglican roots for his theological convictions.

The Evangelical State of Affairs from 1759

When Simeon first drew breath in Reading in 1759 the Evangelical Revival was in full swing and had begun to leave its mark on the Church of England.⁸ John Wesley was crisscrossing England and Wales by horseback in order to develop his "Connexion".⁹ Howell Harris had established the centre of Welsh Calvinistic Methodism at Trevecca. Selina, the Countess of Huntingdon, was organizing proprietary chapels. Charles Wesley was composing hymns in Bristol. George Whitefield, under the patronage of the Countess of Huntingdon, was preaching throughout Great Britain. William Grimshaw was the incumbent of

⁷See the introduction, pp.21-23.

⁸ The Evangelical Revival was by no means limited to the Established Church. Its manifestations in 1759 were readily apparent in Baptist, Independent [i.e., Congregational], Presbyterian, and Quaker circles, etc., and in the Scottish churches.

Moreover, G.F. Nuttall has argued convincingly that eighteenth century Dissent contributed significantly to the foment of the Revival. Consider, for example, the Nonconformist writings of Matthias Maurice and Abraham Taylor. In 1737 Maurice published "*The modern question modestly answered*" as a refutation of the supralapsarian principles of High Calvinism. Taylor's "*The modern question concerning repentance and faith examined with candour*" was published in 1742 in support of Maurice's work. Although Maurice and Taylor did not embrace evangelicalism, Taylor's writings in particular had a profound effect on evangelical Dissenters such as Andrew Fuller. Fuller's *The Gospel worthy of all acceptation* [c.1785] was instrumental in moderating the Calvinism of the Particular Baptists and did much to further the progress of the Evangelical Revival as a whole. [See Nuttall, G.F., "Northamptonshire and *The modern question*: A turning-point in eighteenth century Dissent," *Journal of Theological Studies* 16 (April 1965), 101-23.]

⁹ Wesley's travels had averaged 4,000 miles a year for two decades. [Brauer, J.C., ed., *The Westminster dictionary of church history*, Philadelphia, 1971: 860.]

Haworth. Samuel Walker was curate at Truro. William Romaine was lecturer at St. Dunstan's, London. John Thornton had just become an evangelical. The Earl of Dartmouth, another recent convert to evangelicalism, had secured the living of Huddersfield for Henry Venn.¹⁰ Evangelical Anglicans in 1759 were slowly becoming situated in Great Britain, although their power was mostly limited to the periphery of British society and the Established Church.¹¹

By the time Simeon entered King's College, Cambridge, in 1779, evangelicalism in the Church of England was on a somewhat broader footing. The leading evangelicals who influenced Simeon in his early years of ministry were in place in their parishes. John Berridge held the incumbency of Everton, where he could be found when not itinerating. John William Fletcher, John Wesley's close friend and former colleague, was the vicar of Madeley in Shropshire. The Earl of Dartmouth had played the patron on two more occasions, securing St. Mary's in Leicester for Thomas Robinson and the living of Olney for John Newton.¹² Most important for Simeon, Henry Venn was in semi-retirement in the nearby parish of Yelling. It was in Venn that Simeon would find "a father, an instructor, and a most bright example."¹³

¹⁰ Balleine, G.R., *A history of the evangelical party in the Church of England*, London, 1908: 57-8.

¹¹ For example, evangelicals were forced to wait until 1815 for their first bishop, Henry Ryder [of Gloucester]. Simeon's letter of May 19, 1815, to Thomas Thomason reveals the exultation among evangelical Churchmen over the "wonderful event." [Carus: 286.]

¹² Balleine, op.cit.: 58.

¹³ Carus: 26.

Charles Simeon was positioned in time and space to benefit from the very best tutors that first-generation evangelicalism had to offer. Their legacy to Simeon and other second-generation evangelicals is important to this study.¹⁴ For example, the extent to which Simeon's social views and philosophy of ministry were formed by contact with the elder evangelicals of the eighteenth century is considered in chapters two and three. In this chapter, however, the core issues are theological. Who or what shaped Simeon's theology? What evangelical literature influenced his thought? Was he 'disciple'd by the senior evangelicals of his day? Did the remains of English Puritanism help to shape Simeon's theological commitments? These questions are addressed in reverse order.

Questions of Puritan Influence

In a defence of the Established Church in 1808, Josiah Thomas drew an alarming parallel between the principles behind "Cromwell's rebellion" and Nonconformist appeals for the revocation of the Test and Corporation Acts.¹⁵ Attacking the concept of "private religious judgment," Thomas objected to the notion that "every mechanic, whether he can read or not, is as unexceptional a judge in religion ... as St. Paul."¹⁶ Thomas also charged "half-dissenting churchmen," i.e., evangelical Anglicans, with leading the nation toward "another

¹⁴ Although Simeon was a second-generation evangelical Anglican, he was the first evangelical in his family. See Simeon's exchange of correspondence with his brother Jack in Carus: 30-2.

¹⁵ Thomas, J., *Strictures on subjects chiefly relating to the established religion and the clergy: In two letters to his patron, from a country clergyman*, 2nd edition, London, 1809: 7. Thomas later became Archdeacon of Bath.

¹⁶ Op.cit.: 13.

Cromwell and ... revolution."¹⁷ Thomas clearly believed that a direct connection existed between nineteenth century evangelicalism and the vestiges of seventeenth century Puritanism. The politics of evangelical Anglicans will be discussed in chapter two, but their theology and its link to Puritan thought can be examined at this point.

The theological constructs that undergirded Puritanism included an absolute fidelity to the Scriptures, mechanistic hermeneutics, an affirmation of the total depravity of human nature, complete dependence upon the grace of God for salvation, and an unequivocal call to individual conversion. As an evangelical Simeon fully embraced these beliefs. However, these principles did not originate with the English Puritans. They were imported from the Continent and were a product of the Reformation, especially at Geneva. The fact that Simeon and the Puritans shared certain points of theology demonstrates a Protestant and Calvinistic connection, but it did not make Simeon a latent Puritan. This conclusion is further reinforced by a brief summary of Puritanism's genuine distinctives.

Puritanism, dating roughly from the reign of Elizabeth I through the end of the seventeenth century, has been ably defined by Patrick Collinson as "'a further reformation,' the logical completion of the process of reconstructing the national church, which in [the Puritan] view had been arrested halfway."¹⁸ Central to Elizabethan Puritanism was a call for the reconstitution of the English Church, measured "not by the Christians of whom [the Church] was composed, nor by the sincerity of their profession, but by the purity of the doctrine publicly preached ... and by the sincere administration and reception of the sacraments, safeguarded by

¹⁷ Op.cit.: 7, 19.

¹⁸ Collinson, P., *The Elizabethan Puritan movement*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967: 11.

the exercise of church discipline."¹⁹ It should be noted, however, that the Puritan agenda was not strictly ecclesiastical. The commitment of the Puritan community to social reform and the achievement of a 'godly commonwealth' revealed the extent to which the seventeenth century Puritan movement sought to renew English society and its Church through the recovery of explicitly biblical values.²⁰

The chief opponents of Puritanism, which Collinson labels "Conformists," were more satisfied with the Elizabethan Settlement. They were a diverse group of Protestants who genuinely desired to rid the Established Church of the vestiges of Romanism, but they distinguished between the "essentials and nonessentials of religion" by allowing human reason to rule in "indifferent" matters.²¹ At the outset of the Puritan movement the two sides were not that far apart. John Hooper's opposition to the surplice was matched by Nicholas Ridley's defence of it, but both bishops were burned at the stake in 1555 by Mary Tudor on account of their Protestant convictions. The catastrophic break between Puritanism and mainstream Anglicanism developed over questions of polity [i.e., episcopacy], but the rift did not become fatal until Laud's suppression of Puritan lecturers in the

¹⁹ Collinson, op.cit.: 25.

²⁰ For example, Collinson recounts the efforts in the 1620s of Puritans in Salisbury, led by Henry Sherfield, "to abolish poverty and to erect a godly commonwealth" through the "municipalization" of the local brewery and "the appropriation of [its] profits to maintain the workhouse." [Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants*, ut sup.: 148.] S.J. Brown's introduction to his *Thomas Chalmers and the Godly Commonwealth in Scotland* [Oxford, 1982: xv-xvii] includes a brief summary of the Calvinist notion of the 'godly commonwealth' and its impact in Britain.

²¹ Collinson, op.cit.: 27.

1630s.²² The Civil War, the execution of Charles I, and the Restoration settlement of 1660-2 marked the end of Puritanism as a distinct movement.²³

The collapse of the Puritan Establishment in England had two outcomes. First, the Puritan movement veered toward pietistic emphases. For a quarter of a century, from the Ejection until the Act of Toleration [1689], no legal means existed for dissent in the English Church. Puritans had nowhere to turn but inward. Van den Berg suggests that Puritanism began to borrow from the German Pietists, developing a more intimate concept of conversion: i.e., a direct encounter with God with a view toward greater spiritual power for Christian living.²⁴ Second, with no future in the Church of England the 'religious enthusiasm' of Puritanism began to express itself through various denominational circles. As Nuttall has argued, English Nonconformity -- with a legal status provided by the Act of Toleration -- effectively absorbed English Puritanism into its historical course.²⁵

²² Laud believed lectureships and house meetings -- common Puritan devices -- to be evidences of "a church within the church" and, therefore, a sectarian threat to the Established Church. [Collinson, P., *The religion of Protestants: The Church in English society, 1559-1625*, The Ford Lectures, 1979, Oxford, 1982: 271.]

²³ Although it was distinctive in its various phases, Puritanism was not monolithic. The meaning of the term shifted significantly over the course of the century in which it was in common use. See Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan movement*, ut sup.: 28 and passim.

²⁴ van den Berg, J., *Constrained by Jesus' love: An enquiry into the motives of the missionary awakening in Great Britain in the period between 1698 and 1815*, Kampen, 1956: 31.

²⁵ Nuttall, G.F., *The Holy Spirit in Puritan faith and experience*, Oxford, 1946: 8-9.

Collinson rightly urges us to avoid reading "later denominationalism" in Elizabethan Puritanism. [Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan movement*, ut sup.: 28.] Nuttall is not guilty of this error. He differentiates, for example, between Puritans and separatists [e.g., Quakerism] prior to 1662. However, Nuttall maintains that the ejected Puritans had more in common with the separatist movements than they did with the Laudian Church of England. On this basis Nuttall concludes that English Nonconformity -- elements of which predated 1662 -- was significantly energized by Puritanism.

Puritanism per se continued as a distinct force in the Scottish context, but its appearance in eighteenth century England was limited to the writings of Nonconformist divines such as Philip Doddridge.

The influence of Puritanism on Charles Simeon appears to have been limited. First, Simeon had no interest in the reconstruction or reconstitution of the Established Church; he was perfectly happy with its Articles and Prayer Book.²⁶ Although ecclesiastical reform was not Puritanism's sole agenda, it was a mark of the movement. It is significant that Simeon did not consider such reforms to be necessary. Second, Simeon was able to differentiate between requisite and voluntary principles; for example, he was a firm advocate of episcopacy for the Established Church but he recognized that other forms of government could be employed by foreign Protestant churches.²⁷ Third, he was absolutely loyal to the Crown and the Government.²⁸ Finally, Simeon judged Dissent to be a political and social evil.²⁹ These facts suggest that the chief connection between Simeon and Puritanism was his embrace of the Calvinistic principles that had become known as evangelicalism's 'peculiar doctrines'. Eighteenth and nineteenth century Nonconformity may have reincarnated certain elements of seventeenth century Puritanism, as Josiah Thomas charged, but the allegation was unfounded with respect to Simeon. If anything, the activities of radical Puritan groups such as the

²⁶ Simeon's commitment to the formularies of the Church of England is documented in chapter two, p.83.

²⁷ See chapter two, pp.112-18.

²⁸ Simeon's allegiance to the British constitution and his confidence in the existing social structure is treated in chapter two, pp.68-9,71-4.

²⁹ He made this claim without objection to the exercise of personal religious discretion. See chapter two, pp.95,103-4.

Ranters, Levellers, Seekers, etc., would have served to reinforce Simeon's social conservatism.³⁰ For all intents and purposes Charles Simeon was no Puritan.

Sources for Simeon's Evangelicalism

By what means, then, did Charles Simeon become an evangelical? This question was of great interest to his contemporaries. Simeon's obituary in the *Christian Observer* attributes his Christian formation to a Pauline-like experience:

He did not receive [his Christian views] by communication either oral or written from any human being, but from the Divine source of light and truth -- from God's speaking to him through his own word, the Bible. He distinctly affirmed that he did not learn it even from the formularies of our Church, though he found in those formularies what was in perfect accordance with his own sentiments.³¹

This theme is repeated in more common terms in Preston's *Memoranda of ... Simeon*. There the source of Simeon's early Christian growth is attributed to prayer and Scripture reading.³²

³⁰ As suggested by S.J. Brown of Edinburgh University in private discussion and correspondence with the author.

³¹ "Obituary: Rev. Charles Simeon," *Christian Observer* 37 (1837), 56.

³² Preston, M.M., *Memoranda of the Rev. Charles Simeon, M.A., late Minister of Trinity Church, and Fellow of King's College, Cambridge*, London, 1840: 12. In the preface Preston claims the authorship of Simeon's obituary in the *Christian Observer*, with this work being a refinement of it. [See the preceding note and related text.]

Preston's assessment is supported by Simeon's autobiography, which Carus included in the *Memoirs*. Following his conversion, culminating on Easter Sunday 1779, Simeon's evangelical experience was limited to his own devotional life; three years passed before Simeon met another Christian "of like mind."³³ Through study of the Scriptures he began to discover the implications of the trust he had placed in Christ's work on the cross. Through prayer his enthusiasm for those implications grew: "From the time I found peace with God myself, I wished to impart to others the benefits I had received."³⁴ Simeon became an evangelical in private through the unaided discovery -- at least initially -- of the biblical principles that were known as evangelical. For these reasons Canon Charles Smyth suggested that Simeon's conversion was "entirely independent of the normal influences of environment."³⁵

The method of Simeon's conversion was not unique. Quite naturally the Reformers themselves, the first Protestants, attributed their new faith to the work of the Scriptures. Richard Baxter, the Puritan divine, claimed that his father had been instructed in the faith solely by reading the Scriptures, "without preaching or fellowship."³⁶ This was also the experience of Henry Venn [senior], Simeon's mentor.³⁷ Reports of similar but unconnected spiritual discoveries were associated

³³ Carus: 18.

³⁴ Carus: 17.

³⁵ Smyth, C.H.E., *Simeon and church order: A study of the origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the eighteenth century*, The Birkbeck Lectures for 1937-1938, Cambridge, 1940: 11.

³⁶ Baxter, R., *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, 1696, p.2, as quoted in Collinson, *The religion of Protestants*, ut sup.: 250.

³⁷ The elder Venn's testimony was recounted by his grandson, Henry Venn of the CMS, in *The treasure in earthen vessels: A sermon preached ... at the consecration of ... the Lord Bishop of Norwich ...: To which is appended, an historical sketch of the revival of evangelical preaching in* (continued...)

with numerous eighteenth century evangelicals, including the dramatic account of John Newton's conversion.³⁸ The means of Simeon's spiritual rebirth placed him in good company.

Simeon and his fellow evangelical Anglicans also found form and meaning for their biblical convictions in the writings of the Puritan divines and their successors. The contribution of Baxter, for example, was significant to the eighteenth century Revival. Sir James Stephen, early historian of the Evangelical Revival, credits Baxter [1615-1691] with forwarding a number of causes that became distinctives of evangelicalism: concern for clerical neglect of the parish, evangelizing of commoners, catechizing of communicants, the occasional necessity of itineration [i.e., where the parish minister was negligent], commitment to limited monarchy, and documenting the natural and historical evidences of Christianity's truthfulness.³⁹

In Baxter's *Call to the unconverted to turn and live* [1657], the importance of spiritual conversion is reinforced. The *Call* also advocates a moderate Calvinism through Baxter's distinction between God's "simple will," his natural desire to save men, and God's "complex will," his choice to condemn them if they

³⁷(...continued)

the Church of England, London, 1857: 14. See also Hennell, M., *John Venn and the Clapham Sect*, London, 1958: 56.

³⁸ J.D. Walsh supports this view in "The origins of the Evangelical Revival," *Essays in modern English church history in memory of Norman Sykes*, edited by G.V. Bennett and J.D. Walsh, London, 1966: 136.

³⁹ Stephen, J., *Essays in ecclesiastical biography*, 1849, 3rd edition, London, 1849: vol.2, 49.

will not "turn and live."⁴⁰ Affirmation of election concomitant with the rejection of reprobation became associated with evangelical views of conversion, including those of Simeon.⁴¹ Simeon had read at least some of Baxter's writings and found them "correct" in theological terms, although he judged the Puritan's "vituperative style" to have been unnecessary.⁴²

Perhaps the most important textbook for first- and second-generation evangelical Churchmen was Philip Doddridge's *Rise and progress of religion in the soul* [1745]. 'Experimental religion', a watchword for evangelicals, is a concept straight from the writings of Doddridge:

Religion, in its most general view, is such a sense of God on the soul, and such a conviction of our obligations to Him, and our dependence upon Him, as shall engage us to make it our great care to conduct ourselves in a manner which we have reason to believe will be pleasing to him.⁴³

⁴⁰ Baxter, R., *A call to the unconverted to turn and live and accept of mercy while mercy may be had: Containing directions and persuasions to a sound conversion*, 1658, reprint, Edinburgh, 1787: 50.

⁴¹ Simeon's sublapsarian position is evident in Horae: Sermon 2379, "Offices of the Holy Trinity," vol.20, 131-2.

⁴² Brown: 195.

⁴³ Doddridge, P., *The rise and progress of religion in the soul: Illustrated in a course of serious and practical addresses*, 1745, reprint, London, 1892: 7.

The table of contents of *Rise and progress* reads like a summary of Whitefield's open air sermons or a series of titles from Simeon's *Horae homileticae*:

2. Careless sinner awakened
3. Awakened sinner urged to consider his situation
4. Sinner charged and convicted
5. Sinner stripped of excuses
6. Sinner sentenced
7. Sinner helpless and condemned
8. News of salvation brought to convinced and condemned sinner
9. The way of salvation
10. Sinner urged to accept salvation
11. To the intransigent sinner
[etc.]

Doddridge was read with great effect by Henry [senior] and John Venn, John Newton, Charles Grant [senior], William Wilberforce, and many other leading evangelicals. Although Simeon makes no printed mention of *Rise and progress*, it is inconceivable that he was not directed to it by Henry Venn and others.

Another seventeenth century text of importance to the eighteenth century Revival was a collection of extracts from the Reformers and the Puritan divines entitled the *Marrow of modern divinity* [1645 and 1648]. Published in London, supposedly by Edward Fisher, the *Marrow* attempted to strike a balance between the extremes of Christian legalism and antinomianism. The publication also sought to strengthen evangelistic imperatives by championing the principle of universal grace.⁴⁴ The *Marrow* was banned in Scotland by the General Assembly of 1720 as an antinomian heresy associated with the Erskine brothers and other 'Marrowmen'. The *Marrow* proved to be too much for the Moderate Party's

⁴⁴ Mechie, S., "The Marrow Controversy reviewed," *Evangelical Quarterly* 22 (1950), 20. See also: van den Berg, J., *Constrained by Jesus' love: An enquiry into the motives of the missionary awakening in Great Britain in the period between 1698 and 1815*, Kampen, 1956: 32.

commitment to the Westminster Confession.⁴⁵ The Assembly's judgment was flawed. Marrowmen affirmed limited atonement in that only the 'elect' could respond positively to the grace of God. Their innovation was to suggest that the Christian Church should broadly declare the grace of God in Christ. They also contended that piety is not a necessary prerequisite to salvation but a consequence of it.⁴⁶

Although he makes no reference to the *Marrow* in his writings, Simeon's views on the grace of God have a familiar ring to them.⁴⁷ Consider his expectations for the conversion of the Jewish and Gentile nations. Simeon did not expect the global progress of the Gospel to occur by miraculous means, but by "first century methods," viz., Gospel preaching. Mass conversions of Jews and Gentiles will ensue in "God's appointed time, and *that, too, through the instrumentality of human efforts.*"⁴⁸ Nevertheless, Simeon continued to maintain a view of election that was characteristic of moderate Calvinism. He affirmed single

⁴⁵ Mechie, op.cit.: 22-7.

⁴⁶ Op.cit.: 24.

⁴⁷ Simeon's famous saying, "The Bible first, the Prayer Book next, and all other books and doings in subordination to both," [Brown: 12] explains why Simeon made few references to sources other than the Scriptures and the Liturgy in his writings. His desire to avoid theological and party labels also contributed to his hesitation to editorialize: "As for names and parties in religion, he equally disclaims them all; he takes his religion from the Bible; and endeavours, as much as possible, to speak as that speaks." [Preface to *Helps to composition*, ut sup.: v.]

⁴⁸ Horae: Sermon 1251, "The connexion between the conversion of the Jews and Gentiles," vol.10, 489.

predestination and limited atonement. In his sermon entitled, "The doctrine of election explained," Simeon draws upon an orthodox Calvinist argument:

It is not sufficient to say that [God] foresees everything, though he has not foreordained it; for if things be uncertain, they cannot be foreseen; and if they be certain, they cannot but be foreordained, since the certain operation of every distinct cause must be traced up to the first great Cause of all.⁴⁹

Simeon spurned extremes and dialectic. He uncritically accepted the implications of God's sovereignty and he simultaneously advocated the use of human means to declare universal grace and to effect conversion. In doing so Simeon followed an important Puritan tradition summarized by Rooy:

Universal grace is sufficient for salvation in the sense that God will give the special grace to find salvation, provided man faithfully does what he can in order to seek it. Universal grace is insufficient in the sense that man cannot be saved without receiving special grace.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Horae: Sermon 1679, vol.14, 76. Simeon's views of election were not always popular with the public. In an attempt to present his mentor in the best possible light, James Scholefield ignored statements such as this and asserted that Simeon did not affirm any form of predestination. [Scholefield, J., *A zealous ministry the safeguard of a nation: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on Sunday, November 20, 1836, on occasion of the death of the Rev. Charles Simeon*, Cambridge, 1836: iii.]

⁵⁰ Rooy, S.H., *The theology of missions in the Puritan tradition. A study of representative Puritans: Richard Sibbes, Richard Baxter, John Eliot, Cotton Mather, and Jonathan Edwards*, Delft, 1965: 312.

J.D. Walsh noted that election was part of the evangelical faith but not its public creed; i.e., evangelicals tended to avoid the subject in the pulpit. [Walsh, J.D., *The Yorkshire evangelicals in the 18th century, with special reference to Methodism*, Cambridge University, Ph.D. thesis, 1956: 37] Simeon's genuine appreciation of the paradoxes he found in the Scriptures must have given him an extra measure of freedom on the subject.

Challenges to Simeon's Theology

Simeon's affirmation of 'saving faith' by means of individual conversion met with criticism from the proponents of rationalism in England as well as Scotland. However much Simeon stressed the universality of God's grace, the necessity of personal conversion proved to be a stumbling block to many. The 'enthusiasm' implied by the necessity of a personal encounter with God drew sharp critiques from the mainstream of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland. In both contexts Christian faith had been defined in terms of intellectual assent. Redefining faith in experiential terms was unpopular.

An amusing and anonymous criticism of Simeon's theology is the pamphlet *David and Jonathan* [1797], penned following one of Simeon's preaching tours in Scotland. It reflects the rationalist sentiments of the Moderate Party in the Scottish Church. Using a contrived conversation between Jonathan -- the Simeonite -- and his broad-minded friend David, John Locke's notion of faith by assent and obedience is set opposite to Simeon's 'saving faith'.⁵¹ When Jonathan expresses his desire to bypass Locke's writings in favour of "the Bible and those books that

⁵¹ Anon., *David and Jonathan: An account of a conversation, occasioned by a sermon, preached in the Chapel in New Street, Canongate, on Mark xvi.15.16, by Charles Simeon ... and since published under the title of The Gospel Message*, Edinburgh, 1797.



help him understand it," David suggests that he might prefer the Puritan regimen, "the Bible and *nothing* else!"⁵² David's further judgment on Simeon:

It is something worse than unaccuracy [*sic*] to compound effects with their causes ... Faith is approbation and acceptance, but also love and obedience ... Faith and works are not one in the same thing.⁵³

Simeon's basic Calvinism did little to overcome the resistance of the Moderates in the Church of Scotland to his evangelical distinctives. His theology was insufficiently Reformed for the Scottish Presbyterians, as he discovered twenty years later.⁵⁴ The sensitivities that Simeon had disturbed during his visit to Scotland in 1796 were not matters of Calvinist dogma. The issue, in this case, was his emphasis on 'experimental religion' and its implications for experiencing and demonstrating the grace of God.

It is important to note that Simeon was no antinomian. He expected holiness to be a mark of evangelical conversion. Personal faith makes morality a part of Christian duty. Nevertheless, moral effort and behaviour does not imply spiritual conversion, nor are they preconditions for salvation: "... we must not in

⁵² Op.cit.: 7-8.

⁵³ Op.cit.: 8-9.

⁵⁴ In the 1820s Simeon and the Cambridge backers of the British and Foreign Bible Society were taken to task by Robert Haldane and the Edinburgh Bible Society over the distribution in Europe of the Apocrypha with the canonical Scriptures. Haldane asserted that Simeon's accommodation of this Continental practice was a symptom of deeper theological heterodoxies, including a faulty view of election. Haldane advocated supralapsarian election.

See Haldane, R., *Review of the conduct of the directors of the British and Foreign Bible Soc., relative to the Apocrypha and to their administration on the Continent: With an answer to C. Simeon, and observations on the Cambridge remarks*, Edinburgh, 1825.

our zeal for morals overlook those principles which alone have efficacy to produce them."⁵⁵ The connection between spiritual conversion and Christian behaviour is a necessary one. Moral improvement is thus a Christian duty but it is consequential to 'saving faith'.

Distinguishing between faith and obedience, while calling men and women to both, were hallmarks of Simeon's ministry. In a sermon appropriately titled, "Christians do more than others," Simeon asserted that "true believers" are more responsible than any other group of citizens for moral effort in society. This obligation follows from the Christian's indebtedness to Christ for salvation, the Holy Spirit's motivation toward good works, the many public professions of moral zeal made by evangelicals, and the "greater dependence of God's honour on their conduct."⁵⁶ Simeon did not approve of Methodistical sanctification -- they "wink hard to see perfections"⁵⁷ -- but he commended zeal for moral improvement.

Simeon's most frequent critics were to be found among fellow Churchmen. Mainstream Anglicans opposed his efforts to bring evangelical perspectives to a centre of the Establishment like Cambridge. At issue was the 'enthusiasm' associated with evangelicals and -- for the Arminian majority in the Church of England -- his moderate Calvinism.

⁵⁵ Horae: Sermon 202, "God's electing loves excites to holiness," vol.2, 327.

⁵⁶ Horae: Sermon 1310, vol.11, 165-9.

⁵⁷ Brown: 225. The subject was also the matter of discussion at the May 16, 1808, meeting of the Eclectic Society. According to Simeon, Methodists "will look and wink hard till they find perfection; we are looking for imperfection. They are looking for ground of self-complacency; we for ground of humiliation ... Their views (1) lead to looking for good in themselves, and (2) make their very gratitude pharisaical." [Pratt, J.H., ed., *Eclectic notes: or, Notes of discussions on religious topics at the meetings of the Eclectic Society, London, during the years 1798-1814*, 2nd edition, London, 1865: 436.]

In December of 1805 Simeon preached a University sermon entitled *The Churchman's confession*. It was an attempt to demonstrate that salvation by faith and a call to holy living are central to the teachings of Scripture and are affirmed by the Liturgy of the Church of England.⁵⁸ Simeon drew from both sources to illustrate "[humanity's] lost estate" as sinful people, "the means of ... recovery" through faith in Christ, and "the path of [moral] duty" for the Christian.⁵⁹ These were uncomfortable subjects for a University audience. Simeon acknowledged that evangelicals were often accused of calling ordinary citizens to "impossible and impractical" moral standards. He then discarded such defences by affirming that lives "entirely devoted to God" are the only appropriate responses to God's grace and mercy.⁶⁰

The *Churchman's confession* was more than an appeal for biblical Christianity, although this was the sermon's primary purpose. Simeon frequently used University sermons to declare the loyalty of evangelical Anglicans to the Church of England. Simeon's churchmanship receives significant attention in chapter two, but it is appropriate to note here that the vicar of Holy Trinity Church used this particular visit to the pulpit of St. Mary's to emphasize his confidence in the Liturgy. Simeon told his audience that the unity between the Scripture and the Prayer Book made the use of the Liturgy both sound and desirable.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Simeon, C., *The Churchman's confession: or, An appeal to the Liturgy: Being a sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, December 1, 1805*, Cambridge, [1805].

⁵⁹ Op.cit.: 8.

⁶⁰ Op.cit.: 21-2.

⁶¹ Op.cit.: 24.

Simeon's professions of Anglican loyalty notwithstanding, the reaction of non-evangelicals to the sermon was immediate. Dr. Edward Pearson, Master of Sidney Sussex College, began an off-and-on debate with Simeon that ran for half a decade. In a letter to the editor of the *Orthodox Churchman's Magazine*, Pearson wished aloud that Simeon had examined "the conduct of Christians in general," not merely Churchmen, "against the terms of the [Liturgy]."⁶² Pearson was rankled by the apparent attack on regular Churchmen, such as himself, over their refusal to accept the evangelical doctrines of total depravity and salvation by faith alone. Simeon wished to see these emphases in Scripture and expected others to do so as well.⁶³ In contrast, Pearson believed that Simeon had failed to distinguish between justification, which was a matter of faith, and salvation, which depends also on obedience.⁶⁴ According to Pearson, Simeon would have better served the Church of England by stimulating the University, and his parish, to proper observance of the sacraments. Simeon did not believe that Pearson's letter warranted a published reply: "The ground I feel [for my position] is tenable against the whole world."⁶⁵

Edward Pearson's next challenge to Charles Simeon followed another of Simeon's University sermons, *Evangelic and pharisaic righteousness compared*, preached in November 1809. True to form, Simeon portrayed pharisaical faith as external, ceremonial, critical of others, and effective only as a means for

⁶² Pearson, E., *A letter, addressed to the editor of the Orthodox Churchman's Magazine, containing remarks of the Rev. Mr. Simeon's sermon, entitled, The Churchman's confession*, Broxbourn, 1806: 3.

⁶³ Op.cit.: 5-6.

⁶⁴ Op.cit.: 10.

⁶⁵ December 12, 1805, letter to John Venn. In Carus: 150-1.

self-aggrandizement; it yields nothing in God's scales of justice and judgment.⁶⁶

"This is the kind of religion which is held in esteem by mankind at large," but only evangelical faith [i.e., without works] produces true righteousness.⁶⁷

Pearson's reply was the acerbic *Cautions to the hearer and reader of ... Mr. Simeon's sermon*. Pearson condemned Simeon's message as "error," "evil" of a "calculated" nature, and he accused its author of being a "deceiver" -- a closet Dissenter -- who had gained the confidence of the Church of England in order to libel its ministers with a "thinly-veiled innuendo."⁶⁸ Pearson was particularly troubled by the comparison between traditional Anglicans and the Jewish Pharisees. Curiously, however, Pearson shot himself in the foot when he acknowledged that Simeon's standards for Christian duty were higher than his own!⁶⁹

In one of his few published rebuttals of criticism, *Fresh cautions to the public*, Simeon denied the charge of libelling the Church of England. He argued that modern pharisees were as common outside of the Established Church as within it.⁷⁰ The "hypocrites" to which Simeon had referred in his sermon were those who profess a regard for the Scriptures while expounding them unsoundly. The

⁶⁶ Simeon, C., *Evangelic and pharisaic righteousness compared: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on Sunday, November 26, 1809*, Cambridge, 1809: 9-11.

⁶⁷ Op.cit., 21: 23.

⁶⁸ Pearson, E., *Cautions to the hearer and reader of the Reverend Mr. Simeon's sermon entitled Evangelic and pharisaic righteousness compared*, Broxbourn, 1810: 3-6, 11.

⁶⁹ Op.cit.: 11.

⁷⁰ Simeon, C., *Fresh cautions to the public: or, A letter to the Rev. Edw. Pearson ... in reply to his Cautions to the readers of Mr. Simeon's sermon, entitled, "Evangelic and pharisaic righteousness compared,"* Cambridge, 1810: 21.

denial of salvation by faith alone is a case in point, according to Simeon. Offenders are to be found among clergy and laity of the Established Church as well as the Dissent.⁷¹

Simeon also turned Pearson's admission of inferior piety to his advantage:

You know, Sir, that persons who maintain the doctrine of justification by faith alone without the works of the law, are supposed in general to disregard good works. But you have informed the world, that this, with me at least, is not the case; and whatever they have need to be *cautioned* against in my writings, they have no reason to fear an Antinomian spirit: You acknowledge, not only that I am as strong an advocate for good works as you yourself can be, but that I even go beyond you, and maintain a higher standard of holiness than you. Thus for [the readers] all is well.⁷²

Without doubt this exchange caught the attention of evangelicals and High Churchmen alike. It was an embarrassment to Pearson from which he was unable to extricate himself despite a final attempt in the press, *Remarks on ... Fresh cautions to the public*.⁷³ Pearson's cease-fire, in a subsequent letter to his

⁷¹ Op.cit.: 19.

⁷² Op.cit.: 16.

⁷³ Pearson, E., *Remarks on the Reverend Mr. Simeon's Fresh cautions to the public*, Broxbourn, 1810.

antagonist, was graciously accepted by Simeon.⁷⁴ Simeon's evangelical convictions emerged unharmed, if not reinforced from the fray.

Rationalist Leaven

Without minimizing his commitment to evangelical conversion, Simeon's high view of Christian duty recalls to mind the tradition of rationalism in the eighteenth century Church of England. Indeed, the extent to which Simeon stressed personal holiness and moral social duty reflected the genuinely Anglican aspects of Simeon's thought. That Simeon was influenced by the rationalist world-view should come as no surprise given his upbringing as a regular Churchman.

The Church of England in the eighteenth century was, in van den Berg's words, in its "Erasmian period": God, the "benevolent creator," is in his heaven. Humanity, admittedly needful of betterment and capable of it, is God's regent on earth. The Kingdom of God, the "crown of the steady progression of Christianity," is come.⁷⁵ The optimism of the rationalist message was an attempt to answer the Deistic challenge to Christian orthodoxy through intellectual argument and charitable practice. Nowhere are these values more self-evident than in some of the religious literature of early eighteenth century England.

⁷⁴ Carus: 208-209. Carus' final comment on the controversy: "Would that all discussions on religious topics, between earnest and serious men, were conducted in the same spirit of candour, and brought with the like courtesy and Christian feeling to a conclusion." Candour certainly marked Simeon's and Pearson's writings, but Carus deceived himself with respect to courtesy. These were brutal exchanges.

⁷⁵ van den Berg, J., *Constrained by Jesus' love: An enquiry into the motives of the missionary awakening in Great Britain in the period between 1698 and 1815*, Kampen, 1956: 38.

The whole duty of man was the most widely read religious work in England during the eighteenth century. It reflects a curious mixture of sentiments. For example, it rejects speculative theology in favour of faith that is defined in terms of Christian practice. This was also a mark of Puritan piety. By the strict observance of obligations to God [i.e., faith, worship, sacraments], to oneself [i.e., humility, contentedness, temperance], and to one's neighbour [i.e., justice, honesty, fairness], a man cares for his soul and secures temporal and eternal happiness.⁷⁶ Nevertheless, *Whole duty*, first published in 1657, is an example of the measured, rational, and emotionless literary style that typified the anti-Puritanism of the Restoration period.⁷⁷ *Whole duty* does not call for 'experiential religion', i.e., Puritan or evangelical rebirth by means of conversion. It urges a faith that is expressed in the observance of certain religious duties. Such "formal religion," as Simeon was fond of calling it, shared a similar external morality with evangelical Anglicans, although the piety of *Whole duty* variety was criticized by them as soteriologically deficient.

The wide use of *Whole duty* was a function of its purpose. The book was written as a Sunday devotional guide for families in a Sabbatarian age. As such it developed a captive audience. This, no doubt, resulted in the frequent sale of the book despite its grave and ponderous style. *Whole duty* was recognized for its unwavering loyalty to the Established Church, consequently it was one of the few religious texts -- apart from the Bible and the Prayer Book -- that were widely read by High Churchmen. This probably explains Simeon's familiarity with the text.

⁷⁶ [Allestree, R.], *The whole duty of man laid down in a plain and familiar way for the use of all, but especially for the meanest reader ...: Necessary for all families. With private devotions for several occasions*, 1658, reprint, London, 1888: 13.

⁷⁷ Balleine, G.R., *A history of the evangelical party in the Church of England*, London, 1908: 74.

Simeon's experience with *Whole duty* was formative. The story is also quite humorous. Simeon tells the tale of his encounter in his autobiography:

On my coming to College, Jan. 29, 1779, the gracious designs of God toward me were soon manifest. It was but the third day after my arrival that I understood I should be expected in the space of about three weeks to attend the Lord's Supper [i.e., for the first time]. What! said I, *must* I attend? On being informed that I *must*, the thought rushed into my mind that Satan himself was as fit to attend as I; and if I must attend, I must *prepare* for my attendance there. Without a moment's loss of time, I bought the old *Whole Duty of Man* [the only religious book that I had ever heard of] and began to read it with great diligence ...⁷⁸

In assisting Simeon through his first communion, *Whole duty* reinforced three important values: the preeminent worth of the human soul, the demands of Christian duty, and an aversion to theological speculation. Each of these issues proved significant in Simeon's churchmanship and ministry.

What Simeon did not accept, of course, was the suggestion implicit in *Whole duty* that the observance of Christian forms is a sufficient means for achieving peace with God. The book's ignorance of personal conversion severely limited its usefulness among the children of the eighteenth century Revival.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ Carus: 14.

⁷⁹ "Whitefield ... said that its author knew no more about Christianity than Mohammed." [Balleine, G.R., *A history of the evangelical Party in the Church of England*, London, 1908: 74.]

The primary evangelical attempt to correct the deficiency in *Whole Duty* came in the form of Henry Venn's *The complete duty of man* [1763]. It recast Christian duty as the manifestation of personal holiness made possible by evangelical conversion. Like its predecessor, *Complete duty* was designed as a family devotional aid. [See Venn, H., *The complete duty of man: or, A system of doctrinal and practical Christianity with prayers for families and individuals*, with an introductory essay by the Rev. J. Brown, Select Christian authors, no. 53, Glasgow, 1829.]

Evangelical Anglicans, Simeon included, were not satisfied with rationalism, scholasticism, or formal religion as a reply to Deism or other Christian heterodoxies. Moderate Calvinists recognized God's righteousness as well as his benevolence, saw humanity as incapable of absolute good in itself, and believed the Kingdom of God to be a spiritual realm that only becomes tangible through the evangelical conversion. Simeon's commitment to moral Christian behaviour may have been greatly reinforced by his Anglican roots, but he did not embrace moral duty at the expense of his evangelical distinctives. Nevertheless, as Ervine has argued in his study of evangelical Churchmen, Simeon's appeals to universal grace and the "excellence of the Liturgy" betray the strong influences of mainstream Anglican thinking.⁸⁰

The Evangelical and the Anglican in Charles Simeon

In summary, how can Simeon's theological values be described? They are best understood in terms of what he taught and asked of his congregation and his students. On the one hand, as illustrated in the introduction and in this chapter, Simeon called his hearers to embrace evangelicalism's key principles, with particular reference to justification by faith. As Simeon declared to the University community in 1815, such justification is only realized when a man or a woman

⁸⁰ Ervine concluded that Simeon should be seen as a moderate Arminian, rather than a moderate Calvinist. This orientation reflects Simeon's desire to serve as a bridge between High Churchmen and evangelicals. [Ervine, W.J.C., *Doctrine and diplomacy: Some aspects of the life and thought of the Anglican evangelical clergy, 1797-1837*, Cambridge University, Ph.D. thesis, 1979: 31,59.]

Simeon certainly desired to draw traditional Anglicans into the evangelical camp. However, Simeon's statements on election cannot be labelled as fundamentally Arminian. [See current chapter, p.50.] Manor's assessment is more accurate: Simeon shared Wesley's Arminian heritage, which moderated Simeon's basic Calvinism. [Manor, J., "The coming of Britain's age of empire and Protestant mission theology, 1750-1839," *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 61 (1977), 38.]

looks to Christ "as the propitiation offered for the sins of the whole world."⁸¹ Such an affirmation, and the contrition implied by it, is a *sine qua non* for true Christian faith and life.

Simeon also declared, "We cannot be too often reminded, that religion is not a matter of speculation, but of practice."⁸² The integrity of religious commitment is not judged merely by the principles professed, but by the fruit or effect of their exercise.⁸³ Christian duty, in its simplest formulation, is the hate of evil and the love of good expressed in belief, in attitude, and in behaviour.⁸⁴ Simeon unhesitatingly affirmed private and public morality as a cause to which the Church of Jesus Christ is called. Moreover, the moral agenda of the Church is as necessary as its attention to the doctrines of grace.⁸⁵ "Knowledge of the law is at the foundation of all true religion," declared Simeon.⁸⁶ With respect to its importance to the kingdom of God, Simeon believed piety to be as necessary as "new birth."

⁸¹ Fourth University sermon in the November, 1815, series, "On justification by faith." In: Simeon, C., *Let wisdom judge: University addresses and sermon outlines by Charles Simeon*, edited with an introduction by A. Pollard, London, 1959: 63-4.

⁸² Horae: Sermon 1554, "Suddenness of Christ's second coming," vol.13, 13.

⁸³ Horae: Sermon 709, "The true test of religion in the soul," vol.6, 350.

⁸⁴ Horae: Sermon 1908, "Christian duties to God and man explained," vol.15, 488.

⁸⁵ Simeon's preface to the Horae: vol.1, xxv.

⁸⁶ First University sermon in the 1828 series, "The uses of the law." In: Simeon, C., *Let wisdom judge: University addresses and sermon outlines by Charles Simeon*, edited with an introduction by A. Pollard, London, 1959: 116-7.

It is important, however, to recognize that Simeon did not connect Christian morality with purely natural inclination or effort. In the same way that corporate or societal morality is influenced by civil authority -- a subject to be considered at length in chapter two -- personal morality is strategically enabled by Christ's authority and influence.⁸⁷ As indicated previously, Simeon likened submission to Christian duty [i.e., moral effort] as a form and indication of divine election.⁸⁸ The disposition to obey the will of God is as much a gift from him as is justification. For this reason Simeon carefully distinguished between religious 'enthusiasm' and the unreserved obedience of faith.⁸⁹

This is the intersection of Simeon's evangelical theology, philosophy of Christian experience, and notions of religious effort: Men and women encounter the universal grace of God, respond to it externally through personal conversion and internally through "new birth." By these processes, and as a voluntary consequence, the people of God enter into a holy life of profound moral obligation to God, to their own souls, and to society at large. In these distinctives Simeon reflected his heritage as both an evangelical and a Churchman.

⁸⁷ Horae: Sermon 325, "The equity of Christ's government," vol.3, 305.

⁸⁸ See the quotation on "Christian duty and privilege" in the current chapter, p.35.

⁸⁹ Horae: Sermon 85, "The waters of Marah sweetened," vol.1, 413.

Chapter Two

Order in Church and Society

[John Berridge] was complained of to the Bishop, who sent for him, and reproved him for preaching at all hours and on all days. "My Lord," said he modestly, "I preach only at two times." -- "Which are they, Mr. Berridge?" -- "In season and out of season, my Lord."¹

The entrepreneur and 'the establishment' are at odds by virtue of their natures. Berridge, the innovator, justified his peripatetic ministry by admitting that "if every parish were blessed with a Gospel minister ... there [would] be little need of itinerant preaching."² As a result the "Bishops ... scarcely knew what to do with" him.³ The first rule of the establishment is order. The first rule of the entrepreneur is that there are no rules.

If it can be argued that John Wesley and company took the Evangelical Revival beyond the bounds of the Established Church, and Anglicans like Berridge tested its limits, then Charles Simeon can be said to have focused the evangelical agenda on the parish infrastructure of the Church of England. He did this by encouraging his fellow evangelical Churchmen to observe Anglican church order.

¹ As told by Simeon and recorded in Brown: 200.

² Berridge, J., "Copy of a letter of the Late Rev. John Berridge, of Everton, Bedfordshire, to the Rev. Mr. -----, a Gospel clergyman at C-----," *Evangelical Magazine* 2 (1794), 198.

³ Brown: 202.

He used his chief strength, "an ordered and disciplined ministry," to save many from the "ranks of Nonconformity," and helped preserve evangelicalism as a movement within the Church of England.⁴ In twentieth century jargon Charles Simeon became an 'intrapreneur', an innovator within the Establishment.

H.C.G. Moule's assessment, written in 1892, is representative of this point of view:

The Evangelical revival of the eighteenth century found a certain defect supplied in the school of Simeon. Its earlier leaders, with really few exceptions, were by no means careless of the essential sacredness of order and cohesion; but they found themselves often in circumstances where at least there seemed to be "a need of disorder." Simeon, one with them in main spiritual principles, always in quest, like them, of individual conversions, was led by his situation and his reflections to a more distinct sense than most of them had felt of the claims of corporate and national religious life.⁵

Charles Smyth, in *Simeon and church order*, echoed this opinion by noting that Simeon answered the Church of England's two most significant challenges of the day: Simeon demonstrated in his parish that the proper observance of Anglican church order does not preclude a ministry with spiritual vitality. Further, by his emphasis on training men for the ministry in the pulpit and by controlling sufficient patronage to ensure them a reasonable living, Simeon created a means for

⁴ Pollard, A., and M. Hennell, eds., *Charles Simeon [1759-1836]: Essays written in commemoration of his bicentenary by members of the Evangelical Fellowship for Theological Literature*, Great Anglicans, London, 1964: 26.

⁵ Moule, H.C.G., *Charles Simeon, Leaders of Religion*, edited by H.C. Beeching, London, 1892: 260.

maintaining evangelical continuity in the parish.⁶ Simeon's "steadying influence"⁷ proved strategic in keeping evangelicalism within the pale of the Church of England.⁸ This achievement is considered by many to be Simeon's greatest legacy.

Nevertheless, was Charles Simeon's passion for church order an expression of confidence in the ideal nature of the Church of England? Or, as this chapter suggests, was there another dynamic at work in the Simeon world-view of which ecclesiastical regularity was merely a subset? In order to examine this possibility it is necessary to look closely at the relationship between Simeon's evangelicalism and his concern for church discipline.

Churchmanship or Evangelicalism?

However committed Charles Simeon was to observing Anglican church order, numerous exceptions to ecclesiastical regularity can be found in the record of his life and ministry. Were these irregularities, to be introduced shortly, simply a function of the higher call of evangelical principles? This might be a first

⁶ Smyth, C., *Simeon and church order: A study of the origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the eighteenth century*, The Birkbeck Lectures for 1937-1938, Cambridge, 1940: 250.

Not all historians have agreed with this assessment. Ford Brown concluded that Simeon's use of patronage was not an attempt to maintain continuity in the parish, but was calculated to exclude High Churchmen from key pulpits. [Brown, F.K., *Fathers of the Victorians: The age of Wilberforce*, Cambridge, 1961: 479-80.] Although it is true that Simeon refused to patronize High Church clergy, his actions were support for the evangelical movement rather than opposition to the High Church party or liberal Anglicanism. This is an important distinction.

⁷ Op.cit.: 255.

⁸ Webster, D., "Charles Simeon and the Liturgy," *Theology* 44 (1951), 296.

impression. Consider, for example, Simeon's comments on John Berridge's itinerations:

[Berridge] was, perhaps, right in preaching from place to place as he did ... He lived when few Ministers cared about the Gospel, and when disorder was almost needful. I don't think he would do now as he did then; for there are so many means of hearing the Gospel, and a much greater spread of it; a much greater call for order, and a much less need for disorder. To do *now* as he did *then* would do much harm.⁹

In this instance Simeon's evangelicalism took precedence over church order.

Were evangelicalism and churchmanship the only values at work here? It is easiest to posit a hierarchy of two values -- evangelicalism before churchmanship -- and by this argument to question Simeon's loyalty to the Established Church. Simeon has been criticized on this basis on more than one occasion.¹⁰ What these criticisms fail to acknowledge adequately is the genuine attention Simeon gave to proper Anglican churchmanship. At the same time, a simple affirmation of Simeon's respect for Church order fails to explain his ecclesiastical irregularities.

It is necessary to affirm that another value must also have been operating within Simeon's world-view in order for his evangelicalism and his churchmanship to have coexisted so well. That 'something' would need to have been a

⁹ Brown: 200.

¹⁰ This was the chief point that Edward Pearson hoped to establish in his running battle with Charles Simeon from 1806-11. [See chapter one, pp.55ff.] Ford Brown's criticism is more subtle. While Brown acknowledges Simeon's general observance of Anglican church order, he endeavours to show that Simeon employed a superficial churchmanship to forward an agenda that was, in reality, subversive of the Established Church. [See the introduction, p.8, note 21; and Brown, F.K., *Fathers of the Victorians: The age of Wilberforce*, Cambridge, 1961: 271ff.]

conviction or set of convictions that did not conflict with Simeon's evangelical distinctives. It also would need to have been a more fundamental value to Simeon than churchmanship, one to which he could have resorted when Anglican church order conflicted with evangelicalism. Before introducing this new aspect of Simeon's world-view, it will be helpful to examine some of his socio-religious presuppositions and their impact on his thought and work.

Evangelicals and the Social Order in England

G.F.A. Best, in his examination of the tensions between evangelicals and the Established Church at the outset of the nineteenth century, suggests that the chief divisions between the two camps were ecclesiological and political in nature.¹¹ Evangelicals, by virtue of their emphasis on personal conversion, placed a high value on the spiritual unity of 'true Christians'. This position weakened evangelical commitment to national churches and their institutions by submitting the interests of the 'Visible Church' to those of the 'Invisible Church'. This ecclesiology made evangelical Churchmen susceptible to charges of sympathy with the Dissent. There was a measure of truth in this allegation. Evangelicals in the Church of England shared common religious purpose with evangelical Nonconformists. Simeon was no exception.¹² Although evangelical Anglican support for the political agenda of the Dissent was minuscule, the ecclesiology of evangelical Churchmen created uncertainty among regular Anglicans as to their

¹¹ Best, G.F.A., "The evangelicals and the Established Church in the early 19th century," *Journal of Theological Studies* 10, new series (1959), 69-70.

¹² A funeral sermon for Simeon, preached by the Dissenting minister Samuel Thodey, is indicative of the religious agenda held in common between Churchmen like Simeon and evangelical Nonconformists. ["Death of the Rev. C. Simeon," *Christian Observer* 37 (1837), 105 and passim.]

political and religious reliability. After all, as the Establishment argument went, seventeenth century Puritan rebels used the primacy of the 'Invisible Church' as a basis for their support of the Parliamentary cause during the English Civil War.¹³

There was a major difference of socio-religious opinion between evangelical Churchmen and mainstream Anglicans, but the conflict was not centred on political loyalties. The means for moral betterment were at issue. Evangelicals sought to apply themselves to the recovery of Britain's identity as a Christian nation.¹⁴ This purpose called for emphases on the evangelical conversion of the population and the moral reform of public behaviour. This agenda was rejected by the other two "parties" in the Church of England. High Churchmen would not accept the Calvinistic principles that underlay evangelical appeals for individual conversion and liberal Churchmen dismissed the whole of evangelical dogmatism as embarrassing and unnecessary. Both parties externalized these objections by labelling evangelical Anglicans as Puritans, schismatics, Methodists, and Dissenters. In doing so some genuinely religious issues were mistaken for political ones.

A classic example of such confusion is the 1809 pamphlet by Josiah Thomas, already introduced.¹⁵ Thomas attacked the right of private religious

¹³ Best, op.cit.: 69-70.

¹⁴ Wilberforce's objective in *Practical view* was to transform the common "groundless prepossession" of nominal religious belief into "sober reason and conviction" consistent with a nation that calls itself Christian. [Wilberforce, W., *A practical view of the prevailing religious system of professed Christians in the higher and middle classes in this country contrasted with real Christianity*, 1797, 6th edition, Glasgow, 1837: 92 and passim.]

¹⁵ Thomas, J., *Strictures on subjects chiefly relating to the established religion and the clergy: In two letters to his patron, from a country clergyman*, 2nd edition, London, 1809. See chapter one, pp.39-40.

judgment by "every mechanic" who wished to exercise it.¹⁶ Such attempts usurp the privilege of the educated classes, said Thomas. He further observed that "atheism, deism, sectarianism, and evangelicalism" have united "against sound religion." This was demonstrated, according to Thomas, by the efforts of "Dissenters and Methodists" to disestablish the Church of England.¹⁷ Thomas included evangelical Anglicans under the term "Methodists," as well as the Wesleyans. Thomas believed that there was an automatic and necessary connection between religious dissent and political unreliability.

For an example of anti-evangelical sentiment from the liberal side of the Church of England, one might turn to Sydney Smith. Smith took himself less seriously than did Thomas, thus his writings are full of self-criticism and humour. Nevertheless, his famous essay on "Indian missions" associates evangelicals on the India Company Court of Directors [i.e., Charles Grant and Edward Parry] with the politics of the Serampore baptists.¹⁸ Political guilt by religious association, however limited, is inferred in Smith's arguments.

It is true that an evangelical view of Christianity gives preference to the 'Invisible Church' by emphasizing faith that is based on an encounter with God. This distinctive set 'true Christians' in contrast to the 'nominal' variety. As

¹⁶ Op.cit.: 13.

¹⁷ Op.cit.: 18, 93-4. Thomas returns to view in 1817-8, as the Archdeacon of Bath, in the context of the controversy over the formation of the Church Missionary Association for Bath. See chapter five, p.245, note 99, and pp.290-1.

¹⁸ Smith, S., "Indian Missions," *Edinburgh Review* 12 (1808), 151-81. Charles Grant's connection with the missionary movement in India receives attention in chapters five and six.

previously illustrated, Simeon agreed with this principle.¹⁹ He was determined to declare the bankruptcy of 'formal religion' by disputing the notion that observance of external duties and forms had any salvific effect. This emphasis was a frequent element in Simeon's pulpit messages.²⁰

However, sympathy for the disestablishment of the Church of England or the abolition of the Crown would have been groundless indictments against Churchmen such as Charles Simeon. Fringe evangelicals in the Church, such as Thomas Haweis, were advocates of 'democratic' causes, although their motivations were more eschatological than political. They believed they recognized the arrival of the Millennium in the opening events of the French Revolution. This was a temporary opinion. Haweis and outright Dissenters such as David Bogue were forced to reverse themselves with the outbreak of the Reign of Terror and the Napoleonic Wars.²¹ Even the evangelical Anglicans most noted for itinerant preaching were loyalists at heart, as illustrated by William Grimshaw of Haworth: "I believe the Church of England to be the soundest, purest, most apostolical Christian Church in the world."²²

The Establishment could rely upon intense Tory convictions among second-generation evangelicals. Simeon, for example, left little doubt on his

¹⁹ See the introduction, pp.9-10.

²⁰ E.g., Horae: Sermon 584, "Spiritual obedience preferred before sacrifice," vol.5, 381-2.

²¹ Jong, J.A. de, *As the waters cover the sea: Millennial expectations in the rise of Anglo-American missions, 1640-1810*, Kampen, 1970: 161-3; and Orchard, S.C., *English evangelical eschatology, 1790-1850*, Cambridge University, Ph.D. thesis, 1969: 34.

²² As recorded in Balleine, G.R., *A history of the evangelical party in the Church of England*, London, 1908: 71.

opinion of the French Revolution, its patriots, and anyone with designs on radical changes in British society. Although he attributed nothing more than extreme irregularity of order to Haweis, Simeon distanced himself from his efforts.²³

Further, in his sermon entitled "Korah's rebellion," he drew a sarcastic and critical comparison between the seditionists in Israel and the authors of the turmoil in France:

In a word, [Korah, et al.] were true patriots: they were enemies to usurpation and tyranny, and friends to the liberties of the people. Liberty and equality was their motto.²⁴

The watchwords of the two revolutions were little more than thin covers for an intense envy of "mild and just" governors and "pious" ministers.²⁵ French monarchy, albeit supported by Romanism, was infinitely preferable to the political and social chaos of the Revolution. Simeon did not wish to discourage the progress of Continental Protestantism, but the French Revolution was not the way forward. While Simeon acknowledged the theoretical validity of civil disobedience, he also called Christians to be "the quiet in the land."²⁶ Simeon believed that the British public should have no difficulty exercising such self-

²³ Simeon to Rev. E. Edwards, March 14, 1807, in Carus: 170. The letter discusses the subject of Benjamin Flower's charges of irregularity in the *Cambridge Intelligencer*. Simeon was vindicated by his bishop.

²⁴ Horae: Sermon 162, vol.2, 88.

²⁵ Op.cit.: 89.

²⁶ Op.cit.: 90. Non-resistance and passive obedience did not perish entirely with the Hanoverian succession. [See Abbey, C.J., and J.H. Overton, *The English Church in the eighteenth century*, new edition, London, 1887: 54.]

control owing to the quality of their national constitution. It is "the most perfect of any on earth"²⁷ because of its equitable and impartial dispensation of law.²⁸

Charles Simeon and the vast majority of second generation evangelicals, including William Wilberforce and the 'Clapham Saints', demonstrated anything but ambiguity in their support for the English ecclesiastical and political Establishment. Best correctly diagnosed the nature of mainstream Anglican fears vis-à-vis evangelicalism, i.e., anxieties over the prospect of political or social change. The growing prospect of an evangelical "party" with significant Parliamentary power, by means of the Clapham Saints, exacerbated these worries. Such trepidation, however, was entirely misplaced. Evangelicals in the Established Church had no plans to gain or hold the balance of political power in Great Britain. Their popular base was too small.²⁹ Moreover, evangelical Churchmen were as conservative as their High Church brethren with respect to social change. Evangelicals like Simeon were dedicated to maintaining the status quo, with the exception of specific 'correct' issues such as the abolition of slavery. When the political and social reforms of the 1820s and 1830s were forced through Parliament, the Nonconformists were the primary agents of change. Evangelical support for the reforms was limited to the changes deemed necessary to avoid the

²⁷ Horae: Sermon 1911, "Duty to civil governors," vol.15, 509.

²⁸ Horae: Sermon 291, "Samuel's judicial character," vol.3, 157.

²⁹ According to Gladstone, evangelicals in the Church of England had never been the dominant party. [Gladstone, W.E., "The evangelical movement: its parentage, progress and issue," *Gleanings from past years*, vol. 7, London, 1879: 208ff.] In 1853 evangelical clergy in the Established Church numbered some 7,000 out of 18,000. [Smyth, C.H.E., "The evangelical movement in perspective," *Cambridge Historical Journal* 7 (1943), 166] The ratio would have been significantly smaller in Simeon's day.

ultimate social evil, civil revolution.³⁰ Simeon, for example, opposed Roman Catholic emancipation until he recognized that it was a choice between extending the benefits of religious toleration to Romanism or facing the social collapse of the nation.³¹

The Irregular Simeon

Whereas Charles Simeon's political reliability could not have been seriously questioned, the ecclesiastical regularity of the vicar of Holy Trinity Church was not as unassailable. Notwithstanding Simeon's many expressions of loyalty to the Established Church and his historical reputation as a steady Churchman, many instances of irregularity in the early years of Simeon's ministry raise questions about his ecclesiastical principles. Were these 'innovations' in Anglican discipline, described below, merely indications of a developmental process, or do they suggest the existence of a value competing with church order in Simeon's *Weltanschauung*?

The circumstances surrounding Simeon's appointment to the living of Holy Trinity parish were not ideal for a minister's first charge. He had been ordained deacon by the Bishop of Ely on May 26, 1782, and undertook the honorary curacy of St. Edward's for Christopher Atkinson. In October, when Simeon's brother Richard died, he anticipated an imminent and permanent departure from Cambridge in order to return to Reading to care for his father. However, another death

³⁰ E.g., the Reform Bill of 1832 was a spectacular success for the Methodists and radical Dissenters. They embarrassed the Clapham evangelicals into finally supporting the measure. See Ward, W.R., *Religion and society in England, 1790-1850*, London, 1972: 124-8.

³¹ Brown: 116; and Carus: 440-3.

intervened, that of Mr. Therond, the minister of Holy Trinity Church. By Simeon's own admission the incumbency of Holy Trinity had been a personal aspiration: "How should I rejoice if God were to give me that church, that I might preach his Gospel there, and be a herald for him in the midst of the University."³² Simeon acted on his desire by asking his father to make an application for the living on his behalf to the bishop.

Unfortunately, the parishioners favoured their curate, Mr. Hammond, as Therond's successor. They promptly made him Lecturer, believing that the living without the Lectureship would be unattractive, financially and otherwise, to a competitor. Simeon understood the congregation's message and indicated that he would reconsider his application. However, the parishioners made the mistake of immediately informing their bishop that Simeon had withdrawn, although he had not yet done so.³³ The bishop, in a letter to Simeon, was not impressed with the congregation's tactics:

The parishioners have petitioned for Mr. Hammond, and unless gratified, insinuate their intentions of bestowing their lectureship on a different person than my curate. I do not like that mode of application, and if you do not accept [the living, I] shall certainly not license Mr. H. to it. I shall await your answer.³⁴

Knowing that the congregation's desire could not be met in any event, Simeon felt constrained to accept the appointment. Simeon thus found himself vicar of Holy Trinity Church, preaching there for the first time on November 10, 1782. He was

³² Carus: 37.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Bishop Yorke to Simeon, November 9, 1782, as recorded in Carus: 38-9, editor's note.

subsequently ordained priest by Bishop Hinchliffe of Peterborough on September 28, 1783.

It was not a happy beginning for a new minister:

The disappointment which the parish felt proved very unfavourable to my ministry. The people almost universally put locks on their pews, and would neither come to church, nor suffer others to do so ... I put in there a number of forms, and erected in vacant places, at my own expense, some open seats; but the churchwardens pulled them down, and cast them out of the church. To visit the parishioners in their own houses was impracticable; for they were so embittered [*sic*] against me, that there was scarcely one that would admit me into his house.³⁵

With Simeon's Sunday morning service under boycott, the afternoon lecture in Mr. Hammond's hands, and pastoral ministry in the town made largely impossible, Simeon decided to establish a Sunday evening lecture. This, too, the churchwardens prevented by locking the church doors. The situation was desperate. Simeon believed that those who were open to his ministry would soon be lost to "dissenting meetings" if they had no other opportunity for biblical instruction except once a week on Sunday morning."³⁶

Simeon's answer to the situation was a clear ecclesiastical irregularity. He rented a small room in the parish and met there with those who would come for exposition of the Scriptures and prayer. When the room became too small for the growing crowd, and a larger place was not available in the parish, one in an adjoining parish was hired. Simeon was conscious of the implications of his

³⁵ Carus: 39.

³⁶ Carus: 40.

actions: "I was sensible that it would be regarded by many as irregular; but what was to be done?"³⁷

The expected reaction was not long in coming: "My friends, as I expected, were all alarmed; and at last they prevailed on my dear and honoured friend, Mr. Henry Venn, to speak to me on the subject."³⁸ That Venn took the initiative on his own is much closer to the truth. Wilbert Shenk has documented Venn's convictions on irregularity. Venn believed that first generation evangelicals, such as he and John Berridge, had little alternative to occasional itinerant preaching. But he was convinced that the second generation of evangelicalism should adhere to the order of the Church of England. Venn hoped that this sea change would follow from an improved availability of livings for evangelicals, made possible by the purchase of advowsons by patrons such as John Thornton.³⁹ Berridge, however, was of a different mind. He asked Thornton to intervene with Henry Venn in favour of Simeon's irregular lecture. Berridge believed that Simeon's initiative ought not to be curtailed because of the impact the young minister's preaching was having in Cambridge. Venn was not moved by Berridge's argument.⁴⁰ Simeon rode to Yelling, at Venn's request, whereupon his mentor urged restraint and regularity. Simeon responded with an explanation for his irregular activity and made a strong profession of commitment to the cause of God

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Shenk, W.R., *Henry Venn as missionary theorist and administrator*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1978: 82.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

and the Established Church.⁴¹ Henry Venn was persuaded and left Simeon with the benediction, "Go on, and God be with you."⁴² Simeon did exactly that. The Sunday evening lecture continued for a decade, even after Simeon was made Lecturer in 1790. The evening lecture also formed the basis for his "lay societies," small groups of men and women who began to meet for instruction and prayer beginning in 1794.⁴³

Simeon had anticipated that his evening lecture would be viewed by many as a 'conventicle', a public religious meeting held in an unlicensed location and, therefore, technically illegal. Such activities were normally associated with the Dissent. For Simeon to accept this risk implied that he saw a potential benefit to the parish that exceeded the possible repercussions of alleged irregularity.

⁴¹ Simeon's explanation is a familiar one. John Wesley used a similar argument to justify his itinerant work. Wesley claimed that he was driven to irregularity by the opposition of the Anglican clergy. [John Wesley to Henry Venn, June 22, 1763, as quoted in Wesley, J., *An extract of the Rev. John Wesley's journal*, London, 1794-1797: vol.4, 217.] See also: Lawson, A.B., *John Wesley and some Anglican evangelicals of the eighteenth century*, University of Sheffield, Ph.D. thesis, 1973: 96.

⁴² Carus: 41.

⁴³ Carus: 108.

Paradoxically, Simeon defended his actions by an appeal to the Establishment's fear of the Dissent:

Indeed it is a curious fact, that the establishing of such [activities] is generally supposed to indicate indifference towards the Church, when it actually proceeds from a love to the Church, and a zeal for its interests ... [Such meetings are] not merely for the edification of the people, *but chiefly for the preservation of the Established Church* ... [Without such meetings,] the members of any Church are only a rope of sand ... What influence can a minister maintain over his people, if he does not foster them as a brood under his wings?⁴⁴

Simeon's arguments were insufficient in the eyes of many, including Benjamin Flower of the *Cambridge Intelligencer*. In 1807, Flower "associated [Simeon] with Dr. Haweis, as preaching in unlicensed places, defying all ecclesiastical order, and yet determined not to relinquish [his] church till compelled to do it by [Simeon's] Diocesan."⁴⁵ Simeon's bishop was not equally persuaded as to the charges. However, Carus, in an editorial comment, noted that "there can be no doubt that some occasion had been given for these violent attacks of Flower upon Mr. Simeon."⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Carus: 108-9.

⁴⁵ Carus: 170.

⁴⁶ Carus: 199. See also: "Death of the Rev. C. Simeon," *Christian Observer* 37 (1837), in which Thomas Webster's sermon [pp.95-6] echoes Carus' admission. Dissenter Samuel Thodey, in another funeral sermon for Simeon, considered Simeon's bits of irregularity to have left his loyalty to the Church of England unharmed [p.105].

Impressions of Simeon as an irregular Churchman were further encouraged, in his early days, by spells of itinerant preaching:

Having but one sermon in the week at my own church, I used on week-days to go round to the churches of pious ministers, very frequently, to preach to their people; taking one church on Mondays, another on Tuesdays, another on Wednesdays. Amongst the places where I preached were Potton, Wrestlingworth, Everton, Yelling, Haddenham, Wilburton, etc., ...⁴⁷

This is not to suggest that Simeon preached uninvited in neighbouring parishes, such as Venn's in Yelling. On the contrary, Venn was always grateful for his visits, and fully aware of them.⁴⁸ In fact, Venn and Simeon occasionally exchanged pulpits.⁴⁹ Simeon's justification for his itinerancy, apart from visiting his mentors and temporary relief from the strains of his parish ministry, was the development of his skills at extempore preaching.⁵⁰ Simeon's intentions were not irregular but the impression given to others was another matter.

⁴⁷ Carus: 50.

⁴⁸ See Henry Venn to James Stillingfleet, October 9, 1782, in Venn, H., *The life and a selection of the letters of the late Rev. Henry Venn*, edited by J. Venn and H. Venn, London, 1834: 351-2.

⁴⁹ See Henry Venn to Simeon, January 8, 1790, in Carus: 67.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

John Berridge had even greater plans for the itinerating vicar of Holy Trinity Church. In a letter, probably addressed to Simeon and reprinted in the *Evangelical Magazine* after his death, Berridge advised a promising minister:

If you are enabled to preach without notes -- feel an abiding desire to preach the Gospel -- meet with calls for this purpose -- comply with the calls -- find the word sealed, and, if persecuted and threatened, have the word given for support: Where these concur ... I have no doubt but such a minister is designed for a *rural dean*, or a *rambling bishop*.⁵¹

Simeon, who certainly met the criterion for Berridge's itinerant minister-missionary, received encouragement and practical instruction in his ecclesiastical irregularity. In addition to advice on the day-to-day routine of the wandering prophet, Berridge warned Simeon that "the chief blocks in your way will be *the prudent* Peters, who will beg, intreat, and beseech you to avoid irregularity."⁵²

To the impartial observer, the vicar of Holy Trinity Church had embraced enough of Berridge's advice to jeopardize the integrity of Simeon's commitment to

⁵¹ Berridge, J., "Copy of a letter of the Late Rev. John Berridge, of Everton, Bedfordshire, to the Rev. Mr. -----, a Gospel clergyman at C-----," *Evangelical Magazine* 2 (1794), 198.

⁵² Op.cit.: 199.

the Church of England. This was an ambiguity for which Simeon was quite repentant in later years:

On one occasion, a few years before his death, [in the presence of the Editor] he was good-naturedly reminded by an old friend of some of those instances of his early fervour: -- "Do you remember, Mr. Simeon, in former times coming very early in the morning to my great barn, to preach to the men before they went to their work?" After a most significant look, instantly turning his face aside, and then with both hands uplifted to hide it, he exclaimed -- *O spare me! spare me! I was a young man then.*⁵³

Simeon recognized the dangers accompanying his well-meaning preaching excursions, which he began to curtail in the 1790s as his conflicts with his parishioners moderated. At the same time, and for the same reason, he reversed his earlier habit of accepting invitations to address mid-week Dissenters' meetings in Cambridge.⁵⁴

M.M. Preston, a contemporary of Simeon's, suggested that the vicar of Holy Trinity also became concerned for the physical safety of his congregation in the early 1790s. With the rising terror in France and the prospects of hostilities increasing, anti-Jacobin activity in Cambridge took on a violent character. Students, en route to Simeon's evening lecture, were frequently subjected to threats from militant townspeople. Simeon's 'uncanonical' lectures were increasingly

⁵³ Carus: 199-200. See also: Preston, M.M., *Memoranda of the Rev. Charles Simeon, M.A., late Minister of Trinity Church, and Fellow of King's College, Cambridge*, London, 1840: 39; and Smyth, C.H.E., *Simeon and church order: A study of the origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the eighteenth century*, The Birkbeck Lectures for 1937-1938, Cambridge, 1940: 283-4.

⁵⁴ Hopkins, H.E., *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*, London, 1977: 190.

labelled as "needless irregularity and dangerous innovation."⁵⁵ To avoid further political difficulties, Simeon discontinued his Sunday evening lectures in 1792.⁵⁶

Simeon's Appeal to Fundamental Order

Where do these facts leave Simeon's commitment to Anglican order? His public position was regular: "The Articles, the Homilies, and the Liturgy, are the standard of Divine truth, as embraced and professed by our Established church," he said; they had achieved a greater degree of perfection and inspiration than any other books written by men.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, as has been indicated, in his early years Charles Simeon violated Anglican church order for the sake of practising his call to ministry and defending his parish against the inroads of the Dissent. Moreover, Simeon's heavy involvement in voluntary causes, treated in chapters

⁵⁵ Preston, op.cit.: 22.

⁵⁶ Simeon's memorandum on the subject, December 1792, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge. Simeon's "lay societies" soon filled the vacuum.

⁵⁷ Horae: Sermon 1519, "Forms of prayer, good," vol.12, 436.

Such professions did not protect Simeon from the censure of Herbert Marsh, the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in 1812. Marsh insisted that the Liturgy must also be affirmed as an "authorized" interpreter of the Scriptures for members of the Established Church. By this means, according to Marsh, a Churchman is distinguished from a Christian. [Marsh, H., *An inquiry into the consequences of neglecting to give the Prayer Book with the Bible ...*, Cambridge, 1812: 4-5] Simeon would not venture this far in his affirmation of the Liturgy, thus earning him the charge of inconsistency from Marsh.

See also: Marsh, H., *A letter to the Rev. Charles Simeon ... in answer to his pretended congratulatory address, in confutation of his various misstatements, and in vindication of the efficacy ascribed by our Church to ... baptism*, Cambridge, 1813; and Marsh, H., *A second letter to the Rev. Charles Simeon, in confutation of his various misstatements, and in vindication of the efficacy ascribed by our Church to the sacrament of baptism*, Cambridge, 1813.

five and six, perpetuated the impression of irregularity even when he maintained careful attention to church order in Cambridge.

The ambiguities created by Simeon's ecclesiastical experiments are significant when seen in the context of his many public statements of loyalty to the Church of England. Simeon's occasional but obvious violations of church order allowed his opponents to infer that the discipline of the Established Church would always be subject to the theology, piety, and personal agendas of evangelical Churchmen. How, then, could churchmanship occupy a central place in Simeon's world view? This tension is resolved in recognizing that church order itself was not an ultimate value for Charles Simeon. What occupied the centre of his world-view, along with his fundamental evangelicalism, was an obligation to preserve social order in general.

Charles Simeon joined fellow Establishmentarians in conceiving of a divine origin for the basic structure of European and, especially, British society. This belief developed in the context of the Deistic controversies of the early eighteenth century. A rational response was deemed to be the most promising answer to Deism. Disregarding polemical literature, the success of the theistic cause arrived in the form of Joseph Butler's *Analogy of religion* [1736].⁵⁸ The *Analogy* attempted to do for religion what Isaac Newton's theories had done for physics: to establish a rational framework for understanding reality. Butler endeavoured to show that God had established 'laws' to govern the spiritual and moral dimensions of the universe in the same way he had instituted the laws of physics. Although the *Analogy* does not mention Deism by name, Butler's arguments for an essential unity between 'natural' and 'revealed' religion did much to undermine

⁵⁸ Butler, J., *The analogy of religion, natural and revealed, to the constitution and course of nature*, London, 1736.

the rational appeal of the Deistic tradition. Butler and his contemporaries in the Church of England had created a rational and mechanistic view of Christianity. This proved to be a crucial step toward a quasi-transcendent view of British society.

With the collapse of Deism in the early decades of the eighteenth century, advocates of mechanical theism turned to the task of building defences against any future challenges to what they perceived to be the God-given order of spiritual things. The person of God being the cornerstone to their world-view, rationalist theologians applied themselves to evidential proofs for God's existence. Teleological arguments abounded. The complexity of nature and the laws governing it served as evidence in the Platonic "argument by design." This theological movement reached a crescendo in Simeon's day with the publication of William Paley's *View of the evidences of Christianity* [1794].⁵⁹ Paley's analogy of the watch, which Simeon used frequently from the pulpit,⁶⁰ continued to have appeal into the present century.

Teleological principles also began to influence Establishment attitudes toward the structure of British society. The supposed 'excellence' of the British constitution and the unexpected, ergo Providential development of Great Britain's overseas dominions [e.g., in India] served to indicate a divine purpose behind

⁵⁹ Paley, W., *View of the evidences of Christianity*, London, 1794.

⁶⁰ Simeon used Paley's illustration in defending his paradoxical statements on election. He referred to himself as a Calvinist and an Arminian. [See the introduction, pp.21-2.] He likened this ambiguity to the gears of Paley's watch, which turned in opposite directions yet kept good time. [Simeon, C., *Helps to composition: or, Five hundred skeletons of sermons, several being the substance of sermons preached before the University*, Cambridge, 1801-1802: vol.1, viii; see also Horae: Introduction, vol.1, xvii.]

things British.⁶¹ Visions of a God-given destiny for the British people produced three effects in Establishment circles. First, there was a hesitation to alter the structure of such an 'ideal' society. Second, in order to ensure the continued blessing of God, momentum was created for politically safe moral reforms. Third, Britain's role in the wider world was couched in benevolent and colonial terms.⁶²

A subsequent hardening of these attitudes was created in Establishment minds by certain historical developments. The American Revolution challenged the perfection and benevolence of British rule and it cast doubt upon the blessing of God on British society: Why would the colonies have revolted and how could they have succeeded? The turmoil in France brought crisis even closer to home. The Establishment could not allow an 'irreligious' Continental revolution to cross the Channel and disrupt so perfect a society.⁶³ The defence chosen to guard against such developments was a static view of human society. While it is beyond the

⁶¹ For example: In a presentation to the East India Company Court of Directors in 1797, Charles Grant argued that the "destitution" of Bengali morals could be rectified by the introduction of [British] Christianity in India. The inherent goodness of British society and the "Providential" manner by which India had come into the British sphere [i.e., with limited effort and opposition] suggested divine purpose and made such a policy imperative. Grant hoped that the Court of Directors would see the benefits for India, and for the Company, in setting such a "healing principle" in motion. [Grant, C., *Observations on the state of society among the Asiatic subjects of Great Britain, particularly with respect to morals and the means of improving it: Written chiefly in the year 1792*, [London], 1797: 44f.,146-9.]

Bradley's examination of providential assumptions vis-à-vis British India is a helpful treatment of the subject. [Bradley, I., *The politics of godliness: Evangelicals in Parliament, 1784-1832*, Oxford University, D. Phil. thesis, 1974: 99 and passim.]

⁶² The philosophical underpinnings to the social and political views of evangelicals in Simeon's day are considered in detail in: Stanley, B., *Home support for overseas missions in early Victorian England, c. 1838-1873*, Cambridge University, Ph.D. thesis, 1979: 118-53. See also: Willmer, H., *Evangelicalism, 1785-1835*, Hulsean Prize Essay, Cambridge University, 1962.

⁶³ From the political camp, Burke was representative of these sympathies. [Burke, E., *Reflections on the Revolution in France and on the proceedings on certain societies in London relative to that event: In a letter intended to have been sent to a gentleman in Paris*, London, 1790.]

scope of this study to trace fully and document the development of these social attitudes in Great Britain, it is important to illustrate the extent to which Charles Simeon held Britain's social structure in high regard, and why he did so. Simeon's thought was innovative.

Consider, first of all, the dilemma inherent in appeals to social order. The enforcement of social order requires some measure of control, an unpopular concept among those who are subjected to it. There is a true sense in which liberty can be defined merely by what the social order will not allow. Governments, in generic terms, exist to maintain regularity in society and, thus, are obliged to limit personal liberties through dictation of uniform standards. In response, opposition elements in a society will seek for freedom from governmental authority through conscientious resistance to its control. Therefore, in actual fact, attention to order as a means of social control necessarily produces tendencies to disorder in society.

Simeon endeavoured to avoid this theoretical discontinuity by asserting that the God-given essence of order is not control but benevolence. This conviction was entirely consistent with evangelical confidence in the arrival of "The Age of Benevolence".⁶⁴ Nowhere is the importance of benevolence to Simeon's world-view more clear than in his understanding of order in human society.

⁶⁴ In a letter to Thomas Thomason, dated December 29, 1814, Charles Simeon joined many of his contemporaries in heralding the welcomed age. In *Carus*: 285.

An Affirmation of Social Order

Simeon uncritically accepted the existence of two contrasting yet interdependent orders in secular society, the rich and the poor. Moreover, in Simeon's view, this reality had been ordained by God as evidenced by the warning to Israel in Deut. 15.11, "the poor will never cease to be in the land." However, Simeon was quick to affirm that this text did not condemn the members of one economic rank to destitution while it licensed the members of the other rank to opulence. The rich are always to be benevolent to the poor.⁶⁵ Consistent with this conviction, Simeon felt little need to promote economic self-improvement. What he did urge was proper social and moral responsibility on the part of the "higher orders." For his own part, and as an example to others, Simeon annually made generous gifts for the poor.⁶⁶ He also believed that he consistently exercised his influence for the benefit of the poor during times of extremity, such as in his efforts to ensure the fair distribution of bread in Cambridge during the famine of 1788-1789.⁶⁷

Simeon endorsed the concept of the "happy poor," uncomplicated by the problems of management and government that dogged the rich. "The poor, whilst they enjoy their health, and are under no extraordinary pressure, are quite as happy

⁶⁵ Horae: Sermon 208, "The duty of charity enforced," vol.2, 367.

⁶⁶ Brown: 123.

⁶⁷ Carus: 64-5. See also: Hopkins, H.E., *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*, London, 1977: 51.

as the rich."⁶⁸ It is this simplicity of life that enables the poor to excel in matters of religion. This is the chief advantage of the poor over the rich:

To provide for their present wants, and to lay up something for a time of sickness, is the utmost that the generality of [the poor] aspire to do. But what glorious views does religion open to them!"⁶⁹
Like the Apostles of the early Church, the poor's social status creates an internal disposition to seek for eternal life as a "sovereign antidote to their temporal disadvantages."⁷⁰

By this argument Simeon was able to suggest that real benefits, albeit spiritual ones, inherently accrue to the poor.

In contrast, while the wealthy may have the advantage of secular education and knowledge, they are spiritually disadvantaged in comparison with the poor. Many of the rich are blinded by the vanity of their wealth; they hold a natural prejudice against anyone who might serve as their spiritual teacher.⁷¹ The independent spirit of the rich prevents them from seeing their true spiritual condition. Moreover, they fail to recognize that the objects of God's election are never "the self-wise, the noble, or the mighty." By this affirmation, Simeon did not mean to imply the absolute exclusion of the rich from the Kingdom of God, nor the automatic preference of God for the poor. Rather, "the weak, ignoble, and illiterate" simply tend to be more responsive to spiritual things, showing their

⁶⁸ Horae: Sermon 481, "Job's compassion for the poor," vol.4, 453.

⁶⁹ Horae: Sermon 2355, "The effects of religion on different orders of society," vol.20, 19.

⁷⁰ Op.cit.: 20.

⁷¹ Horae: Sermon 816, "Advantages of the rich and poor compared," vol.7, 277-9.

"spiritual discernment ... indifference to the world ... [and] delight in holy exercises."⁷² Gospel preaching, in Simeon's opinion, is the only means able to correct the chief sin of the rich, i.e., pridefulness:

[Religion] does not indeed despoil [the wealthy] of that honour which is due to their rank; [it rather confirms it to them, cf. Rom. 13.7]; but it humbles them *in their own estimation*, and *in the estimation of others*, and *in the daily habit of their minds*.⁷³

Simeon believed that evangelical faith would produce a spiritual unity between the economic ranks of society. 'True Christians', rich or poor, would be brought to the same point of spiritual humility and contrition, albeit by different processes. Although God acts sovereignly in placing people in their material station, there would be no difference in their ultimate condition as a result of their temporal social status.⁷⁴ The fact that God exercises his benevolence in Christ toward rich and poor alike precludes any basis for spiritual pride in either group. Thus, in Simeon's view, the universal Church enjoys a spiritual unity that is independent of economic standing.⁷⁵

Furthermore, Simeon believed that the intrinsic goodness of material ranks in society is demonstrated in God's socio-religious economy. The poor benefit by their predilection to true faith, created by the modest means of their station. The rich, in turn, are drawn to trust in God through their education and, with even

⁷² Horae: Sermon 1931, "The objects of God's call," vol.16, 10-13.

⁷³ Horae: Sermon 2355, "The effects of religion on different orders of society," vol.20, 19.

⁷⁴ Horae: Sermon 1931, "The objects of God's call," vol.16, 14-16.

⁷⁵ Horae: Sermon 1001, "Excellency of the Church of Christ," vol.8, 543.

greater effect, by the pious example of the poor. Simeon believed that the spiritual example of the poor are a more effective witness to Christ than the work of most parish ministers.⁷⁶ Genuine faith among rich and poor is thus fostered by the existence of an economic order in society and the ultimate good of both groups is served by such order.

Simeon felt no need to encourage the material betterment of the poor as a religious function: "Christianity does not at all interfere with [economic] distinctions in civil life: they are the appointment of God himself; and are necessary to the well-being of mankind."⁷⁷ In addition to their spiritual benefits, material ranks serve a practical purpose. They bring an order to society that "binds all the classes of men together by the ties of mutual usefulness and dependence."⁷⁸ In Simeon's model, all citizens -- regardless of economic means - - have a contribution to make to society: The Crown, in order to rule, is dependent upon the Government for its appropriations. The Government, in order to administer the nation, is dependent on trade for income and assets to tax. Growth in business depends on a growing population. Population growth depends on landowners for an increasing food supply. The landowner, in order to market his crops, is dependent upon his field workman. The workman is dependent upon the smith to shoe the plough horses, while the smith is dependent on the labourer to mine the coal to feed the forge, and so on. Such a perfect, God-given balance and interdependence requires no adjustment by human wisdom.

⁷⁶ Brown: 156.

⁷⁷ Horae: Sermon 1001, "Excellency of the Church of Christ," vol.8, 543.

⁷⁸ Horae: Sermon 208, "The duty of charity enforced," vol.2, 366.

Simeon was not alone in his understanding of the ordering of society. William Wilberforce, in *Practical view*, described a truly Christian nation as one whose people diligently discharged the duties of their station in life without breaking in on the rights and duties of others.⁷⁹ Simeon and Wilberforce drew on the Puritan ethic of meaningful work, set it in the context of a static social structure, and ascribed the design to God. Not only is it pleasing to God for men and women to "fulfil the duties of [their] respective stations,"⁸⁰ it is also essential to resist 'democratic' tendencies. Simeon feared that democracy would substitute "King Mob" for the law, as he believed had occurred in France through the influence of godless men. Such revolutions undermined the truly benevolent society, such as was in place in Britain.⁸¹ Simeon's caution to his hearers is explicit:

['Natural men'] do not understand what necessity there is for such a state of things [i.e., material ranks in society], nor how connected it is, for the most part, with civilisation and the liberal arts. They are not aware, that if the whole system were subverted, and all men were reduced to perfect equality, the same inequality would soon arise, and greater evils ensue than those which have already been experienced.⁸²

That some men and women are forced by their station or social class into destitution was, to Simeon, an evil to be addressed by the rich. It is their

⁷⁹ Wilberforce, W., *A practical view of the prevailing religious system of professed Christians in the higher and middle classes in this country contrasted with real Christianity*, 1797, 6th edition, Glasgow, 1837: 374.

⁸⁰ Horae: Sermon 1287, "The call of the four apostles," vol.11, 41.

⁸¹ Hopkins, H.E., *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*, London, 1977: 197.

⁸² Horae: Sermon 1961, "Abiding in our calling," vol.16, 179.

responsibility to secure the relief of the poor through benevolence. However, the evil of destitution is no reason to violate the God-given material order upon which British civilization rested. If some need to rule, govern, educate, conduct business, colonize, and minister in the Christian Church, others need to practise the trades, and most needed to labour with their backs and their hands. That a man is in a poor station is a result of God's sovereignty and, therefore, a condition to be tolerated in obedience to God and for the good of society.

Simeon recognized that the evangelical movement might create certain complications among the poor. When a slave or a labourer experienced spiritual conversion, Simeon expected the subsequent prodding of the Holy Spirit to produce a desire for Bible study and prayer. These activities, by virtue of the time required for them, were often incompatible with the vocations of the poor. Slaves, for example, were not generally at liberty to make room for personal devotions in the course of their day. The problem became even more critical if a slave aspired to the Christian ministry, a practical and legal impossibility without freedom from indenture.⁸³

Notwithstanding these hindrances to religious practice by the poor, Simeon prohibited any unlawful effort to avoid the obligations of one's vocation or economic station in life.⁸⁴ He based his position on what he perceived to be the God-given, proper authority of a slave owner or employer. Moreover, in light of the great benefit of ranks and orders in society, "in whatever state a man be called ... he should abide therein" in submission to the will of God and in the support of

⁸³ Op.cit.: 180.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

the collective welfare of society.⁸⁵ This obedience often required a willingness to accept circumstances in which the worship of God is limited to private, extempore prayer and the glory given to God by perseverance in adversity. To change one's material station in life is not absolutely forbidden by Scripture, but Simeon stressed that "no man should change *merely* on account of the difficulties that attend his present calling."⁸⁶

Shortly after the beginning of the nineteenth century, conceptions of society like Simeon's were dismissed by the reform movements as unjust, self-serving, and patently unbiblical. Nevertheless, Simeon's social model -- which remained unchanged throughout his life -- was typical of pre-reform Establishment thinking.

A Hierarchy of Authorities

In the same way that Simeon fostered adherence to social order for the sake of its benevolent effect on society, so also Simeon insisted on obedience to proper authority for the universal benefit of community and nation. Eighteenth century views of authority, which Simeon shared, generally recognized three rightful "powers" that bear on life in its normal course: the familial, the ecclesiastical, and the civil. A coordinate relationship exists between them, with each authority having primary jurisdiction within its domain. The unifying factor between each authority, and essential to preclude conflict between them, is their origin. The authority of the family, the church, and the state is derived from God's general authority.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Op.cit.: 182.

A motif for authority in Simeon's day was parenthood. God, as universal father, serves as the ultimate parent. In turn, God delegates a portion of his authority to natural parents [i.e., fathers and mothers], to religious parents [i.e., ministers], and to civil parents [i.e., state officials].⁸⁷ These sub-authorities are to establish and maintain order within their respective domains for the good of people's education and vocation, eternal soul, and social experience, respectively.⁸⁸ Apart from the precedence granted to the authority of parents over their minor children, each authority is to keep to its own province.

The exercise of authority within its proper domain was a principle of profound importance to Charles Simeon. For example, his fundamental objection to the Dissent followed from an application of this tenet. While Simeon respected the right of Dissenters to exercise private religious judgment, and he was willing to cooperate with them in common evangelical causes in Cambridge, he adamantly proclaimed to his congregation, "Dissent is an evil."⁸⁹ In doing so, Simeon was not objecting to the principle of private religious judgment, but to social and political dissent. Simeon explicitly differentiated between religious nonconformity -- undesirable, but perhaps necessary -- and political "schism," a great evil and without basis. He maintained this distinction throughout his ministry. Calls for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts by Cambridge Baptist Robert Hall were, according to Simeon, disruptive of the social order and an inappropriate intrusion by the religious leaders of the Dissent into the realm of

⁸⁷ E.g., [Allestree, R.], *The whole duty of man laid down in a plain and familiar way for the use of all, but especially for the meanest reader ...: Necessary for all families: With private devotions for several occasions*, 1658, reprint, London, 1888: 169-177.

⁸⁸ Op.cit.: 177.

⁸⁹ Brown: 224.

civil authority.⁹⁰ As late as 1835 Simeon affirmed the religious agenda of evangelical Dissenters while at the same time fearing their negative impact on public attitudes toward the Establishment.⁹¹

In Simeon's day the central issue in the battle between the Establishment and Nonconformity was not the nature of religious zeal. In question was the propriety of the civil disabilities placed on Dissenters. The matter was civil more than religious and the arguments turned on matters of authority. The Dissent sought to be freed from the disadvantages associated with the Test and Corporation Acts. Theirs was a demand for social equality with Churchmen. The Establishment, including clergy like Simeon, believed that the disqualification of Dissenters from public office and University admission, etc., were not manifestations of religious intolerance, which Simeon would have been bound to

⁹⁰ Carus did not document Simeon's protest. However, Hall's printed letter to Simeon, in 1795, details Simeon's objections to the politics of the Cambridge Baptists, especially in their public call for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. Hall answered Simeon by claiming a right of free expression.

[Flower, B., ed., *National sins considered in two letters to the Rev. Thomas Robinson ... to which are added a letter from the Rev. Robert Hall to the Rev. Charles Simeon, and reflections on war, by the late Rev. W. Law*, Cambridge, 1796: 77-82; see also *The miscellaneous works and remains of the Rev. Robert Hall, with a memoir of his life by Olinthus Gregory ... and a critical estimate of his character and writings, by John Foster*, London, 1846.]

Simeon was not alone, among evangelical Churchmen, in distinguishing between religious and political dissent. For example, *Zeal without innovation* was published in 1809 as an attempt to disassociate evangelical Anglicans from the alleged political unreliability of the Dissent. *Zeal* condemned the "abuse of the Act of Toleration" in Nonconformist appeals for political liberty and exhorted evangelicals to give no cause for rumours of association with such campaigns. [*Zeal without innovation: or, The present state of religion and morals considered, with a view to the dispositions and measures required for its improvement: To which is subjoined, An address to young clergymen, ...*, 2nd edition, London, 1809: 16,22.]

⁹¹ Simeon to William Carus, August 21, 1835, Trinity College Library, Cambridge, Add.MS b113, f.50.

oppose.⁹² Rather, the social advantages of Churchmen arose out of their cooperation with civil authority; it is necessary to reward, and therefore reinforce, the preservation of the Establishment as the Establishment.⁹³ That Simeon and his company had a vested interest in maintaining their status in society was not lost upon Dissenters; Robert Hall, in the 1790s, railed against what he declared to be self-seeking propaganda.⁹⁴ It was to no avail for the time being. The public majority at the time generally believed that Nonconformists should have some price to pay for the protection under the Act of Toleration. Reforms remained out of reach until the social despair following the Napoleonic Wars produced an explosion in the numbers of Dissenters. Public sympathy then turned against the privileges of Churchmen. Until the 1820s, however, the eighteenth century status quo prevailed.

With respect to authority, Simeon accepted that it was vested in an office. Appointment to such an office was required in order to exercise authority in a proper fashion. The individual is not authoritative in himself or herself. The office endows its holder with the right to govern or rule.⁹⁵ This distinction reinforces the assertion that all authority is relative to God's. Superior authority [e.g., the office of father, minister, king] derives its jurisdiction directly from God by virtue of the sovereignty of its establishment. No authority exists, and no one properly occupies such a position, but by God's choice, although people are free to

⁹² Horae: Sermon 1792, "The character of Gallio," vol.14, 478.

⁹³ Ibid. Simeon acknowledged the "political necessity ... for *withholding certain privileges*."

⁹⁴ Hall's printed letter, of 1795, to Simeon, in Flower, op.cit: 80ff. Briggs' study of class consciousness in early nineteenth century English politics echoes this view. [Briggs, A., "Middle class consciousness in English politics, 1780-1846," *Past and Present* 9 (1956), 65.]

⁹⁵ Brown: 209.

determine the form or manner of the exercise of authority.⁹⁶ The ultimate source of all proper authority makes submission to it, in the view of Simeon, a submission to the general government of God.

Simeon further strengthened his insistence on obedience to proper authority by urging submission to 'superiors' as the most fundamental social duty of 'inferiors'. Simeon derived such submission, as well, from God: "... the duties of the inferior arise solely from the command of God, and are totally independent of the conduct of the superior; so that no neglect of duty on the one part can justify any neglect of it on the other."⁹⁷ Thus, the failure of one who holds an authoritative office to carry out his personal duties to God or to his superiors does not affect the authority of the office or the benefit of the order maintained by it. On this basis Simeon could affirm the proverbial "right of kings to rule badly," the efficacy of the sacraments even if administered by an unconverted minister, and the right of 'heathen' parents to raise their children as adherents to an indigenous religion.⁹⁸ One must begin with the assumption that a proper authority always acts beneficially toward those for whom it is responsible. This presupposition alone is sufficient to call for general obedience to all proper authorities.

The importance of civil authority, especially in the form of the magistrate, figured prominently in Simeon's sermons and writings. Because Simeon believed that magistrates bear a portion of God's authority, Simeon argued for routine

⁹⁶ State government, discussed below, is the clearest example. See also: Horae: Sermon 2396, "Subjection to civil government," vol.20, 199.

⁹⁷ Horae: Sermon 2189, "The relative duties explained," vol.18, 260.

⁹⁸ For example, Simeon was an outspoken advocate of the efficacy of the ministerial office even if critical of individual ministers. See Simeon's comments on "the degeneracy of the Clergy" [Carus: 29] and the spiritual authority of ministers [Horae: Sermon 153, vol.2, 48].

subjection to them. Public complaints against civil magistrates should be limited to "just and great occasion[s]"⁹⁹ because of the social benefit of good government. The magistrate holds the administration of civil order in his hand: "Hence every man feels himself secure; the weak fears not the invasion of his rights any more than the strong; but all sit under their own vine and fig tree ..." ¹⁰⁰ This priceless service to society confirms the magistrate's divine appointment and calls citizens to submit to his government and taxation.¹⁰¹

Simeon believed sedition to be absolutely forbidden to the Christian. It would be an affront to proper authority and an unanswerable charge in the eyes of a secular or 'heathen' government. For the Church of Jesus Christ to be directly connected with any form of civil disobedience or revolution threatens religious freedom, a risk to be avoided unconditionally. The Christian minister or missionary is called to proclaim that magistrates are the "governor[s] for God." The magistrate is also to be heralded as a "benefactor from God," sent forth to suppress evil and promote happiness.¹⁰² Simeon allowed that "rulers *may* so conduct themselves, as totally to destroy the compact between them and their subjects," i.e., when civil authority contradicts God's authority¹⁰³ Unfortunately,

⁹⁹ Horae: Sermon 153, "Aaron and Miriam reprov'd," vol.2, 47.

¹⁰⁰ Horae: Sermon 277, "The Benjamites' wickedness," 85. See also: Horae, vol.3, sermon 325, "The equity of Christ's government," vol.3, 305-7.

¹⁰¹ Horae: Sermon 1911, "Duty to civil governors," vol.15, 506-7.

¹⁰² Op.cit.: 505.

¹⁰³ Horae: Sermon 153, "Aaron and Miriam reprov'd," vol.2, 47-8. Simeon judged the post-revolutionary government in France to have erred in this fashion.

in Simeon's desire to urge Christians to be "the quiet in the land,"¹⁰⁴ he failed to clarify adequately the practical considerations involved in determining what constitutes a contradiction of God-given authority by a civil government. He also did not address the role of the Christian Church in such considerations.

In forcefully affirming proper civil authority, Simeon was careful to distinguish between the office of magistrate and the politician. In contrast with his theological basis for the observance of civil order, "Politics in general have very little to do with religion, because politics are seldom founded upon truth."¹⁰⁵ To Simeon, true patriotism is professed by many but practised by few, and rarely by politicians. Selfishness is a more common motive for those seeking elected office. For example, Simeon believed that most public figures hope for incompetent successors upon their retirement, so as to promote and prolong their own sense of public value and worth.¹⁰⁶ Simeon also saw political patronage as little more than an attempt to further the politician's name through the reward of his family and friends. Whereas the civil office is above reproach, the office holder has no such immunity.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Brown: 294. This was not an uncommon viewpoint. Bradley has suggested that Joseph Milner's *Church history* was written, among other things, to demonstrate the avoidance of politics by the early Church. [Bradley, I., *The politics of godliness: Evangelicals in Parliament, 1784-1832*, Oxford University, D. Phil. thesis, 1974: 6.] However, Milner's arguments were hardly neutral in the political context of the 1790s. He denied private religious or political judgment when it led to heterodox Christianity, especially with respect to attacks on Trinitarian theology. He declared that the State has the right to preserve Christian orthodoxy by the enforcement of uniform religious standards. [Milner, J., *The history of the Church of Christ ...: With additions and corrections, by Isaac Milner.*, 1794-1809, new edition, London, 1827: vol.4, 209-10.]

¹⁰⁶ Horae: Sermon 169, "Joshua appointed to succeed Moses," vol.2, 169.

Apparently Simeon's attitude toward political involvement was an acquired value based on experience. In 1784 Simeon solicited John Venn's vote for a Parliamentary candidate. Simeon did so in order to reward one of Holy Trinity's churchwardens who had moderated his opposition to Simeon's ministry.¹⁰⁷ This was hardly a principled action. But, by 1811, Simeon had subjected his use of the franchise to a more careful process. This is illustrated in his congratulatory letter to Lord Palmerston on his election to Parliament. Simeon made clear that his support for Palmerston stemmed from issues rather than personal or party considerations.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, Simeon later declined to vote for the younger Charles Grant, afterwards Lord Glenelg, on account of his support for Roman Catholic emancipation, a reform Simeon was [then] unwilling to endorse.¹⁰⁹ Despite his friendships with M.P.s such as Wilberforce and the elder Grant, Simeon's general suspicion of politicians made his vote, let alone his public support, a difficult commodity to secure.

Simeon's treatment of ecclesiastical authority followed similar lines to his convictions on its civil counterpart. The chief benefit of church order is its ability to engender true faith and holiness from generation to generation. Church authorities, in turn, promote ecclesiastical order with this beneficial end in view. Simeon's favourite example in this regard was the Anglican Liturgy, whose efficacy he extolled in his famous series of University sermons, "The excellency of the Liturgy," presented in November 1811.

¹⁰⁷ Simeon to John Venn, April 13, 1784, Venn MSS, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.81 C22.

¹⁰⁸ Lord Palmerston to Simeon, April 8, 1811, and Simeon's reply of April 9, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁰⁹ Simeon to Henry Venn, CMS General Secretary, undated, Venn MSS, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.81 C35/40.

At the centre of his argument in favour of the value of the Liturgy lay an historical consideration. From his study of the Scriptures, Simeon believed that God's people are most likely to express dependence and trust in God immediately following what they perceive to be his intervention in their lives. Israel's statement of fealty in Deut. 5.24-27, following Moses' reading of the Decalogue, served as an example to Simeon. Israel's liturgy [i.e., the Decalogue] translated a genuine, albeit momentary sentiment of fealty into a continuing disposition.¹¹⁰ Given the consistency with Scripture demonstrated by the Liturgy of the Church of England, Simeon was certain that "a heart suited to the spirit of the Liturgy" is all that is required for the Prayers have their effect.¹¹¹ Thus, in the case of the English Establishment, ecclesiastical authorities should foster the use of the Liturgy and the attitudes toward it that enable its good result.

As with the connection between civil law and the magistrate, the benefits of the divine service are the product of the ministerial office, rather than the minister per se.¹¹² For this reason Simeon affirmed the validity and value of liturgical worship even when conducted by a nominally Christian minister. Thus, for those

¹¹⁰ Horae: Sermon 191, "Excellency of the Liturgy [no. 1]," vol.2, 234-240.

¹¹¹ Horae: Sermon 191, "Excellency of the Liturgy [no. 3]," vol.2, 274, 368.

¹¹² Horae: Sermon 1731, "Inspiration and authority of the Apostles," vol.14, 217. See also: Pollard, A., and M. Hennell, eds., *Charles Simeon (1759-1836): Essays written in commemoration of his bicentenary by members of the Evangelical Fellowship for Theological Literature*, Great Anglicans, London, 1964: 149.

who had chosen the Establishment, Simeon's call to obedience to ecclesiastical authority was as strong as it was to civil authority:

Man, as a social being, has duties to the society of which he is a member: and of these duties he must be reminded, no less than those which are purely personal. The Church of Christ is one great family, in which, as in every other family, order must be observed, by the exercise of power in those who preside, and a submission to it amongst those placed under their direction.¹¹³

Simeon acknowledged the problem of "unscriptural usurpation of authority" by some ministers.¹¹⁴ Simeon believed that this occurred most frequently when the Christian minister also served as civil magistrate.¹¹⁵ Although there should be "cordial and energetic cooperation" between them, these two offices should remain separate: "*Civil* power was [never] delegated by God to his ministers; that exclusively belongs to civil magistrates."¹¹⁶ This limitation, however, does not weaken the clergyman's authority within his proper domain. According to Simeon the first responsibility of the congregation is uncritical submission to the parish minister, especially in his pulpit ministry.¹¹⁷ Thus, Simeon declared, "Dissent is an evil" and "schism is a great evil," even though they may have "mainly arisen

¹¹³ Horae: Sermon 2350, "The duty of people, and the responsibility of ministers," vol.19, 545.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ In 1832, a fourth of England's 5,371 justices of the peace were clergy. [Young, Jr., H.V., *The Evangelical clergy in the Church of England, 1790-1850*, Brown University, Ph.D. thesis, 1958: 13.]

¹¹⁶ Ibid. See also: Horae: Sermon 633, "The zeal of Phineas commended," vol.6, 233; and Horae, Sermon 758, "The reward of charity," vol.7, 25.

¹¹⁷ Horae: Sermon 1938, "Mysteriousness of the Gospel," vol.16, 69.

from a want of real religion" in the Established Church.¹¹⁸ As previously discussed, the Dissent violated the proper and legal authority of the Established Church by opposing its ministers and by creating of divisions among professing and -- worse still -- 'true Christians'. Once more, however, Simeon avoided discussing appropriate responses to improperly exercised authority, in this case the means of disciplining corrupt ministers.¹¹⁹

Simeon often spoke on the topic of resolving apparent conflicts between secular and religious duty. It was a subject with which he was very familiar, as a Fellow of his college, for his students were frequently caught between the demands of University authorities and their sense of Christian responsibility. Simeon's first advice was harmony: "... we should not without necessity place [these requirements] in opposition to each other. We should rather place our duty to man in subordination to our duty to God; and so endeavour to perform the commands of both ..."¹²⁰ If "both-and" was an insufficient answer, then Simeon recognized the

¹¹⁸ Brown: 224.

¹¹⁹ One might assume that Simeon would defer this matter to the minister's peers or to an applicable hierarchy. Such issues would not have been an issue for congregational consideration.

¹²⁰ Horae: Sermon 1447, "Duties to our earthly and our heavenly king," vol.12, 138-9.

domain of the most applicable authority. Abner Brown recorded a definitive statement with regard to the religious activities of his students:

We are all here in relative stations, and must conform to the duties and submit to the regulations which those stations impose. In no case is private devotion and duty to God to be given up. But if our [college] governors forbid external meetings for prayer, it becomes a question whether our duty to God does not require us to obey them that have rule over us. College is the place for study; not only for studies of the examinations, but for general information. Biblical studies belong more to the time when we have occasion to be always in the Bible, -- when we are in a parish. At that time studies of a general or secular nature are out of place.¹²¹

Simeon consistently held to his view that students must give first priority to College discipline and study. Private duty to God serves as the only exception, for which each college had made provision through chapel services.

Circumstances in the late 1820s provided a test of Simeon's convictions on the subject. It had been reported to Simeon that the Master of another Cambridge college had reputedly scheduled a Sunday evening Greek lecture in order to prevent students from attending his preaching class. Simeon instructed his charges, "Unless the Master has expressly told you that this new lecture was appointed to prevent your attending my church, you are not to know that it is so."¹²² Simeon was consistent, even to his own disadvantage, in his commitment to proper authority and order.

¹²¹ Brown: 193-4.

¹²² Brown: 46.

Resolving the Tension

By placing ecclesiastical order within the larger context of general social order, Simeon was able to resolve the tension between his evangelicalism and his identity as a Churchman. This can best be seen by looking more closely at one of Simeon's parochial innovations, his lay society.¹²³

Simeon's Sunday evening lecture, established in 1783, was discontinued in 1792 owing to increased public sensitivity to activities that smacked of political unreliability. The lecture was, technically, a "conventicle." Two years later, in 1794, Simeon was finally made Lecturer of Holy Trinity Church and, thus, the long sought after Sunday afternoon lecture came into his hands.¹²⁴ Although one might assume that two weekly services would have been sufficient, this apparently was not the case. Simeon took advantage of his newly-found status as vicar and lecturer to reestablish the Sunday evening meeting as well. This time, however, it was termed a 'lay society'. It is significant that Simeon did not expect the afternoon lecture to accomplish the same purposes as his parochial society. This was a consequence of the composition of such a group. The Sunday evening meeting was comprised of the men and women in the parish who were the "most serious" of his congregation in spiritual matters. These were the parishioners who were the chief objects of Simeon's pastoral attention.

¹²³ See current chapter, pp.76-83, for the background.

¹²⁴ Lectures were a Puritan innovation. Being endowed by parishioners, the Lecturer was elected by the congregation. Unless he committed a breach of ecclesiastical law, neither the incumbent nor the diocesan could interfere with the Lecturer's weekly sermon. The Puritans used lectureships, among other tactics, to provide pulpits for their ministers. In addition, Lecturers were not required to use the Liturgy, thus enabling Puritan ministers to avoid censure for refusing to say the Prayers. In Simeon's case, it is ironic that the "lecture tactic" was employed against a 'Puritan'.

In order to give his laity the pastoral attention he believed they required, Simeon secured a curate to handle the official Lecture in the afternoon. Simeon regarded three sermons on Sunday to be "unprofitable for one minister."¹²⁵ With the appointment of Thomas Thomason as Simeon's first curate in 1796, Simeon delegated the afternoon lecture to his curate and concentrated on his morning service and the evening meeting of the parochial society.¹²⁶ That Charles Simeon saw his lay society as strategic to his parish ministry is self-evident from the foci of his efforts.

In 1806-7 a lengthy illness forced Simeon to leave the lay society to its own devices. During this period, and on its own initiative, the society also began to meet on Tuesday evenings for extempore prayer. The precise reasons for this independent action are not clear, but perhaps the members of the society wished to model more closely the Wesleyan pattern [i.e., meeting during the week without clerical supervision]. While the Sunday evening meeting continued under the direction of Thomason, who had assumed Simeon's responsibilities in his absence, the curate was never able to assert control over the lay society as Simeon had done. The Tuesday evening gathering continued. No doubt Thomason was overwhelmed by his tasks, which included the three Sunday services. Even when Simeon returned to his parish, his health did not permit him to participate in the Tuesday evening meeting with any regularity.

In 1811 difficulties with the parish societies came to a head when the Tuesday evening society, still functioning independently of the parish minister, became a public point of contention. A number of Simeon's parishioners who

¹²⁵ Carus: 108.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

were uninvolved in the societies threatened to inform the bishop of the Tuesday prayer meeting. They contended that it was a conventicle, operating outwith the minister's supervision, but with Simeon's full knowledge. Not desiring a confrontation with the bishop, Simeon decided to abolish the prayer meeting in favour of a half dozen home meetings, which would have been ecclesiastically regular. Simeon chose this course rather than put all of his societies and, possibly, his entire ministry at Holy Trinity at risk in a general investigation by his diocesan.¹²⁷

What Simeon did not reckon on was the stubborn resistance of the Tuesday society's lay leaders to his dissolution order. Simeon attributed their intransigence to his own neglect during his illness, but he could not allow "the cause of Religion in Cambridge" to be threatened by a minority group in his congregation. It was a painful year for Simeon. One part of his congregation was seeking his dismissal over a conventicle he was endeavouring to abolish, while another segment was resisting his ministerial authority to abolish the offending meeting. After months of fruitless pleadings and discussion, Simeon openly began to consider some form of prosecution under ecclesiastical law. The recalcitrant laity finally yielded to a compromise with Simeon. The protesting members of the Tuesday society were allowed to form one of the house societies for themselves. Loath as Simeon was to acknowledge this interest group, he found no alternative if he wished to end quickly the conflict that had already darkened a full year.¹²⁸

¹²⁷ The story is told in Carus: 238-42.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

Having settled the conflicts within his parish lay societies, Simeon reflected on his innovation in parish ministry:

After all this experience, What is my judgment in relation to private Societies? My judgment most decidedly is, that without them, where they can be had, a people will never be kept together; nor will they ever feel related to their Minister, as children to a parent: nor will the Minister himself take that lively interest in their welfare ... If [the minister] make it a rule to conduct the service in the private societies himself, he will, for the most part, keep down these [i.e., above] evils.¹²⁹

By 1811, after twenty-eight years of experience in lay-oriented ministry, one hundred and twenty people in six societies were meeting monthly under the limited authority of twelve stewards. Simeon believed that his experiment had been marred only by the tendency of a few stewards to become "their own masters." As a the result, "I have scarcely lost one whom I would not have dismissed."¹³⁰

Among other things, this case study demonstrates Charles Simeon's determination to forward his agenda in the parish. That determination was expressed in terms of flexibility, expediency, and a measure of ecclesiastical

¹²⁹ Carus: 243-4.

¹³⁰ From an Eclectic Society meeting, dated April 29, 1811, in: Pratt, J.H., ed., *Eclectic notes: or, Notes of discussions on religious topics at the meetings of the Eclectic Society, London, during the years 1798-1814*, 2nd edition, London, 1865: 496.

Simeon's stewards functioned as his parish assistants as well as overseers of home meetings. The division of the parish into districts and the assignment of stewards for routine pastoral care was a genuine innovation. Hopkins, for example, believes that John Venn at Clapham and Thomas Chalmers at St. John's, Glasgow, emulated Simeon's model. [Hopkins, H.E., *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*, London, 1977: 47.] This would certainly confirm Canon Smyth's view that Simeon's innovative lay societies made him "a pioneer in the intelligent utilization of the laity in the pastoral ... working of a parish." [Smyth, C.H.E., *Simeon and church order: A study of the origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the eighteenth century*, The Birkbeck Lectures for 1937-1938, Cambridge, 1940: 289.]

irregularity. To what extent, then, did Simeon's parochial lay society violate his commitment to the Established Church? To a much lesser extent than first impressions would suggest. One key to the understanding of Simeon's motives in this case is his pragmatism, his desire to find practical solutions to the problems faced by evangelical ministers.

Simeon was an innovator. As suggested previously, he functioned as an 'intrapreneur' within the Established Church. Simeon's parish lay society is one example, and a number of other innovations are examined in chapter three. He fostered change, but wished to do so from within the Church of England. If this is a valid statement, then there must be a sense in which even the irregularities that accompanied Simeon's lay society truly served the interests of the Established Church. This is demonstrable.

Simeon was a strong advocate of flexibility and expediency in ministry. Abner Brown recorded a classic question-statement on the subject at one of Simeon's "conversation parties" for University students: "Were inflexibility our duty always, why did St. Paul become all things to all men, and circumcise Timothy for good, and refuse to circumcise Titus also for good?"¹³¹ In a sermon entitled, "The propriety of considering times and circumstances,"¹³² Simeon endeavoured to answer his own question. Simeon defined expediency as an action, taken in light of the setting, to produce a desired effect. Simeon saw his world as a rapidly changing one. He believed that rapid change required one to take civil, social, and personal circumstances into account in applying basic principles. It was, however, important to remember that flexibility applies only to the application

¹³¹ Brown: 96. See also the notes for the January 26, 1828, conversation party in Brown: 93.

¹³² Horae: Sermon 384, vol.4, 5-7.

of the principles, not to the principles themselves. For example, whether or not to jeopardize public order is not subject to debate, but one's context could alter the point at which this principle would come into operation.

The first ten years of Simeon's Sunday evening lecture/society provide an illustration of the limits to his expediency. As previously indicated, Simeon knew that his evening lecture would be perceived by some people as a conventicle. Nevertheless, Simeon proceeded with his meeting because he judged that its negative public effect would be minimal while it would be of great spiritual benefit to those who participated. In 1790, after seven years of operation, Simeon's judgment was proven correct. The churchwardens of Holy Trinity Church allowed Simeon to hold his Sunday evening lecture in the church. The 'conventicle' became a meeting in the parish church. However, Simeon discontinued the lecture in 1792 when it began to create public concern. Developments in France [i.e., The Terror] had aroused anti-Jacobin sentiments in the town. Even though the meeting was held in a licensed place, its uncanonical hour and its similarity to a Dissenting chapel service threatened public order and the safety of his parishioners. The spiritual benefits of the lecture had not diminished, but they were made secondary to civil order. Would a Dissenter have taken such a decision?

It is also important to note that Simeon attributed his irregular actions to jealousy for the Established Church. The very week that Simeon began his ministry at Holy Trinity, Mr. Hammond [who had been favoured for the incumbency by the congregation] was elected as Lecturer. This was intended to frustrate the new minister, and it did. Whether rightly or wrongly, Simeon believed that this state of things [i.e., limiting Simeon's pulpit ministry to one service] would result in the loss of many of the congregation to the Dissent. Simeon believed that the interests of his congregation and the Established Church

[i.e., in the retention of its members] would be served by a Sunday evening lecture, even though it would be perceived as a violation of church order.

Simeon's 1811 confrontation with the rebel members of the Tuesday evening society serves as a final illustration of the paramount importance of social order in Simeon's world-view. Not only had the Tuesday evening meeting led to a resurgence of public cries of "conventicle!" but the leaders of the Tuesday group were openly challenging Simeon's authority as their parish minister. Regardless of the spiritual benefits that accrued to the participants in the Tuesday evening meeting, the interests of the Established Church were no longer being served by this 'rebellion'. Moreover, the basic order of society was being threatened by these insubordinate parishioners, or so Simeon believed. It is interesting that the solution reached [i.e., consolidating the rebels into one of a number of house groups] restored a semblance of submission to clerical authority while it avoided pushing the 'rebels' into the Dissenting camp. The subsequent development of Simeon's parochial societies, which were of clear benefit to the parish and the interests of the Established Church in Cambridge, would have been severely limited by any other outcome.

Plurality in the Wider Church

Simeon's recognition of the benefits of church order, in the larger context of general social order, also encouraged the vicar of Holy Trinity to affirm the plurality of the Church of Jesus Christ. This appreciation for the diversity of the global Church left evangelical Anglicans with an important legacy, one that would bear greater fruit in the second half of the nineteenth century: an ecumenical spirit. Simeon, along with fellow evangelicals, recognized that he had spiritual colleagues across the spectrum of British Christianity and world Protestantism. Wilberforce's

"distinguishing doctrines" of evangelicalism -- humanity in need of a Saviour, God's grace in Christ alone, and the call to holiness as a result -- were at work in the English Establishment and the Dissent. Simeon also found allies throughout the Scottish Church. He recognized common cause with Continental and American Protestantism as well. As he saw the opportunity to do so, Simeon was determined to forge a unity of sentiment among the children of the eighteenth century Revival, and to do so by a formula that became a watchword in later years, a unity in the essentials.¹³³

In Scotland Simeon found the common tie of Establishment, "... where the king *must* attend a[n Anglican] clergyman *may* preach,"¹³⁴ and used it to build bridges between evangelicalism in England and Scotland that would have far-ranging implications. During one of Simeon's preaching tours of Scotland, he visited the parish of Moulin. The life and ministry of the parish minister, Rev. Alexander Stewart, was profoundly affected by Simeon's encouragement.¹³⁵ In turn, the renewed Stewart later converted one of his parishioners, a man by the name of Duff. The parishioner's son, Alexander, took up his father's newly-found faith. Alexander Duff's ensuing fifty-year ministry in India wrote a significant page in the history of the expansion of Christianity in South Asia. Simeon's indirect influence on Duff was a classic illustration of the benefit of an ecumenical spirit.

¹³³ Horae: Sermon 2143, "Unity recommended," vol.18, 40-2.

¹³⁴ Carus: 90.

¹³⁵ Stewart's letter of November 25, 1796, to Simeon, in Carus: 104-6.

Simeon's toleration of Nonconformity took on a particularly ecumenical flavour in his financial support of "Johnny Stittle." A lay Christian worker in one of the "viler" parts of Cambridge, Stittle maintained a preaching station at his modest home.¹³⁶ When the response to Stittle's simple Gospel preaching became so great as to overflow the sitting room, it was the Churchman of Holy Trinity who met the expense of altering Stittle's house to accommodate the crowds. Why did Charles Simeon stand behind a self-appointed, formally unqualified, and highly irregular layman? Brown recorded his opinion:

And in his earnest, self-denying endeavour to promote the good of souls anywhere and everywhere, he sometimes shut his eyes to irregularities, and looked to the desire and aim of such as were, in his opinion, working for the direct spiritual good of others, without sufficiently weighing *all* the results, remote as well as immediate, of what was going on; and thus occasionally he took a questionable step.¹³⁷

It was not merely Simeon's own concern for "souls" that allowed him to overlook his standards of ecclesiastical regularity. The compassion for lost men and women in Cambridge that Simeon found he shared in common with Johnny Stittle proved more compelling than a strict application of church order. In the same way, the evangelical values that Simeon shared with Quaker J.J. Gurney enabled the personal friendship, mutual respect, and joint effort [e.g., in the work of the British

¹³⁶ Stittle's house was in Green Street, a very short walk from Holy Trinity Church. [Gray, A.B., *Cambridge revisited*, Cambridge, 1921: 97-9]

¹³⁷ Brown: 13.

and Foreign Bible Society] that marked the relationship between the two men of radically different churchmanship.¹³⁸

Simeon endeavoured to apply the principle of Christian pluralism beyond the scope of his personal relationships with Dissenters. He encouraged his students to avoid "religious bigotry." Although he was opposed to the violation of order inherent in the formation of the Dissenting movement, Simeon did recognize that it was primarily an anemic Establishment that was its cause.¹³⁹ Dissent being a *fait accompli*, Simeon pleaded for Anglican tolerance of Baptist, Congregational, Presbyterian, and even Quaker contributions to the English Church. "There is among religious people a kind of Popish infallibility," Simeon observed. "Everyone thinks his own line straight, and that of all who differ from him crooked."¹⁴⁰ Simeon thus refused to participate in the wholesale castigation of Methodism, as many Churchmen were inclined to do.¹⁴¹ Simeon also noted that

¹³⁸ See Gurney, J.J., *Reminiscences of Chalmers, Simeon, and Wilberforce*, [1835].

Gurney considered Simeon to have been a spiritual father to him. [Gurney to Simeon, May 12, 1830, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.]

¹³⁹ Brown: 224.

¹⁴⁰ Carus: 512.

¹⁴¹ Carus: 439.

Dissenters had little better to say of regular Anglicans. Simeon's objections were explicit:

Protestants ... are as bitter in proscribing each other, as the Papists are in anathematizing them ... From the spirit with which [various Protestant groups] view each other, one would be ready to think that Christ did indeed come to introduce division, not accidentally, but intentionally; not by a separation of his people from the world, but by an alienation of heart from each other.¹⁴²

Although Simeon's tolerance for Nonconformity did not go so far as to support their full emancipation in British society [i.e., repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts], Simeon was an ardent opponent of religious repression:

That a political necessity may exist for *withholding certain privileges* from some, is beyond doubt: but nothing can justify the *inflicting of pains and penalties* upon any, on account of religious sentiments.¹⁴³

Simeon knew that a man or woman was bound to worship God according to conscience, and that popular opposition to Dissenters should not be allowed to give rise to religious tyranny.

Canon Smyth has noted the many contemporaries of Simeon who mistook his comprehension of various doctrines for personal compromise, and misunderstood his toleration of irregularity as lack of conviction.¹⁴⁴ Nothing

¹⁴² Horae: Sermon 784, "The way of salvation misconceived," vol.7, 137.

¹⁴³ Horae: Sermon 1792, "The character of Gallio," vol.14, 478.

¹⁴⁴ Smyth, op.cit.: xiii.

could have been further from the truth. Simeon's ecumenism was never fostered at the sacrifice of his evangelical convictions. For example, Simeon's ecumenism did not extend to the Roman Church. Simeon believed that "there are times when [a true Christian] must contend earnestly for the faith," and assume a posture that is marked by great firmness.¹⁴⁵ Although he taught his students that Roman Catholics should be treated fairly and cared for as members of the parish,¹⁴⁶ Simeon uncompromisingly labeled Romanism as idolatrous, superstitious, "Antichrist," and a "perverter" of the Scriptures.¹⁴⁷ Protestantism's rejection of the Roman Catholic "doctrine of merit" made ecumenical overtures toward Rome an impossibility for Simeon. Because he feared a resurgence of "popery" in the land, Simeon was resolute in his opposition to Roman Catholic emancipation. He moderated his opposition only in the face of an impending civil war.¹⁴⁸ Clearly, there were limits to Simeon's ecumenical spirit that were set by his evangelical convictions.

Finally, Simeon's accommodation of plurality in the Church is demonstrated in his views on ecclesiastical polity. Although he believed episcopacy to be a plain implication of the visitation of Barnabas and Paul to the churches they had established in Asia Minor [Acts 14.23; 15.36ff.], this text does not establish a

¹⁴⁵ Carus: 267.

¹⁴⁶ Brown: 220-1; and Carus: 26.

¹⁴⁷ E.g., Horae: Sermon 105, "Moses' indignation against the idolaters," vol.1, 498; Horae: Sermon 376, "Hezekiah destroys the brasen serpent," vol.3, 539; and Horae: Sermon 1134, "The destruction of popery," vol.9, 535.

¹⁴⁸ Brown: 116; and Carus: 440-3.

universal polity for the Christian Church.¹⁴⁹ Simeon affirmed that "... in primitive times, every Church was governed in its own way, some by Bishops, some by Presbyters ..." ¹⁵⁰ He advocated the validity of both forms of order:

Episcopal ordination is derived from the Apostles, I have no doubt. But I do not say that Presbyterian ordination is not as old as apostolic times also; ... Scripture has not *commanded* any one form of Church government.¹⁵¹

Simeon's tolerance of non-episcopal forms of church administration followed from the general benefit of religion in society: "Every society has some ground of mutual agreement, and some principles on which the members are formed into one collective body."¹⁵² Churches, as societies, are no different, although "some have limited their formularies to a statement of principles [while] others have extended them to forms of prayer ..." ¹⁵³ Simeon affirmed the universal importance of church order itself, but he decried intolerance of one form by another.¹⁵⁴ Simeon was personally delighted with the rites and forms of the Church of England, and thought them to be unsurpassed in their 'usefulness', but he was equally thankful that Anglican order was enforced only upon members of the Church of England.

¹⁴⁹ Horae: Sermon 1784, "Inquiry into the state of the Church," vol.14, 444.

¹⁵⁰ Brown: 214.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Horae: Sermon 1519, "Forms of prayer, good," vol.12, 434.

¹⁵³ Op.cit.: 435.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

He found the tolerance of the Established Church to be in marked contrast to the "bigotry" of the Roman Catholics. The "papists" invite Protestants to embrace the order of Rome or receive condemnation, whereas the Church of England leaves other churches free to adopt their own form of government. This, to Simeon, was an essential implication of Christian plurality: "... to think for ourselves; but *neither to be intolerant nor rigid* [with others]."¹⁵⁵

The Apostle of Order in Church and Society

How should the interplay between Simeon's evangelicalism, his Anglican churchmanship, and his commitment to general social order be summarized? As indicated by the instances of irregularity in Simeon's early ministry, and by his activity in voluntary causes throughout the balance of his life, Charles Simeon demonstrated the preeminence of his evangelical principles above all other aspects of his world-view. His second love was, indeed, for the Church of England; Simeon held his Church's formularies and discipline to be the most perfect of any developed by man. But, Simeon knew the limits to that perfection.

In those few instances when Simeon believed it necessary to choose between evangelical and Anglican principles, he did so as an exercise of the religious authority imparted by his call to Christian ministry. This authority certainly functioned on the level of church order, but it originated at the more fundamental level of the general order of human society. For Churchmen,

¹⁵⁵ Horae: Sermon 2055, "Remembering the poor," vol.17, 40.

The similarities in thinking between Simeon and Richard Hooker [1554-1600], the "apologist of the Elizabethan Settlement," are striking. For example, both clergymen argued for episcopacy without condemning presbyterian polity. [See Hooker, R., *Of the lawes of ecclesiastical politie, eight booke*s, London, 1604, especially Book IV.]

Anglican ecclesiastical order should be observed whenever possible because of its inherent goodness and benefits to society. Nevertheless, when higher causes [i.e., evangelical principles] or expediency forced exceptions to church discipline, Simeon was able to maintain his commitment to the fundamental order underlying his churchmanship.

Simeon thus instituted his parochial lay society, recognized that it would be seen as irregular churchmanship, but did not apologize for it because he believed it would ultimately serve the interests of his evangelicalism and the Established Church. It did. Further, he made certain that his parish innovations did not disrupt the social order. When they threatened to do so, he discontinued them. By consistently valuing general order in society, especially when his evangelicalism and his Anglican churchmanship collided, Simeon was able to resolve in his own mind the tension inherent in his identity as an evangelical and a Churchman.

Daniel Wilson, a third-generation evangelical Anglican, was much influenced by Simeon. Wilson, who served as the Bishop of Calcutta from 1832 to 1853, was impressed by Simeon's ability to keep the divergent emphases as faith and order in a constructive and productive tension. In his "Recollections" of Simeon, included by William Carus in the *Memoirs*, Bishop Wilson judged that the Old Apostle of Cambridge had been successful in a task previously found difficult by evangelicals:

Mr. Simeon neither verged toward the great error of over magnifying the Ecclesiastical Polity of the Church and placing it in the stead of Christ and Salvation; nor towards the opposite mistake of undervaluing the Sacraments and the authority of an Apostolic Episcopacy.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁶ Carus: 597-8.

Evangelical faith and Anglican churchmanship were formative influences on Simeon and, as is demonstrated in chapter three, profoundly affected his strategy for exerting personal and public influence. This chapter has demonstrated that the natural tension between the evangelical and the Anglican in Simeon was eased by his social world-view. This enabled Charles Simeon to be an evangelical and a Churchman in the authentic sense of both terms.

Chapter Three

The Influence of a Mentor

Charles Simeon's fundamental commitment to order in society suggests that his primary channels for exerting personal and public influence should have been institutional. Simeon should have been a 'company man'. In fact, the evidence points in an entirely different direction. Charles Simeon did not aspire to or achieve higher office in the Established Church. Only infrequently, and with reluctance, did Simeon accept official roles at King's College or in the University.¹ Further, as demonstrated in chapters five and six, Simeon's contributions to evangelical voluntary societies, such as the CMS, did not include regular participation on governing committees. Based on the facts, it appears that the vicar of Holy Trinity Church was no institutional leader.

Nevertheless, Charles Simeon was one of the most influential clergymen in the history of the Church of England.² This achievement was realized through Simeon's commitment to and perfection of the model for leadership employed by first-generation evangelicals: Charles Simeon made disciples. Above all other accomplishments, Charles Simeon was a mentor.

¹ Simeon took his turns as Vice-Provost and Dean of the College, as did all Fellows. These officers of the College were responsible for enforcing student discipline. Simeon never sought such a post on a permanent basis.

² This is the force of T.B. Macaulay's opinion, referred to in the introduction, p.17, note 44.

Simeon's Christian Formation

Any consideration of Simeon's influence on his students or parishioners would be incomplete without some reference to the first-generation evangelical Anglicans who mentored Simeon in his first years of parish ministry. As previously mentioned, Simeon did not knowingly encounter another evangelical during the three years following his conversion in 1779.³ The situation changed in 1782. In that year Simeon made the acquaintance of Christopher Atkinson, vicar of St. Edward's Church in Cambridge, "good old Latimer's pulpit."⁴ Atkinson did two favours for Simeon that he could never repay. He offered Simeon his first parish charge, an honorary curacy for the summer months of 1782, and Atkinson introduced Simeon to John Venn. Simeon did not know Venn even though they had been at Cambridge at the same time.⁵ John Venn, in turn, introduced Simeon to his father Henry.

Henry Venn, rector of Yelling and in semi-retirement, exerted more influence on Simeon than any other person during his life. Perhaps Simeon's friendships with Thomas Thomason and Henry Martyn were emotionally closer, but Venn was father, tutor, and model to Simeon until Venn's death in 1797.⁶ Henry Venn also introduced Simeon to three others who shaped his life and work: John Berridge, John Newton, and John Thornton. In his autobiography Simeon credits

³ See chapter one, p.45.

⁴ Carus: 24.

⁵ Carus: 24-5. Hennell infers that Venn had known something of Simeon's conversion but he neglected to introduce himself to the new evangelical on account of his [Venn's] shyness. [Hennell, *John Venn and the Clapham Sect*, London, 1958: 54.]

⁶ Carus: 26.

much of his character development to these elder evangelicals. From Berridge, vicar of Everton, Simeon learned evangelical zeal, sympathy for parishioners, a benevolent spirit, and the value of celibacy.⁷ John Newton, then rector of St. Mary Woolnoth, instilled in Simeon a prudent and moderate evangelicalism.⁸ From the patron of Clapham and its patriarch, John Thornton, Simeon was confronted on three fronts: "Humility ... Humility ... [and] Humility."⁹

The influence of Henry Venn et al. was not directed toward Simeon's theological development. Existing correspondence between Simeon and his mentors rarely addresses the theological distinctives of evangelicalism. As previously suggested, Simeon's theological convictions were already in place by the time he made the connection with the Venn family.¹⁰ Rather, Simeon's mentors contributed to his pragmatic side, including the formation of his principles of churchmanship and pastoral methodology.¹¹ Perhaps most important to Simeon's future life and work, Venn and his colleagues were crucial to the positive development of his personal character.

⁷ Smyth, C.H.E., *Simeon and church order: A study of the origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the eighteenth century*, The Birkbeck Lectures for 1937-1938, Cambridge, 1940: 269. See also: Berridge, J., "Copy of a letter of the Late Rev. John Berridge, of Everton, Bedfordshire, to the Rev. Mr. -----, a Gospel clergyman at C-----," *Evangelical Magazine* 2 (1794), 198-200.

⁸ Moule, H.C.G., *Charles Simeon, Leaders of Religion*, edited by H.C. Beeching, London, 1892: 42-3.

⁹ Carus: 60. See also: Moule, op.cit.: 39-41.

¹⁰ See chapter one, pp.44ff.

¹¹ See chapter two, pp.77-8, for Henry Venn's advice to Simeon on the subject of churchmanship.

The first true challenge to Simeon during his fifty-four years as vicar of Holy Trinity Church was the need to overcome himself. Simeon was known as a vain man in 1782. In the three years since his conversion he had, for lack of any influences to the contrary, continued to depend upon the only social skills he knew: a quick tongue and extravagant dress. It is not surprising that John Venn, raised in a modest evangelical minister's home, was hesitant to meet "this singular gownsman of King's College,"¹² or to loose Simeon on his family. Apparently John did so only at the repeated request of his father.¹³ Fortunately the example of the Venn family quickly began to affect Simeon.

Henry Venn began to see change, and potential, in the young Cambridge minister. In a letter to a friend written three months after first meeting Simeon, Venn was able to say of him: "This is the young man [who was] so vain of dress that he constantly allowed more than £50 a year for his own person. Now he scruples keeping a horse, that the money may help the saints of Christ."¹⁴ Simeon's moderation in dress was not lost on the elder Venn. The improvement Henry saw in Simeon persuaded him that even the man's foul temper could be overcome. Venn believed that Simeon's disposition was a greater liability than his vanity. Simeon was, in truth, an angry young man, although he "was affronted not so much by personal insults as by contempt of his work and message."¹⁵ The anger in Simeon, a product of the constant opposition in his parish, had become

¹² Simeon's self-description in Carus: 26.

¹³ Hennell, M., *John Venn and the Clapham Sect*, London, 1958: 54.

¹⁴ Venn to a friend, September 18, 1782, as quoted in Carus: 28-9. At the time most curates in the Church of England received £40-£50 annually, excluding the provision of housing [if any].

¹⁵ Moule, op.cit.: 45.

conspicuous during his frequent visits to the Venn home in Yelling. Simeon's fits of temper proved to be a great embarrassment to Henry Venn's daughters. One of them, Mrs. Charles Elliott of Brighton, told the story of her father's tolerance of his protégé:

"Come into the garden, children," their father said, and led them out into that favourite school-room. "Now, pick me one of those peaches." But it was early summer, and "the time of peaches was not yet"; how could their father ask for the green fruit? "Well, my dears, it is green now, and we must wait; but a little more sun, and a few more showers, and the peach will be ripe and sweet. So it is with Mr. Simeon."¹⁶

Henry Venn's patient confidence in Simeon did not take the place of direct advice. Venn's counsel to Simeon on the parochial opposition to his pulpit ministry at Holy Trinity was totally contrary to Simeon's natural inclinations. In a letter to Simeon, dated August 6, 1784, Venn pleaded for a compliant spirit: "I would rather have you give place to the rising prejudice against your preaching than to oppose it and preach in spite of them ... *Above all* things have fervent charity among yourselves."¹⁷ Venn believed that a demonstration of submission would counter the growing impression of pride and vanity engendered by Simeon's aggressive resistance to opposition. Venn knew that salvaging Simeon's personal reputation would be of far greater importance for his future than any amount of splendid preaching.

Simeon received similar advice from two other elders in the evangelical movement. John Thornton took the opportunity of Simeon's presentation of Holy

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Op.cit.: 44.

Trinity Church to urge restraint upon his zealous friend: Make no changes in the usual order of service, at least to begin with; avoid "exhorting from House to House as heretofore you did;" slow change works as well as rapid; remember that it is God's work that is effective, not man's; the Lord's voice is small and still, rather than noisy and loud; preach "not over long but pithy;" and make repentance, faith, and love self-evident.¹⁸ In like manner John Newton was careful not to discourage Simeon's zeal, but he reminded Simeon:

There is such a thing as true Christian prudence, and perhaps at this time Satan may not attempt to damp your zeal, but to push you to extremes, to make you throw unnecessary difficulties in your own way, and thereby to preclude your usefulness.¹⁹

Preventing Simeon from becoming his own undoing was a serious endeavour among his senior evangelical colleagues.

Simeon's friends were successful in their efforts to moderate the irascible young preacher. Henry Venn noticed further improvement in a letter of 1785 to his son: "[Simeon] appears to be much more humbled from a deeper knowledge of himself,"²⁰ confirming his earlier conviction that "Mr. Simeon is made for great usefulness."²¹ As Francis Close observed in his retrospective on Simeon's personal character, the "Old Apostle of Cambridge" had learned the only lesson that

¹⁸ John Thornton to Simeon, November 13, 1782, in Moule, op.cit.: 40-1.

¹⁹ John Newton to Simeon, received November 23, 1782, in Moule, op.cit.: 42-3.

²⁰ Carus: 56.

²¹ Venn, H., *The life and a selection of the letters of the late Rev. Henry Venn*, edited by J. Venn and H. Venn, London, 1834: 382.

redeemed the proud and vain, viz., humility.²² It proved to be the chief means by which Charles Simeon survived his early years in Cambridge.

Charles Simeon's vanity was not without painful and personal repercussions, most notably in his relationship with John Venn. It was only in the early years of their friendship, under the common influence of Henry Venn, that John was able to return the warmth of Simeon's affections. In the summer of 1783 the relationship took a bad turn. The younger Venn invited Simeon to preach for him in his parish of Dunham. Simeon declined, explaining that he was concerned to avoid excessive absences from his parish.²³ Venn received the news as an indication of Simeon's unwillingness to preach "in a small place."²⁴ Whether a fair judgment or not, Venn's confidence in Simeon's motives had been seriously undermined. Their relationship never recovered its previous vitality.

²² Close, F., *A brief sketch of the character and last days of the Rev. C. Simeon, A.M., being the substance of a sermon, preached in ... Cheltenham on Sunday morning, Nov. 27, 1836: With additional matter and original memoranda*, 2nd edition, Cheltenham, [1836]: 18. See also: Hennell, M., *John Venn and the Clapham Sect*, London, 1958: 88-9.

²³ Simeon to John Venn, July 15, 1783, Venn MSS, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.81 C22.

²⁴ John Venn to his wife, July 22, 1790, in Hennell, op.cit.: 94. The date of this letter, seven years after the offence, indicates how deep the rift was between Simeon and Venn.

Simeon's comment to a friend in 1820 suggests that he recognized his error in the matter:

I thank God, it does not *now* give me any concern who comes to church or who stays away, whether there is a large congregation, or whether there be a dozen. The consideration that God has sent me to preach to the congregation, be it what it may, engrosses every other feeling.²⁵

To his credit, Simeon did attempt a reconciliation with Venn in a series of letters. For example, Simeon's letter of April 23, 1794, acknowledges that he and Venn "are indeed cast somewhat in a different mould" and that his own "complexion necessarily induces a conduct which needs forbearance, particularly from those whose natural dispositions do not altogether accord with mine ..."26 Nevertheless, geography and personality differences increasingly drew John Venn and Charles Simeon apart, especially after Henry Venn's death in 1797.

For the first decade and a half of his ministry, Simeon was on the receiving end of the mentoring process. As a result Simeon gained a spiritual "family" in the Venns, Berridge, Newton, and the Thorntons. He also established his credibility among his elder evangelicals and was helped to overcome faults in his character that would have otherwise hindered his work as a clergyman. Most important for

²⁵ As quoted in Hennell, op.cit.: 94. These comments were overheard by Henry Venn, John Venn's son. Hennell suggested, quite reasonably, that this statement was a retrospective by Simeon on his difficulties with Henry's father.

²⁶ Simeon to John Venn, April 23, 1794, Venn MSS, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.81 C22. Venn declined to answer this letter, as indicated by Simeon's subsequent appeal for peace, dated May 13 of the same year [op.cit.].

Simeon and Venn were able to resolve their differences by 1795. From that year until Venn's death in 1813, the two men frequently worked together for the formation and early development of the Church Missionary Society. [See chapter five.]

Simeon's life and work, his relationships with first-generation evangelicals enabled him to discover what it means to mentor others. In doing so Simeon's ability to influence the course of evangelicalism in the Established Church was significantly enhanced.

The Character of an Evangelical Clergyman

Simeon's struggle with the liabilities of his own personality prompted his concern for the development of proper character among evangelical ministers. Simeon held a high view of the importance of the parish minister to the general condition of the Christian Church. Reflecting on the first century of Christianity, Simeon noted that "the welfare of the Church, humanly speaking, depended on the preservation of [the Apostle Paul's] life: and in like manner does it depend [today] on the continuance and efficiency of every minister's labours."²⁷ Essential to that labour, in Simeon's view, was the character of a Gospel minister. In examining Simeon's approach to mentoring the third generation of evangelical Anglicans, an examination of his understanding of Christian ministry is warranted. What values did Charles Simeon hope to instill in those he mentored?

A Call to Ministry: Simeon believed that Christian ministry originates out of a sense of personal call to the service of Christ and his Church. If the parish minister is to survive the rigours of Christian service, he needs more than the external orders of an ecclesiastical body. The clergyman requires an internal summons to ministry as evidenced by the surrender of his heart and soul to God.²⁸

²⁷ Horae: Sermon 1926, "Prayer for ministers," vol.15, 589.

²⁸ Brown: 207.

For this reason Simeon discouraged parents from "setting apart" their children for the ministry. No amount of parental hope would substitute for the external call of the Church, let alone the internal call of God. Likewise, Simeon cautioned against the use of volunteers.²⁹ Personal enthusiasm for a vocation, or recourse to one as a last resort, is no substitute for a sense of obligation to God.³⁰ This principle, vis-à-vis the development of missionary personnel, will be explored in detail in chapter five.

Fidelity to God: In response to a genuine call to the ministry, the clergyman should be a character study in fidelity to God. Simeon hoped for an expression of such loyalty in a number of dimensions. The full proclamation of human depravity served as a litmus test of theological and evangelical loyalty.³¹ According to Simeon, the redemption of the unconverted in the congregation would be thwarted by any obscurity of humanity's true moral condition. In turn,

²⁹ Simeon was an advocate of voluntaryism, i.e., the private support of societies formed to advance specific causes. However, Simeon had little confidence in people who volunteer. Missionaries, etc., should be chosen carefully. Potter must have had this dynamic in mind when she labelled the nineteenth century missionary movement as "mentocratic." [Potter, S.C., *The social origins and recruitment of English Protestant missionaries in the 19th century*, University of London, Ph.D. thesis, 1974: 145.]

³⁰ Pollard, A., and M. Hennell, eds., *Charles Simeon (1759-1836): Essays written in commemoration of his bicentenary by members of the Evangelical Fellowship for Theological Literature*, Great Anglicans, London, 1964: 148.

³¹ Horae: Sermon 4, "The serpent beguiling Eve," vol.1, 23; and Horae: Sermon 204, "The great alternative," vol.2, 339.

theological 'treason' of this sort might jeopardize the salvation of the clergyman; God would hold the minister accountable for "the blood on his hands."³²

The minister's loyalty to God is also expressed in the practice of worldly separation. John Newton described "a Christian in the world [as] a man transacting his affairs in the rain; he will not suddenly leave his client because it rains, but the moment the business is done he is off."³³ Simeon echoed Newton when he urged fellow ministers to "let your rule be -- go into the world as a doctor into an hospital, in the path of duty; not liking the place, not lingering long in it, but glad when you can get out and breathe pure air again."³⁴ Christians in general, and ministers in particular, are to avoid alliances, conformity, and unnecessary association with non-Christians. However, these restrictions do not hinder the proper exercise of compassion or the observance of social duty and courtesy.³⁵

A third expression of the minister's fidelity to God is the observance of the Sabbath. Unlike the Sabbatarian movement of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Simeon's view was quite moderate: "The *spiritual* observance of the Sabbath is to be as strict as ever, but that the *ritual* observance is not."³⁶ By this argument Simeon affirmed certain activities on the Sabbath, viz., those based

³² Horae: Sermon 354, "Faithful ministers objects of hatred," vol.3, 442. Naturally, Simeon's contemporaries at Cambridge who did not embrace Calvinist theology, such as Edward Pearson and Herbert Marsh, received such declarations with contempt.

³³ Hopkins, H.E., *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*, London, 1977: 202.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Horae: Sermon 409, "Jehoshaphat's connexion with Ahab reproved," vol.4, 128.

³⁶ Simeon to a Miss M.E., March 24, 1832, in Carus: 487.

in piety, goodwill, and necessity. Since recreation is self-centred it is to be avoided on the Sabbath. But the dictates of necessity include the freedom of government ministers to confer, as "they cannot command their own time."³⁷ Other Sunday trade or business, including personal study if it is vocational [e.g., for students and teachers], is precluded. In a place like Cambridge, where diversions were almost a vocation, the observance of Simeon's Sabbath rules would have been notable.

Dependence on the Holy Spirit: In contrast with the severe demands of Simeon's standards for clerical duty and fidelity, he placed significant emphasis on the minister's dependence on the Holy Spirit in life and ministry. Hopkins notes that Simeon's stress on the Holy Spirit came at a time when Churchmen tended to overlook the third person of the Trinity.³⁸ Fears of 'Methodist enthusiasm' in mainstream Anglicans created scepticism of any reference to 'internal' spiritual authority. Eschewing the middle ground or a single extreme, Simeon found room in his pastoral theology for multiple authorities: Scripture, the Church of England, and the Spirit of God at work within the believer.

Simeon believed that the Holy Spirit was a distinct person in the Trinity, fully God in nature, but subordinate to the other persons in terms of his role in redemption: "... [W]hilst in his essential Godhead he is equal with the Father and the Son, in his office he is inferior to them both, and acts ... a subordinate part under the Gospel dispensation."³⁹ The primary labour of the Holy Spirit is the

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Hopkins, H.E., *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*, London, 1977: 183.

³⁹ Horae: Sermon 1863, "The offices of the Holy Spirit," vol.15, 213; and Horae: Sermon 1701, "The personality and office of the Holy Spirit," vol.14, 90-1.

inward possession and expression of faith. This is a work that is subsequent to conversion, hence it is secondary to that of God the Father and Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, the work of the Holy Spirit is unique and essential. The Spirit clears man's spiritual vision, bringing invisible things, such as the benefits of piety, into view.⁴⁰ "Spiritual knowledge," made accessible by the Holy Spirit, leads to an "appetite" for spiritual values; "this advancement toward [spiritual] maturity will be more or less visible to all ..."⁴¹

As Swift has shown, Simeon's doctrine of the agency of the Holy Spirit has parallels in the teachings of George Fox.⁴² These common beliefs were one of the bases for Simeon's close friendship with the Norwich banker J.J. Gurney, the preeminent Quaker reformer of the early nineteenth century. Simeon met Gurney in 1817 while attending the annual meeting of the Norfolk and Norwich Auxiliary of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Gurney was a driving force behind the auxiliary. An unlikely friendship was struck between the two men. Gurney and

⁴⁰ University sermon, "The Spirit's work in believers" [no. 4], in Simeon, C., *Let wisdom judge: University addresses and sermon outlines by Charles Simeon*, edited with an introduction by A. Pollard, London, 1959: 140.

⁴¹ Op.cit.: 146.

⁴² Swift, D.E., "Charles Simeon and J.J. Gurney: A chapter in Anglican-Quaker relations," *Church History* 29 (1960), 174.

Simeon often visited each other in the course of their travels in East Anglia. Few men recollected their encounters with Simeon as warmly as J.J. Gurney:

Simeon has the warm and eager manners of a foreigner, with an English heart beneath them ... We were soon afterwards talking of the crude zeal of many persons in the present day, who lose their balance in religion, and seem to drive up the Church of Christ into a narrow corner ... He had no liking for any new-fangled notions or strange flights in the things of God; but steadily pursued the old beaten path of Gospel-faith and Gospel-practice.⁴³

Simeon and Gurney frequently recommended each other's lectures and writings to their respective friends. Through their cooperation evangelical Churchmen were encouraged to recover some of the inward and immediate knowledge of Christ that had been lost to rationalism. In turn, through Gurney's writings on the importance of the Scriptures to Christian faith and practice, the Friends were urged to return to their Puritan roots, the historical Christ, and the biblical record.⁴⁴ Simeon's relationship with Gurney reveals another instance in which Simeon found common ground with evangelical Nonconformists. This was made possible, in part, through his uncommon emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in Christian faith. It was also a demonstration of the character he longed for the Spirit of Christ to produce in the ministers of the Church of England.⁴⁵

⁴³ From Gurney's "Memoranda of an afternoon spent at Cambridge, April, 1831," in Carus: 471-80.

⁴⁴ Swift, *op.cit.*: 175.

⁴⁵ See chapter two, pp.112ff., for more on Simeon's ecumenism.

Exercise of Proper Authority: Loyalty to and dependence upon God formed the foundation for the minister's spiritual authority. Simeon conceived of this authority as similar to that of the Apostles, while also different from it.

The Apostles of the Church, according to Simeon, had a unique jurisdiction. This was confirmed by the miracles they performed in Christ's name.⁴⁶ Simeon believed that miracles had been absolutely necessary for the establishment of Christianity in an era predominated by Jewish heresy and Roman paganism. The authenticity of the Apostles' proclamation of the resurrection of Jesus Christ was verified by the signs and wonders the Holy Spirit accomplished through them. However, as the purpose for the supernatural dispensation had been accomplished in the ascendancy of Christianity in the Roman Empire, miracles had ceased to be a function of the Holy Spirit's work in the Church.⁴⁷ Consequently the authority of the minister in Simeon's day diverged from the apostolic model in that it was unaccompanied by supernatural confirmation.

⁴⁶ Horae: Sermon 1434, "Fasting and prayer," vol.12, 70.

⁴⁷ Horae: Sermon 1984, "Gifts and graces compared," vol.16, 313-4.

Moreover, Simeon believed that physical miracles would have been ineffective even if they had continued to mark the Christian Church in the modern age:

We may well say, that if men believe not the [miracle accounts in the] records of the Old and New Testaments, neither would they be persuaded though they saw one rise from the dead.⁴⁸

Simeon's belief reflected a pre-critical approach to the Scriptures. Because Simeon unconditionally accepted the miracle accounts as records of fact, they were of no less authority than an eyewitness experience of the events themselves. To Simeon's thinking, if the biblical record was rejected, then the miracle itself would have fared no better with a sceptic.⁴⁹ Simeon's attempt to de-emphasize the miraculous also reflected the rationalist bias of the Anglican Church. This bias had developed in the course of the Church's reply to Deism in the early eighteenth century. It is doubtful that Simeon would have given credibility to any report of contemporary supernatural phenomenon. It was an age of rational and natural law in the church and society.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Nevertheless, it is difficult to conceive how an eyewitness experience would not carry more weight than a second-hand account, however reliable. This was precisely one of the reasons that the authority of the Apostles was recognized as apostolic; they were 'eyewitnesses' of Jesus. Simeon's argument -- particularly in the context of ministerial authority -- is not convincing.

Simeon was not suggesting, however, that God no longer intervened supernaturally in history. He recognized the progress of Christian knowledge and piety as the contemporary equivalents of physical miracles:

Learning is now the substitute for those [miraculous] gifts: and by learning must we labour to attain the ends for which those spiritual gifts were formerly bestowed; namely, *to acquire the knowledge of religion; to attain a facility of diffusing it; and to maintain it against all its adversaries.*⁵⁰

The intellectual disciplines of evidential apologetics and Bible translation had become the means of producing modern miracles, albeit spiritual rather than physical ones.⁵¹ Simeon believed that Christian conversion and holy living were the result of the supernatural hand of God and the sovereign work of the Holy Spirit.⁵²

⁵⁰ Op.cit.: 314-5.

⁵¹ Op.cit.: 316.

⁵² Horae: Sermon 1746, "Outpouring of the Spirit," vol.14, 243.

Simeon was consistent in his phenomenology. As miracles in the Christian Church had ceased, so also the power of Satan had been altered. No longer could Satan supernaturally affect the human body [e.g., by demonic possession], although he could exert an equivalently irresistible influence over man's corrupted will. This would be expressed as a "besetting sin" that resisted all resolutions of change. In the same way that men and women of the supernatural dispensation had been unable to defy Satan's physical attacks without divine aid, only the power of God through prayer and fasting was effective against modern Satanic oppression. [Horae: Sermon 1434, "Fasting and prayer," vol.12, 71.]

Supernatural spiritual gifts, then, had no place in Simeon's Christian experience, neither for establishing the Church of Christ, for benevolence to the infirm, or for use in spiritual warfare. Much of twentieth century Western Christianity continues to share these sentiments, although the testimony of the non-Western Church stands against the exclusively rationalist world-view.

Although Simeon declared that modern ministers should not look for the miraculous confirmation of their authority, as did the Apostles of the Church, there are a number of distinctives that ministerial and apostolic authority share in common. Most important, apostolic authority was no more personal in nature than contemporary ministerial authority. For example, Jesus' promise to establish the Christian Church "on Peter" [Matthew 13.52] did not relate to the person of Peter, but to the truth of his confession. Consequently, Peter's power to adjudicate in the Church was a function of his obedience to the call of God as an Apostle, and not the result of some authority intrinsic to Peter himself.⁵³ This led Simeon to assert that when a parish minister acts on the basis of Scriptural principles and under proper ecclesiastical orders, the minister's actions are as authoritative as those of any Apostle.⁵⁴

In addition, the minister shares many credentials in common with the Apostles: Nothing inhibits the modern Christian minister from being called of God by the Holy Spirit and the Church, instructed by God through the Holy Scriptures, experienced with the grace of God through his salvation, authorized to proclaim the Gospel, and assured of eternal life.⁵⁵ Further, Simeon believed that the contemporary minister's call is as urgent as that of any Apostle, his commission is broader [i.e., global], and the opportunities for the progress of the Gospel as great as any that confronted the Apostles of the first century.⁵⁶ Moreover, an even

⁵³ Horae: Sermon 1374, "Peter's confession rewarded," vol.11, 449.

⁵⁴ Simeon, C., *The Churchman's confession: or, An appeal to the Liturgy: Being a sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, December 1, 1805*, Cambridge, [1805]: 7.

⁵⁵ Horae: Sermon 1342, "Diffusion of the Gospel," vol.11, 312.

⁵⁶ Horae: Sermon 1341, "The limited commission to the Apostles," vol.11, 309; and Horae: Sermon 1415, "The Apostles' commission," vol.11, 619.

greater confidence is given to the Anglican minister, who also derives his authority from the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy of the Church of England.⁵⁷ Given these representations, there can be little wonder at the number of Simeon's students who began to consider seriously the clerical vocation, and to do so in a new light.

The enormous authority that accompanied the ministerial office also brings with it commensurate responsibility. Simeon expected those with religious authority and influence to use it to its fullest extent for the benefit of mankind, the good of the state, and the revealed concerns of God.⁵⁸ In the theological realm, the penalty for violating the minister's obligation to proclaim the whole Gospel, especially the depravity of man, has already been illustrated.⁵⁹ Moreover, opposition by non-Christian powers, whatever their source, must not deter the parish minister. Simeon was absolutely confident that a clergyman held sufficient God-given authority [i.e., within his domain⁶⁰] to stand against all irreligious opposition. What God could accomplish with just one dedicated person was of inestimable value.⁶¹

As a minister of the Established Church, Simeon also believed that his authority protected him from the vagaries that plagued Nonconformist clergy.

⁵⁷ Simeon, *The churchman's confession*: 7; and Horae: Sermon 194, "Excellency of the Liturgy" [no. 4], vol.2, 278-80.

⁵⁸ Horae: Sermon 291, "Samuel's judicial character," vol.3, 159.

⁵⁹ See current chapter, pp.131-2.

⁶⁰ Religious authority operated within the religious realm. See chapter two, pp.95-6.

⁶¹ Horae: Sermon 381, "Covenanting with God," vol.3, 559.

"Dissenting ministers are not independent," Simeon said.⁶² They receive letters on Monday criticizing the sermon from the day before. Since those ministers serve at the pleasure of the congregation, they are obliged to take every opinion into account. In contrast, Simeon knew the Churchman could say, "Did God place me here to teach you, or for you to teach me?"⁶³ Simeon had little tolerance for congregational criticism of ministers. This was a function of his view of ministerial authority. However, Simeon's view of the division between ministerial and congregational authority was moderate for an Anglican. Simeon believed that Dissenting congregations exerted too much power over their clergy, while Anglican congregations wielded too little.⁶⁴

Submission to Proper Authority: As an extension of the minister's allegiance to God, Simeon looked for submission to higher ecclesiastical authority. For example, hymnody -- an alternative to the metrical psalms -- had broken into the Established Church in parishes such as John Newton's.⁶⁵ However, many

⁶² Brown: 150.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Brown: 221.

Not all evangelicals shared Simeon's appreciation for the ideal nature of the Church of England. An anonymous evangelical Churchman suggested that Dissenting congregations did not criticize their ministers because there were no "bad" Nonconformist clergy. The grass is always greener ... [*Consideration on the probable effects of the opposition of the orthodox clergy to their evangelical brethren: Occasioned by the late protest against the Church Missionary Society ...: By an orthodox clergyman*, London, 1818: 32f.]

⁶⁵ Newton and Cowper, the poet, collaborated in hymn writing.

bishops viewed the use of hymns as a 'Methodist' irregularity.⁶⁶ Such a situation prompted a young minister to seek Simeon's counsel. Although Simeon was sympathetic with his friend's desires, he advised a conciliatory stance:

The less *you* take, the more [the bishop] will give ... You should consider that when a storm is raised, you are not the only sufferer. Pray study to maintain peace, though you make some sacrifices for it ... Do all the good you can in visiting your parish, but don't exercise any pastoral function out of it ... Put aside Hymns, which are quite unnecessary.⁶⁷

Duty to church order often requires the moderation of a minister's own wishes in order to secure the general good and happiness of his parish, his bishop, and the wider Church.⁶⁸ Simeon also believed this strategy helped to ensure the favour of a bishop when his backing is truly crucial. A pertinent example was illustrated in the support Simeon received from his diocesan in the midst of controversy with Benjamin Flower over his [Simeon's] occasional ecclesiastical irregularities.⁶⁹ Simeon attributed the bishop's helpfulness to his previous deference to the diocesan's authority.

A Spirit of Moderation: Simeon also looked for a moderate spirit in evangelical ministers. He discouraged vituperative judgment of society and appeals

⁶⁶ Opponents of evangelicalism used the term 'Methodism' broadly. With respect to hymns the designation would also have included those of Isaac Watts and others who had no connection with the Wesleyans. Watts, an Independent [Congregationalist] clergyman, died in 1748.

⁶⁷ Carus: 271-2.

⁶⁸ Carus: 312.

⁶⁹ See chapter two, p.79.

to extreme separatism: "We must take care not to make that sin which is not sin, or that duty which is not duty; the former of these is needless scrupulosity; the latter is superstition."⁷⁰ Balance is ever the essence of ministerial character: "I would *run after nothing*, and *shun nothing*."⁷¹ In an Eclectic Society discussion on temptations confronting ministers, Simeon identified a number of imbalances in his own ministry: insufficient concern for his relationship with other ministers, paucity of personal intercession for God's presence in his life and ministry, neglect of the children and servants in his parish, inadequate emphasis on the daily application of the sermon and its text, and limited attention to his own spiritual condition and growth.⁷² Such self-criticism contrasted with the zealous anger and pride that marked his early days in Cambridge. Moreover, it characterized the harmony Simeon desired to create between the spiritual oversight of his parish and that of his own soul.

Compassion in the Parish: Simeon also desired his disciples to be known for their compassion to parishioners. Love is to be the distinguishing feature of the 'true Christian', with the poor and the afflicted as the special objects of that love.⁷³ In particular, "the Christian poor" are to receive the highest degree of charity. Unemployed or homeless parishioners who demonstrate spiritual interests, especially though regular church attendance, are to receive special attention. Simeon's students would have noted that these criteria did not disqualify Dissenters

⁷⁰ Carus: 325.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Pratt, J.H., ed., *Eclectic notes: or, Notes of discussions on religious topics at the meetings of the Eclectic Society, London, during the years 1798-1814*, 2nd edition, London, 1865: 404.

⁷³ Horae: Sermon 1399, "Importance of charitable exertions," vol.11, 544.

from receiving assistance. Moreover, the parish should be the vehicle through which aid to the poor is provided. Simeon did not intend Christian compassion to be limited to Christians, only manifested to them in a more "superior way."⁷⁴ Benevolence to the poor is a general religious duty; benevolence to the *Christian* poor is a "family" necessity.⁷⁵ However, and consistent with his understanding of social structures, Simeon did not expect Christian charity to lift the poor into a middle class. Rather, the end of benevolence is the relief of poverty and the demonstration of 'true religion'. Simeon's application of these principles are best illustrated in his organized relief for the poor in his parish during the bread famine of 1788-1789.⁷⁶

Diligent Effort: Consistent with Simeon's belief in human agency as the chief means of furthering the purposes of God, a commitment to diligent effort is essential for the Christian minister. Simeon challenged the thinking of those who relaxed their efforts in God's service out of confidence in their own standing before God. Those who hold such views risk discovering that they have "no part or lot in salvation."⁷⁷ Meaningful work for the conversion and spiritual development of men and women is a general Christian duty for the parish minister.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Horae: Sermon 2266, "Benevolence encouraged," vol.19, 119.

⁷⁶ Carus: 64-5. There are a number of similarities between Simeon's model for poor relief and the social system later advocated by Thomas Chalmers in his *Christian and civic economy of large towns* [Glasgow, 1821-1826: vol.1, 26]. Chalmers argued for the transfer of responsibilities and resources for social welfare from the municipality to the parish, to be administered by the minister and his district elders. What Chalmers attempted in the parish of St. John's, Glasgow, in the 1820s was not without a precedent of narrower scope in Simeon's parish.

⁷⁷ Horae: Sermon 109, "Past mercies pleaded before God," vol.1, 523.

However, the efforts of the minister are not to proceed from an estimate of abilities: "We are not to confide in duties because we perform them *as well as we can*," nor are we "to be discouraged from duties, because we cannot perform them so well as we would."⁷⁸ John Berridge advised a correspondent, probably Simeon, "If you would do work for the Lord ... you must venture for the Lord."⁷⁹ Simeon took this lesson to heart and taught it to others. He stressed that God often chooses instruments or means that are unfit, in themselves, as his agents.⁸⁰ People and things [e.g., books] are entirely unable to produce spiritual fruit apart from God's empowering, yet God consistently chooses to work his will through them, demonstrating their necessity to God's intentions. Although work that is necessarily bound to fail ought not to be attempted,⁸¹ a willingness to risk efforts that are beyond one's skills and abilities is an essential character of the Christian minister. In a letter to his brother Jack, the earliest correspondence in Carus' collection, Simeon defended his commitment to zealous Christian effort:

You seem to think that we are too young as yet to dedicate ourselves to the service of God, and that it would be better if deferred to a more advanced period of life: but will anyone insure us the possession of our lives and senses till that time?⁸²

⁷⁸ Horae: Sermon 425, "God's condescension to the upright," vol.4, 201.

⁷⁹ Berridge, J., "Copy of a letter of the Late Rev. John Berridge, of Everton, Bedfordshire, to the Rev. Mr. -----, a Gospel clergyman at C-----," *Evangelical Magazine* 2 (1794), 200.

⁸⁰ Horae: Sermon 251, "Persevering zeal recommended," vol.2, 581.

⁸¹ Carus: 326.

⁸² Carus: 32.

To avoid the charge of 'enthusiasm', Simeon stressed the need for a proper balance between activism and quietism [without its mystical overtones]. Trust in God frequently demands patient waiting and relative inactivity. Simeon recommended the postponement of action when effort was "to no avail," unlawful, or contrary to submission and trust in God.⁸³ Simeon further removed his position from extreme, eccentric, and ascetic forms of human effort by asserting that "Christians in general do not sufficiently advert to Christian principles as a ground of action. Whilst they acknowledge their obligation to serve God, they lose sight of those considerations which alone can render his yoke easy."⁸⁴ In particular, Simeon wished to place Christian effort in the context of Christian fellowship. Simeon espoused shared effort between minister and congregation, as opposed to unilateral and isolated work by the parish priest or deacon. Simeon's "lay societies" were a reflection, in part, of this principle.⁸⁵

Perseverance in Adversity: Although Simeon was convinced that consistent effort would result in the progress of the Gospel,⁸⁶ he was also aware that the

⁸³ Horae: Sermon 903, "Confidence in God recommended," vol.8, 33.

An illustration of this principle can be seen in Simeon's role in delaying the formation of the Cambridge Church Missionary Association. In 1815 Simeon urged the leaders of the CMS to lower their expectations for the immediate creation of a Cambridge CMA until the furor over the formation of the town's Bible Society auxiliary subsided. The Cambridge CMA was formed in 1818.

[Minutes of the CMS General Committee, October 23 and December 11, 1815, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/2 ff.399 and 408.]

⁸⁴ Horae: Sermon 2312, "Steadfastness and activity in God's service inculcated," vol.19, 337-9.

⁸⁵ See chapter two, p.109, note 130.

⁸⁶ Horae: Sermon 417, "Connexion between diligence and prosperity," vol.4, 166; Horae: Sermon 1325, "Against uncharitable judging," vol.11, 240; and Horae: Sermon 2293, "Exhortation to (continued...)

Christian minister must be prepared to persevere through opposition and affliction. Simeon expected "the most eminent saints not [to be] exempt from ... the heaviest calamities."⁸⁷ He believed affliction to be a school in which "the children of God attain to any considerable eminence in religion" and learn to receive difficulty as a loving gift from God, as opposed to a reflection of his wrath.⁸⁸ Affliction, Simeon said, "qualifies us for services for which we would otherwise be unfit."⁸⁹

These were the chief marks of character that Charles Simeon desired to produce in those he mentored: personal humility, fidelity to God, confidence in proper ministerial authority, dependence on the Holy Spirit, a moderate temperament, hard work, practical trust in God, and perseverance in the face of opposition and affliction. It now remains to examine the various means Simeon employed to impart these values to his students and parishioners.

⁸⁶(...continued)
diligence," vol.19, 245.

⁸⁷ Horae: Sermon 451, "Trials and resignation of Job," vol.4, 322.

⁸⁸ Horae: Sermon 1091, "The views of a saint in his affliction," vol.9, 322-4.

⁸⁹ Horae: Sermon 463, "A word of sympathy condemned," vol.4, 382; and Horae: Sermon 1416, "The scope of our Lord's ministry," vol.12, 1.

A Third Component of Simeon's World-view

Canon Smyth observed that Simeon's work as an evangelical and a Churchman is best understood as a series of attempts to address concrete situations.⁹⁰ Simeon was not primarily theological or philosophical in his approach to his parish and College. Rather, he delighted in finding practical ways to apply his evangelical convictions and orderliness to the progress of the Gospel. Simeon characterized his ideals in pragmatic fashion: "Truth when delivered in simple terms, does not so forcibly impress the mind, as when it is embodied, as it were, in some image that is visible before our eyes ..."⁹¹ Simeon's dedication to creativity extended to the whole of his ministry.

It was in the context of his efforts to help produce the third generation of evangelical Churchmen that Simeon's gift for innovation made itself most apparent. Simeon was cognizant of the new approaches to parish ministry that were being developed at the time, such as the use of the Scriptures as an evangelistic tool [versus its use as "merely an establishing book"], Christian education for children, social action programmes, and recognition of the growing influence of women in the parish and on the Church of England as a whole.⁹² Simeon did not personally endorse or adopt each of these innovations, but he consistently recognized the need for creativity in parish work. With reference to the wineskin analogy in Luke 5, Simeon noted that Jesus did not forbid the mending of the old wineskin, nor did he

⁹⁰ Smyth, C.H.E., *Simeon and church order: A study of the origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the eighteenth century*, The Birkbeck Lectures for 1937-1938, Cambridge, 1940: 16-17.

⁹¹ Horae: Sermon 1007, "The conversion of the world to God promised," vol.8, 572.

⁹² Brown: 149-50.

forbid wine being put in an entirely new vessel.⁹³ In like manner, Simeon was fully prepared to amend traditional parish practices for the sake of their functional affect on the progress of 'true religion'. He was also prepared to innovate new approaches to bringing forth the fruit of evangelical faith.

The unquestionable focus of these creative energies was the task of training men for the Anglican ministry. Further, the exclusive means Simeon employed toward this end was personal discipleship. It is in this context that Simeon's work as a mentor should be seen, and it is in this sense that Simeon's drive to mentor others defines a third component to his world-view. To equip men for the ministry was as essential to Simeon's character as his identity as an evangelical and a Churchman. However, there were also some external reasons for Simeon's efforts to train parish ministers.

Malaise in the Anglican Parish

Charles Simeon hoped that the students he trained at Cambridge would be of genuine aid to the Established Church. This motivation was consistent with one of Simeon's chief ambitions: to help the Established Church recover its spiritual vitality.⁹⁴ The demographics of the Church of England in the early nineteenth century illustrate something of the battle in which Simeon was engaged. Simeon believed that the Church of England, in his day, was in a desperate state.

⁹³ Horae: Sermon 1492, "The new wine and old bottles," vol.12, 327.

⁹⁴ Brown: 60. The full quotation is in the introduction, p.6.

In 1811 Simeon estimated that there were roughly eleven thousand Anglican church buildings in England, with a like number of Dissenting chapels.⁹⁵ The fact that Nonconformist places of worship had achieved equal numerical footing with parish churches suggests remarkable growth for the Dissent since the beginnings of the Evangelical Revival. What particularly troubled Simeon was the reason for the growth of the Dissent: "a want of real religion" in the Church of England.⁹⁶ Simeon attributed the malaise in the Anglican parish to two problems: ministerial non-residence and clerical incompetence. He was determined to address these twin challenges by mentoring clergymen who could and would answer them.

A contemporary of Simeon's, John Byng, commented in 1791 on the impact of non-residency on the Anglican parish: "The day must come when this country will be convulsed by interior commotions, on the claims and oppressions of the clergy, their non-residence, and their neglect of duty."⁹⁷ Echoing Byng's sentiments, Simeon was appalled at the problem and its impact on the spiritual development of the nation: "The evils arising from *the non-residence of ministers* is incalculable,"⁹⁸ equally as devastating to the parish as the residence of an immoral or incompetent curate or incumbent. The problem was not imagined. In

⁹⁵ Horae: Sermon 193, "Excellency of the Liturgy" [no. 3], vol.2, 273.

Seating in parish churches was grossly insufficient, primarily because the buildings were not well distributed for an increasingly urban population. However troubled Simeon was by the growth of the Dissent, he was grateful that their chapels gave people an opportunity for worship that many would otherwise have lacked. Simeon apparently included Wesleyan "meeting houses" among Dissenting chapels.

⁹⁶ Brown: 222.

⁹⁷ As quoted in Hopkins, H.E., *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*, London, 1977: 214.

⁹⁸ Horae: Sermon 2074, "A minister's chief wish for his people," vol.17, 178.

1799 there were 11,194 Anglican parishes in England. The minister of two-thirds of these parishes resided elsewhere, leaving the church in the hands of a resident curate or, in some cases, to an itinerant curate, lay reader, or University student.⁹⁹ Three decades later things had improved to a small extent: Only forty per cent of the nation's 10,478 parishes were served by a curate who was employed by a non-resident incumbent.¹⁰⁰ Still, the situation was far from satisfactory.

Money, i.e., too little of it, was the chief reason for the absentee minister. While the bishops enjoyed excellent incomes, fully a third of all parish incumbents in 1831 received less than £150 annually, half of the livings were under £200, and two-thirds of them were below £300 a year; as for curates, those unfortunate people received an average of £80 a year.¹⁰¹ When Simeon began his ministry, most clerical incomes would have been half of those amounts, especially those of curates.¹⁰² Unless a minister in a charge had independent funds or an adjunct post that could be held while resident in the parish [e.g., a fellowship in a nearby college], the choices before him were poverty or multiple benefices. The latter would invariably be chosen, if possible. Simeon never faced the threat of clerical poverty because he inherited the estates of his father and brothers and, remaining unmarried, was able to retain his Fellowship at King's, which provided for his accommodation. Few ministers were as fortunate as Simeon. For most, the financial prospects of multiple benefices were almost irresistible.

⁹⁹ Sykes, N., *Church and state in England in the XVIIIth century*, 1934: 217.

¹⁰⁰ Op.cit.: 409.

¹⁰¹ Ibid. For example, in 1831 the see of Canterbury provided its holder with an income of £19,128. The Bishop of Llandaff, by comparison, received a £924 in that year, although this living was five times that of the average minister.

¹⁰² See current chapter, p.125, note 14.

With respect to clerical incompetence, Simeon believed that his own preparation for the ministry illustrated the root of the problem: inadequate training. His education began at age seven with twelve obligatory years at Eton, a place Simeon found "so profligate" that he stunned Henry Venn with the confession that he "should be tempted even to murder his own son ... sooner than let him see there what he had seen."¹⁰³ Simeon's memory of Eton was of a place of physical, mental, and emotional abuses by the tutors and headmasters, and where Christianity was so nominal as to be virtually non-existent.¹⁰⁴ His interim escape was in athletics, riding in particular; his ultimate escape was to the University at age nineteen.

Simeon found the spiritual climate of Cambridge in 1779 to be little better than what he had left behind at Eton. The agenda of the place, as far as Simeon was concerned, tended more to entertainment and ritual religion than it did to education or Christian faith and life. Of his religious experience as an undergraduate at King's College, Simeon noted in his diary: "The service in our chapel has almost at all times been very irreverently performed."¹⁰⁵ Moreover, Simeon found the University curriculum to be sadly lacking in opportunities for ministerial education. Cambridge did not provide any practical training for future parish ministers while Simeon was a student, despite the fact that a University

¹⁰³ Henry Venn to a friend, September 18, 1782, in Carus: 28.

¹⁰⁴ Simeon to/from Rev. Dr. Goodall, Provost of Eton, dated 1827, in Carus: 426-30.

¹⁰⁵ Carus: 17. A young contemporary of Simeon's at King's College could not recall Simeon's presence at a chapel service during his residence in Cambridge in the mid-1820s. [Tucker, W., "Life in the Old Court, King's College, Cambridge, 1822-1825," *Etoniana* 32-35 (1923), 514.] Simeon may have been less aware of the character of his College's chapel service than one might assume. It again appears that Simeon exerted little institutional influence at the University, apart from his occasional University sermons at Great St. Mary's. Tucker noted that Simeon's rooms were always full, but that he made "no disciples" at King's College. [Ibid.]

degree was one avenue toward holy orders. That a graduate of Cambridge or Oxford would be capable in the classics was without doubt. But, whatever theology, preaching skills, or pastoral abilities a new minister required would need to be developed by extra-curricular means or in the parish. Simeon was uncompromising in his judgment: Here was a curriculum virtually devoid of emphasis on the purpose for which the University had been first created: training for the Christian ministry.¹⁰⁶ Charles Simeon determined to change that reality, and he did so through his activities as a mentor.

Matters of "Before" and "After" the University

Simeon's work as a mentor did not begin when his students arrived at Cambridge and found their way to his church or College rooms. Neither did Simeon's efforts on behalf of his disciples end when they left the University. Through an active role in the formation and operation of a number of evangelical clerical societies, Simeon was enabled to recruit the students he would later mentor. Then, through his famous activity in patronage trusts and in recruiting chaplains for the East India Company, Simeon assisted his students to find appropriate "spheres" of ministry and Christian service. These aspects of Simeon's labours as a mentor were brilliantly coordinated with his direct discipleship of students during their residency in Cambridge.

¹⁰⁶ Stephen, J., *Essays in ecclesiastical biography*, London, 1849: vol.2, 368.

Clerical Societies

Owing to the limited means and influence of most evangelical Churchmen in the eighteenth century, it was not easy for their sons to secure a place at Cambridge or Oxford in Simeon's early days.¹⁰⁷ It was equally difficult, if not more so, for evangelicals to secure a respectable living after taking a degree. Access to the Universities and to good parishes upon graduation was essential to resolve the evangelical's dilemma: the choice between poverty and multiple charges. Simeon worked tirelessly to rectify this situation.

In order to give evangelical students greater access to the Universities, Simeon gave active support to the development of clerical societies. F.W.B. Bullock, in his study of training for the ministry in the Church of England, provides a brief history of these ad hoc organizations.¹⁰⁸ In 1767 Henry Venn established an informal "society" for Yorkshire's evangelical ministers. These clergymen met regularly in his parish of Huddersfield for fellowship and encouragement. The society had also been formed to assist young men in preparation for the ministry. This was to be achieved through helping selected students to secure places at Cambridge or Oxford and by meeting their expenses while at University.

¹⁰⁷ Case in point: John Venn. His father's reputation as an evangelical prevented John from entering Trinity College, Cambridge, owing to the Master's fear of the Venn 'Methodism'. John entered Sidney Sussex College, although it was not his first choice.

[Venn, J., *Annals of a clerical family: being some account of the family and descendants of William Venn, Vicar of Otterton, Devon, 1600-1621*, Cambridge, 1904: 114.]

¹⁰⁸ Bullock, F.W.B., *A history of training for the ministry of the Church of England in England and Wales from 598 to 1799*, St. Leonards-on-Sea, 1969: 121.

When Venn removed to Yelling in 1771, his successor at Huddersfield was unsympathetic to the evangelical cause. Fortunately, Venn's colleague in the parish of Elland, George Burnett, was determined that ministerial training for the "Yorkshire evangelicals" would continue. In that same year the various members of Venn's informal group of ministers organized the Elland Clerical Society. Progress was slow, nevertheless. Even with Professor Farish's support at Magdalene College, the Elland Society's first student did not enter Cambridge until 1782.¹⁰⁹

In April of 1786 Henry Venn, by then semi-retired at Yelling, discussed with Simeon and a number of other ministers the possibility of a clerical society for their area, following the Elland pattern. Hennell has noted:

Simeon ... became such a staunch advocate of these clerical societies that it is scarcely possible to find an account of the inaugural meeting of such without discovering there was at least one visitor present and his name, Charles Simeon.¹¹⁰

One of Simeon's first such efforts was, with Henry Venn, the formation of the West Norfolk Clerical Society.

The turning point for the evangelical clerical societies was the appointment of Isaac Milner, a friend of Simeon's, to the Presidency of Queen's College, Cambridge, in 1788. This event, combined with Farish's influence at Magdalene

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Hennell, M., *John Venn and the Clapham Sect*, London, 1958: 85.

and Simeon's at King's, opened wide the doors for evangelicals at the University.¹¹¹ Much larger numbers of students subsequently came to Cambridge, sponsored by the societies, to prepare for parish work under the tutorial care of the evangelical dons. Nevertheless, even with the formation of the Bristol Clerical Society in 1795, demand consistently exceeded supply. In a letter of 1814 to Thomas Thomason, Simeon observed that the societies were able to meet only a tenth of the need for "pious curates."¹¹² Persevering in the vision of his mentor, Simeon helped found the London Clerical Education Society in 1816 with the help of Clapham members Charles Grant and William Wilberforce.¹¹³ Simeon persisted in his enthusiasm for clerical societies throughout his life.

Ecclesiastical Patronage

Simeon's efforts to bring reasonable livings within reach of his students overlapped with his desire to see an evangelical pulpit within every major population centre in England. Simeon's strategy toward this end was based on the purchase of advowsons, the right to appoint the holder of a church benefice and, hence, the incumbent of a parish. Advowsons were held by an assortment of persons. They were most frequently owned by wealthy businessmen, but also by the aristocracy, the Crown, and some of the bishops. Until the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835 required their divestiture, town authorities could also

¹¹¹ Bullock, *A history of training for the ministry of the Church of England in England and Wales from 598 to 1799*: 122.

¹¹² Carus: 285.

¹¹³ Bullock, F.W.B., *A history of training for the ministry of the Church of England in England and Wales from 1800 to 1874*, St. Leonards-on-Sea, 1955: 41; and Hopkins, H.E., *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*, London, 1977: 87.

own the right to appoint a parish's minister. What was important to Simeon, however, was the market for advowsons. They were a commodity that could be easily bought and sold. If a patron was in need of cash, the advowson could always be offered to the highest bidder. However unseemly the practice appeared to Simeon, or others, he took great advantage of it in order to further the evangelical cause.

What were Simeon's personal motives in purchasing advowsons? Most, he said, wished to "purchase *income* [i.e., for their use] -- I purchase *spheres*, wherein the prosperity of the Established Church, and the kingdom of our blessed Lord, may be advanced; and not for a season only, but if it please God, in perpetuity also."¹¹⁴ Moule correctly concluded that Simeon's involvement in church patronage was a practical attempt to exercise responsible religious influence in society. Having been raised with patronage as a fact of life, and in a class of people who were frequently patrons, Simeon saw no objection to ecclesiastical patronage as long as the patron exercised "conscientious and religious care" of the privilege.¹¹⁵

One of the first to purchase advowsons for evangelical purposes was John Thornton. At Thornton's death in 1792, his son Henry assumed control of what came to be known as the Thornton Trust. John Thornton's will also appointed trustees to manage the trust upon Henry's death. John Venn was named as a trustee, with Simeon as an alternate.¹¹⁶ Simeon began his role as a patron at

¹¹⁴ Simeon to C.B. Elliott, May 2, 1836, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹¹⁵ Moule, H.C.G., *Charles Simeon, Leaders of Religion*, edited by H.C. Beeching, London, 1892: 176.

¹¹⁶ Hennell, M., *John Venn and the Clapham Sect*, London, 1958: 79.

John Venn's untimely death in 1813.¹¹⁷ With Henry Thornton's equally unexpected demise the following year, Simeon found himself in effective control of a dozen livings.¹¹⁸ By the time of his own death in 1836, the Thornton livings had been acquired by and merged into the Simeon Trust.¹¹⁹ The combined number of livings controlled by Simeon's trustees at his death were exceeded forty.¹²⁰ Simeon had used his own estate and funds raised from wealthy friends to create a Trust of enormous influence.

In the role of Thornton trustee Simeon emphasized that his "mind was at once made up to act for the glory of God, and for that alone."¹²¹ Simeon did not view Trust appointments as choices between good and poor candidates, but between "greater good and lesser."¹²² Many men were qualified, in general, for the livings controlled by the Trust, but patronage [as defined by Simeon] is a matter of finding the candidate who is "truly fittest," whose removal would cause the least damage to his current parish, and whose motivations for a change in

¹¹⁷ Carus: 261.

¹¹⁸ Simeon was acknowledged as the most influential of the three trustees. This is confirmed by a review of the Trust's papers. [Simeon Trust MSS, Cambridge University Library, Add.8293, box 4.]

¹¹⁹ Simeon's efforts to acquire the holding of the Thornton livings are discussed in the introduction, pp.18-19.

¹²⁰ Hopkins, op.cit.: 216-8.

¹²¹ Carus: 261.

¹²² Simeon to Mr. King, another of the three Thornton patrons, January 27, 1814, in Carus: 269.

ministry are most appropriate.¹²³ These guidelines remained hallmarks of Simeon's utilization of patronage throughout his life. They were also embodied in his "rules" for the trustees he appointed to manage the Simeon Trust after his death.¹²⁴

Simeon's involvement in church patronage earned him criticism from his contemporaries, as previously illustrated.¹²⁵ Similarly, Sir James Stephen, who otherwise praised Simeon, labelled the creation of his Trust as a "last, ugly epithet."¹²⁶ Stephen found Simeon's patronage to be an inappropriate intrusion into the workings of parishes. In a recent study Wesley Balda echoed this criticism and has suggested that Simeon's involvement in ecclesiastical patronage appears to violate his commitment to church order.¹²⁷ This contradiction is resolved if one recognizes that Simeon was broadly committed to order in society, not merely to the ecclesiastical variety. Patronage was an established practice, affirmed by the hierarchy of the Church of England, and it provided for an orderly succession of

¹²³ Simeon to Rev. Richardson, the third Thornton trustee, August 8, 1814, in Carus: 270.

¹²⁴ Rules 2,4 and 7 in Simeon's "Notes on the administration of livings," March 18, 1829, Simeon Trust MSS, Cambridge University Library, Add.8293, box 4.

Consistent with these principles, Simeon refused to sell a living to the Duke of Northumberland when he discovered that the Duke merely wished to use the advowson to reward a personal friend with an extra income. [T. Dikes to Simeon, August 29, 1836, and Simeon's reply of August 31, Simeon Trust MSS, Cambridge University Library, Add.8293, box 4.]

¹²⁵ See the introduction, pp.18ff.

¹²⁶ Stephen, J., *Essays in ecclesiastical biography*, 1849, 3rd edition, London, 1853: vol.2, 371.

¹²⁷ Balda, W.D., *"Spheres of Influence": Simeon's Trust and its implications for evangelical patronage*, Cambridge University, Ph.D. thesis, 1981: 43.

ministers in a parish.¹²⁸ Moreover, patronage provided an important means by which Simeon could "employ" those he had mentored. It would have been far more contradictory for Simeon to have ignored the opportunities presented by patronage. It should also be noted that modern criticisms of nineteenth century church patronage run the risk of forcing present day sensibilities onto a period when such concerns [i.e., for congregational rights] were much less common.¹²⁹

Anglican ecclesiastical patronage has also been characterized as anachronistic, even in Simeon's day. Evershed, for example, concludes that the Church of England was, until recently, the most "medieval" of post-Reformation churches, owing to its dependence on patronage.¹³⁰ In his study he traced the basis for Anglican patronage to Justinian's decree in 541 A.D., affirming a lord's right to appoint the minister for churches he erected; this power was reaffirmed by the Council of Aachen in 816.¹³¹ However much the patronage model employed by Simeon had medieval roots, the vicar of Holy Trinity believed it to be a way forward for the Church of England.¹³²

¹²⁸ It was for these reasons that Samuel Wilberforce urged Simeon to purchase as many livings as possible when the Municipal Corporations Act forced municipalities to divest themselves of their advowsons. [Samuel Wilberforce to Simeon, November 14, 1835, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.]

¹²⁹ For example, H.H. Henson took Simeon to task for his "unconsciousness" of the moral rights of congregational petitioners. [Henson, H.H., *Sibbes and Simeon: An essay on patronage trusts*, London, 1932: 36-7.]

¹³⁰ Evershed, W.A., *Party and patronage in the Church of England, 1800-1945: A study of patronage trusts and patronage reform*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1985: 9.

¹³¹ Op.cit.: 23ff.

¹³² Henson's opinion contradicts Evershed. The former affirmed that the patronage exercised by the Cambridge Puritan, Richard Sibbes, served to free the English Church from its medieval past.
(continued...)

Simeon also played the patron with respect to East India Company chaplaincies. Through his relationship with Charles Grant [senior], a member of the Company's Court of Directors, Simeon was able to secure chaplaincies for twenty-one of his students. Although Grant, and his fellow Director Edward Parry, actually held the patronage, their confidence in Simeon's recommendations vastly increased the effective scope of the Cambridge minister's influence. Simeon approached chaplaincy recommendations with the same care that he gave to ecclesiastical patronage. Above all else, Simeon was concerned to match candidates to posts for which they were especially suited. This principle led to a very personal and direct involvement with his students, an aspect patronage that attracted the vicar of Holy Trinity. Simeon's relationships with Charles Grant and the "pious" chaplains of the East India Company are considered in detail in chapter six.

The criticisms notwithstanding, Simeon's impact on the Church of England through ecclesiastical patronage was remarkable. It elevated Simeon to an 'episcopate' of sorts, conferring on him a prestige that was out of proportion to his natural popularity.¹³³ His 'diocese' embraced "every ecclesiastical section of the Empire," wrote Sir James Stephen.¹³⁴ So far-reaching was Simeon's power as a patron that his friends and former students were often hard pressed to smooth

¹³²(...continued)

Henson was referring to the Puritan practice of endowing lectureships with private funds in order to bypass the control of the aristocracy and the Crown over those who were licensed to preach. [Henson: op.cit.: 22.] Incidentally, Henson believed modern patronage to have been no improvement over the medieval system; he was an advocate of joint responsibility between bishop and congregation, as is now mostly [although not exclusively] the case in the Church of England.

¹³³ Once again, this is precisely the sense of Macaulay's epitaph on Simeon. See the introduction, p.17, note 44.

¹³⁴ Stephen, op.cit.: vol.2, 371.

"the waters of jealousy" in the Church hierarchy even after his death.¹³⁵

Nevertheless, it must be remembered that Simeon's experiments in patronage, like his work with the clerical societies, were a means toward another end. These were efforts to address the problems of ministerial non-residence and incompetence that confronted the Established Church. This cause was forwarded by training men for ministry and providing them with a meaningful "sphere" of activity for their labours.

The Mentor at Work at Cambridge

The practical task to which Simeon dedicated himself as a mentor was the training of ministers who could preach. The reality of this need, as far as evangelicals were concerned, was illustrated in the opinion of the *Christian Observer* in 1820. The magazine lamented "that so many thousands should be paid in a Christian country to preach well, and after all should preach so badly."¹³⁶ Thirty years earlier Simeon had recognized the same deficiency and, in response, attempted to redefine the preaching task and training for it. He rejected and contradicted the prevalent use of the 'mandated' [i.e., memorized] text. Instead, Simeon insisted on the development of original sermon material.

Simeon provided an historical rationale for his emphasis on training men for the pulpit in the preface to his *Horae homileticae*. Although Simeon considered the reading of the Homilies of the Church of England to be appropriate for divine worship, their effectiveness was limited by their narrow scope and archaic

¹³⁵ "Death of the Rev. C. Simeon," *Christian Observer* 37 (1837), 98.

¹³⁶ "Review of Simeon's *Horae Homileticae*, vols. 7-11," *Christian Observer* 19 (1820), 761.

language. He believed that the English Reformers had considered increasing the number of Homilies, but did not do so when they recognized that the proclamation and application of the Scriptures is a contemporary task for each generation. Therefore, "the Ministers of the Church have never considered their private labours [i.e., in the pulpit] as superseded by the Homilies; but have, from age to age, supplied to the nation Discourses of the highest value."¹³⁷ This was, of course, optimistic and wishful thinking on Simeon's part, calculated to stimulate clergy and students to reconsider their approach to the pulpit task.

Simeon developed his own preaching skills in much the same way as he initially formed his evangelical theology, viz., by personal discovery. There was no one at Cambridge during his student days who would teach homiletics to future ministers. Certainly Simeon received example, encouragement, and advice from Venn, Berridge, Newton, et al., in the early days of his ministry.¹³⁸ But Simeon's mentors were pioneers. They were more concerned to preach the Gospel than to teach others to do so. No doubt Venn and his colleagues recognized the need for a pioneer in evangelical homiletics, and this task they left to Simeon. By the time he was appointed to Holy Trinity Church, in November of 1782, Simeon had already demonstrated his remarkable preaching skills in Christopher Atkinson's pulpit.¹³⁹ The prospect of Simeon's influence on future ministers was a factor in Henry Venn's enthusiasm for Simeon's joint appointment to Holy Trinity Church and to the his Fellowship at King's College.

¹³⁷ Horae: Preface, vol.1, xxii.

¹³⁸ The Dissenting tradition had also encouraged extempore preaching, and Simeon would not have been unaware of or unaffected by the examples of Cambridge Dissenters such as Robert Robinson.

¹³⁹ Henry Venn to James Stillingfleet, October 9, 1782, in Venn, H., *The life and a selection of the letters of the late Rev. Henry Venn*, edited by J. Venn and H. Venn, London, 1834: 351-2.

A close examination of Simeon's printed sermons and the "skeletons" that comprise the *Horae homileticae* reveals an important point at which Simeon's homiletics departed from those of his mentors. Simeon sought to be more moderate in his treatment of the moral condition of humanity. For example, John Berridge advised young ministers to begin their sermons with human depravity to soften the heart ["... Moses will lend you a knife, which may often be whetted at his grindstone ..."] then "preach Christ" to produce repentance.¹⁴⁰ Although Simeon affirmed the need for ministerial fidelity to the whole truth of God, including human depravity,¹⁴¹ and he practised Berridge's advice to a degree, Simeon preferred to feature the mercy of God in his sermons. He wished to make the grace of God more than a theological and psychological trump card.

Simeon encouraged his students to adopt a similar posture and was not beyond criticizing them for undue harshness. For example, Simeon's close friend and curate, Henry Martyn, took what Simeon believed was an inappropriate liberty with his fellow passengers in transit to India in 1805: "Martyn's preaching on hell, after being requested not [by the captain], was unwise; it was the act of a young man."¹⁴² As a mentor Simeon attempted to develop the kind of character in his students that honoured God while it also ensured "usefulness" in ministry to others. Unnecessary harshness and violent condemnation only made clergymen less useful.

¹⁴⁰ Berridge, J., "Copy of a letter of the Late Rev. John Berridge, of Everton, Bedfordshire, to the Rev. Mr. -----, a Gospel clergyman at C-----," *Evangelical Magazine* 2 (1794), 198-9.

¹⁴¹ See current chapter, pp.131-2.

¹⁴² Conversation party, February 2, 1828, in Brown: 96. Henry Martyn receives additional attention in chapter six.

In 1792 Simeon made a discovery that significantly affected the course and nature of his work as a mentor. In that year he became aware of the seventeenth century French divine, Jean Claude, and his *Essay on the composition of a sermon*. Translated by Cambridge Baptist Robert Robinson, Simeon found his own homiletical rules mirrored in the *Essay*.¹⁴³ Recognizing a ready-made textbook for his preaching methods, Simeon revised the *Essay* and published it with one hundred of his own sermon "skeletons" in 1796.¹⁴⁴ Heartened by the response from his students and friends, Simeon added four hundred more outlines in 1801 and published the two volumes as *Helps to composition*.¹⁴⁵ By 1833 the project had grown into the twenty-one volumes of Simeon's *Horae homileticae*, a resource for the minister [at one discourse a day for seven years!] and for family and household instruction by parents.¹⁴⁶ Simeon believed that Claude's *Essay* and his thousands of carefully developed outlines would aid parish ministers throughout the nation to discard the 'mandated' text as the mainstay of the Anglican pulpit ministry.

The fruit of Simeon's monumental publishing labours were mixed. Many, including the *Christian Observer*, praised the quality and thoroughness of Simeon's work, but they expressed fears that readers would simply use Simeon's material

¹⁴³ Moule, op.cit.: 85.

¹⁴⁴ Brown: 48.

¹⁴⁵ Simeon, C., *Helps to composition: or, Five hundred skeletons of sermons, several being the substance of sermons preached before the University*, 4 parts in 2 vols, Cambridge, 1801-1802.

¹⁴⁶ *Horae*: Preface, vol.1, xxvi.

verbatim.¹⁴⁷ This would have been little different from the employment of a memorized text. In actual fact few clergymen made such use of the *Horae*. Readers discovered that it took a Simeon to bring life to the "dry bones" of his skeletons.¹⁴⁸ Most ministers found the outlines useful only for what they are: outlines. Not long after Simeon's death the *Horae* fell into disuse, where it remains today. Nevertheless, Simeon's works, beginning with the first "century" of outlines published in 1796, were an important and innovative tool used by Simeon in his efforts to mentor a new generation of evangelical ministers for the Established Church. In this sense the *Horae homileticae* was a success.

If Simeon's sermon outline was a new development in terms of printed aids for the parish preacher, his sermon classes and "conversation parties" at Cambridge were a further and even more important innovation. It was in the context of these weekly meetings that the mentor had regular contact with his students and gave them instruction on a wide variety of subjects. In 1790 Simeon began a Sunday evening gathering for undergraduates; this weekly event eventually became his "sermon class" in 1792.¹⁴⁹ Simeon used this class to introduce his students to Claude's *Essay* and his own homiletical principles, to teach the preparation and use of the sermon "skeleton," and to demonstrate the exposition of a brief text and

¹⁴⁷ "Review of Simeon's *Horae homileticae*, vols. 7-11," *Christian Observer* 19 (1820), 777.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁹ Bullock, F.W.B., *A history of training for the ministry of the Church of England in England and Wales from 1800 to 1874*, St. Leonards-on-Sea, 1955: 40.

sermon delivery. Thomas Thomason, while a student at Cambridge, wrote his mother with a description of the class:

Mr. S. has invited me to his Sunday evening lectures. This I consider one of the greatest advantages I ever received ... He reads the fruit of his labours to us, and explains it. We write after him. He then dismisses us with prayer.¹⁵⁰

In 1812, after taking larger rooms at King's College, Simeon began his "conversation" tea party on Fridays at 6.00 pm. This gathering was open to all and usually attracted sixty to eighty students.¹⁵¹ The format was simple: Simeon served tea and answered his guests' questions. There was no lecture or prayer, so as to avoid any resemblance to a conventicle. Eventually the sermon class, for fifteen to twenty *invited* students, was rescheduled to follow Simeon's conversation party at 8.00 pm.¹⁵² It was primarily through these two events, and his Sunday pulpit, that Simeon helped train Anglican ministers and missionaries for a generation and a half. Some of their stories and reflections are considered in chapters five and six.

It is interesting that Simeon's efforts to develop capable ministers was limited neither to students, nor to the minister only. Although Simeon had chosen unmarried life -- or, perhaps, his temperament had chosen it for him -- he recognized that most Anglican ministers were married, and that ministers' wives exerted a tremendous influence, positive or negative, on their husbands. For this

¹⁵⁰ Thomason to his mother, undated, in Carus: 79.

¹⁵¹ Carus: 412; and Brown: 51-3.

¹⁵² Brown: loc.cit.

reason, and every summer from 1796 to 1817, Simeon invited a group of twenty to thirty clergy and their wives to his curate's residence in Little Shelford. Over a period of two days the men discussed "scriptural and parochial matters" while the women considered their "usefulness" in the parish. The evenings were given to joint "conversation upon subjects of wide interest and importance to religion."¹⁵³ By nineteenth century standards, Simeon's "retreats" for clergy and their wives were a novel development for the Established Church.

Most important for this study, Simeon established special bonds of friendship and concern with a relatively small circle of his students during his years in Cambridge. Thomas Thomason, one of those students, recorded that "Mr. Simeon watches over us as a shepherd over his sheep. He takes delight in instructing us, and has us continually at his rooms ..." ¹⁵⁴ Abner Brown, a student of Simeon's in the late 1820s, noted that Simeon was extremely close to a small number of students, often relying on them for advice and assistance in such weighty matters as evaluating the fitness of a fellow student for appointment to a curacy.¹⁵⁵

Some of these students from the "inner circle" became, themselves, curates to Simeon. These include Thomason and Henry Martyn, later India Company chaplains; Thomas Sowerby; Matthew Preston; James Scholefield, later Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge; and William Carus, Simeon's biographer.¹⁵⁶ It

¹⁵³ Carus: 78-9.

¹⁵⁴ As quoted in Brown: 47.

¹⁵⁵ Brown: 31.

¹⁵⁶ Carus: 108.

was Simeon's custom to spend a portion of Sunday, over supper, with his curates and close student friends. There they would discuss the day's activities and receive Simeon's advice for the coming week. It was also a meaningful time for Simeon, for these men were his 'family'. Preston recorded the effect of one such occasion on Simeon: "I am an eight-day clock. Now I am wound up for another week."¹⁵⁷ Over the years, Simeon's "inner circle" grew in number, stature, and influence.

The Legacy of the Mentor

Simeon's work as a mentor proceeded from his experience as one who was equipped for ministry by others. It was the means Simeon used to impart the character values he believed were needed in the clergy. It also served as the channel through which Simeon's pragmatism and innovative spirit was brought to bear on the problems of ministerial non-residence and clerical incompetence. In these distinctives Simeon's evangelicalism and churchmanship converged on his two-fold pastoral purpose: "The perpetuating of a succession of duly qualified instructors in the Church [of England]" and the edification of the Church itself.¹⁵⁸ But, most of all, it was as a mentor that Simeon's influence on the third generation of evangelical Churchmen was exerted. In short, Simeon made disciples.

Today, when one enters Simeon's old College from King's Parade, his former rooms [from 1812] occupy the centre of the top floor of the building opposite the gate. From this viewpoint it is difficult to avoid thinking of David

¹⁵⁷ Preston, M.M., *Memoranda of the Rev. Charles Simeon, M.A., late Minister of Trinity Church, and Fellow of King's College, Cambridge*, London, 1840: 66.

¹⁵⁸ Horae: Sermon 2109, "The use of a stated ministry," vol.17, 348.

Brown, Claudius Buchanan, William Carus, Daniel Corrie, Joseph Fenn, William Jowett, Henry Martyn, Thomas Thomason, and the many other disciples of Charles Simeon. Every one of them passed the same point many times on their way to see their mentor. To be able to make such a statement is, itself, a tribute to the Old Apostle of Cambridge.

With the possible exception of John Henry Newman and his influence at Oxford, Simeon occupies a unique place in English ecclesiastical history as a consummate mentor of students and clergy.¹⁵⁹ Through this aspect of his world-view, a fundamental drive to make disciples, Charles Simeon served as one of the "Fathers of the Victorians," to borrow Ford Brown's term. Even more important for this study, it was as a mentor that Simeon profoundly influenced the early decades of the nineteenth century British missionary movement.

¹⁵⁹ Bishop Charles Wordsworth observed that "Simeon had a large following of young men -- larger and not less devoted than that which followed Newman -- and for a much longer time." [From Wordsworth's *Annals of my early life*, p.35, as quoted in Coggan, F.D., "Great Preachers IV: Charles Simeon," *Theology* 54 (1951), 136.] However, it is important to note that Cambridge University made no effort to continue Simeon's sermon classes, etc., upon his death. [Webster, T., *God glorified in his faithful ministers: A sermon preached at St. Botolph's, Cambridge, on the morning and evening of November 20, 1836, on occasion of the death of the late Rev. Charles Simeon*, London, 1836: 9-10.] This only serves to reinforce the nature of Simeon's work as a mentor. He influenced people rather than institutions.

The closest Simeon came to reproducing his mentoring strategy in an institutional context was in his relationship with R. Waldo Sibthorpe of Magdalene College, Oxford. Sibthorpe wrote Simeon for advice on establishing "conversation parties" for Oxford students. [Sibthorpe to Simeon, December 7, 1829, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.] It is interesting that Sibthorpe seceded to the Roman Church in 1841. The connections between Simeon's evangelicalism and the Oxford Movement is a topic beyond the scope of this study, but one which deserves attention.

PART TWO

SIMEON AND THE MISSIONARY MOVEMENT

Chapter Four

Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

In 1813, and for the second time in less than a decade, Parliament was forced to give way to the evangelical agenda.¹ The inclusion of William Wilberforce's "pious clauses" in the renewal charter of the East India Company [EIC], enacted in July of that year, was a watershed for the emerging British missionary movement. India, and effectively all of Britain's overseas possessions, were opened to missionary activity. More narrowly, 1813 was also a vintage year for the missionary agenda of the evangelicals in the Church of England. In addition to a major role in the EIC charter campaign, 1813 witnessed the coming of age of their chief voluntary agency, the Society for Missions to Africa and the East, known by the end of that year as the Church Missionary Society.²

Formed in 1799, the CMS had struggled for legitimacy during its first fifteen years. The origins of the Society's first two missions illustrate its difficult beginnings. Just two handfuls of Lutheran clergy were sent to West Africa in 1804 and 1806 to establish the CMS's presence there. For its initial four years, the West African mission undertook little more than chaplaincy work in British-ruled Sierra

¹ The first of these evangelical "victories" occurred in March of 1807 when the slave trade in British dominions was abolished by Act of Parliament. It was a distinct victory for evangelical principles and interests. See Bradley, I., *The politics of godliness: Evangelicals in Parliament, 1784-1832*, Oxford University, D. Phil. thesis, 1974; and Howse, E.M., *Saints in politics: The "Clapham Sect" and the growth of freedom*, Toronto, 1952.

² The change of name was approved by a special General Meeting of the Society on December 12, 1813. [Hole, C., *The early history of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1896: 361.]

Ch.4 Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

Leone. Then, from 1808, the mission's focus became the Rio Pongas valley and the work was supposedly conducted "on purely heathen ground."³ However, the inexperience of the CMS's missionaries seriously limited their impact on the indigenous population for some time. Meanwhile, in 1809, the CMS endeavoured to establish its second field of activity. The Society despatched two artisans to New Zealand as catechists under the patronage of the government of New South Wales. They were to be supervised by Samuel Marsden, chaplain of the NSW penal colony. The venture proceeded no further than Port Jackson, where Marsden and the catechists were met by the news of a major uprising in New Zealand. With the burning of the *Boyd* and the murder of most of her crew, the New Zealand mission was halted in its tracks until Marsden's reconnaissance trip in 1814.⁴ By any account, the Society for Missions to Africa and the East was in need of a genuine success of some sort as 1813 dawned.

That breakthrough did not come in Africa or Asia, but in English cities such as Bristol. In March 1813, the Bristol Church Missionary Association [CMA] was established in order to make the parent society a household name in what was then England's second city. Although it was not the CMS's first local association, Bristol was the first CMA to fulfil Josiah Pratt's expectations for such structures: financial viability for the Society.⁵ In its first year the Bristol association collected more than £2,300 for the parent society, equivalent to eighty per cent of the CMS's total income for the previous year. With Bristol leading the way, local

³ Hole, op.cit.: 139.

⁴ The indigenous New Zealanders had been provoked by the social excesses of drunken sailors on shore leave. Hole, op.cit., 140ff.

⁵ The details of Pratt's "Plan" may be found in *The Missionary Register* 1 (1813): 21f.

Ch.4 Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

associations contributed £7,322 to the work of the CMS in 1813-14, more than double the funds received as direct income in the same period.⁶

The immediate effect of such a massive influx of funds was the decision by the CMS membership to establish Church Missionary Associations "throughout the Empire."⁷ Toward this end the Parent Committee of the Society authorized "a systematic country itineration" by their chief clerical friends.⁸ These deputations were seen as essential steps toward establishing a local association of the CMS in every major population centre in England and Wales. Evangelical clergy such as William Goode, Basil Woodd, and Daniel Wilson began to itinerate for the Society. By the end of 1813 CMAs were formally operating in London, Norfolk and Norwich, Suffolk and Ipswich, Southwark, as well as in Bristol. Moreover, local associations were being formed in Bedford and Dedford, Dublin, Hull and the East Riding, Leeds, Manchester, Shrewsbury and Shropshire, and York. CMAs in each of these locations were fully functional by the end of 1814. With such a response

⁶ Some confusion exists over the timing of the CMS's first income from local associations. Hole credits Bristol's gift to 1812-13, while the Society's report on its first half-century records the funds as received in 1813-14. [Hole, op.cit.: 267; Church Missionary Society, *The jubilee volume of the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East, 1848-1849*, London, 1849: 266.] Either way the positive financial effect of the Bristol CMA and its sister local associations was profound. CMS "years" ran from April 1 to March 31, with reporting at the Society's anniversary in the first week of May.

⁷ Third resolution of the 13th anniversary's General Meeting, May 4, 1813. [Hole, op.cit.: 269.]

⁸ Minutes of the Parent Committee, May 10, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/1. In anticipating a nation-wide development of local associations, the CMS was modelling itself after the British and Foreign Bible Society.

[N.B. The formation of CMAs in Britain, combined with the organization of "corresponding committees" abroad, led to a proliferation of committee structures that were associated with the Society. In order to distinguish the true managing body of the CMS from its many "children," the term "Parent Committee" was innovated. Actions by the General Committee in London and its immediate sub-committees were described as having been taken by the Parent Committee. For the sake of convenience, this study employs the same terminology.]

Ch.4 Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

from the laity of the Established Church, the Society renamed as the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East at the end of 1813.⁹ The new name was believed to be a much more fitting one for a society "instituted by members of the Established Church"¹⁰ and one at last marked by a significant measure of popular support.

As has been suggested by many historians, the initial successes of the British missionary movement were not achieved abroad, but at home.¹¹ The case of the CMS certainly supports this view. The rapid formation of local associations gave the CMS the credibility and financial relief it needed. As a result the Church Missionary Society passed from its childhood into institutional adolescence. All in all, 1813 was a very good year for evangelical Anglicans. The newly-found success of the CMS was one of the key developments in this watershed for evangelicalism. Further, the Society's much-improved prospects were the immediate result of its reliance on a clearly voluntary course of action.

⁹ The change of name was approved by a special General Meeting of the Society on December 12, 1813. [Hole, op.cit.: 361.]

¹⁰ From the title page of John Venn's *Account of a Society for Missions to Africa and the East*, London, 1799. This document is reprinted in Hole, op.cit.: 651-3.

The new name was in use in some private circles long before it became official. For example, Henry Martyn wrote of the "Church Missionary Society" in his journal entry for September 3, 1806. [As cited in Hole, op.cit.: 189.] Nevertheless, it would have been ill-advised to take such a name in England until the Society had something to show for itself. As is later illustrated, the new name became an immediate source of conflict with the Anglican hierarchy. Hole's comments on the change in name [op.cit.: 648-50] are also informative.

¹¹ Brown, F.K., *Fathers of the Victorians: The age of Wilberforce*, Cambridge, 1961: 284; Piggin, F.S., "Sectarianism versus ecumenism: The impact on British churches of the missionary movement to India, c. 1800-1860," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 27 (1976), 392; and Ward, W.R., *Religion and society in England, 1790-1850*, London, 1972: 45.

Ch.4 Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

As is well known, Charles Simeon played an important role in the formation of the Society for Missions to Africa and the East. It is difficult to review the early chronicles of the Society without encountering Simeon's name. Nevertheless, how could a committed Churchman associate so openly with a thoroughly voluntary effort such as the CMS? In order to answer this question -- which is the chief substance of chapter five -- it is necessary to trace something of the development of British voluntaryism in general and its evangelical component in particular.

Historical Precedents for Voluntaryism

Much has been written on the profound increase in voluntary activity in eighteenth century Britain. It is sufficient for this study merely to review a few of the chief factors that gave rise to the voluntary movements of Simeon's day. These key elements of the voluntary ethos are particularly helpful in understanding the missionary activity that flowed out of the eighteenth century Evangelical Revival.

Religious Toleration: First and foremost, religious "options" in eighteenth century England were made possible by the Act of Toleration [1689]. As Abbey and Overton have suggested, the seeds of voluntary activity were sown when religious uniformity was weakened in order to guarantee a Protestant consensus in Britain.¹² Voluntaryism flowed quite naturally out of the limited pluralism of this milieu. This is particularly evident when an accurate definition of voluntaryism is employed.

¹² Abbey, C.J., and J.H. Overton, *The English Church in the eighteenth century*, new edition, London, 1887: 172. It is important to recognize that religious toleration was limited to Protestant, Reformed, Trinitarian, and politically reliable Dissenters.

Ch.4 Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

Voluntary activity is frequently defined as the private financial support of a specific cause, i.e., in contrast with patronage by Government or Establishment. However, means of support is not the sole or even primary indicator of voluntaryism. More important to the voluntaryist is control of the agenda, the freedom to determine how resources of time, skills, and finance should be utilized. That voluntary societies must raise funds from private sources is merely an implication of taking such control in hand, whether or not the voluntary structure actually loses [or bars itself from gaining] Establishment funding.¹³ Hence the importance of the climate created by the Act of Toleration. Not only did the Act make religious dissent from the Church of England legal, it opened the door for voluntary activity by affirming the validity of private religious judgment. Clergy and laity who believed themselves to be inhibited by conscience from submitting to the order of the Established Church were free to dissent under the protection of the Act. They could then form private ventures [e.g., proprietary chapels or independent societies] to be operated on voluntary principles.¹⁴

The spirit of the Act of Toleration also stimulated conscientious judgment among genuine Anglicans. Without rejecting the formularies of the Church of England, some members of the Established Church felt compelled to pursue certain causes as matters of conscience. These Churchmen prosecuted agendas they believed were insufficiently embraced by the Established Church. Such alternative agendas took on a voluntary nature in that independent leadership structures were

¹³ This principle is aptly illustrated in the attempts of the Church Missionary Society to secure episcopal patronage during its early years, a subject considered in the next chapter. The CMS would have been no less voluntary if it had been successful in winning the support of the bishops because the control of the Society's agenda and the use of its resources would have remained in the hands of its oligarchy, the Parent Committee. The campaign to gain episcopal support was no attempt to change the CMS's voluntary nature. See chapter five, pp.244-7.

¹⁴ Binfield, C., *So down to prayers: Studies in English Nonconformity, 1780-1920*, London, 1977: 10.

Ch.4 Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

established and supported. However, the explicit association of these causes with members of the Established Church, combined with the introduction of limited religious toleration into the public mind, made it possible to portray such emphases as valid options for Churchmen. These developments were important precedents for nineteenth century Anglican voluntaryism.

The Nonjuring Tradition: In a certain sense the Nonjurors were a prototype of a voluntary movement within the Church of England. These bishops and their clergy were deprived of their livings for scrupling to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary. They refused to acknowledge the power of Parliament to relieve clergy of their sworn fealty to a monarch [i.e., James II]. Nevertheless, the Nonjurors retained the goodwill of most Churchmen because of their Protestant orthodoxy, their commitment to Laudian churchmanship, and their politically benign form of dissent.¹⁵ The respect and toleration afforded to the Nonjurors by the hierarchy of the Church can be measured by the offers of restoration made to leading Nonjurors such as Thomas Ken.¹⁶

The chief connection between the Nonjurors and the Evangelical Revival was William Law. Law's writings, especially *A serious call to a devout and holy life*, stimulated the Wesleys and other first-generation evangelicals in the formation of their evangelical distinctives.¹⁷ Law's personal example as a Nonjuror

¹⁵ For example: Thomas Bray, a loyalist, willingly accepted the aid of Robert Nelson, a Nonjuring layman, in the formation of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge [SPCK]. See Allen, W.O.B., and E. McClure, *Two hundred years: The History of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1698-1898*, London, 1898; and Clarke, W.K.L., *A History of the SPCK*, London, 1959.

¹⁶ Ken, deprived Bishop of Bath and Wells, was invited to reassume his diocesan office in 1703. He declined. See Every, G., *The High Church Party, 1688-1718*, London, 1956.

¹⁷ See the introduction, p.3, note 5.

challenged the early evangelicals to maintain their convictions despite opposition. And, important for this study, the Nonjuring tradition as a whole set an important precedent for evangelical Anglicans who later embraced voluntary methods. The Nonjurors demonstrated that Churchmen could embrace alternative agendas without breaking all ties with the Established Church.

The Venerable Societies: Voluntaryism within the Established Church was also indirectly forwarded by the formation of the "Venerable Societies," the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge [SPCK], established in 1698, and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts [SPG], established in 1701. In order to support this statement it is necessary to consider to what extent these societies were voluntary in nature.

The goal of Thomas Bray et al. in forming these structures was the advancement of Christianity in Britain and its dominions through the agency of the Established Church.¹⁸ Toward this end, both societies sought the broad support of the bench of bishops, with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London having been endowed with significant constitutional powers in each case. Moreover, the SPG was incorporated under a Royal Charter. The charter was a demonstration of the Society's submission to royal supremacy and conferred

¹⁸ The formation and development of the Venerable Societies is so well documented that a detailed rehearsal of facts and sources is unnecessary here. The purpose of this discussion is merely to interpret the significance of the SPCK and SPG for the development of evangelical voluntaryism.

See Allen, W.O.B., and E. McClure, *Two hundred years: The History of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1698-1898*, London, 1898; Clarke, W.K.L., *A History of the SPCK*, London, 1959; Pascoe, C.F., *Two hundred years of the SPG: An historical account of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701-1900: Based on a digest of the Society's records*, London, 1901; and Thompson, H.P., *Thomas Bray*, London, 1954.

Ch.4 Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

official status on the SPG, making it a legitimate part of the Establishment.¹⁹ The nature of the SPG's charter also effectively limited its fields of activity to those determined by the Government's colonial policies.²⁰ In addition, Cnatingius has demonstrated that the original intent of the SPG was to establish self-supporting parishes under the control of the Bishop of London, as opposed to permanent missionary presences directed by the Society.²¹ These facts suggest that the SPCK and the SPG were intended to augment the effectiveness of the Established Church without replacing or by-passing Church structures. In the words of Andrew Walls, the Venerable Societies cannot be labelled as "crypto-voluntary" bodies.²² Can, then, these societies serve as a precedent for evangelical voluntaryism in any reasonable sense?

The answer is yes. A number of studies have concluded that the Venerable Societies functioned voluntarily, however they were theoretically intended to operate. Cnatingius judged that both societies appointed and supervised their own missionaries with little involvement of the Bishop of London, apart from pro forma

¹⁹ G.F.A. Best noted that the Established Church and its institutions were always "enmeshed in legal limitations" in comparison with the freedom enjoyed by Dissenters to "set up where they would." [Best, G.F.A., *Temporal pillars: Queen Anne's Bounty, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and the Church of England*, Cambridge, 1964: 257-8.] The SPG's charter demonstrated the Society's willingness to limit itself to the scope of operations set by Parliament and, on this basis, to lay claim to the patronage of the Establishment.

²⁰ McKelvie, G.D., *The development of official Anglican interest in world mission, 1783-1809: With special reference to Bishop Beilby Porteus*, Aberdeen University, Ph.D. thesis, 1984: 22-3. The SPG's incorporation followed the pattern of a trading company.

²¹ Cnatingius, H., *Bishops and societies. A study of Anglican colonial and missionary expansion, 1698-1850*, London, 1952: 23.

²² From a personal conversation with Prof. Walls.

Ch.4 Religious Voluntarism in 19th Century Britain

licensure.²³ McKelvie concluded that the control of the SPG lay in the hands of an oligarchical committee rather than the bishops of the Church, thus the Incorporated Society could not claim to operate as an organic body of the Church of England.²⁴ This reality was demonstrated when the SPG rejected Beilby Porteus' interest in missionary activity in the West Indies, offered in his capacity as the Bishop of London.²⁵ These developments reveal voluntary tendencies in the operation of the Venerable Societies. By 1838 competition with the CMS forced the SPG to openly commit itself to securing private means of support, thus setting the Society on a clearly voluntary course.²⁶

It might be argued that the voluntary-like actions of the Venerable Societies were merely anomalies that were made necessary by the organizational weakness of the Church of England in the eighteenth century. Convocation, the legal decision-making bodies of the Established Church, had been prorogued since

²³ Op.cit.: 38.

²⁴ McKelvie, op.cit.: 36, 49. Charles Hole noted that the SPG's incorporation was civil rather than ecclesiastical. The charter had been issued by Parliament, not by Convocation. [Hole, C., *The early history of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1896: xxix.] The matter of the SPG *could* have been taken up by Convocation, as it was not prorogued until 1717.

²⁵ Hodgson, R., *The life of the Right Rev. Beilby Porteus, D.D., late bishop of London*, 2nd edition. London, 1811: 87-90. As a result, Porteus concluded that the SPCK and the SPG were virtually useless as missionary societies. [McKelvie, op.cit.: 28ff.]

²⁶ In 1833, public support for the CMS amounted to £45,707, compared with £8,747 for the SPG. [Stanley, B., *Home support for overseas missions in early Victorian England, c. 1838-1873*, Cambridge University, Ph.D. thesis, 1979: 13, 76.]

The SPCK had already adopted openly voluntary methods in forming district committees at its general meeting on June 12, 1810. The action was taken in response to the success of the auxiliaries of the British and Foreign Bible Society, with which the SPCK competed for funds. [Clarke, W.K.L., *A History of the SPCK*, London, 1959: 141-44, 148.]

1717.²⁷ From that point onward the bishops of the Church had no opportunity to consult together, except in Parliament in the presence of the Lords Temporal, and thus the business of the Venerable Societies could not be taken up by the leaders of the Established Church. The fact that the governing bodies of the SPCK and the SPG acted independently of the bishops of the Church might be justified by these circumstances.

The real extent of the voluntary tendencies of the Venerable Societies must be determined by assessing the intentions of the founders. Bray, Robert Nelson, and the other Churchmen involved in the creation of the SPCK and the SPG had dual motives in bringing these societies into existence. They desired to advance Christianity in Great Britain and its possessions through the agency of the Established Church. They also wished to limit the growth of the Dissent, particularly in Wales [ergo, the SPCK] and the Americas [ergo, the SPG]. Further, Bray's activism was not a function of values contrary to those held by most Churchmen. Bray found little objection to his concerns for the future of the Established Church among fellow Anglicans. What he discovered was relative indifference and inward thinking.²⁸ Bray and his colleagues thus chose to act.

This is precisely the mark of voluntary activity: the manifestation of Christian duty and pragmatic zeal vis-à-vis a cause perceived by its advocates as

²⁷ Convocation had been prorogued by royal decree to prevent the two Houses from condemning Benjamin Hoadly, then Bishop of Bangor, for a controversial sermon on the nature of the Kingdom of God. Erastianism was the real issue, however. The sermon had been preached before the George I and the king did not wish the bishop to be chastised. Walpole's commitment to the supremacy of the state over the church required that he prevent the clergy from successfully opposing the government. Convocation did not meet again for business until 1852.

²⁸ McKelvie, among others, has endorsed this view. [McKelvie, G.D., *The development of official Anglican interest in world mission, 1783-1809: With special reference to Bishop Beilby Porteus*, Aberdeen University, Ph.D. thesis, 1984: 66.]

having been ignored. The issue is not merely one of financial resources. The inception and operation of the Venerable Societies were a measure of the commitment of their founders to certain values. Further, the founders were determined to maintain and propagate those values through the control of the agendas of the structures they had formed. At best, the incapacity of Convocation was not a relevant factor; at worst, the inability of the bishops to act required Bray and company to do so. It is in this sense that the SPCK and the SPG were important precedents for the development of evangelical voluntaryism.²⁹

Methodism: The development of Wesleyan Methodism also provided a certain impetus to evangelical voluntaryism. Although the movement can be said to have departed from the Church of England with the inception of Methodist ordination and the consecration of "overseers" in the 1780s, it is not fair to make a Dissenter out of John Wesley. Wesley claimed to be a loyal minister of the Established Church up to his death.³⁰ However, Wesley was a committed voluntaryist within the Church of England. He had his own Christian agenda and he intended to prosecute it with or without the support of the hierarchy of the Established Church.³¹

²⁹ As is later illustrated, the CMS differed fundamentally from the Venerable Societies. The CMS was totally voluntary in nature, it was thoroughly evangelical in values, and it strictly limited its submission to the episcopate. See chapter five.

³⁰ Baker's *John Wesley and the Church of England* [London, 1970] provides a detailed look at the relationship between the chief founder of Methodism and the Established Church. A.B. Lawson's thesis [*John Wesley and some Anglican evangelicals of the eighteenth century*, University of Sheffield, Ph.D. thesis, 1973] also addresses the subject of Wesley's ecclesiastical loyalties.

³¹ If a personal comment be allowed, it was a good thing he did. Without arguing the merits of Methodism per se, the Wesleyan movement infused vitality into the Church in Britain. Moreover, Wesley's efforts were a material aid to the development of genuine Christian pluralism in Great Britain. That pluralism proved to be significant in the course of Western Christianity. The U.S. context is a case in point. The American Revolution ended Britain's control of the Colonies. The Revolution also terminated the direct influence of the Established Church. Nevertheless, a British
(continued...)

Ch.4 Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

Wesley and his colleagues believed that Christian faith in Britain had taken a wrong turn in response to the challenge of Deism. Deism's chief affirmation was the sufficiency of the laws of nature to impart knowledge about God. If this be true, then 'revealed religion' [i.e., the Scriptures] is unnecessary. The orthodox reply to Deism did not question the value of 'natural religion', but asserted a limit to human reasoning that is compensated for in what God reveals through the Scriptures.³² Wesley did not dispute the need for a thoughtful and reasonable Christian faith. In point of fact, Wesley's theology was as dependent upon rationalism as was the mainstream Anglicanism in his day. But, under the influence of Moravian pietism and the proto-evangelicalism of William Law, the Wesleys came to believe that holiness is as important to Christian faith as is reasonableness. Out of this conviction came the Methodist distinctive of one's personal encounter with God combined with a commitment to personal piety. In an age of measured and predictable religion, it was a truly radical agenda.

What is particularly important for later evangelical voluntaryism is Wesley's obvious belief in the compatibility of Methodism with Anglicanism proper. However ecclesiastically irregular were Wesley's Methodist societies and lay

³¹(...continued)

export -- in Methodism -- became one of the most significant religious influences in the westward expansion of the American nation. The social and religious impact of the Methodist circuit riders in nineteenth century America is well known. No parochial church [e.g., the Church of England] could have hoped for such an impact across a continent without also resorting to Wesley's itinerant methods. Christianity in North America owes a measure of its existence and vitality to the export of eighteenth century religious pluralism and voluntaryism from Great Britain.

³² These issues, for example, can be seen in Matthew Tindal's *Christianity as old as the creation* [1730] and Conybeare's reply, *Defence of revealed religion against Christianity as old as the creation* [1732]. Tindal was similarly answered by no less than one hundred and fifteen defenders of 'revealed religion,' according to J.H. Overton's estimate. [Abbey, C.J., and J.H. Overton, *The English Church in the eighteenth century*, new edition, London, 1887: 86-7.]

preachers, Wesley fully expected that he and the Anglicans among his followers would continue as loyal members of the Established Church.³³ Nevertheless, they would be Churchmen with a mission, viz., to bring spiritual renewal in the land.³⁴ This they endeavoured to accomplish through the use of means that were clearly voluntary: the creation of a specialized structure, viz., Wesley's "Connexion," combined with the development of the resources required for its support and development. Once more evangelical voluntaryism had been given an example to follow.

The Scottish Connection: Another precedent for evangelical voluntaryism in the nineteenth century was Scottish in origin. On first impression this might appear to be backward. In May 1796 the General Assembly deferred action on the formation of a committee to draw up a missionary agenda for the Kirk, including a collection on behalf of the existing [i.e., English] missionary societies. By this time, of course, the Baptist Missionary Society and the [London] Missionary Society were in operation and efforts were underway to create a voluntary society for evangelical Anglicans. Although missionary societies were formed in 1796 in the cities of Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen, Dundee, Perth, and Stirling, these organizations arose in response to a circular letter from the LMS that sought

³³ This expectation, maintained by John Wesley to his death, became wholly untenable when Wesley began to ordain his clergy and consecrate 'overseers' [i.e., bishops] such as Asbury and Coke.

³⁴ It is beyond the scope of this study to consider the growth of Methodism, except to observe its impact on the voluntary ethos. It would also be unnecessary to cover this ground once more. The best source on the development and impact of Methodism is Wesley himself: Wesley, J., *An extract of the Rev. John Wesley's journal*, 21 vols., London, 1794-1797.

Modern and helpful studies include Baker, op.cit.; Reeve, R., "John Wesley, Charles Simeon, and the Evangelical Revival," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 2 (1956), 203-14; Semmel, B., *The Methodist revolution*, London, 1974; and portions of Thompson, E.P., *The making of the English working class*, London, 1963, reprint, London, 1988.

Scottish support for its work.³⁵ If anything, it might appear that voluntaryism in England was a precedent for its Scottish counterpart.

This conclusion fails to take account of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge [SSPCK], formed within a few years of the Act of Union. Roxborough notes that the SSPCK was created to spread Presbyterianism and the Whig politics of the Revolution Settlement in the Highlands and Islands. As a result the Society exerted its primary influence in Scotland during its initial years.³⁶ Then, in 1730, the SSPCK began to sponsor evangelistic work among native North Americans. The efforts of John Eliot, the seventeenth century New England Puritan, served as a model to the Society. David Brainerd eventually became connected with the SSPCK's North American mission. The SSPCK also began to experiment with parish-based 'local missionary societies' as a means of developing interest and support in the work of the SSPCK.

The legacy of the SSPCK for the nineteenth century voluntary missionary movement is multi-faceted. Brainerd's diary, portions of which were published during his lifetime, served as a stimulus to the revival in Cambuslang in 1741 and to many eighteenth and nineteenth century evangelicals in Britain. Henry Martyn, for example, was profoundly affected by the account of Brainerd's life.³⁷ In turn, the Cambuslang "concert of prayer" movement eventually touched the English

³⁵ Roxborough, W.J., *Thomas Chalmers and the mission of the Church, with special reference to the rise of the missionary movement in Scotland*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1978: 282.

³⁶ Op.cit.: 278. This fact subtracts nothing from the importance of the work of the Society in a context that was culturally remote from the rest of Britain. As Andrew Walls noted in private correspondence with the author, the SSPCK helped to preserve Highland identity through the circulation of the Gaelic Bible.

³⁷ Sargent, J., ed., *Memoir of the Rev. Henry Martyn*, 4th edition, London, 1820: 31.

Independents and Baptists who created the BMS and the LMS in the 1790s.³⁸ Most important for this study, the SSPCK's network of local missionary associations served as a precedent for the auxiliary structures that all of the major English voluntary societies developed in the second decade of the nineteenth century. As Roxborough notes, "A feature of the [Scottish] missionary movement was the widespread formation of local societies ... [This produced an] unprecedented involvement of laity in the mission of the church."³⁹ The dependence of nineteenth century evangelical voluntarism on the support of the laity followed a pattern set by the SSPCK more than half of a century earlier.

Philosophical Foundations for Voluntarism

The voluntary ethos of the British missionary movement was the product of the events and organizational precedents summarized in the previous section. In addition, a number of philosophical issues also were formative for evangelical voluntarism. These include an enlarged view of the world, eschatology, isolationism, and sectarianism.

A Wider World: The startling and new geographical and cultural information acquired through the "Age of Discovery" served to capture the imagination and instill a romantic view of the world in the public mind.⁴⁰ For

³⁸ These developments are touched on in greater detail later in this chapter, pp.189-91.

³⁹ Op.cit.: 275.

⁴⁰ Such was the effect of publications such as Hawkesworth's *Account of the voyages, undertaken ... by Comm. Byrom, Captain Wallis, Capt. Cartaret, and J. Cook*, 3 vols., London, 1773.

Ch.4 Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

example, to many in the educated classes the moment had arrived to internationalize the world through commerce. Trading concerns flourished, driven by the romance of new worlds to explore and markets to exploit. Of course, secular and commercial idealism created little opportunity for Christian mission. The trading companies in the second half of the eighteenth century were preoccupied with turning a profit. Social change, religious or otherwise, was resisted as a destabilizing factor.⁴¹ However, the trading companies served as a

⁴¹ For example, this was the period of 'irreligion' in the East India Company, culminating in the famous seven-year corruption trial of Warren Hastings, Governor-General of British India from 1773 to 1785. He was acquitted after spending £70,000 in his defence. Hastings was followed in office by the "reforming" Governor-Generals Charles Cornwallis [1786-93], Lord Teignmouth [1793-8], and Marquis Wellesley [1797-1805]. Indeed, reforms were made. Private trade by EIC employees was severely restricted under Cornwallis, contributing to Charles Grant's decision to return to England. [See Hess, W.R., *The religious policy of the British East India Company, 1806-1843*, University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. thesis, 1964, 20-2.] An iniquitous system of revenue and taxation was reformed under Teignmouth. What was not reformed were EIC attitudes, in India or in England, toward missionary activity. The official policy was one of restriction in the interest of stability [i.e., of the trading environment]. This posture was maintained into the early nineteenth century and was reinforced -- however wrongly -- by the 1807 incident at Vellore. [See Scott Waring, J., *Observations on the present state of the East India Company: With prefatory remarks on the alarming intelligence lately received from Madras, as to the general disaffection prevailing amongst the natives of every rank ...*, 4th edition, London, 1808.] Not until the India Company's charter was modified in 1813 were the restrictions on missionary activity eased.

I.J. Gash [*An historical survey and assessment of the ecclesiastical and missionary policy of the East India Company*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1968.] suggested that pre-1813 EIC policy on missionary activity was a reflection of the Company's commitment to religious pluralism in India [p.30 & passim]. To a certain extent R.E. Frykenberg agreed ["Religion and Company Raj in South India," *Fides et Historia* 17 (1985), 6-37] when he observed that the Company tried to satisfy Anglican interests and the Hindu 'Establishment' at the same time [p.13]. However, what Gash missed and Frykenberg correctly observed was the motive behind the Company's religious pluralism: stable profits. It is important to note that even Charles Grant recognized the importance of profits, although he argued that missionary activity would enhance them. [Grant, C., *Observations on the state of society among the Asiatic subjects of Great Britain, particularly with respect to morals and the means of improving it: Written chiefly in the year 1792*, [London], 1797: 189, 199f.]

structural precedent for the voluntary missionary societies founded at the end of the century.⁴²

Optimistic Eschatology: Wider views of the world yielded a global view of the Church and its mission. This manifested itself in what today would be labelled a post-millennial eschatology. From the middle of the eighteenth century, much of evangelicalism in Britain and its American colonies was swept by a growing confidence in the approach of the "latter days," to be ushered in by the global proclamation of the Christian Gospel.⁴³ Such optimism had a profound effect on the British and American missionary movements.

An illustration of the effect of post-millennialism on voluntarism in Britain can be seen in a chain of events leading indirectly to the formation of the Baptist Missionary Society [BMS]. Eschatological expectations were an important factor in the Scottish revival at Cambuslang in the early 1740s. As a result, out from the town went a call to all Christians to join in "concerts of prayer" for the unity of

⁴² William Carey drew an explicit comparison between trading companies and voluntary missionary societies: both types of structures exist to achieve the objects of a charter. With respect to the missionary society, it attends to its immediate constitution and the "charter" of the Christian Church, viz., the commission of Christ in Mt.28.18-20. [Carey, W., *An enquiry into the obligation of Christians to use means for the conversion of the heathen*, Leicester, 1792, reprint, London, 1891: 81-2.]

Van den Berg has shown how new knowledge about the world and the increase in international trade, combined with the rational presupposition that knowledge and experience should be put to use, gave impetus to the developing British missionary movement. [van den Berg, J., *Constrained by Jesus' love: An enquiry into the motives of the missionary awakening in Great Britain in the period between 1698 and 1815*, Kampen, 1956: 97-102, 153-55.]

⁴³ J.A. de Jong has traced the development of evangelical eschatology up to the period under study in *As the waters cover the sea: Millennial expectations in the rise of Anglo-American missions, 1640-1810*, Kampen, 1970. See also Manson, W.M., "Mission and eschatology," *International Review of Missions* 42 (1953), 390-7; and portions of Rooy, S.H., *The theology of missions in the Puritan tradition: A study of representative Puritans: Richard Sibbes, Richard Baxter, John Eliot, Cotton Mather, and Jonathan Edwards*, Delft, 1965.

Ch.4 Religious Voluntarism in 19th Century Britain

the Christian Church in the global proclamation of the Gospel. In due course, the Cambuslang appeal caught the attention of Jonathan Edwards in New England, who was struck by the possibilities for global renewal and awakening if only the Church could be mobilized to prayerful action. Hence, Edwards' *Humble attempt* [1747] to continue the prayer movement in New England.⁴⁴ Romantic, post-millennial expectations were at the very centre of Edwards' writings.

The link with the BMS occurs some thirty-seven years later, in 1784, when *Humble attempt* and Edwards' biography of David Brainerd found their way into the hands of Northamptonshire Baptists Andrew Fuller, John Ryland, and John Sutcliff. The books were a gift from John Erskine, an evangelical minister in the Scottish kirk.⁴⁵ The three Baptists were profoundly affected by Edwards' writings. Fuller at once preached a sermon calling for Baptists in England to join the Scottish prayer movement. Moreover, the three men took leading roles with William Carey in the launch [in 1792] of what became the Baptist Missionary Society. With Carey they believed that voluntary means were entirely consistent with their eschatological expectations, if not also a necessary implication of them.⁴⁶ Similar opinions, for almost identical eschatological reasons, were held

⁴⁴ Edwards, J., *An humble attempt to promote explicit agreement and visible union of God's people in extraordinary prayer ...*, The works of President Edwards, new edition, 1747, reprint, London, 1817, vol.2, 424-541.

⁴⁵ The full story of the connection between Scotland, New England, and the English [Particular] Baptists in the Midlands is told in Fawcett, A., *The Cambuslang Revival: Scottish evangelical revival of the eighteenth century*, London, 1971. De Jong also noted the round-about pathway for the missionary movement. [de Jong, op.cit., 166f.]

⁴⁶ Carey's emphasis on the "use of means" was a classic manifestation of romanticism. Carey argued for the creation of missionary societies on the basis of religious demographics derived from the accounts of various explorations. He also portrayed voluntary structures as vehicles through which post-millennial expectations might be fulfilled. Carey was particularly encouraged with the prospects for the progress of the Gospel as a result of funds made available through subscriptions. This seemed to Carey to be an appropriate and effective approach to functional unity among
(continued...)

Ch.4 Religious Voluntarism in 19th Century Britain

by David Bogue and the other Congregationalists who were instrumental in the formation of the [London] Missionary Society in 1795.⁴⁷ Thus romanticism, in the form of optimistic eschatology, was a formative influence on voluntary missionary activity in and from Great Britain.⁴⁸

The Isolation of the Established Church: One context in which romanticism and optimistic eschatology had reduced effect was the mainstream of the Established Church. The wider view of things fostered by romanticism was limited by the ecclesiastical conservatism of the Church of England in the eighteenth century. This situation was a further product of religious toleration. While official Anglicanism had accepted the fact of Protestant pluralism, it avoided accommodation to other traditions by maintaining distance from them. Naturally, Reformation principles divided the Church of England from its Roman and Eastern counterparts. Politics and church polity limited cooperation with Continental Protestant churches. Common cause with Dissenters at home was largely precluded by the civil disabilities that accompanied protection under the Act of Toleration. The early Methodists, who saw themselves as Churchmen, were held at a distance from the Established Church because of their 'enthusiasm' and irregularity. Even evangelical Anglicans, legitimate Churchmen in every respect,

⁴⁶(...continued)

Christians. [Carey, W., *An enquiry into the obligation of Christians to use means for the conversion of the heathen*, Leicester, 1792, reprint, London, 1891: 81-2, 85f.]

⁴⁷ Bogue, D., "To the evangelical Dissenters who practice infant baptism," *Evangelical Magazine* 2 (1794), 378-80.

⁴⁸ Hinchliff characterized early nineteenth century British missionaries as being marked by a "romantic casualness." [Hinchliff, P., "The selection and training of missionaries in the early 19th century," *Studies in Church History*, vol. 6: *The mission of the Church and the propagation of the faith*, edited by G.J. Cuming, Cambridge, 1970: 31-5, 131.]

were kept on the periphery of things. The institutional posture of the Church of England toward the spectrum of eighteenth century Christianity created an insular mentality among the hierarchy and much of the rank and file of Established Church. As Abbey and Overton observed a century later, the Church of England from the 1780s onward may have been tolerant of the diversity of Protestant traditions, but it was distant from them.⁴⁹

Paradoxically, these isolationist tendencies stimulated the very pluralism that the hierarchy of the Church of England wished to avoid. Voluntary societies became the means through which Churchmen, who were so inclined, could occasionally work outside of the confines of the Established Church.⁵⁰ In some cases, such as with the Bible Society, voluntary structures afforded opportunity for progressive Churchmen to cooperate with Dissenters and foreign Protestants in common concerns. Alternatively, voluntary societies like the CMS had been created to further neglected agendas without overt association with Dissenters.⁵¹ By either course, tendencies toward voluntaryism were enhanced by the generally inward focus of the Church of England at the end of the eighteenth century. Voluntary societies became a natural outlet for those Churchmen with vision that pushed at the ecclesiastical limits of the Established Church.

Evangelical Sectarianism: Max Weber's sociological distinction between 'church' and 'sect' is helpful in understanding the crux of voluntary motives,

⁴⁹ Abbey, C.J., and J.H. Overton, *The English Church in the eighteenth century*, new edition, London, 1887: 195-6.

⁵⁰ McKelvie, G.D., *The development of official Anglican interest in world mission, 1783-1809: With special reference to Bishop Beilby Porteus*, Aberdeen University, Ph.D. thesis, 1984: 66.

⁵¹ As McKelvie noted, voluntaryism was perceived to be connected with religious dissent, thus guilt by association was imputed whether or not Dissenters were included in a society. [Op.cit.: 68.]

especially in the missionary context. Sarah Potter, in her assessment of missionary recruitment in nineteenth century England, made good use of Weber's theory. Using Weber's distinctions, she defined 'church' as an inclusive social structure, able to draw its members broadly from society because it asks relatively little from them and exerts little influence on their values.⁵² In contrast, Potter defined the 'sect' as an exclusive social structure. It views itself as the ideal church; i.e., what a church would be if it took its religion seriously.⁵³ The membership of a sect is limited by the heavy demands it makes on its members, but its influence on the morals and ethics of its adherents is significant. Owing to the natural disinclination of people to submit to close supervision or control, the sect must be marketed. Its benefits must be 'sold' to prospective members. Thus, sects are far more aggressive in recruiting members than are churches. In short, the sect serves as a vocal, prophetic body to the wider religious community. Moreover, a chief objective of the sect is to further its agenda through an alternative religious community.

The similarities between the 'sect' and the voluntary missionary society are obvious. As is illustrated in chapter five with respect to the CMS, British missionary societies in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries developed out of the work of handfuls of highly motivated people. Although they never grew very large relative to the general religious population, the societies sought members through

⁵² Weber's 'church' deals primarily with religious forms, matters easily isolated from an individual's moral or ethical choices. Of course, this is not to suggest that 'churches' exert no public influence. On the contrary, the fact that a church produces social conformity on a wide scale makes it a powerful force in defining acceptable public values and behaviour, even if limited to externals. Weber, M., *The sociology of religion*, translated by Ephraim Fischoff, London, 1965: 187-94; as cited in Potter, S.C., *The social origins and recruitment of English Protestant missionaries in the 19th century*, University of London, Ph.D. thesis, 1974: 11-13.

⁵³ Ibid.

intense promotional efforts.⁵⁴ The founders and later advocates of the missionary societies also sought for the universal acceptance of their causes among the clergy and laity of the churches to which they were connected. These are moderately sectarian characteristics.

However, it is important to note one important sense in which British missionary societies were not sectarian. While the 'sect' views itself as distinct from the 'church' and an alternative to it, the voluntary missionary societies under consideration here were discontinuous subsets of the wider Christian community in Britain. It is in this sense that missionary societies are sodalities, in contrast with the modality of church structures. Although the voluntary religious societies of Simeon's day did exercise a prophetic role in advocating their respective causes and agendas, an alternative religious community was not their object or by-product. This was certainly the case for the SPCK and the SPG, and the same can be said for evangelical voluntary societies such as the CMS. Nevertheless, there was a limited sectarianism in the character of the voluntary structures with which Simeon would have been familiar.

The Voluntaryism of the 'Clapham Saints'

Voluntary activity by evangelical Anglicans in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was typified by the work of William Wilberforce and the Clapham Saints. Clapham's efforts were marked by a number of traits. As these

⁵⁴ E.P. Thompson noted the same wide-scale recruiting dynamic among the radical political societies of the late eighteenth century. Although the actual membership of the radical groups was limited by the social risks associated with advocacy of their agendas, these societies offered a place to all who would join. ["Members Unlimited," chapter one of Thompson, E.P., *The making of the English working class*, London, 1963, reprint, London, 1988: 19ff.]

were formative for the CMS and Simeon's role in its founding, they are worth a brief review.

Common Cause with Dissent: The characteristic of evangelical voluntaryism that most troubled mainstream Anglicans was the presumption of common cause with Dissenters. Nowhere was this more evident than in the thinking and practices of the Clapham Saints.

The Clapham evangelicals used the first number [1802] of their *Christian Observer* to publish something of a manifesto for their movement within the Church of England. Having been labelled a "party" by High Churchmen and liberals alike, Zachary Macaulay was quite keen to publish a statement indicating the opposition of evangelical Churchmen to "sectarianism" and "religious intolerance."⁵⁵ This was important for the relationship of evangelical Churchmen to their fellow Anglicans, but it was also an essential position if they were to have some basis for common cause with the voluntary efforts of evangelical Dissenters. To avoid a party or sectarian image, they even declared their preference to be called "Christians" rather than "evangelicals."⁵⁶ It was, incidentally, a plea honoured by none; the original name stuck.

To encourage Dissenters in their voluntary efforts required evangelical Anglicans to walk a very fine line. On the one hand, Dissenters wished to be assured that the civil disabilities associated with Nonconformity did not carry over into the voluntary sphere. At the same time, evangelical Churchmen needed to demonstrate their commitment to episcopacy and their political reliability to the

⁵⁵ "An account of the anti-sectarian sect," *Christian Observer* 1 (1802), 708.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

Ch.4 Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

powers of the Established Church and the Government, respectively. The Clapham evangelicals were acutely aware of these tensions, as can be seen in their ecclesiastically ambiguous missionary agenda from 1793 to 1813.

An Appeal to the Establishment: Taking concepts from the aborted "Plan for a Mission to Bengal and Behar" [1787], William Wilberforce sought to obligate the EIC to patronize missionary activity through proposed revisions to its charter in 1793.⁵⁷ From an ecclesiastical viewpoint, this was a safe proposal for a Churchman. As Company policy would have required such patronage to be limited to ministers of the Church of England, Wilberforce earned support for his efforts from Beilby Porteus, then Bishop of London.⁵⁸ In fact, Wilberforce's proposals were not initially opposed by the bench of bishops or by the Government. Defeat came through the last-minute lobbying efforts of the India Company Court of Directors. At issue were the costs involved and the assumption that missionary activity would hinder Company trade.⁵⁹ The Company's rebuff, unchallenged by Church or Government, turned Wilberforce toward a voluntary course of action.

Voluntary Alternatives: When the renewal of the EIC charter again came before Parliament in 1813, Wilberforce had not forgotten his defeat at the hands of the Court of Directors twenty years earlier. This time Wilberforce was determined not to depend on the goodwill of the Establishment to admit missionaries to India. Rather, he would rely on its sensitivity to public pressure. The Clapham strategy

⁵⁷ The "1787 Plan." in which Simeon was a key player, is considered in detail later in chapter five.

⁵⁸ McKelvie, G.D., *The development of official Anglican interest in world mission, 1783-1809: With special reference to Bishop Beilby Porteus*, Aberdeen University, Ph.D. thesis, 1984: 860, 869.

⁵⁹ See current chapter, pp.187-9.

Ch.4 Religious Voluntarism in 19th Century Britain

was brilliant. Wilberforce proposed an episcopate for India and access to India for missionaries. Only the ecclesiastical establishment would be under EIC patronage, with missionary activity operated entirely on a voluntary basis. It was a cause that caught the public eye, thus one that Parliament could not easily ignore.⁶⁰ But, essential to securing a groundswell of popular support for Wilberforce's "pious clauses" was the backing of evangelical Dissenters. To gain their loyalty, Wilberforce assured men such as John Ryland that episcopacy for India would not limit access by Dissenting missionaries.⁶¹ This was not mere political expediency. In the course of the EIC charter campaign, Wilberforce had become concerned with the emphasis of Churchmen such as Claudius Buchanan on the "form" for Indian missions, i.e., its relationship to the Establishment. What troubled Wilberforce was the lack of "substance" to the Anglican missionary movement, i.e., the dearth of English clergy prepared to serve as missionaries in India.⁶² Thus, Wilberforce gave open praise to the work of William Carey and the Serampore Baptists.⁶³ Nevertheless, Wilberforce also wished to restrain the

⁶⁰ The story of the 1813 EIC charter renewal has been told too often to require its rehearsal here. See Bradley, I., *The politics of godliness: Evangelicals in Parliament, 1784-1832*, Oxford University, D. Phil. thesis, 1974; Davidson, A.K., *The development and influence of the British missionary movement's attitudes towards India, 1786-1830*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1973; and Howse, E.M., *Saints in politics: The "Clapham Sect" and the growth of freedom*, Toronto, 1952.

⁶¹ Wilberforce to Ryland, 1812, as cited in Davidson, op.cit., 273.

Josiah Pratt, of the CMS, shared Wilberforce's expectation. [Pratt to Thomas Thomason, March 3, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E 8.]

⁶² Wilberforce's comments are in his diary entry for February 12, 1812, in Wilberforce, R.I., and S. Wilberforce, *The life of William Wilberforce*, 2nd edition, London, 1838: vol.4, 14. In fairness to Claudius Buchanan, he was credited with the same concern by van den Berg. See current chapter, p.204.

⁶³ Wilberforce, R.I., and S. Wilberforce, *The life of William Wilberforce*, ut sup.: vol.4, 123f.

increase in Dissenting missionaries until the Church of England, via the CMS, could step forward.⁶⁴ Clearly, the Clapham evangelicals were pulled in two directions -- loyalty to the Established Church and appreciation for the work of evangelical Dissenters -- in their advocacy of voluntary methods for missionary activity.

The Voluntary Course Confirmed: However puzzling were Clapham's ecclesiastical principles, by 1813 Wilberforce and his colleagues were unequivocal about their strategy for securing the admission of missionaries to British India. This outcome would be achieved only through voluntary action supported by public demand.⁶⁵ Such was also the opinion of evangelical Anglican clergy such as William Dealtry. He connected authority in Great Britain with public opinion, thus it had become necessary to "strengthen opinions" on the progress of Christianity in India.⁶⁶ Dealtry's objective in his sermon was to nurture public support for missionary activity by voluntary means.

⁶⁴ Wilberforce to Mr. Butterworth, February 15, 1812, op.cit.: vol.4, 10-12.

⁶⁵ [Anon.], *A letter to a friend on the duty of Great Britain to disseminate Christianity in India: Occasioned by the proposed renewal of the charter of the East India Company*, London, 1813: 10,15. This pamphlet, although anonymous, was clearly written by a Clapham ally for use in the lobbying campaign. The failure of Wilberforce's efforts in 1793, at the hands of the EIC Court, is explicitly stated as the immediate cause for the Clapham strategy two decades later. Wilberforce himself made no secret of his "methodology of agitation" [McKelvie, G.D., op.cit., 869], as illustrated in an 1813 letter to a friend from whom he hoped to secure a public word of affirmation for Indian missions. [Wilberforce, R.I., and S. Wilberforce, *The life of William Wilberforce*, ut sup.:vol.4, 101-5.] Bradley provides thorough documentation of Clapham motives and methods vis-à-vis the charter renewal campaign in *The politics of godliness: Evangelicals in Parliament, 1784-1832*, Oxford University, D. Phil. thesis, 1974, especially pp.92-7.

⁶⁶ Dealtry, W., *Duty and policy of propagating Christianity: A discourse delivered before the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East, May 4, 1813*, London, 1813: 22.

Ch.4 Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

Morris has suggested that the voluntary phenomenon in eighteenth and nineteenth century Britain was a function of the mobilization of urban "middle class elites," those who had the material means to make their causes independent from government aid.⁶⁷ He particularly identified the Clapham Saints with such efforts. If anything, Morris draws the voluntary circle too narrowly. While the governing bodies of voluntary societies were frequently urban-based, the development of county-wide auxiliary structures by the Bible Society and the CMS demonstrated the widespread public appeal of the voluntary ethos. Evangelical voluntaryism was a rural movement as well. Furthermore, the "penny associations" often connected with auxiliaries reflected the desire of society leaders for material and moral support from labourers in addition to the middle class.⁶⁸ Voluntary societies publicly advocated a "subscribers democracy" along the lines of the joint stock company or a proprietary chapel.⁶⁹

The Impetus of Evangelical Ecumenism

While the evangelical Anglican missionary movement was certainly driven toward voluntaryism by the determined pragmatism of Clapham, more philosophical minds urged a similar direction for slightly different reasons. Less

⁶⁷ Morris, R., "Voluntary societies and British urban elites, 1780-1850: An analysis," *The Historical Journal* 26 (1983), 96.

⁶⁸ Auxiliaries of the CMS are considered in some detail in chapter five.

⁶⁹ As previously noted, this was William Carey's view. [See current chapter, p.189, note 42.] Morris [op.cit.: 101-4, 15] correctly observed that the structural product of this model is oligarchy, a conclusion supported by the preoccupation of governing committees with the maintenance of their powers and privileges. Nevertheless, broad public involvement -- however benign -- was always sought after. It was, in E.P. Thompson's words, "members unlimited." [See current chapter, p.194, note 54.]

Ch.4 Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

motivated by the failure of 1793, evangelical clergy such as William Mandell and Daniel Wilson advocated the involvement of Churchmen in voluntary societies as a means toward achieving the unity of the Christian Church.

Consider Mandell's vision of the future:

How great and glorious the change, when men of every colour and of every clime shall unite in ascriptions of praise to God! When "the shin'ning [sic] Icelander and sun-burnt Moor," the hardy Canadian and the effeminate Asiatic, the marauding Tartar, and the untutored savage of the Australian isles, shall alike fall down before the one true God, and do him service!⁷⁰

How is such a universal Church to be achieved? In all likelihood, according to Mandell, through the "instrumentality of man." Although God has the power to bring about the miraculous conversion of whole nations, it is "more analogous to his ordinary dispensations to accomplish, by a gradual process, the purposes of his infinite and eternal purposes."⁷¹ This means missionaries, Mandell continued, and thus the very purposes of God in history recommend the CMS to all Churchmen.⁷²

Daniel Wilson, writing in the same year [1814] as Mandell, expected voluntary missionary efforts to achieve another noble outcome even before its success in missionary terms. Wilson looked to voluntary societies to achieve a

⁷⁰ Mandell, W., *The duty of promoting Christian missions as connected with the peculiar character of the present times: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, on Sunday, December 4, 1814*, Cambridge, 1814: 17.

⁷¹ Op.cit.: 19.

⁷² Op.cit.: 20.

unity of purpose among Christian denominations. Wilson believed the use of human means to be essential to the development of the global Church, allowing the "church at home" to unite in sending missionaries.⁷³ A growing unity of missionary effort by Protestant denominations -- as a precursor to truly global Christianity -- was a common expectation among evangelicals, and especially those within the Church of England.⁷⁴

Criticisms of Anglican Voluntaryism

Anglican voluntary activity -- however ecumenical -- was a direct challenge to the Established Church. Ford K. Brown characterized Clapham's religious agenda as an attempt to force High Church clergy and laity into the evangelical camp by means of public pressure.⁷⁵ In Brown's opinion, their plans were a series of unfortunate triumphs: The Clapham propaganda machine latched on to certain issues -- such as the missionary question -- and made popular causes out of

⁷³ Wilson, D., *A sermon preached at the parish church of St. Bride, Fleet Street, on ... November 10, 1814, before the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East, on the occasion of the departure of ... missionaries to ... Africa*, London, [1814]: 4, 24, 30.

⁷⁴ This theme has been explored in two important accounts of the British missionary movement: Piggin, F.S., "Sectarianism versus ecumenism: The impact on British churches of the missionary movement to India, c. 1800-1860," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 27 (1976), 392 and passim; and Piggin, S., *Making evangelical missionaries, 1789-1858*, Evangelicals and society from 1750, vol. 2, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, 1984: 114 and passim.

⁷⁵ Brown, F.K., *Fathers of the Victorians: The age of Wilberforce*, Cambridge, 1961: 5ff.

I.J. Gash shared Brown's opinion of Clapham's tactics, labelling Wilberforce's efforts with respect to the 1793 and 1813 EIC charter renewals as "coercive." Gash attributed Clapham's strategy to intentional disinformation by Charles Grant, Sr. Gash believed that Grant intentionally misrepresented India Company policy as anti-Christian. [Gash, I.J., *An historical survey and assessment of the ecclesiastical and missionary policy of the East India Company*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1968: 34, 37, 243.]

them. Once established in the public mind, Clapham used the media with great effect to suggest that the only genuinely Christian position [i.e., on such subjects as the EIC charter renewal] was the evangelical position. Clapham's antagonists were left with two choices, to capitulate or lose public confidence. In fairness to Brown, Wilberforce's speeches before Parliament in 1813 on the subject of the India Company charter reinforce this point of view.⁷⁶

Evangelicalism's victory in Parliament imparted significant momentum to the voluntary movements associated with Clapham, and especially to the fledgling CMS. Moreover, the EIC charter campaign reinforced the genuinely radical nature of voluntaryism vis-à-vis the Established Church: the voluntaryist's agenda must go forward by all legal means, the wishes of the Anglican hierarchy notwithstanding. William Dealtry, a disciple of Simeon, affirmed just such a viewpoint in an 1833 commentary on the relationship of voluntary activity to the Established Church. In *Religious establishments tried by the word of God* [1833], Dealtry urged no one to wait for the Establishment to take initiative when one's conscience bids action.⁷⁷ This is the voluntary manifesto in its basic form. As an operating principle it drew a wide range of critics and criticisms.

Contemporary opposition to the voluntary missionary movement of Simeon's day came from many quarters, some anticipated and some unexpected. Naturally, the bastions of the Establishment provided their share of critics. For example, consider those who opposed the attempts to open India to voluntary

⁷⁶ See Wilberforce, W., *Speeches of William Wilberforce, Esq., on the clause in the East India Bill for promoting the religious instruction and moral improvement of the natives of the British dominions in India [in] ... June and ... July, 1813*, London, 1813.

⁷⁷ Dealtry, W., *Religious establishments tried by the word of God: A sermon preached in St. John's Chapel, Bedford Row, on Wednesday, May 1, 1833, before the Prayer Book and Homily Society*, London, 1833: 26-7.

Ch.4 Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

missionary activity. John Scott Waring, a sharp critic of the evangelical agenda in India, could not conceal his angst over the successes of Clapham's campaigns.⁷⁸ As previously indicated, India House and its allies in Church and Government were more concerned with the political and economic consequences of missionary activity than they were with religious matters per se.⁷⁹

Genuine ecclesiastical challenges also confronted the voluntary movement. Direct resistance -- in England and in India -- to the organization and operation of the CMS are cases in point. The Anglican hierarchy at home frequently attacked the Society and its local associations [i.e., CMAs] as thoroughly uncanonical, with the "Bath controversy" the most famous of such incidents. The CMS's conflicts with the Indian bishops during the first half of the nineteenth century -- and especially with Daniel Wilson -- also demonstrate the difficulties encountered by the evangelical voluntaryists. Both of these sets of circumstances are considered in chapter five because of the direct roles of Charles Simeon and his disciples in these matters.

Voluntaryism also had its critics within the evangelical camp. When Wilberforce and the Clapham Saints finally succeeded in opening India to voluntary missionary activity in 1813, Claudius Buchanan was reported to have offered a pessimistic prognosis: "And now we are likely to be all disgraced. Parliament has opened the door, and who is there to go in? From the Church not

⁷⁸ See Scott Waring, J., *Remarks on Mr. Weyland's letter to Sir Hugh Inglis, Bart., on the state of religion in India*, London, 1813.

⁷⁹ See current chapter, pp.187-9, especially note 41.

one man!"⁸⁰ Although Buchanan was not a committed voluntaryist -- his preference for Indian mission had been via Government patronage -- this comment was not meant to criticize the achievements of Wilberforce and company.⁸¹ Rather, Buchanan was concerned that Anglican voluntary efforts in India would come to nothing for lack of evangelical clergy who would be willing to serve as missionaries in a voluntary society. Within a decade, both aspects of Buchanan's prediction had been realized. As of 1823 only seventeen Anglican clergy were serving with the CMS in India and Ceylon.⁸²

More significantly, as the missionary movement progressed a growing sense of unease developed among some evangelicals. Missionary efforts in India, whether by the CMS or the Serampore Baptists, were not producing the results promised in the propaganda of 1813. This was precisely the point made by John Haldane Stewart and Edward Irving in the early 1820s.

Stewart, a faithful advocate for the CMS, acknowledged the EIC charter renewal of 1813 as a genuine political and structural achievement, but he believed that it subsequently had little impact on the progress of the Gospel in India. This failure was a function of voluntaryism's dependence on human effort as opposed to

⁸⁰ Buchanan's journal entry for July 24, 1813, as quoted in Pearson, H., *Memoirs of the life and writings of the Rev. Claudius Buchanan, D.D., late Vice-Provost of the College of Ft. William in Bengal*, 2nd edition, Oxford, 1817: vol.2, 307.

⁸¹ This could hardly have been the case. Buchanan had written *An apology for promoting Christianity in India* [London, 1813] and *Colonial ecclesiastical establishment* [London, 1813] as propaganda tools for the EIC charter revision campaign.

⁸² An additional six missionaries with Lutheran ordination were also serving in India under the CMS. Church Missionary Society, *The centenary volume of the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East, 1799-1899*, London, 1902: 618-20.

intercessory prayer.⁸³ Similarly, Irving believed that the very limited results of missionary activity in India demonstrated the spiritual bankruptcy of the voluntary system. According to Irving, the expediency of the voluntary societies made a mockery of faith, a view that he portrayed in acerbic tone:

This is the age of expediency ... [and] all institutions are modelled upon the principles of expediency, and carried into effect by the rules of prudence ... We must accommodate ourselves to the absence of ... supernatural means, and go about the work in a reasonable and prudent way, if we would succeed in it; calculate it as the merchant does an adventure; set it forth as a statesman doth a colony; raise the ways and means within the year, and expend them within the year; and so on as long as we get our accounts to balance.⁸⁴

Of course, these early "radical evangelicals" were hardly advocates of a return to the SPCK/SPG models. Irving's answer, for example, was a recovery of what he perceived to be the simple material values of the early church, essentially a missionary asceticism.⁸⁵

Perhaps the most thoughtful caution to Clapham-style voluntary effort came from the famous Scottish evangelical, Thomas Chalmers.⁸⁶ Although he was no

⁸³ Stewart, J.H., *Thoughts on the importance of special prayer for the general outpouring of the Holy Spirit*, London, 1821: 4, 8-9.

⁸⁴ Irving, E., *For missionaries after the apostolical school: A series of orations*, London, 1825: xiv, xvix.

⁸⁵ Irving, op.cit.: 29, 32, 87, 89, 91, 95.

⁸⁶ W.J. Roxborough's thesis is a general source on the connection between Chalmers and the Scottish missionary movement. See: *Thomas Chalmers and the mission of the Church, with special reference to the rise of the missionary movement in Scotland*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1978.

opponent of evangelical voluntaryism, Chalmers agreed in principle with Claudius Buchanan's concerns. Christian benevolence, including mission, is best accomplished via a religious establishment. The focus of Chalmers' concerns were primarily domestic rather than international, but they indicate something of Chalmers' lateral thinking on the subject.

The Scot envisioned a place for voluntary effort only when undertaken by specialized structures within a religious establishment [i.e., a national church]. In his lectures on the nature of national churches, given in London in 1838, Chalmers forcefully argued for religious establishment versus purely voluntary religion. Chalmers acknowledged the need for some voluntary effort in order for the Christian Church to impact society. Nevertheless, he believed that a religious establishment would be a more reliable framework than absolute voluntaryism, especially with respect to meeting expenses.⁸⁷ Thomas Chalmers was hardly motivated in his comments by opposition to the missionary movement, as evidenced by his formative influence on the missionary vision of Alexander Duff and several other students at St. Andrew's.⁸⁸ However, Chalmers was clearly unsure of the prospects for the evangelical agenda if left entirely in voluntary hands.

⁸⁷ Chalmers, T., *Lectures on the establishment and extension of national churches, delivered in London from April 25th - May 12th, 1838*, Glasgow, 1838: 79-80. The lectures were given as an answer to the call for the disestablishment of the Church of England and help demonstrate the extent to which Chalmers' legacy was as much British as it was Scottish.

⁸⁸ See Piggin, S., and J. Roxborough, *The St. Andrews Seven: The finest flowering of missionary zeal in Scottish history*, Edinburgh, 1985.

The Voluntary Movement in Perspective

In tracing the influence of millennial expectations on the origins of the Anglo-American and British missionary movements, de Jong suggested that the development of voluntaryism in Britain followed the same path as the flow of eschatological interest: from Scotland -- where local missionary societies were controlled by local clergy -- to the Scottish churches in London, then to the Baptists in the Midlands, on to the Independents, and then to the Established Church in England and Wales.⁸⁹ By the time these currents touched evangelical Anglicans, the eschatological effects were attenuated for the most part, but the voluntary spirit found a home. As Ervine correctly observed, a commitment to voluntary methods became the hallmark of the evangelicals in the Church of England and shaped them as a party to a far greater extent than did their doctrine.⁹⁰ Why so? Because voluntary efforts created channels for the evangelical agenda while official Anglican structures did not. Voluntary societies made for 'progress.' They were expedient.

As this chapter summarizes, evangelicals in the Church of England had many historical reasons for turning to voluntary methods in order to undertake their missionary agenda. Among the most significant of factors:

The Act of Toleration created a religious pluralism that proved to be a fertile ground for voluntary thinking.

⁸⁹ de Jong, op.cit.: 166ff., 173.

⁹⁰ Ervine, W.J.C., *Doctrine and diplomacy: Some aspects of the life and thought of the Anglican evangelical clergy, 1797-1837*, Cambridge University, Ph.D. thesis, 1979: 212, 214.

Ch.4 Religious Voluntaryism in 19th Century Britain

The functional voluntaryism of the "Venerable Societies" encouraged the formation of evangelical counterparts.

Wesleyan Methodism set a precedent in its attempt to prosecute an alternative Anglican agenda.

The SSPCK demonstrated the extent to which local support could be developed for voluntary causes.

The BMS and the LMS were formed in response to philosophical romanticism and accompanying eschatological expectations.

And the Clapham Saints had concluded that it was impossible to depend on the Establishment to open India to missionary effort.

With little surprise, then, nineteenth century evangelical Anglicans turned to voluntary efforts as a *via media* between their commitment to the missionary agenda and their commitment to the Established Church. It is in such a context that the impact of Charles Simeon on the British missionary movement must be viewed.

Chapter Five

The Strange Case of Charles Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

The year 1788 marked Charles Simeon's admission into the British missionary movement. For Simeon, it began with a letter from an India Company chaplain and former student, David Brown. With that letter, posted from Calcutta in September 1787, came a copy of the "Plan for a Mission to Bengal and Behar" as prepared by Brown and Charles Grant.¹ Across the top of Brown's letter is Simeon's own annotation, written in 1830:

It merely shows how early God enabled me to act for India; to provide for which has now for forty-two years been a principal and incessant object of my care and labour.²

As will be demonstrated in this chapter, the beginnings of Simeon's connection with the Church Missionary Society can be traced from the day Brown and Grant's proposal came into his hands.

It is relevant to ask why Charles Simeon, a relatively new minister facing enormous difficulties in his own parish, would have been attracted to the missionary agenda? In 1788 Simeon had been in his charge for slightly more than

¹ Brown's letter and Simeon's copy of the "1787 Plan" are held in the Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

² *Ibid.* Also quoted in Carus: 61.

five years. At the time he was facing significant opposition from his churchwardens and parishioners over his evangelical preaching and parochial innovations [e.g., the Sunday evening lecture].³ Why would Simeon add further to his docket? Part of the answer surely parallels the justification for Simeon's itinerant preaching in those days: as a diversion from the difficulties of his parish ministry.⁴ But there were other motivations as well. Van den Berg has illustrated how evangelicals were brought into the missionary movement by a number of common factors. These also touched Simeon, but not always in the manner described by van den Berg.

Sources of Simeon's Missionary Agenda

Utilitarianism: Van den Berg correctly suggested that the loss of the American colonies weakened the colonial motives that had influenced the efforts of the Venerable Societies in previous decades. These stimuli were replaced by utilitarian influences. Evangelicals expected missionaries to serve Indian interests far better than armies. This anticipation followed from the emphasis of missionaries on the moral reform of the subcontinent.⁵ Utilitarianism drove such expectations, as demonstrated by evangelical India Company officials such as Charles Grant. Grant's *Observations* [1797] argues for Christian missionary effort as the surest means of achieving the greatest good for India. Grant also believed it

³ See chapter two, pp.74ff.

⁴ See chapter two, p.80.

⁵ Van den Berg quotes David Bogue as an example: "And I frankly acknowledge that it would give me infinitely more delight to hear of a few solitary missionaries crossing the Ghauts, than a well-appointed English army." [*Constrained by Jesus' love: An enquiry into the motives of the missionary awakening in Great Britain in the period between 1698 and 1815*, Kampen, 1956: 144.]

would help produce a positive trade balance for the India Company. The marginalization of India's Hindu culture, a reality not unrecognized by Grant, would be compensated for in the Christianization of India. India's highest interests would be served by the eventual eradication of the national religion, Hinduism. Grant's ethics were clearly utilitarian.⁶

Utilitarian thinking did influence Simeon's expectations for Christian mission. He shared with Grant and Wilberforce a high view of 'Christian' [i.e., British] culture as a force for moral reform, but his expectations for the reforming process were even more idealistic than Grant. Simeon would have tended to ignore, rather than rationalize, the adverse effects of Christianization on committed Hindus.⁷ Simeon's social world-view led him to expect all segments of any society to recognize -- and welcome -- Christianization for its moral benefits. This reasoning paralleled his affirmation of economic ranks as the chief means through which benevolence is dispensed to society. Simeon believed that both rich and poor accept their 'stations' in life because they see the 'benefits' of the social order.⁸ By similar logic, Simeon would have concluded that a non-Christian

⁶ Grant, C., *Observations on the state of society among the Asiatic subjects of Great Britain, particularly with respect to morals and the means of improving it ...*, [London], 1797: 146ff.

Max Warren described the utilitarian interplay between British government and the missionary movement as the "co-efficient[s] of political trusteeship." [Warren, M.A.C., *The missionary movement from Britain in modern history*, London, 1965: 50.]

The term 'utilitarianism' is not being equated with 'pragmatism'. Utilitarianism also has a philosophical content. Collins defines utilitarianism as "the doctrine that right action consists in the greatest good for the greatest number ... without regard to the distribution of benefits and burdens." It is in this sense that Grant was a utilitarian, not merely that he was practical.

⁷ In missiological terms, 'Christianization' is being used as a label for Christian evangelization without regard to cultural contextualization. This is an accurate description of the majority of American and British missionary efforts during the historical period under study.

⁸ Chapter two, pp.88ff.

society could not fail to recognize the 'benefits' of giving up their false religion.⁹ Further, Charles Simeon felt no need to consider whether missionary activity would better serve India than the colonial process. Simeon understood missionary effort to have an intrinsic value of its own because it is derived from the command of God.¹⁰

Simeon departed from classic utilitarianism in the links between moral reform, Christianization, and the political process. While Wilberforce and Grant often spoke and wrote of the political implications for a 'Christian nation', these themes were largely absent from Simeon's writings. It would have been uncharacteristic of Simeon to link religious and political agendas, as utilitarianism required, given his great distrust of the political process.¹¹ His comment on

⁹ Simeon never visited a non-Western context.

¹⁰ Horae: Sermon 1340, "Our duty to the benighted world," vol.11, 305.

The notion of the "command of God" was a general influence on the missionary movement, as noted by van den Berg [op.cit.: 164]. He cites Carey's *Enquiry* [1792] as a chief example of evangelical commitment to Christian mission as a holy imperative.

¹¹ See chapter two, pp.100-1.

Claudius Buchanan's concept of an ecclesiastical establishment for India is a case in point:

I confess, I have always been of the opinion, originally suggested by you and our beloved [Henry] Martyn, respecting Dr. B[uchanan]'s plan of a visible Episcopal Government among you. Power is good, if used for the Lord; but there is great danger of it not being used for truth. People in authority think they must do something; and to obstruct good men and good things, is more popular than to punish neglect, or to censure lukewarmness. Our great comfort is, that God reigneth, and that He will ultimately be glorified in men, whether they will or not.¹²

Simeon certainly did not disapprove of Clapham's moral programme for the nation, but the sphere in which Simeon chose to work was distinctively religious and apolitical in process. It must be said, however, that Simeon's personal agendas would have been impossible to prosecute without reliance on the Christian consensus implicit in the University. He was a benefactor of civil religion in all its political dimensions.

Social Responsibility: With characteristic idealism, Simeon was not greatly moved by van den Berg's "debt" motive, viz., "'penance' for all the faults and wrongs perpetrated by the 'Christian' nations in their colonial and mercantile policy."¹³ Simeon's appreciation for British culture, as noted above, prevented him from viewing his nation's colonial history in such a light. For example, Simeon

¹² Simeon to Thomas Thomason, March 8, 1816, as quoted in Carus: 301.

These comments exemplify the "final-righting-of-all-wrongs" mentality of early nineteenth century evangelicals in the Church of England. Taken out of context and without the references to Martyn, etc., Simeon's remarks could be mistaken for an encouragement to Protestant clergy working under the evils associated with 'popery'.

¹³ van den Berg, op.cit.: 150.

never embraced the abolition of slavery as a cause, although he did not oppose the movement. However, Charles Simeon was greatly moved by a paternal love for non-Christian peoples: "The pitiable ignorance of the heathen" calls Christians to missionary service and to the material support of the missionary societies.¹⁴ Moreover, a lack of missionary resources reflects the heartlessness of the Church: "We do not see people perishing [even as] the remedy [is] in our hands."¹⁵ While Simeon was not driven by a sense of social guilt, love for the 'heathen' was a distinct incentive for him. Simeon thus shared in the motives of humanitarianism and compassion as described by van den Berg.¹⁶

Theocentric Influences: Simeon also departed from van den Berg's model in another fashion. Theocentric motives, viz., mission for the "glory of God,"¹⁷ rarely figured in Simeon's missionary preaching and writings. This is not to suggest that Simeon was unconcerned for God's honour. Van den Berg noted that such disregard would have been impossible for a Calvinist [i.e., like Simeon]. Rather, Simeon preferred to interpret the missionary agenda to his audiences in

¹⁴ Horae: Sermon 361, "The King of Moab sacrifices his son," vol.3, 475.

¹⁵ Horae: Sermon 1756, "The Zeal of Moses," vol.14, 327.

¹⁶ van den Berg, op.cit.: 147, 156.

¹⁷ van den Berg, op.cit.: 155. William Carey's *Enquiry* provides multiple examples of this dynamic.

terms of obedience. This reflected his pietistic concern over the "brutish apathy" he saw in the Established Church:

For ministrations at home, where ease, and honour, and emolument, are found, multitudes are ready to obtrude themselves, and to solicit employment in the sacred office: but when God inquires for labourers in the heathen world ... how few are found who are ready to reply, "Here am I; send me!" ... One, like Moses, has not the qualifications for so great a work: another has some temporal occupation inconsistent with it: and another has married a wife, or intends to do so, and therefore cannot go. Much labour and little pay is not the preferment which the generality of us affect: a thousand difficulties rise up to view; and every mole-hill becomes a mountain.¹⁸

However, Simeon's pietism did expose him to what van den Berg labelled as "ascetic" factors, e.g., missionary accounts.¹⁹ While there is no indication of influence on Simeon by Brainerd's biography, a well known missionary text in his day, he was motivated by contemporary examples of missionary obedience. Henry Martyn, whose own life and biography became a stimulation to others, is a case in point. Martyn attributed the beginnings of his commitment to missionary service to some comments by his mentor at Cambridge [Simeon] on the remarkable work of an English shoemaker in Calcutta.²⁰ Clearly, Charles Simeon had been sufficiently impressed with William Carey and the Serampore Baptists to use them as an example to his own students. Simeon's sermons at Holy Trinity Church

¹⁸ Horae: Sermon 1340, "Our duty to the benighted world," vol.11, 305.

¹⁹ van den Berg, op.cit.: 149.

²⁰ Sargent, J., ed., *Memoir of the Rev. Henry Martyn, late fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain to the Honourable East India Company*, 4th edition, London, 1820: 31. Martyn also made reference to Brainerd's biography.

frequently called his Cambridge congregation to emulate the zeal of the Apostle Paul, Carey, Martyn, David Brown, and the like.²¹

Wider Views of the World: Charles Simeon could not have remained unmoved by the accounts of the "Age of Discovery" due to their wide circulation in the press. But Simeon's response to religious demographics, for example, would have been of the more "sober" kind, such as ascribed by van den Berg to David Bogue.²² However, Simeon would not have joined his student Claudius Buchanan in looking for proto-Christian content in Hinduism.²³ To Simeon, Christianity was true religion while non-Christian religions were false. For example, Simeon's considered Islam to be a religion "... propagated by the sword [that] tended to gratify, [rather] than counteract, the sinful passions of mankind."²⁴ With respect to Hinduism, Simeon completely supported Bishop [of Calcutta] Daniel Wilson's plan to abolish all caste observance in the Indian Church: "... the distinctions of Caste are inadmissible in a Christian community."²⁵ The mild apprehension expressed by

²¹ Horae: Sermon 2041, "St. Paul's zeal illustrated and improved," vol.16, 619.

The frequency of such exhortations in Simeon's public ministry challenges F.D. Coggan's suggestion that Simeon did not significantly stress the Church's responsibility for the world and its needs. [Coggan, F.D., *These were his gifts: A trio of Christian leaders*, The Bishop John Prideaux Lectures for 1974, Exeter, 1974: 16.]

²² van den Berg, op.cit.: 153.

²³ For example, Buchanan treated certain Vedic teachings as "shadowing forth the peculiar doctrines of Christianity." [Buchanan, C., *The star in the East: A sermon preached in the parish-church of St. James, Bristol, on Sunday, February 26, 1809, for the benefit of the "Society for Missions to Africa and the East."*, 2nd cheap edition, corrected, Greenock, 1809: 10.]

²⁴ Horae: Sermon 164, "Aaron's rod that budded," vol.2, 100.

²⁵ Simeon to Wilson, August 19, 1835, as quoted in Carus: 536.

(continued...)

Simeon to the Bishop on the subject reflected no waffling in spiritual terms. Simeon merely wished to urge Wilson not to upset Indian social order unnecessarily:

Respecting the abolition of Caste, I think nothing can be said against it as a measure; but possibly the time, the manner, the means may admit of a diversity of opinion ... I feel myself, that I should rather undermine that horrid structure, than have butted it down at once.²⁶

Clearly, these comments were no affirmation of Hindu religious values. Simeon ascribed no redemptive benefits to any religion but Christianity.²⁷

Eschatology: Related to romanticism, but isolated by van den Berg as a distinct influence on the missionary movement, was evangelical eschatology.²⁸ The impact of this force on Simeon was also mixed. Until the end of the first decade of the nineteenth century, Simeon seems to have been untouched by the post-millennialism that had captured the attention of evangelicals such as William

²⁵(...continued)

Wilson's proposals for the abolition of caste distinctions in the life of the Anglican Church in India are summarized in Wilson, D., *On the distinction of castes in India*, extract from an unidentified periodical, vol. 7, July, 1834: 495.

²⁶ Simeon to Wilson, March 16, 1835, as quoted in Carus: 534.

In a letter to William Carus, dated August 21, 1835, Simeon makes clear that his letters to Wilson on the subject were intended to encourage cultural toleration. [Simeon to Carus, Trinity College MSS, Add.MS b113 f.50.]

²⁷ However, Hole was correct in noting that Simeon did not automatically condemn all 'heathens'. [Hole, C., *The early history of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1896: 79.] His moderate Calvinism made some provision for God's mercy to those beyond the reach of the Church's witness.

²⁸ van den Berg, op.cit.: 160.

Carey, David Bogue, Melville Horne, Thomas Haweis, and John Venn in the 1790s. Eschatological considerations were not significant in shaping Simeon's role in the formation of the CMS. However, eschatology -- especially regarding the relationship of the Jews to the evangelization of the Gentiles -- figured prominently in Simeon's work on behalf of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews. His efforts for the "Jews Society" effectively date from 1813.²⁹ This addition to Simeon's missionary agenda comes at too early a date to be attributed solely to unfulfilled expectations for the CMS. Simeon's extensive service to the Jews Society must have been a function of other factors such as eschatological motives.³⁰

Churchmanship: Finally, ecclesiastical matters also gave a certain impetus to evangelical Anglican missionary effort. Simeon fully shared these concerns. As van den Berg noted, at issue was not a *plantatio ecclesiae* as had been hoped for by the Venerable Societies in the eighteenth century.³¹ The creation of a network of episcopal state churches, with the English Church at its head, was not envisioned by Simeon or his mission colleagues. Rather, evangelical Churchmen were responding to the denominationalism of the Dissenting missionary societies. A key motive shared by Charles Simeon and the other Churchmen who founded the CMS was the creation of an evangelical missionary society that could draw

²⁹ A complete chronology of Simeon's efforts on behalf of the Jews Society may be found in Cartwright, J.B., *Love to the Jewish nation: A sermon preached at the Episcopal Jews' Chapel, Bethnal Green, London, on Sunday morning, November 27th, 1836, on the occasion of the death of the Rev. Charles Simeon*, 2nd edition, London, 1836: 31-4.

³⁰ This subject is explored in some detail in chapter six, pp.378ff. Eschatology was not the only issue.

³¹ van den Berg, *op.cit.*: 159.

upon the clergy of the Established Church for its missionaries.³² Simeon's churchmanship required this emphasis.

These are the primary motives that influenced the missionary agenda of Charles Simeon and, through him, that of his disciples. With this immediate background, and the understanding of Simeon's world-view afforded by the first three chapters, the connection of Simeon to the Church Missionary Society can be examined.

The Beginnings of a Strange Case

What may the reader expect to discover in examining Simeon's connection with the Church Missionary Society? With characteristic paradox, Charles Simeon's very energetic role in the creation of the Society for Missions to Africa and the East was followed by three decades of much less intense activity on behalf of the Society. After 1799 the vicar of Holy Trinity Church played only a limited part in the on-going work of the CMS. Further, all of Simeon's contributions to the Society were selective and not entirely uncritical in nature. What Simeon did do for the CMS, supportively or critically, must be seen in the context of his world-view, viz., his convictions on Christian faith and duty, his commitment to order in church and society, and his drive to make disciples. Only by an assessment of these factors can the strange case of Charles Simeon and the Church Missionary Society be properly understood.

³² This was a stated concern of Simeon, Charles Grant, William Wilberforce, and John Venn as they met at Battersea Rise on November 9, 1797. They gathered to discuss the formation of a missionary society for Churchmen. [Hole, op.cit.: 28; and Wilberforce, R., and S. Wilberforce, *The life of William Wilberforce*, 2nd edition, London, 1838: vol.2, 251.]

First Effort: The "1787 Plan"

The Wesleyans really were first off the mark in the race to establish an evangelical missionary movement from Britain. Fully eight years ahead of Carey and the Baptists, at least one Methodist was actively seeking to send missionaries to India. In 1784 and again in 1786, Thomas Coke was in correspondence with an India Company official in Calcutta, Charles Grant, in order arrange for transit licences for Methodist missionaries.³³ Coke attracted Grant's attention, if not also his encouragement.³⁴ Levee Kadenge has determined that Coke's missionary enthusiasm produced a degree of distrust in Wesley.³⁵ As a result Coke's plans failed to secure financial support from Wesley or the Conference.³⁶ Coke's missionary agenda was delayed for three decades.³⁷ However, Coke's temporary failure stimulated Charles Grant to act on his own. Grant's first instinct was to

³³ Grant's journal entry for November 21, 1784, and Coke's letter to Grant, dated January 25, 1786; as quoted in Morris, H., *The life of Charles Grant: Sometime member of Parliament for Inverness-Shire and director of the East India Company*, London, 1904: 99.

³⁴ This was Morris' conclusion. [Op.cit.: 99-101.]

³⁵ Kadenge, L.T.C., *The origins and the early development of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society*, University of Aberdeen, M.Th. thesis, 1986: 84.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Kadenge [Ibid.] concludes that Coke "became a sort of voluntary society himself," making five visits to the West Indies [1786, 1788, 1790, 1792, and 1793] to supervise the Methodist work there. Nevertheless, the Methodists did not form their missionary society until 1817. In the interim Coke attempted to inject himself into the Indian scene by volunteering in 1813 to serve as the first Bishop of Calcutta. [Vickers, J., *Thomas Coke: Apostle of Methodism*, London, 1969: 346.] Coke died en route to Ceylon in 1814 in a last personal attempt to enter missionary service.

arrange for the passage of two missionaries to serve through his private patronage.³⁸ He eventually took this course of action, but not until after a more grand approach.

In 1786 David Brown arrived in Calcutta to serve as chaplain to the Military Orphan House. Brown immediately met three India Company officials who were warm evangelicals: William Chambers, George Udny, and Charles Grant. Within three days Brown was appointed to the more prestigious post of chaplain to the garrison at Ft. William. This quick advancement came through the patronage of Grant.³⁹ Sharing an evangelical spirit, and motivated [through Grant] by the failure of Coke's initial efforts, the four men drew up a "Plan for a Mission to Bengal and Behar."⁴⁰ The essence of the "Plan" was a proposal for India Company patronage of missionaries in the same way as the EIC supported its chaplains. The scheme called for the posting of an English clergyman in each of

³⁸ Hole, op.cit.: 13. Apparently Grant was confident of his ability to arrange for the required Company licenses required for passage to India.

³⁹ The directors of the orphanage were nonplussed. See [Simeon, C., ed.], *Memorial sketches of the Rev. David Brown: With a selection of his sermons preached at Calcutta*, London, 1816: 8-9; and Hyde, H.B., *Parochial annals of Bengal: Being a history of the Bengal ecclesiastical establishment of the honorable East India Company in the 17th and 18th centuries: Compiled from original sources*, published for private circulation, Calcutta, 1901: 204-5.

⁴⁰ There has been some debate as to the actual authorship of the "Plan." Morris credited Grant as the final editor [op.cit.: 103]. E.T. Sandys gave the recognition to Brown on the assumption that Grant would not have limited missionaries to ministers of the Established Church. [Sandys, E.T., *One hundred and forty-five years at the Old or Mission Church, Calcutta*, Calcutta, 1916: 14.] Simeon believed Brown to be the author because the "Plan" came to him covered by a letter from him. [Carus:60-3.] The copy in the Simeon MSS at Ridley Hall does not clarify things as the handwriting does not resemble either Brown's or Grant's. This merely confirms that Simeon received a copy. 'Seniority' or 'qualification' arguments also are inconclusive. While Grant was the senior member of the group in terms of EIC rank, Brown was the only member with the professional qualifications to draft a plan with ecclesiastical implications. The best answer seems to be the one suggested by the "Plan" itself. It was a joint effort by Brown, Chambers, Grant, and Udny.

the eight divisions of Bengal and Behar "to establish schools, employ catechists, and establish churches."

With the "Plan" drafted, it remained to secure the approval of the Company's Court of Directors. Being already an adept politician, Grant knew that Company approval would be gained through Parliamentary influence. Thus, on September 17, 1787, Grant and company sent the "Plan" to William Wilberforce, then Member for the county of Yorkshire and the leading evangelical in Parliament.⁴¹ In recognition of the ecclesiastical infrastructure of the "Plan," a copy of the proposal was forwarded to the Archbishop of Canterbury.⁴² Further religious input was sought through copies to Thomas Raikes and the Countess of Huntingdon.⁴³

Then, being pragmatic men, Grant and Brown also considered the consequences of success. If Wilberforce was victorious and the Court agreed to patronize missionaries, what kind of missionaries were the Directors likely to approve? The answer would naturally parallel Company policy on chaplains. The

⁴¹ Covered by Grant's letter to Wilberforce of the same date, as cited in Morris, *op.cit.*: 107-17.

⁴² As indicated on Simeon's copy of the "Plan," Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

⁴³ Grant to Raikes, dated September 15, 1787, as cited in Morris, *op.cit.*: 117. The copy to the Countess of Huntingdon is noted on Simeon's copy, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

Raikes had the wisdom to send a copy to the Bishop of London, Beilby Porteus. [Raikes to Grant, April 5, 1788, as cited in Morris, *op.cit.*] Apart from the fact that the Bishop of London would have had episcopal oversight of any Anglican clergy who might serve as missionaries in India, Raikes was apparently aware of Porteus' evangelical sympathies. No doubt he reasoned that an ally in the Lords would not hurt the cause.

EIC would employ Churchmen.⁴⁴ How would evangelical Anglican clergy come to India? By the encouragement of their elders, mentors, and friends. The "Plan" needed a clerical agent in England, one who could influence senior ministers to recommend India to their juniors, and one who might challenge those training for holy orders to consider serving the Established Church as a missionary. A name came to the mind of David Brown in the midst of this discussion: Charles Simeon, vicar of Holy Trinity Church, and his own mentor in Cambridge.⁴⁵ In September of 1787, Brown wrote to Simeon on behalf of the authors of the "Plan," inviting him to serve as their clerical agent in England.

His own autobiography and other contemporary sources agree that Charles Simeon rose to the challenge of his new 'diocese'.⁴⁶ John Newton, for example,

⁴⁴ Those who might suggest that the authors of the "1787 Plan" intended to make provision for the patronage of Dissenting missionaries by the India Company are mistaken. The "Plan" document makes no such suggestion. Moreover, Grant's positive response to Coke is no precedent. It is likely that Grant viewed Coke as an evangelical Churchman. Coke held Anglican orders and Methodism had not yet been "cast out of the fold" of the Established Church. Nor was Grant's later patronage of John Thomas, a Nonconformist, significant in this regard. Grant and Brown, and almost all evangelical Churchmen, received evangelical Dissenters as brothers and sisters in a common spiritual cause. Thus Grant could privately support the work of a Baptist, and subsequently terminate that support, without making an ecclesiastical statement in his own mind. But Grant and Brown were also part of the Establishment. As such they knew full well that the missionary patronage of the Establishment, if ever granted, would be limited to Churchmen.

⁴⁵ Brown's appreciation for Simeon, as his spiritual and professional mentor, is one of the subjects of his letter to Simeon, dated December 1809. [Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.] Simeon recognized the potential significance of his relationship with Brown in a letter to John Venn, dated April 13, 1784. [Venn MSS, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.81 C22.]

⁴⁶ The term is Simeon's own, from notes made on the letter from Brown that accompanied his copy of the "Plan." [Op.cit.] That Simeon saw India as a special object of his evangelical influence is clear in his autobiography in Carus, pp.60-3. Simeon found himself obliged to reclassify India as his 'province' upon the creation of the Indian episcopate. See also: Moule, H.C.G., *Charles Simeon*, Leaders of Religion, edited by H.C. Beeching, London, 1892: 111.

noted Simeon's efforts to find clergy for Bengal in 1788.⁴⁷ As it turned out, Wilberforce was unsuccessful in stimulating Parliamentary interest in the "Plan." Although the reasons for this failure have never been clearly researched, it cannot have been for lack of influence. Wilberforce was a Parliamentary darling since his remarkable election as Member for Yorkshire in 1784.⁴⁸ On the heels of such a victory, Wilberforce could certainly have secured a hearing for the "Plan" if he had been determined to do so. Wilberforce also had the ear of the Prime Minister, William Pitt [the younger]. Multiple factors probably intervened. Wilberforce's sensitivity to the missionary question was as yet undeveloped. It certainly was not an issue that figured much in his correspondence for 1788. More important, Wilberforce was becoming a consummate politician. India was on Parliament's mind in 1788, but it was the behaviour of Warren Hastings as Governor-General -- not missionary activity -- that had Parliament's attention.⁴⁹ Wilberforce instinctively knew that the missionary question would need to wait its turn. As a result the "1787 Plan" collapsed.

But the "Plan" was not without its effects. First, Grant and Brown were undeterred by the outcome of their efforts. They began to consider missionary

⁴⁷ Newton to William Wilberforce, September 12, 1788, as quoted in Wilberforce, R.I., and S. Wilberforce, eds., *The correspondence of William Wilberforce*, London, 1840: vol.1, 58.

⁴⁸ Wilberforce's oratory became famous through his campaign speeches, especially the one at the Castle Yard at York on March 25, 1784. See Coupland, R., *Wilberforce*, 2nd edition, London, 1945: 7-9.

⁴⁹ Hastings was impeached by Parliament for gross misconduct in a seven-year trial beginning in 1788. He was eventually acquitted. The trial, a political affair, was part of the larger Parliamentary agenda known as the "Indian Question." At issue was how and when [not whether] Parliament would exercise British rule in India. See Philips, C.H., *The East India Company, 1784-1834*, Manchester, 1940, Reprint, Manchester, 1961.

effort by private patronage.⁵⁰ Second, the Serampore Baptists were relieved, having been uncomfortable with the possible association of missionary activity with the Indian Government.⁵¹ Still, it was not total failure for the missionary agenda of evangelical Churchmen. The "Plan" worked its influence on Wilberforce, instilling in Clapham's leader the dream of a British missionary movement. This new vision clearly revealed itself in 1793. Fourth, and even more important for this study, Charles Simeon's name became permanently associated with the missionary agenda through his efforts on behalf of the "Plan." It is not quite accurate to claim that Simeon's actions in 1788 led directly to the founding of the CMS, as Morris has suggested.⁵² At that point his activities were not in support of voluntary missionary activity, but the course was being set.

⁵⁰ Grant, in particular, had been considering this course ever since Coke's failure. In 1786 Grant met John Thomas, a physician and a Nonconformist. He discussed with Thomas the possibility of a private mission at Gomalty. Grant had invested in a trading concern there and was prepared to use £1,000 of the proceeds to patronize the mission. After the failure of the "1787 Plan," Thomas was employed by Grant as a missionary at Gomalty. His private mission collapsed in 1790 when Grant and Thomas parted company in a dispute over Thomas' place of residence. Grant returned to England in the same year, marking an end to his experiment. The story is told in Morris [op.cit.] and elsewhere.

⁵¹ John Thomas expressed concern over this prospect even before the "Plan" was circulated in England. [Thomas - Grant, January 11, 1787; and Thomas to a Mr. Stennett, dated 1788; both letters as quoted in Morris, op.cit.: 104.] Nearly two decades later, even after evangelical Churchmen had taken a voluntary course with the CMS, Andrew Fuller would raise the same issue with Brown. [Fuller - Brown, September 24, 1800, as quoted in Davidson, A.K., *The development and influence of the British missionary movement's attitudes towards India, 1786-1830*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1973: 60.] The fear that Churchmen would continue to seek the advantage of Establishment patronage, and in doing so hinder the access of Dissenting missionaries to India, haunted the Baptists. In fairness to Fuller, Carey, and company, the civil disabilities associated with religious dissent in Britain gave them reason to be concerned.

⁵² Morris, op.cit.: 121. This conclusion is premature if drawn only from the facts of 1787-8.

The Interlude of 1789-1794

The aborted effort to secure support for Grant and Brown's "1787 Plan" was not the very first expression of formal missionary interest by evangelical Anglicans. That honour must be given to the Churchmen who participated in the meeting of the Eclectic Society on October 30, 1786. The Eclectic, which then had been meeting for three years, was aptly named. Comprised of evangelical clergy and laity, and drawn from Churchmen and Dissenters, the group gathered regularly to discuss a selected issue under the guidance of a rotating moderator. Hole has suggested that the question of evangelical missionary activity was first discussed by Churchmen at this meeting of the group.⁵³ Simeon was not present on this occasion. However, the next time the missionary agenda was discussed by the Eclectic, on February 16, 1789, Simeon was present. This meeting received a report on the failure of the "1787 Plan," and it is likely that Simeon had much to say in this regard.⁵⁴ In all probability, Simeon was invited to attend the meeting because of his role in the "Plan." Apparently the effect of Simeon's report was not too remarkable. The Eclectic did not take up the missionary question again until October 24, 1791, a meeting Simeon did not attend.⁵⁵

This fact uncovers the first wrinkle in the history of Simeon's missionary advocacy. From the 1789 meeting of the Eclectic Society until 1795, Charles

⁵³ Hole, op.cit.: 6. The best source on the religious discussions of the Eclectic Society is Pratt, J.H., ed., *Eclectic notes: or, Notes of discussions on religious topics at the meetings of the Eclectic Society, London, during the years 1798-1814*, 2nd edition, London, 1865. Unfortunately this work does not deal with meetings prior to 1798.

⁵⁴ Hole, op.cit.: 18. Simeon was not a member of the Eclectic Society at the time. He attended as a guest.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

Ch.5 Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

Simeon appears to have had little involvement in the growing missionary movement. This cannot be attributed to a general lack of missionary-related activity in Britain. For example, in 1792 the Baptist Missionary Society was formed. Moreover, the following year witnessed Wilberforce's first attempt to open India to British missionaries. The Clapham leader's "pious clauses," which he hoped to insert into the India Company charter during its bi-decadal review by Parliament, were rejected at the last moment. Defeat came through the lobbying efforts of the EIC Court of Directors.⁵⁶ Simeon was silent on the subject immediately before and after Wilberforce's rebuff. Why so? It is also curious that the creation of the BMS did not stimulate some response from Simeon. Can his missionary inactivity from late 1789 through mid-1795 be explained?

The answers to this question do not always relate to the missionary movement directly. First, the BMS was not really a problem for evangelical Churchmen in 1792. Unlike the later uncertainty regarding the relationship of Churchmen to the [London] Missionary Society, there was never any question of Anglicans serving with the BMS. As previously noted, Simeon deeply appreciated the work of the Serampore Baptists, but he never expected his students or parishioners to patronize or serve in a strictly Nonconformist society.⁵⁷ This would explain why Simeon felt no need to oppose the formation of the BMS. Indeed, he did not object to it. Moreover, he had no reason -- at the time -- to advocate a voluntary missionary society for Churchmen. The patronage of Anglican missionaries by the Establishment was precisely the outcome hoped for

⁵⁶ The story is to be found in many places. For example, see Bradley, I., *The politics of godliness: evangelicals in Parliament, 1784-1832*, Oxford University, D. Phil. thesis, 1974; and Howse, E.M., *Saints in politics: The "Clapham Sect" and the growth of freedom*, Toronto, 1952.

⁵⁷ See current chapter, pp.234,237-9.

through Wilberforce and company in the 1793 renewal of the EIC charter. If the Clapham agenda succeeded then there would be no need for a voluntary missionary society for evangelical Anglicans, at least with regard to India. With what evangelicals believed were good prospects for Wilberforce's efforts, there would have been no felt need for a public campaign to which Simeon could have contributed. The fact that the "pious clauses" were not derailed until almost the last moment supports this view. Thus, only Simeon's quiescence after Wilberforce's defeat needs an answer.

The explanation becomes self-evident when one considers the wider events of 1792-3 and their effect on an evangelical minister in a centre of the Establishment such as Cambridge. As indicated at an earlier point in this study, the first decade or so of Simeon's parochial ministry was marked by a significant degree of irregular churchmanship within and without his parish.⁵⁸ With the growing "Reign of Terror" on the Continent, combined with increasing prospects for war with France, all social irregularities -- ecclesiastical or political -- were greeted by local authorities and 'loyal' citizens with great suspicion. For example, angry mobs of townspeople harassed and threatened Simeon's students as they returned to their lodgings after his Sunday evening lecture. The meeting had been labelled as a conventicle by some. In view of the intensity of public opposition to dissent of any sort, Simeon discontinued the lecture in the interest of the safety of his students.⁵⁹ Nor was it the time to openly criticize Parliament for protecting the interests of an established institution like the East India Company. The only British missionaries in India at the time were Dissenters. In this light, and in arguing for missionary access to India, it would have been difficult to keep the

⁵⁸ See chapter two, pp.74ff.

⁵⁹ See chapter two, pp.82-3.

public's focus on missionary issues and away from political ones. 1793 was no year for an evangelical Churchman -- already under some suspicion -- to risk so much for an issue that could not be addressed again for two decades. Simeon kept quiet for the time being.

In the same way that the collapse of the "1787 Plan" stimulated subsequent efforts, Wilberforce's failure to secure the patronage of the Establishment for missionary work in India had some profound consequences for the future. First, the Clapham leader realized that the key to success for the evangelical agenda in Parliament lay not in argument and debate, but in public opinion.⁶⁰ William Wilberforce applied this lesson with a vengeance in the abolition campaign of 1807 and the 1813 EIC charter renewal. Second, and with very direct effect on the British missionary movement, Wilberforce gave up on the notion of Establishment patronage for missionary activity. He was not alone. Once clear of the social difficulties of 1792-3, Charles Simeon also joined the Clapham Saints in the voluntary camp. The first opportunity to test these waters came in 1795. The events of this year put Simeon on a direct course toward the formation of a voluntary missionary society for Churchmen.

Simeon's Role in the Formation of the CMS

Voluntaryism is not merely about money.⁶¹ Nevertheless, it was a sum of money that stirred Charles Simeon to action in 1795. A portion of the estate of Joseph Jane, Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford, had been designated for the support

⁶⁰ Bradley, op.cit.: 92ff., 97.

⁶¹ See chapter four, p.177.

Ch.5 Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

of evangelical causes. A meeting of the Rauceby Clerical Society was held on May 6-7 to consider the disposition of the funds, some £4,000. The gathering was chaired by the Rev. John Pugh, chief executor of Jane's estate. Simeon attended in order to advocate the use of the funds for missionary purposes.⁶²

Although the group adjourned its first meeting without taking a decision on Jane's legacy, events soon intervened. The Rauceby group reconvened on September 30, nine days after the formation of the [London] Missionary Society. Missionary concerns and the Jane legacy were again on the agenda. The meeting was somewhat reactionary. It was still hoped by many at Rauceby, including Simeon, that evangelical Churchmen would find a channel for missionary service that was compatible with the Established Church. Thus Simeon proposed that the Jane legacy be used to establish a training institution to equip Churchmen for missionary service:

The discussion was begun upon this question: "Is it practicable to send out a missionary? -- and when? -- and how can it be done to the greatest advantage? ... Is it practicable and expedient to form an Institution for educating young men professedly with a view to their becoming missionaries under the sanction of the Established Church?"⁶³

But the newly-founded LMS was not the channel through which Simeon envisioned the school's graduates would serve. Nor was he thinking of encouraging evangelicals to apply to the SPCK or the SPG. Further, the notion of direct patronage of missionaries by such as the India Company was a dead issue after

⁶² Hole, *op.cit.*: 24. The period was marked by the formation of such groups in many places. The societies served as a support infrastructure for evangelical Anglican clergy. Simeon's frequent participation in these founding meetings has already been noted. [See chapter three, pp.154ff.]

⁶³ Carus: 86. Extracted from four pages of detailed notes from the meeting.

1793. Clearly, Charles Simeon was advocating a missionary society for evangelical Churchmen that had the prospect of nominal approval by the hierarchy of the Church of England.

Once more the Rauceby group adjourned without a decision. There was uncertainty over the availability of "proper men," the possibility that the educational process might adversely affect their "missionary zeal," and whether or not use of the Jane legacy should be limited to the training of Churchmen.⁶⁴ Moreover, some wondered if the funds might find better use "at home." The Rauceby group also wished to secure the advice of the Elland and Eclectic associations before acting on the disposition of the Jane legacy.

Despite the ambiguity of the outcome of the second Rauceby meeting, these events highlight an important development. Charles Simeon had -- at last -- affirmed a voluntary course for the evangelical Anglican missionary movement. Significantly, the vicar of Holy Trinity Church openly embraced voluntarism at the very time he was distancing himself from his ecclesiastically irregular past. He had finally been made Lecturer for the parish in 1794 and was at peace, more or less, with his churchwardens.⁶⁵ Simeon had made such progress by curtailing his itinerant preaching and by limiting his innovations to the canonical spheres of his parish and college.⁶⁶ Thus, with characteristic paradox, Simeon must not have

⁶⁴ Hole, *op.cit.*: 24. Some among the Rauceby group must have held out hope for the participation of evangelical Churchmen in the LMS, owing to its [then] 'undenominational' basis.

⁶⁵ See Carus: 108ff.

⁶⁶ Two preaching tours in Scotland in the summers of 1796 and 1797, plus his participation in various clerical societies, 'compensated' for these limitations. Both diversions side-stepped serious criticism by High Churchmen. For a small group of ministers of the Established Church to gather occasionally violated no canon law as long as they did not conduct a worship service. And preaching in Scotland was technically a non-issue, in ecclesiastical terms, as the lands north of the
(continued...)

believed that his support for a voluntary missionary society for Churchmen would be viewed as a contradiction of his churchmanship. Either this is the case, or Simeon intended to exchange one set of ecclesiastical problems for another. The latter is unlikely.

Unfortunately, by the end of 1795 the prospects for using the Jane legacy for missionary purposes had collapsed. According to Hole, John Pugh was never persuaded of the viability of Simeon's missionary plans. Therefore Pugh and his fellow executors used Jane's legacy to create the Bristol Clerical Society and to endow its efforts to secure University education for evangelicals.⁶⁷ Simeon was discouraged by the indifference of his colleagues to the missionary agenda.

Impressions of apathy were reinforced when the Eclectic Society took up the matter for the fourth time on February 8, 1796. Simeon came to the meeting waving the missionary flag: "With what propriety, and in what mode, can a mission be attempted to the heathens from the Established Church?" he asked.⁶⁸ The general response from the Churchmen present was anxiety over "interfering with the SPCK and the SPG ... because the bishops would be likely to take alarm

⁶⁶(...continued)

border were outwith the jurisdiction of the hierarchy of the Church of England. In a feat of imaginative logic, Simeon invoked a bit of the Act of Union to positively justify his pulpitering in Scotland: "Where the king must worship, a[n English] clergyman may preach." [Carus: 90.]

It must be said that Simeon's attempts to strengthen his ecclesiastical reputation did not meet with success in every case. Consider, for example, Benjamin Flower's charges of uncanonical behaviour in 1807 issues of the *Cambridge Intelligencer*.

⁶⁷ Hole, op.cit.: 25. The Bristol Clerical Society thus paralleled the purposes of the Elland Clerical Society.

⁶⁸ Carus: 88.

at the multiplication of such societies."⁶⁹ Only Thomas Scott and Basil Woodd shared Simeon's interest in the formation of an evangelical Anglican missionary society.⁷⁰ The lack of concern of his fellow evangelical ministers produced yet another course correction for Simeon's missionary efforts. Simeon desperately wanted to find some like-minded people who were ready to act. In due course he did. They resided in a London suburb, south of the Thames, at Clapham.

The connection between the CMS and the Clapham Saints has been well documented in all the histories of the Society. In 1790 Charles Grant returned to Britain from India. Soon after he took residence in London to begin a notable period of service at India House.⁷¹ Grant and Wilberforce met and quickly discovered that they shared a common faith and a common commitment to the developing missionary movement. In Henry Thornton of Clapham the two men found a man of business with similar convictions. Thornton's home on Clapham Common, Battersea Rise, soon became a meeting point for the small but highly influential group of evangelicals known as the "Saints" or the "Sect," depending on one's sympathies. Wilberforce resided at Battersea Rise at the time, Grant took a house on the Common, John Venn was made rector of the parish in 1792, and others such as James Stephen and Zachary Macaulay were drawn into the Clapham orbit.⁷²

⁶⁹ Carus: 89.

⁷⁰ Carus: 89; and Hole, op.cit.: 25.

⁷¹ Grant was elected to the Court of Directors in 1794, serving as its chairman in 1805-6, 1809-10, and 1815-16.

⁷² Sir James Stephen's *Essays in ecclesiastical biography* [2 vols., London, 1849] includes a fascinating and not entirely uncritical look at the Clapham evangelicals. The author was the son of one of the "Saints." See also: Bradley, I., *The politics of godliness: Evangelicals in Parliament*,
(continued...)

It is no secret that Charles Simeon participated on at least two occasions in Clapham discussions on the "mission business," to use Wilberforce's words. This should also be of little surprise. Simeon was well-acquainted with John Venn through his contact with the entire Venn family and he had been in regular contact with Grant since his return from India.⁷³ As Venn was the only clergyman who was a regular member of the Clapham Saints, Wilberforce and company recognized their need for the support of other evangelical clergy. Once again Simeon was called upon to play the role of clerical agent. On July 20, 1797, Simeon joined Grant and Wilberforce for deliberations over dinner. This meeting was followed by another on November 9 in which John Venn also participated.⁷⁴ These gatherings were called to consider how to move the Established Church toward missionary activity. Simeon's personal agenda included dissuading Clapham from openly advocating Anglican participation with 'undenominational' voluntary societies such as the LMS. Wilberforce and his colleagues, being broad-minded in ecclesiastical terms, were attracted by the expediency of joint effort with evangelical Dissenters. But Simeon knew that many evangelical clergy in the Church of England would be unable to support such an arrangement, however

⁷²(...continued)

1784-1832, Oxford University, D. Phil. thesis, 1974; Hennell, M., *John Venn and the Clapham Sect*, London, 1958; Howse, E.M., *Saints in politics: The "Clapham Sect" and the growth of freedom*, Toronto, 1952; and Tolley, C.J., *The legacy of evangelicalism in the lives and writings of certain descendants of the Clapham Sect, with special reference to biographical literature*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1980.

⁷³ Although Simeon did not meet Grant in person until he visited Cambridge in October 1792. It was on this occasion that Simeon introduced Grant to Claudius Buchanan. [Morris, H., *Charles Grant, the friend of William Wilberforce and Henry Thornton*, London, 1898: 40.] Simeon corresponded regularly with Grant until the his death in 1823.

⁷⁴ Hole, op.cit.: 28.

efficient. Through these encounters Wilberforce discovered the extent to which "Simeon [was] in earnest" vis-à-vis the missionary agenda.⁷⁵

One question generated by the sequence of events leading to the formation of the CMS has to do with the gaps of time between significant points of involvement for Simeon. For example, seventeen months passed between the meeting of the Eclectic that so discouraged Simeon [February 1796] and the first dinner meeting at Clapham. Another five months would pass before the second conclave at Battersea Rise. If Simeon was all that interested or involved, why is there no evidence of more frequent activity? There are a number of answers to such a question.

First, the context in which the missionary movement began was pre-industrial. The centre of gravity for the "mission business" was London, not Cambridge. Cambridge and "town," as London was called, were separated by a day's ride by coach or horseback.⁷⁶ Simeon's responsibilities to his parish and his college did not allow him to make the trip up to London regularly.

Second, and related to the preceding point, the missionary question and what was to become the CMS were not Simeon's only concerns. Charles Simeon was a parish minister and an educator. As indicated in chapter three, his personal

⁷⁵ Wilberforce, R., and S. Wilberforce, *The life of William Wilberforce*, 2nd edition, London, 1838: vol.2, 251.

Hole suggested that Wilberforce et al. did, indeed, turn away from cooperation with the LMS following the meetings at Clapham. He cited an anonymous letter from a London clergyman [John Venn?] to William Goode, dated December 15, that spoke of the impending formation of a "new society for the Establishment." Hole believed that this letter was an outcome of the November 9 gathering at Battersea Rise. [Hole, op.cit.: 29.]

⁷⁶ This may continue to sound familiar to veterans of British Rail's Network Southeast or the M11.

agenda was very broad. For example, during the decade leading up to the formation of the CMS, Simeon translated Claude's *Essay*, innovated the sermon "skeleton" as a teaching tool, instituted his sermon class, and wrote the five hundred sermon outlines that would be published as *Helps to composition* in 1801.⁷⁷ These were time-consuming efforts.

Third, as one of Clapham's chief backers among the clergy, most of Simeon's work on behalf of the developing missionary movement was advocacy of the cause to fellow ministers and students. This he undertook through personal contacts in Cambridge, while he travelled southern England in support of the formation of clerical societies, and through the post. According to Hennell, Simeon gave enormous amounts of time to meetings with evangelical clergy.⁷⁸ As illustrated above, Simeon used these events to promote the missionary cause. Simeon was also known for his prolific correspondence, much of which touched on missionary matters.⁷⁹ In between the crucial milestones in the process, such as the meetings of the Eclectic and at Clapham, Simeon was busy doing his job as clerical agent. The milestones themselves marked course corrections in strategy as opposed to the context in which Simeon exercised his primary role in the development of the missionary movement.

⁷⁷ See chapter three, p.165.

⁷⁸ See Hennell's quotation in chapter three, p.155.

⁷⁹ 369 letters written by Simeon were examined in the course of this study. Of these, fully 36% touch on the missionary movement. If this ratio is applied to the estimated 7,000 thousand letters written by Simeon in the course of his life, he may have written as many as 2,500 letters dealing at least in part with missionary matters. No eighteenth or nineteenth century evangelical Anglican residing in Britain compares with Simeon in these terms, except those such as Josiah Pratt and Henry Venn [the younger] who directly served the CMS in a professional capacity.

Ch.5 Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

The next such milestone arrived sixteen months after the private meetings at Battersea Rise. The Eclectic Society planned to discuss the missionary question once again on February 18, 1799.⁸⁰ Simeon came to London to urge the Eclectic to recognize that the LMS was not a channel through which Churchmen could work. A genuinely Anglican society was needed.⁸¹ As previously noted, Simeon had already persuaded his Clapham colleagues that open cooperation with Dissenters in a missionary society would fail. To bring the highly influential Eclectic Society to the same conclusion was his next objective.

This ambition proved to be relatively easy to achieve. Significant resistance to cooperation with Dissenters had become prevalent among the most distinguished of evangelical ministers in the Church of England. Respected clergymen such as John Newton and Thomas Robinson feared giving any impression of alliance with 'democratic' [i.e., Dissenting] forces. They were also troubled by the tensions between the Baptists and the government of the Sierra Leone colony. And they

⁸⁰ The date is from Hole [op.cit.: 29]. Carus dates the meeting as February 23, suggesting that more than one gathering may have been held at that time. [Carus: 124.]

⁸¹ It is important to note that Simeon was not opposed to the LMS in itself. For example, in September of 1799 Simeon sent a personal word of encouragement to the LMS. [Minutes of the LMS General Committee, September 9, 1799, as quoted in Martin, R.H., *The pan-evangelical impulse in Britain, 1795-1830: With special reference to four London societies*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1974: 116.] But it was not possible for Simeon to advocate the involvement of Churchmen in the Society by his personal example or recommendation. For a number of years the leaders of the LMS regularly tried to involve Simeon in the work of the Society, but without success. For example, Simeon declined to preach for the LMS in 1805. [Minutes of the LMS General Committee, February 25, 1805, as quoted in Martin, op.cit.: 120.]

Unquestionably, there were circumstances in which Simeon affirmed direct cooperation and common effort with evangelical Dissenters. His support of the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS) is a case in point. Simeon could recommend the BFBS because it was an association of evangelically-minded people with the translation and distribution of the Scriptures in view. The BFBS was not concerned with establishing ecclesiastical structures [i.e., churches]. This was the basis upon which the Bible Society declared itself not to be a "religious" society. [Simeon, C., *The excellency of the Liturgy in four discourses ...: To which is prefixed an answer to Dr. Marsh's inquiry, respecting "The neglecting to give the Prayer Book with the Bible,"* Cambridge, 1812: 4 and passim.]

were unwilling to contribute indirectly to the formation of Nonconformist congregations overseas.⁸² These concerns were not merely recent developments. For example, Joseph Jane had specifically requested that his £4,000 legacy be used in support of Anglican causes for similar reasons.⁸³ It was also increasingly feared that an 'undenominational' society would never satisfy the bishops of the Church of England.

What Simeon believed was needed, and what he hoped the Eclectic Society would endorse, was a new missionary society for evangelical Churchmen. Simeon secured just such a sanction. In light of the doubts among evangelical ministers and the promise of opposition from the hierarchy of the Church, the Eclectic Society went on record in opposition to formal evangelical Anglican involvement in the LMS.⁸⁴ This outcome would have been particularly encouraging to Simeon. His fundamental commitment to social order -- and to church order by implication -- would not allow him to support a plan [i.e., cooperation with the LMS] that was certainly bound for ecclesiastical failure. Through Simeon's encouragement, and with the support of Clapham personalities such as John Venn, the Eclectic affirmed the need for a voluntary missionary society operated by and

⁸² With respect to the Baptists and Sierra Leone, the trouble stemmed from open criticism of episcopacy and infant baptism by Dissenting missionaries in the colony. Martin has looked closely at the failure of the LMS to gain the support of the evangelicals in the Church of England. See Martin, R.H., *The pan-evangelical impulse in Britain, 1795-1830: With special reference to four London societies*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1974: 90-3.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ As noted by Simeon in his autobiography. [Carus: 124.] It is ironic that an LMS personality came to the rescue of the CMS when the younger society was stalled for lack of personnel. Charles Steinkopff, foreign secretary for the LMS, helped the CMS to employ its first missionaries in 1804, a group of German Lutherans who were willing to go to Sierra Leone. [Hole, op.cit.: 76ff.; and Martin, op.cit.: 116.]

for Churchmen.⁸⁵ Unfortunately, the Eclectic would "do no more than be a father to such a plan," in the words of Simeon.⁸⁶ An entirely separate organization would be required.

One month later, on March 18, the Eclectic Society reconvened again to consider the missionary question. Simeon came to the meeting in great frustration. In 1788 it had become clear that Establishment structures such as the India Company could not be relied upon to provide avenues for missionary work in their domains. The events of 1793 had proved that Parliament did not have the will to endorse government patronage of missionaries in British dominions. A voluntary course was required. For four years, from 1795-1799, Simeon had been making every effort to encourage evangelical Churchmen to form a structure parallel to the LMS, only to be met by indifference to the missionary cause. Then, with the prospects for a society for Churchmen on the near horizon, another hindrance arose. For years it had been known that evangelical Anglican clergy and those training for ministry at the Universities would not be easily induced to volunteer for missionary service. Such a vocation lacked status and promise.⁸⁷ Apparently some Eclectic members were advocating further delay until a supply of potential missionaries was assured.

⁸⁵ This was a significant shift of opinion for a circle that ostensibly included Dissenters. The character of the Eclectic had certainly changed since its inception. Van den Berg and Foster drew similar conclusions from their research. See van den Berg, *op.cit.*: 134; and Foster, C.I., *An errand of mercy: The evangelical united front, 1790-1837*, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1960: 66.

⁸⁶ Carus: 125.

⁸⁷ An anticipated lack of "proper men" for missionary service had been noted by the Rauceby Clerical Society four years earlier. [Hole, *op.cit.*: 24.] Of course, Simeon was very familiar with the problem. It was an obstacle that dogged the CMS for its first three decades. [See current chapter, p.215, especially Simeon's comment on "brutish apathy."]

Charles Simeon had reached his limit. He was determined to force the issue then and there. Simeon's comments to the assembled members of the Eclectic Society were a mixture of rebuke and invitation, such as one would expect from a pastor to his congregation:

What can we do? --- When shall we do it? --- How shall we do it? --- What can we do? We cannot join the [London] Missionary Society; yet I bless God that they have stood forth. We must now stand forth. We require something more than resolutions --- something ostensible --- something held up to the public. Many draw back because we do not stand forth. --- When shall we do it? Directly: not a moment to be lost. We have been dreaming these four years, while all England, all Europe has been awake.⁸⁸

Then, to break the impasse with regard to missionary personnel, Simeon suggested that the new society should send "catechists" [i.e., trained laity] if missionary clergy cannot be found.⁸⁹ Simeon's speech and his embrace of missionary work by laity produced the desired effect. The Eclectic Society met again in less than a fortnight, on April 1, to draft the rules for the proposed missionary society. A dozen days later a group of "clerical nobodies" gathered at the Castle and Falcon Inn and gave birth to the Society for Missions to Africa and the East.⁹⁰

It had been eleven years since Simeon had been invited by David Brown to foment a missionary movement among evangelical Churchmen. At last there was

⁸⁸ Carus: 125-6. Also quoted in Pratt's *Eclectic Notes*, ut.sup.: 99. The quotation also appears in the introduction to this study, p.26.

⁸⁹ Hole, op.cit.: 31.

⁹⁰ Andrew Walls is quite right. The laity involved in the formation of the CMS were far better known than were the clergymen present. See Walls, A.F., "Missionary societies and the fortunate subversion of the Church," *Evangelical Quarterly* (88) 1988, 150.

something to show for Simeon's efforts. Even the fact that Simeon was unable to be in London for the April meetings was significant. It was a measure of the momentum that Simeon had helped to set in motion, forces that did not require his presence in order to continue. Nonetheless, his absence was also the beginning of a trend.

Shifts in the Pattern of Simeon's Relationship with the Society

As the previous section demonstrates, Charles Simeon was in every sense a true founder of the Church Missionary Society. He had been constantly at work in the background as he drummed up support for the new venture. Simeon had also been a participant in almost every major event leading up to the formation of the Society. Many of his contributions to these meetings resulted in important course corrections in the development of the CMS. Simeon had been instrumental in securing the support of evangelical Anglican clergy for the Society. He had recognized when headway would only be gained through the lay activism of Clapham. He had comprehended the growing disenchantment of many of his fellow ministers with the LMS, and therefore he steered things toward a voluntary society for Churchmen. And Simeon had urged his fellow founders to embrace the "catechist plan" in order to avert further delay over the availability of ordained missionary candidates. Then, despite all that he had invested in the establishment of the new missionary organization, Charles Simeon was not present when the Society for Missions to Africa and Asia was brought into being. Simeon was famous for his participation in such meetings. Why did he miss the April 1 and April 13 dates?⁹¹ Further, was his absence significant?

⁹¹ It is also surprising that previous studies of Simeon and the formation of the CMS have not asked this question.

There is no evidence to suggest that Simeon was previously committed on the dates in question, although it must be said that his personal calendar for these dates is impossible to reconstruct with complete accuracy. But, given Simeon's immediate history vis-à-vis mission-related gatherings, it is not unreasonable to assume that Simeon could have been in London for one of the two meetings, especially to witness the launch of the missionary society he had laboured hard to bring into being. While it is unreasonable to assume that Simeon had soured on the new Society between March 18 and April 1, his absence suggests a certain ambivalence. We are left with an 'in between' judgment, at best. It is most likely that Simeon did not believe his presence at the Society's founding was of any great importance. As indicated above, his absence did not adversely affect plans to found the Society. But the fact that Charles Simeon did not contribute to two consecutive meetings that were critical to the future of the CMS does imply a change in the pattern of things. For this reason alone Simeon's absence is of significance and warrants some investigation.

Problems with First Principles?

One possible explanation for a shift in Simeon's relationship to the CMS would be some measure of dissatisfaction with the direction in which the Society was being taken by its leaders in London. Were the Society's first steps and initial principles compatible with Simeon's world-view and personal hopes?

Hole recorded that the first public notice of the Society appeared in the May 20 issue of the *Missionary Magazine*.⁹² According to the article, the distinguishing feature of the Society would be its "operation by Churchmen." This

⁹² Hole, op.cit.: 39.

Ch.5 Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

was to be undertaken without becoming adversarial toward the [London] Missionary Society.⁹³ The second meeting of the General Committee on May 27 took steps to reinforce this course. Wilberforce declined to serve as the Society's president to leave open the office for some bishop of the Church. The Committee affirmed the recommendation by making Wilberforce a vice-president.⁹⁴ Certainly Charles Simeon would have enthusiastically supported these actions.

The May 27 meeting of the General Committee also appointed a number of "country members" to its ranks, including Simeon.⁹⁵ These were clergy or laity who were key supporters of the Society who did not reside in London and, thus, were unavailable for regular meetings of the Committee. Simeon's status as a "country member" was a recognition of his service to the Society while also acknowledging that he would not be able to attend many meetings of the executive body of the Society. It is difficult to imagine the Committee taking such action, or Simeon accepting it, if there were fundamental differences of opinion between the Cambridge minister and his CMS colleagues. But it is important to note that the Committee did not inquire of Simeon regarding the possibility of more frequent

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Minutes of the Parent Committee, May 27, 1799, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/1.

In her sociological study of the training of English missionaries in nineteenth century Britain, Sarah Potter suggested that the CMS did not enjoy the patronage of the Clapham Saints in its early days. Instead, asserted Potter, Wilberforce and company gave their support to the BMS. [Potter, S.C., *The social origins and recruitment of English Protestant missionaries in the 19th century*, University of London, Ph.D. thesis, 1974: 115-6.] While it is true that the Clapham evangelicals respected and appreciated the work of Andrew Fuller, William Carey, and the Serampore Baptists, Potter's assessment is incomplete. Even without referring to the facts leading up to the creation of the Society, the involvement of Wilberforce, Grant, and Venn in the founding General Committee demonstrates Clapham's support.

⁹⁵ Minutes of the Parent Committee, May 27, 1799, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/1.

visits to London, nor did Simeon ever take any initiative toward such an end. These facts are puzzling given Simeon's strategic role in the formation of the Society.

Shortly after the April 13 event at the Castle and Falcon Inn, work began on a document to be used to solicit support for the CMS. John Venn's *Account of the formation of the Society ...*, approved by the General Committee and published in June, was the title of the text.⁹⁶ It is an important document in two respects. First, it embodied the ecclesiastical principles of the new missionary structure. Second, the *Account* also reflected the "catechist plan" as proposed by Simeon and subsequently affirmed by the General Committee. Both elements are relevant to an understanding of Simeon's relationship to the Society.

In terms of ecclesiastical matters, the *Account* affirms "Church principles" but "not High Church principles" for the Society. To Venn, this formula called for a society of [evangelical] Churchmen who follow God's leading, are satisfied with a modest beginning, emphasize prayer and careful discussion over fundraising, and depend on the Holy Spirit.⁹⁷ In rejecting "High Church principles," the General Committee was stating its intention to direct the Society itself, in contrast with episcopal supervision. Stock and Cnattingius interpreted Venn's statement as a rejection of the need for direct episcopal oversight of Anglican missionary activity.⁹⁸ While the necessity for "missionary bishops" certainly became a matter

⁹⁶ Copies of the *Account* as printed in 1799 can be found in various archives, but an accurate and accessible reprint appears as Appendix C in Hole, op.cit.: 651-3.

⁹⁷ Ibid. See also: Stock, E., *The history of the Church Missionary Society: Its environment, its men, and its work*, 1899: vol.1, 67.

⁹⁸ Stock, op.cit.: vol.1, 64-5; and Cnattingius, H., *Bishops and societies: A study of Anglican colonial and missionary expansion, 1698-1850*, London, 1952: 59.

of debate later in the century, the relevant question in 1799 was one of immediate authority. At issue was the operation of the Society at home and the appointment and placement of missionaries abroad. Venn and company were asserting that such matters were within the jurisdiction of the General Committee of the Society and not subject to episcopal review.

In taking this position, the General Committee established a structural model for the relationship between the CMS and the hierarchy of the Established Church. This pattern was characterized by an analogy between clerical patronage and missionary appointment. In the same way that the holder of an advowson exercised 'secular' power with respect to a living, viz., the right to present a candidate to the bishop for licensing, the Society intended to choose its missionaries, place them, and meet their expenses. The bishop's 'religious' powers vis-à-vis missionaries were seen by the Society's leaders as parallel to those exercised by any diocesan with respect to his ministers: an initial assessment of fitness for ordination and/or licence, plus review of the on-going work of the missionary in questions touching on ecclesiastical matters.⁹⁹ The bishop's

⁹⁹ These principles were forced to the surface by the tensions between the CMS and Bishop Middleton [of Calcutta] over the placement and supervision of the Society's ordained missionaries in British India.

The "Bath incident" of 1817 is a case in point. Archdeacon Thomas of Bath made an unexpected protest at the founding meeting of the Bath Church Missionary Association [CMA]. Thomas declared the CMS to be uncanonical because of the refusal of the Society to submit its missionaries to direct episcopal supervision, including their placement. [Thomas, J., *An address to a meeting holden at the town-hall in the city of Bath ... for the purpose of forming a Church Missionary Society in that city ... with a protest against the establishment of such a society in Bath*, 5th edition, London, 1817, reprint, *Pamphleteer* 16 (1818): 220-1.] Thomas was not incorrect with respect to the Parent Committee's attitude toward the placement of missionaries. They reserved this right to the Society. [Minutes of the Parent Committee, April 11, 1814, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/2: ff.138-9; Do., February 9 and July 13, 1818, op.cit., G/C 1/3: ff.128, 241-5.] The patronage analogy was explicitly employed by Daniel Wilson in his printed reply to Archdeacon Thomas. [Wilson, D., *A defence of the Church Missionary Society against the objections of the Rev. Josiah Thomas, M.A., Archdeacon of Bath*, 6th edition, London, 1818: 30-1.]

The patronage analogy was best articulated by Henry Venn [the younger] in "Appendix II" of the
(continued...)

approval of the patron's candidate could not be withheld without clear reason under canon law, nor could a minister be removed from his office without such basis.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, the leaders of the CMS expected the Bishop of London to provide religious supervision only to its missionaries under Anglican orders. Lay missionaries would not be subject to episcopal oversight in any sense.¹⁰¹

These ecclesiastical principles, as initially stated by John Venn and reaffirmed by subsequent leaders of the Society, merely underscored the voluntary nature of the CMS.¹⁰² Naturally, the attempted merger of voluntarism and Anglican churchmanship led to many conflicts between the CMS and the hierarchy of the Established Church. These tensions, as they touched Simeon, will be examined in due course. At this point it only remains to be noted that Charles Simeon had no difficulty with the Society's initial ecclesiastical principles. After attempting other courses of action, Simeon himself was one of the seminal

⁹⁹(...continued)

39th Report of the Church Missionary Society, London, 1838. See also: Shenk, W.R., *Henry Venn as missionary theorist and administrator*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1978: 244-7; and Yates, T.E., *Venn and Victorian bishops abroad: The missionary policies of Henry Venn and their repercussions upon the Anglican episcopate of the colonial period, 1841-1872*, Uppsala, 1978: 32-3.

¹⁰⁰ Sykes, N., *Church and state in England in the XVIIIth century*, London, 1934: 96; and Yates, op.cit: 32-3.

¹⁰¹ Since the late seventeenth century, the Bishop of London had been charged with the supervision of all Anglican clergy residing abroad. The Colonial Episcopacy Act of 1786 allowed the consecration of bishops for dioceses in British colonies. The Parent Committee of the CMS secured legal opinion in 1818 confirming that the Bishop of Calcutta had no legal authority over foreign-ordained clergy [e.g., the Lutheran clergy in the employ of the CMS] or Anglican laity. [Minutes of the Parent Committee, July 13, 1818, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/3: ff.244-5.]

¹⁰² This was a contemporary conclusion as well. See [Anon.], *Zeal without innovation: or, The present state of religion and morals considered, with a view to the dispositions and measures required for its improvement: To which is subjoined, An address to young clergymen, ...*, 2nd edition, London, 1809: 150.

advocates for voluntary missionary activity by evangelical Churchmen. Moreover, he was thoroughly committed to the use of patronage, thus he would have fully appreciated and affirmed the analogy drawn by the General Committee vis-à-vis their relationship to the bishops.¹⁰³ There is no evidence whatsoever that Simeon objected to the ecclesiastical formulations implicit in Venn's *Account*. Curiously, as is later suggested, his identification with the rights of patrons may actually have contributed to the decline in his activities on behalf of the CMS. But, in 1799, Simeon would have been quite comfortable with the paradoxical ecclesiastical tenets of the Society.

The matter of personnel for the Society was also dealt with by Venn's *Account*. As indicated previously, a new hindrance to the formation of a missionary society for Churchmen was discussed at the March 18 [1799] meeting of the Eclectic Society. There had been general agreement that ministers of the Established Church were unlikely to volunteer for missionary service. It was not a vocation with much status or remuneration. The "1787 Plan" had spoken of missionary salaries in the range of £50 per annum and this figure seems to have stuck in the minds of the Society's leaders.¹⁰⁴ As salaries for curates in England at the outset of the nineteenth century averaged £81, and incomes for most beneficed clergy doubled that figure, the hesitancy of prospective missionaries can

¹⁰³ Simeon's use of patronage is detailed in chapter three, pp.156ff.

¹⁰⁴ The Society's first two missionaries, M. Renner and Peter Hartwig, sailed for Sierra Leone in 1803 with an annual salary of £50. [Minutes of the Parent Committee, October 10, 1803, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/1.] A decade and a half later, the Calcutta Corresponding Committee urged the Parent Committee to give married missionaries another £20 a year, for a total of £70 per annum. [Do., January 21, 1817, op.cit., G/C 1/2.]

be understood.¹⁰⁵ Proponents of the CMS frequently encountered questions regarding salaries.

Simeon was very much in touch with the status/salary problem through his efforts to recruit missionaries from among those training for holy orders at Cambridge. Well over a year later Simeon would write of his frustration to Thomas Scott:

To those who know not how I have been employed I shall seem to have been extremely remiss; but I have endeavoured (in a prudent way) to sound the dispositions of the serious young men respecting Missions, and I am sorry to say not one of them says, "Here I am, send me." ... I feel a little discouraged at my own entire want of success.¹⁰⁶

In Simeon's mind the hurdle would be overcome by finding the 'right' people, viz., those who were not concerned with matters of money. Such an expectation was fully consistent with his view of the personal character of Christ's ministers.¹⁰⁷ However, even in 1799 Simeon knew that the recruiting process would require time.¹⁰⁸ Rather than agree to suspend all other activities until the

¹⁰⁵ For data on clerical income, see Sykes, N., *Church and state in England in the XVIIIth century*, 1934: 409; and Young, Jr., H.V., *The evangelical clergy in the Church of England, 1790-1850*, Brown University, Ph.D. thesis, 1958: 160ff.

¹⁰⁶ Simeon to Scott, August 22, 1800, CMS Archive, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3. Also quoted in Hole, op.cit.: 62.

¹⁰⁷ Simeon's conceptions of ministerial character are dealt with in chapter three, pp.130-48.

¹⁰⁸ Simeon also came to the conclusion that salary rises were in order. When he learned that costs of living in India were 300% higher than they were in England, he began to urge reconsideration of missionary salaries. [Simeon to Charles Grant, November 20, 1805, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.]

(continued...)

recruits were waiting in the wings, Simeon proposed the use of catechists in lieu of ordained clergy, if necessary. By this lateral action Simeon hoped to avoid the prospect that another year or so of delay might well be followed by even more delay. Eleven years of failed efforts and postponed action gave Simeon good reason to find some way forward then and there.

Was Simeon's suggestion that the Society be willing to send lay missionaries a novel idea? No and yes. Since 1794 Simeon had allowed selected laity to assist him with parish visitation in Cambridge.¹⁰⁹ But this was not a widespread practice in the Church. Lay ministry would still have been an innovation for the mainstream of the Established Church. While Methodists and Dissenters had been making use of lay ministers for decades,¹¹⁰ the association of lay ministry with Nonconformity kept Anglican clergy -- including most evangelicals -- from making full use of the Reformation's affirmation of the

¹⁰⁸(...continued)

Claudius Buchanan joined Simeon in calling for salary increases, urging the CMS in 1813 to pay its people in India at least Rs1,000 p.a., then equivalent to roughly £100. [Buchanan to Josiah Pratt, December 20, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.] This would still have been a second-class salary. In the same year Buchanan urged that chaplains in India be paid no less than £1,000 p.a., which Buchanan asserted to be the equivalent of "only" £500 in England. This was still five times what Buchanan hoped a missionary would be paid. [Buchanan, C., *Colonial ecclesiastical establishment: Being a brief view of the state of the colonies of Great Britain, and of her Asiatic Empire, in respect to religious instruction ...*, London, 1813: 161.]

¹⁰⁹ Such was one of the functions of his "lay society." See chapter two, p.109.

¹¹⁰ Until Wesley's decision to ordain clergy in the 1780s, Methodism was a network of lay societies with Anglican roots. The evolution of Methodism from an alternative agenda within the Established Church to a Nonconformist denomination in its own right is treated thoroughly in Baker, F., *John Wesley and the Church of England*, London, 1970.

priesthood of all believers.¹¹¹ However, the founders of the CMS were either laity themselves or progressive clergy such as Thomas Scott and John Venn. Wilberforce and his Clapham colleagues certainly held no bias against what laity could do. Moreover, the BMS and the LMS had already made use of unordained personnel. Thus Simeon's "catechist plan" was warmly received by the Eclectic Society on March 18. Provision for catechists was made in the "rules" for the new society adopted on April 1, with formal approval of the principle in the General Committee's consideration of Venn's *Account* on June 17. Clearly, Simeon could have no complaint with the Society over their plans for the use of laity as missionaries. It was his own idea to begin with.

Simeon and the CMS's First Setback

On July 1 the General Committee asked William Wilberforce to solicit the support of the Archbishop of Canterbury for the new venture. Dutifully, Wilberforce wrote to the Archbishop, enclosing a copy of the *Account*.¹¹² Well

¹¹¹ The bias had lengthy historical roots. Clericalism was one of the distinctions of the Laudian churchmanship that marked the Church of England after its Restoration. That characteristic was particularly pronounced in the decades leading up to the Evangelical Revival. Nor was clericalism in the 1730s merely a function of the recovery of episcopacy. The government of Sir Robert Walpole [1721-42] laboured to keep the influence of the Church within the ecclesiastical realm. The impeachment of Sacheverell at the hands of the [Whig] bishops had disturbed Walpole greatly. As a consequence, he determined to keep the Church from rocking the ship of state by ensuring that the bishops owed their station in life to political patronage. Clericalism was thus reinforced by governmental as well as ecclesiastical dynamics. Lay movements in the early eighteenth century, such as John Wesley's, violated 'proper' English churchmanship and smacked of political unreliability regardless of questions of conformity. By the end of the century, with the identification of the Dissent with democratic causes in America and on the Continent, the political reasons for suspecting lay movements were strengthened. In any event, regular Anglicans only acknowledged ordination by properly consecrated bishops.

¹¹² Hole, op.cit.: 45.

over a year would pass before the Archbishop would send his regrets.¹¹³ In the interim the CMS found itself frozen in time. Virtually nothing was undertaken to develop the Society while the General Committee waited on Canterbury. How did Charles Simeon relate to this initial predicament and did it affect his view of the Society?

Hole does not clearly intimate whether the delay on the part of the leaders of the CMS reflected real hope for episcopal support or was merely the patient observation of required protocol. The facts appear to suggest the latter. As the year dragged on the Society's backers became increasingly concerned that inaction would prove to be the demise of the undertaking. Consider, for example, Thomas Scott's letter to his son:

The Missionary Society lies off The Bishop and his Clerks, where, if not wrecked, it may rot, for what I can see. They return no answer, and as I foresaw, we are all nonplussed.¹¹⁴

Scott's comments do not reflect any sense of desperation for the support of the Church hierarchy, only an answer. These were pleas from an activist for action. When the answer finally arrived from the Archbishop there seems to have been little shock or surprise. Relief, i.e., that the Society was at last free to progress,

¹¹³ The Archbishop's silence was prolonged by consultations with his bishops. The Archbishop discovered that the CMS's voluntarism was viewed with ecclesiastical suspicion and the Society's approval of missionary catechists was considered to be a mark of Nonconformity. Wilberforce became aware of the developing problem toward the end of 1799. [Wilberforce to Thomas Gisborne, December 6, 1799, as quoted in Wilberforce, R.I., and S. Wilberforce, eds., *The correspondence of William Wilberforce*, London, 1840: vol.1, 189.] Despite Wilberforce's best efforts to head off an adverse opinion, the Archbishop communicated his inability to support the Society in July of the following year. [Wilberforce to John Venn, July 24, 1800, as quoted in Hole, op.cit.: 58.]

¹¹⁴ Scott to his son, July 12, 1800, as quoted in Hole, op.cit.: 51.

characterized the feelings of the CMS's founders. This certainly was Simeon's reaction when he expressed to Thomas Scott his delight that the Society could finally progress after "being so long dormant."¹¹⁵ Although the General Committee would have welcomed the open support of the bishops, it appears that the outcome of Wilberforce's approach to the Archbishop was largely as expected. If so, then the entire exercise was nothing more than an observance of the forms.

The behaviour of Wilberforce, Venn, and the other founders of the CMS was entirely consistent with the churchmanship-cum-voluntaryism that underlay the formation of the Society. By approaching the Archbishop the Society could -- and did -- claim to have submitted itself to the Established Church. In being rejected by the Archbishop, the founders of the Society could -- and did -- claim to be prosecuting a valid agenda that was being ignored by the mainstream of the Church of England. These rationales were precisely those later employed by Daniel Wilson in his defence of the CMS.¹¹⁶ Similar reasoning among the members of the Elland Clerical Society led them to give the CMS their full support exactly because the Archbishop refused to do so.¹¹⁷

In reviewing these developments it is difficult to escape the conclusion that all was progressing as anticipated, apart from the time required to secure the

¹¹⁵ Simeon to Scott, August 22, 1800, CMS Archive, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3. Also quoted in Hole, op.cit.: 62.

¹¹⁶ Wilson, D., *A defence of the Church Missionary Society against the objections of the Rev. Josiah Thomas, M.A., Archdeacon of Bath*, 6th edition, London, 1818: 7. Wilson's *Defence*, offered in the context of the "Bath incident," became the classic evangelical response to charges of ecclesiastical irregularity against the CMS. The events at Bath have been already noted. See current chapter, pp.245-6, note 99.

¹¹⁷ Mr. Powley to the Secretary [Thomas Scott], December 10, 1800, as quoted in Hole, op.cit.: 64.

Archbishop's answer. Apparently the founders of the Society had prepared themselves for an initial setback, and when it came its effects had already been discounted by the principal members of the General Committee. It is in this sense that the failure of the CMS to secure the approbation of the Archbishop was no real crisis.

For Simeon's part, he was entirely silent on the subject of the Archbishop's reply. Nor did Carus comment on the event in his *Memoirs* of Simeon. It is therefore reasonable to infer that Charles Simeon was not unhappy with the initial ecclesiastical and strategic principles of the CMS and that he was not unduly concerned over the lack of support from the hierarchy of the Established Church. Simeon's lack of involvement in the attempt to secure the support of the Established Church illustrates the change in his relationship to the Society, but it does not help explain why that change took place.

The Collapse of the "Catechist Plan"

The Archbishop's lack of support was not an emergency because it seems to have been expected by most of the General Committee.¹¹⁸ However, true crisis first struck the Society shortly thereafter. The Committee had postponed the circulation of Venn's *Account* until the business with the Archbishop was resolved one way or another. Now that a voluntary course had become a virtual necessity for the Society, the *Account* was widely distributed among evangelical clergy with a view toward soliciting moral and material support. The Society's embrace of voluntary methods was accepted broadly by evangelical Churchmen. But the

¹¹⁸ While some of the clergy on the General Committee became hesitant to proceed with the development of the Society after the rebuff from Canterbury, John Venn and Thomas Scott plus the lay members of the Committee urged progress. [Hole, op.cit.: 58-9.]

"catechist plan" as proposed by Simeon proved to be a small nightmare for the Society.

Almost immediately after the *Account* was published, Thomas Scott received a strongly-worded letter of objection to the "catechist plan" from the Rev. Robert Hawker.¹¹⁹ Scott immediately replied to Hawker to discern if the minister's disagreement was a matter of churchmanship or expediency. Was Hawker concerned for church order, or did he fear that laity could not undertake missionary tasks?¹²⁰ Hawker's second letter confirmed that his concern was with matters of legality under Church law. Although he would not hinder the Society, its proposed use of unordained missionaries precluded his support.¹²¹ Thomas Haweis also joined Hawker in rejecting the notion of lay missionaries.¹²² Haweis could not imagine that a catechist who was willing to undertake a 20,000 mile journey would not be worthy of ordination.

Perhaps Scott and the General Committee could dismiss the criticisms of Hawker and Haweis, but concern among evangelical Anglican clergy did not stop

¹¹⁹ Hawker to Scott, August 8, 1800, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3. Hole [op.cit.: 60] also makes reference to this letter.

¹²⁰ Scott to Hawker, August 1800, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.

¹²¹ Hawker to Scott, August 21, 1800, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.

No doubt Scott was somewhat surprised to hear from Hawker on a missionary subject. Hawker was better known for his strident Calvinism, verging upon antinomianism, than for missionary interest. Hawker was never a strong supporter of the CMS.

¹²² Haweis to Thomas Scott, November 11, 1800, as quoted in Hole, op.cit.: 63. Characteristically, Haweis also lamented the inability of Churchmen to share in 'undenominational' efforts such as the LMS, of which he was a strong supporter. This also demonstrated Haweis' affirmation of non-episcopally ordained missionaries.

Ch.5 Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

there. In 1801 John Newton declined to preach the Society's first Anniversary Sermon because he could not endorse the "catechist plan."¹²³ Suddenly the Society found itself without the support of one of the most respected of evangelical ministers in the Church of England. Moreover, Newton was a close friend of the Thornton family, meaning that dissatisfaction with the Society was edging toward Clapham. The matter was decided when Thomas Robinson [senior] also wrote Scott to object to what he termed the "irregular churchmanship" of the Society, viz., the use of catechists.¹²⁴ Robinson's letter also protested at the itinerations of CMS advocates such as Scott and Simeon in preaching for the Society in various parishes. These activities struck Robinson as ecclesiastically inappropriate.

The General Committee could not afford to ignore the complaints of men such as Newton and Robinson. At a meeting in May 1802, the General Committee agreed that priority must be given to recruiting clergymen to serve as the Society's missionaries.¹²⁵ Ironically, Charles Simeon -- the author of the catechist plan --

¹²³ Newton to Scott, January 1801, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3; also cited in Hole, op.cit.: 65.

Hole suggested that Newton later relented, but still did not preach the Sermon due to ill health. Thomas Scott, the Society's first Secretary, preached at the first anniversary.

¹²⁴ Robinson to Thomas Scott, April 26, 1802, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3; also quoted in Hole, op.cit.: 54.

Robinson must have reevaluated his position by 1812. In that year he wrote to Josiah Pratt, then CMS Secretary, to endorse the candidacy of a member of his congregation as a catechist with the CMS. [Robinson to Pratt, November 25, 1812, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.]

¹²⁵ Hole, op.cit.: 77-8. As it happened, the clergy secured were not English. The Committee had been encouraged by contact with Rev. Christian Ignatius Latrobe, a Moravian of Anglo-French descent, and Rev. Charles Steinkopff, a German Lutheran. Latrobe and Steinkopff agreed to help the CMS recruit foreign Protestant clergy as missionaries. Steinkopff's efforts led to the appointment of graduates of the Berlin Seminary.

(continued...)

was asked to preach the second Anniversary Sermon in that year. Neither Newton or Richard Cecil, first and second choices of the Committee, accepted the assignment. Simeon's message to the assembled crowd on June 8, 1802, decried the lack of prospective missionary personnel from among the ministers of the Established Church. He declared that the agenda of the Church at home served as no excuse to neglect the missionary cause, urging those who cannot "go" [e.g., laity] to support liberally those who can [e.g., clergy].¹²⁶ It was a sermon that was entirely supportive of the renewed commitment of the General Committee to secure ordained missionaries. The only words spoken of catechists were as eulogies to the notion. With this message, Charles Simeon's only Anniversary Sermon for the Society, the author of the "catechist plan" yielded.

It appears that Simeon's relationship with the CMS was damaged in the rejection of his "catechist plan." Simeon would not have appreciated Thomas Robinson's remarks or the ease with which they forced the General Committee to climb down. Moreover, the implied criticism of Simeon continued for some time. In 1805, after virtually no progress for the CMS in terms of personnel, John Venn expressed great frustration over the inability of the Society to attract English clergy. In a letter to the General Committee Venn urged the Society to recruit spiritually qualified men, viz., evangelical laity, and then arrange for the education

¹²⁵(...continued)

The sending of lay workers by the CMS was not precluded by these events. Unordained personnel were allowable as long as supervision was provided by ordained clergy. The two laymen sent to New Zealand in 1809 have already been mentioned; they worked under the superintendence of the Rev. Samuel Marsden. [See chapter four, p.173.] West Africa also saw its share of English catechists, also under the direction of the Society's ordained clergy. However, lay workers were not sent to India by the CMS during the period under study.

¹²⁶ Simeon, C., *A sermon preached at the parish church of St. Andrew by the Wardrobe and St. Anne, Blackfriars ... June 8, 1802, before the Society for Missions to Africa and the East ... being their second anniversary*, ..., London, 1802: 127-8. See also: Hole, op.cit.: 79.

and training they would require for ordination.¹²⁷ He made a similar appeal in the context of the 1805 Anniversary Sermon he preached in June of that year.¹²⁸ Venn's suggestions reflected the perceived failure of the Universities, and Simeon by implication, to supply the needs of the Society. Given the history of interpersonal tension between Simeon and John Venn, criticism from that corner would not have encouraged Simeon to redouble his efforts on behalf of the Society.¹²⁹ Venn's critiques, however accurate, served to distance a self-conscious Simeon from the CMS.

These facts and circumstances suggest two good reasons for the decline in the quality and quantity of Simeon's contributions to the CMS between 1800 and 1805. First, a pivotal concept of Simeon's -- the "catechist plan" -- had been accepted and then rejected by the General Committee. Every account of Simeon's life points to a significant degree of sensitivity to criticism.¹³⁰ Charles Simeon could not have received word of the dismissal of his idea without taking a certain degree of offence. Moreover, the General Committee's reversal on the use of lay missionaries was a sore spot for Simeon that would not entirely heal. The issue

¹²⁷ Venn to Josiah Pratt, May 4, 1805, as quoted in Hole, *op.cit.*: 104. Venn expressed regret that the "catechist plan" had failed, but he was equally unsure of Cambridge and Oxford as sources of qualified candidates. Venn's thinking foreshadowed the basis upon which the CMS's "seminaries" at Bledlow, Aston-Sandford, and Islington were founded.

¹²⁸ Hole, *op.cit.*: 106.

¹²⁹ The history of Simeon and Venn's relationship is summarized in chapter three, pp.123ff.

¹³⁰ Henry Venn [senior] recognized this weakness in Simeon from the start of their relationship. See chapter three, pp.124ff.

came up repeatedly with respect to India and Simeon had many opportunities for a mental "I told you so."¹³¹

Second, Simeon's inability to recruit missionary candidates at Cambridge for the CMS wore on him. In the role of "clerical agent," missionary recruiting was to have been Simeon's specialty. To have his failure underlined by Venn's letter to Pratt and in a public sermon, even if only indirectly, did nothing to encourage renewed efforts. It is also likely that Simeon's depression over the recruiting problem had been compounded by time. Since Simeon had been endeavouring to recruit Anglican missionaries since 1788, the dilemma had been wearing on him for almost eighteen years by the time John Venn preached his CMS Anniversary sermon in 1805. Added to these particulars was Simeon's growing conviction that the Society was hindering its potential to enlist workers by unduly low salaries.¹³²

Once Simeon became convinced of the growing criticism of his ideas and efforts, he distanced himself from any significant role in the direction of the Society. According to the minutes of the Parent Committee, Simeon never attended a meeting of the Society's governing body.¹³³ For a "Country Member"

¹³¹ For example, with India on the verge of opening to missionary activity in 1813, Daniel Corrie wrote his mentor Simeon for his help. Corrie asked Simeon to urge the CMS to send catechists to India to serve as Christian schoolmasters if English clergy could not be found. This was a familiar theme to Simeon. [Corrie to Simeon, August 22, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E 15.]

¹³² See current chapter, p.248, note 108.

¹³³ The meetings of the Eclectic Society in March 1799 were his last formal engagements with the founders and first General Committee of the CMS.

Stock noted that Simeon attended only four Anniversary [General] Meetings of the Society. [Stock, op.cit.: vol.1, 261-2.]

of the General Committee and a Lifetime Governor of the Society [from 1818], and one who visited London often enough, Simeon's lack of participation was remarkable. Moreover, Simeon's correspondence and the records of the Society reveal that he made virtually no efforts to secure personnel on behalf of the CMS from 1805 until 1813, and only sporadically after that time.¹³⁴ A brief summary of his efforts for the CMS subsequent to the Society's founding reveals the accuracy of this observation. However, before turning to a synopsis of what Simeon did undertake for the CMS, a critical question needs attention.

Chaplains or Missionaries?

With the Society formed, Simeon's efforts in 1800 turned from matters of organization and strategy to the primary role that he assumed he would play in the work of the CMS: clerical advocate and missionary recruiter. Being a parish priest and a college Fellow, these were natural functions for Simeon. He had, in fact, been attempting to develop personnel and support for the Society even before its formal establishment. But, as noted to Thomas Scott in his letter of August 22, 1800, his efforts had been fruitless to date.¹³⁵ This admission of temporary defeat was followed by the collapse of the "catechist plan" in 1802 and increasing criticism of the Universities [and, therefore, of Simeon] as a source of missionary personnel, culminating in John Venn's open critiques of the Society's development

¹³⁴ From 1804-5 onward, Simeon channelled his energies toward other missionary ventures. This is precisely what Simeon did in working with Charles Grant in filling India Company chaplaincies. Simeon and Grant's efforts with respect to EIC chaplaincies is examined in detail in chapter six.

¹³⁵ The letter is quoted in part in the current chapter, p.248.

tactics. As argued above, these developments led Simeon to invest his missionary-related time and effort elsewhere.

As demonstrated in chapter six, Simeon's energies were joined with those of Charles Grant in directing evangelical clergy into India Company chaplaincies. While the details of these undertakings will be left to the coming chapter, some comments on their relationship to Simeon's advocacy for the CMS is in order. One question in particular must be asked and answered: To what extent did Simeon's almost singular interest in India preclude his efforts on behalf of the CMS with respect to any other field of activity? What about Africa, New Zealand, and the West Indies?

Simeon's Indian bias had an effect. The opening quotation of this chapter indicates the intensity of Simeon's concern for the subcontinent.¹³⁶ With the possible exception of the evangelization of Jewish people, a passion that developed later in his life, no missionary cause rivaled India for Simeon's attention. Does the fact that India remained 'closed' to the CMS while it was 'open' to evangelical chaplains fully explain Simeon's virtual inactivity on behalf of the Society from 1804-5 until 1813? The apparent renewal in Simeon's involvement with the CMS in 1813, simultaneous with the admission of missionaries to British India, would support this view. While not totally incorrect, such a conclusion is incomplete for four clear reasons.

First, many of Simeon's missionary-related letters and sermons make no specific mention of India. Missionary advocacy in general was a well-known hallmark of Simeon's personal and pulpit ministry. Second, as will be documented shortly, Simeon's revived interest in the CMS in 1813 was directly encouraged by

¹³⁶ See current chapter, p.209.

the Society's leaders in London and Calcutta. While Simeon did take the first initiative, there was full reciprocation from the Society. Third, also to be substantiated below, the renewal of Simeon's interest waned when he and the Society failed to see eye-to-eye on a number of missionary candidates. And fourth, to be discussed here and in chapter six, Simeon's appreciation for the exercise of personal patronage was more compatible with the supply of chaplains for a trading company than the recruiting of missionaries for the CMS. These four factors, combined with the failure-cum-criticism that marked Simeon's missionary efforts from 1800 to 1805, effectively subverted Charles Simeon's commitment to the Church Missionary Society. His preoccupation with India was not the sole cause.

Recruiting for the Society

What were Simeon's contributions to the development of missionary personnel for the CMS? Perhaps without recognizing that the Society had lost first place in Simeon's heart, in 1806 the Committee of Correspondence asked Simeon to interview one of the Society's first missionary candidates, the Rev. J.G.F. Schulze. The circumstances were of a disciplinary nature. Schulze was one of the Lutheran clergy secured through the services of Charles Steinkopff from the Berlin Seminary. Steinkopff and his German colleagues provided ordained [or ordainable] candidates for the CMS after it had rejected the use of lay missionaries but before it became successful in recruiting English clergy. Schulze had been approved to sail for West Africa, but he missed his sailing. He had delayed in returning to England from Ireland, where he had been on personal business. The Society's leaders believed that the missed connection reflected poorly on Schulze's character. Simeon was asked to interview the Lutheran "with regard to his fitness and motives

Ch.5 Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

for missionary service."¹³⁷ Apparently Simeon was not impressed with Schulze, for he quit the Society following their meeting.¹³⁸

Incidentally, Simeon made no adverse comment on the Society's employ of foreign clergy in the course of his report on Schulze. Although Simeon might have wished -- as did the CMS -- that English clergy could have been found, Churchmen in general and evangelical Anglicans in particular shared a genuine appreciation for Continental Protestants. They were seen as champions in the opposition of 'popery' by the Church of England.¹³⁹ Even more important to Simeon, the motives of the CMS in utilizing overseas clergy were not a challenge to good churchmanship or episcopal authority. The initial use of Lutheran missionaries was a pragmatic response to the Society's inability to recruit English clergy. However, Simeon's attitude changed upon the creation of the Indian episcopate in 1814. When the Society chose to employ Lutherans in India to facilitate the native ordinations denied by the Bishop of Calcutta, Simeon became much less comfortable. This matter returns to view shortly.

From mid-1806 until the very end of 1813, neither Simeon's correspondence nor the Society's records indicate any significant activity by Simeon vis-à-vis personnel for the Society. During this period Simeon was

¹³⁷ Minutes of the Parent Committee, May 5, 1806, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/1.

¹³⁸ Hole, *op.cit.*: 115, note 3.

¹³⁹ The Established Church's curious tolerance of Protestant pluralism overseas, combined with its opposition to the Dissent at home, has been observed and studied by many. For example, see Neill, S.C., *Anglicanism*, 3rd edition, Harmondsworth, 1965: 211-2

Ch.5 Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

absorbed by his efforts with Charles Grant to supply chaplains for India.¹⁴⁰ Then, on December 27, 1813, with the admission of missionaries to India secured, Simeon wrote to Josiah Pratt to recommend George Mortimer for the Society's anticipated work in Ceylon.¹⁴¹ Also on the 28th, a Mr. William Valentine applied to the Society for India, enclosing a recommendation from Simeon.¹⁴² Simeon knew both men through his responsibilities in Cambridge. It is quite possible that these applications reflected renewed interest by Simeon in recruiting for the CMS.

One week later the Society's Committee of Correspondence made its report on Mortimer to the General Committee. They had rejected Mortimer over what they perceived to be a preoccupation with salary and expense matters.¹⁴³ The speed with which the Corresponding Committee acted suggests that Mortimer had been talking with the Society for some time and that he himself had asked Simeon for a letter of recommendation to the CMS. The rapid turn of events really does not admit any other interpretation. The Society could not have acted upon a completely unsolicited recommendation in a week's time. This observation

¹⁴⁰ Significantly, this activity continued and increased after India was opened to missionaries in 1813. This suggests that Simeon's work with Grant was a matter of preference at least as much as it was expedient. See chapter six.

¹⁴¹ Simeon to the [CMS] Secretary, December 27, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.

¹⁴² The letter appears to be missing from the CMS Archives, but it is cited in Hole, *op.cit.*: 364.

¹⁴³ Minutes of the Parent Committee, January 3, 1814, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/2. The customary offer of £50 must have had its usual effect. Moreover, the Society's leaders in London would have indicated that expenditures in Ceylon [i.e., for ministry expenses] were a matter for the CMS's Corresponding Committee in Colombo to budget. Salary and passage to Asia were the only missionary-related financial matters determined by the Parent Committee at this point in the Society's history.

significantly weakens any argument suggesting that Simeon contacted the CMS in regard to Mortimer only because the Society finally had access to India. More than this single motive was at work. Simeon should be given credit for his willingness to come to the support of a Cambridge student as well as for a degree of *rapprochement* with the Society. Subsequent to the CMS's rejection of Mortimer, Simeon recommended him to Grant for an EIC chaplaincy.¹⁴⁴

As for Mr. Valentine, the Society's Committee of Correspondence declined him on the basis of his age.¹⁴⁵ Being a second-year student at Magdalene College, Valentine was too young for holy orders. The Society did not consider applications until a candidate was approaching his twenty-first year. It is pertinent to note that Simeon later encouraged William Valentine to consider an EIC chaplaincy.¹⁴⁶

Another Henry Martyn?

The circumstances surrounding Samuel Lee's candidacy with the CMS further demonstrates Simeon's renewed interest in the Society. Lee was born of poor parents in a Shropshire village in 1783. Apprenticed as a carpenter, Lee educated himself. By the age of twenty-five Lee had learned the fundamentals of

¹⁴⁴ See chapter six, p.328, note 119.

¹⁴⁵ Hole, op.cit: 364.

¹⁴⁶ See chapter six, p.328, note 119.

Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Aramaic, Persian, and Hindustani.¹⁴⁷ Owing to this unusual facility with languages, Lee entered Queens' College, Cambridge, in 1813 with the encouragement of the CMS.¹⁴⁸ Lee had been corresponding with Isaac Milner and the CMS over the possibility of missionary service; hence the Society's interest in helping Lee secure a University education.¹⁴⁹ Lee became acquainted with Simeon in the course of his studies, probably through an introduction by Isaac Milner. The possibility of missionary work for Lee greatly interested Simeon in 1814. Lee was a brilliant natural linguist, suggesting to Simeon that he might be able to continue the kind of work that Henry Martyn had begun in India and Persia.¹⁵⁰ To Simeon's mind Lee was an excellent candidate for the CMS's work in India. Moreover, Simeon believed that a man like Lee was desperately needed at that time. But there was a problem. Lee was a layman. Simeon thus hoped that the Society would be able to arrange for his ordination.

Months passed without any action, undoubtedly because appointment by the CMS -- which Lee never secured in any event -- was insufficient title for ordination.¹⁵¹ With this problem in mind, the pragmatic Simeon wrote to Pratt

¹⁴⁷ Stephen, L., and S. Lee, eds., *Dictionary of National Biography*, London, 1885-1900: vol.31, 378.

¹⁴⁸ Lee took his B.A. in 1818, followed by the M.A. in 1819, the B.D. in 1827, and the D.D. in 1833. [*DNB*, op.cit.]

¹⁴⁹ The letters may be found in the CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.

¹⁵⁰ Word of Martyn's death at Tokat in 1812 had reached Simeon in February 1813.

¹⁵¹ This was a serious problem for the CMS in its early years. The Society was committed to employing ordained clergy as its missionaries, but the bishops did not consider missionary appointment to be sufficient title for ordination. Moreover, the bishops frowned upon the practice of arranging for a curacy for missionary candidates merely to secure holy orders. For example, the Archbishop of York refused to give deacon's orders to Thomas Norton in 1813 unless he was
(continued...)

early in 1814 regarding Mr. Lee. The Vicar of Holy Trinity offered to make Lee one of his curates in order to expedite the man's ordination.¹⁵² While such manoeuverings were entirely consistent with what Simeon believed to be the role of a mentor and patron, the suggested action was precisely what the bishops disliked. Pratt and company were uncomfortable with the proposition. They asked Simeon to consult with Milner before proceeding.¹⁵³ Milner was a very regular Churchman, far more so than Simeon, and very sensitive to issues of churchmanship. He was able to discourage Simeon from creating a larger ecclesiastical problem in meeting Mr. Lee's need for a title.¹⁵⁴

Mr. Lee was left in limbo. He appealed directly to Pratt in November of 1814, asking to be employed -- as a lay missionary if necessary -- with a view toward completing Henry Martyn's Persian-language work.¹⁵⁵ Simeon followed this request with one of his own. He asked the Society to consider sending Lee to Calcutta to oversee the training and supervision of the native schoolmasters the

¹⁵¹(...continued)

willing to remain in his curacy for one year. [Hole, op.cit.: 363-4.] The situation was rectified by Act of Parliament in 1819, wherein the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of London was empowered to ordain on title of missionary appointment, with the provision that such ordination did not qualify the minister for a curacy or incumbency in England or Wales without special episcopal licence.

¹⁵² Simeon to the Secretary [Pratt], March 26, 1814, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.

¹⁵³ Minutes of the Parent Committee, March 28, 1814, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/2.

¹⁵⁴ Simeon to the Secretary [Pratt], March 30, 1814; and Minutes of the Parent Committee, April 11, 1814; CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3 and G/C 1/2, respectively.

¹⁵⁵ Lee to Pratt, November 9, 1814, as quoted in Hole, op.cit.: 602.

Ch.5 Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

Calcutta Corresponding Committee hoped to employ.¹⁵⁶ Neither Lee's nor Simeon's request met with approval. Almost four years later Simeon would still be appealing to the Society to find a place for Mr. Lee and to arrange for his speedy ordination.¹⁵⁷ With the 1819 Act of Parliament allowing missionary ordination then in force, the disability that previously hindered Lee would not apply. Nothing came of these efforts. After more than six years of effort, Simeon encouraged Lee to accept a University professorship in Arabic.¹⁵⁸ This marked the end of Samuel Lee's missionary candidacy with the CMS and Simeon's lengthy efforts to assist him. Ironically, Lee later became the Society's chief adviser on matters of languages and translation efforts.

What does this brief summary of events surrounding Samuel Lee suggest with respect to Simeon's relationship to the Church Missionary Society? Clearly, the CMS did not see any need to employ Mr. Lee. Given that Simeon saw similarities in constitution and aptitude between Henry Martyn and Lee, the inability of the CMS to find a place for Lee is remarkable. With the possible

¹⁵⁶ Simeon to the Secretary [Pratt], January 20, 1815; and Minutes of the Parent Committee, February 13, 1815; CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3 and G/C 1/2, respectively.

Simeon knew of the prospects for native schoolmasters in Bengal from the author of the plan, Simeon's former curate and then EIC chaplain, Thomas Thomason. Simeon had discussed Thomason's ideas with Grant two years earlier. [Simeon to Grant, September 8, 1813, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.] Thomason did not make the proposal to the Parent Committee until 1814, but Pratt turned down the plan for lack of funds. [Thomason to Pratt, February 2 and 14, 1814; and Minutes of the Parent Committee, August 22, 1814; CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E and G/C 1/2, respectively.] Perhaps Simeon hoped that Lee's availability might resurrect the plan.

¹⁵⁷ Simeon to the Secretary, December 16, 1818; and Minutes of the Parent Committee, January 12, 1818; CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3 and G/C 1/3, respectively.

¹⁵⁸ Simeon had made the point of alerting the Parent Committee of his recommendation to Lee. [Minutes of the Parent Committee, June 2, 1820, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/4.]

exception of Daniel Corrie in Calcutta, no one but Simeon would have been in a better position to gauge potential to follow in Martyn's footsteps. It is surprising that Simeon's recommendation did not carry more weight. Even the records of the Society treat Lee strangely. No judgments on Lee by the General Committee or the Committee of Correspondence survive. Simeon's and Lee's overtures are recorded, and Lee's letter to Pratt survive, but it appears that every recommendation was tabled without action. This is very odd. The longevity of Simeon's efforts on behalf of Lee, combined with his high standards for the integrity of Christian ministers and missionaries, suggests that the Society would have been hard pressed to dismiss Lee's application on the basis of faults in personal character.¹⁵⁹ Why was Samuel Lee never appointed as a missionary with the Society? We are left to choose between unknown reasons, incompetence on the part of the Society's leaders, or lingering tensions between Simeon and the Society. Lee subsequently was made Regius Professor of Hebrew, was appointed to a stall in Bristol Cathedral, held a number of parish livings [probably non-resident], and published a large number of scholarly works in various Semitic and Asian languages.¹⁶⁰

Appeals for Agra

Even before India was opened to missionary activity in mid-1813, Daniel Corrie had set his sights on an expanded Christian presence in Agra. Located in the United Provinces [now Uttar Pradesh], the town was a key military and trading centre. Corrie was the India Company's chaplain in the city. To facilitate his

¹⁵⁹ Simeon's expectations for the character of ministers and missionaries are dealt with in chapter three, pp.130ff.

¹⁶⁰ *DNB*, op.cit.

plans for Agra, Corrie discussed his strategy with his mentor, Simeon, in a letter dated on June 23, 1813.¹⁶¹ Corrie appealed to Simeon to look for chaplains for Agra because, at the time, he was not at all optimistic about the prospect for a missionary presence. He believed that an enlargement of chaplains would be met with less suspicion than any attempt to station missionaries at Agra.¹⁶² Nor did Corrie believe that Wilberforce's success in Parliament would induce many English clergy to come to India, contrary to the opinions of India hands such as William Carey.¹⁶³ Corrie ended his letter ends with a curious exhortation. Noting the deaths of David Brown and Henry Martyn, Corrie observed that only he and Thomas Thomason remained in India [i.e., of Simeon's "pious chaplains"]. Then, in a surprisingly critical comment, Corrie remarked that Thomason knew nothing more of native work than did Simeon himself.¹⁶⁴ Daniel Corrie must have known of Thomason's enthusiasm for the development of the CMS's work in India. Corrie apparently wished to keep Simeon's attention focused on the need for chaplains.

¹⁶¹ Corrie to Simeon, June 23, 1813, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *Memoirs of the Right Rev. Daniel Corrie, first Bishop of Madras: Compiled chiefly from his letters and journals*, London, 1847: 248.

¹⁶² Corrie to Henry Hoare, May 19, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E 10.

¹⁶³ Corrie discussed Carey's view with Simeon. The Baptist missionary feared that the success of the missionary agenda in Parliament would, nevertheless, result in disadvantages for Dissenting missionary societies. Carey expected a tremendous influx of Anglican missionaries into India, rather than Baptist ones, to follow Wilberforce's expected victory. [Corrie to Simeon, June 23, 1813, op.cit.]

Corrie was not as optimistic as Carey about the preparedness of evangelical Anglicans to step into the gap. In this belief Corrie echoed the opinion of Claudius Buchanan on Wilberforce's success: "Now we [evangelicals] are likely to be all disgraced." [See chapter four, pp.203-4.]

¹⁶⁴ This was true. Thomason's activities were largely confined to Calcutta, where he served the English-speaking congregations of the Old Mission Church and the Presidency Chapel. Thomason also served on the Calcutta Corresponding Committee of the CMS. His experience with Indian nationals and his native language skills were very limited.

Ch.5 Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

With good prospects for the opening of India to missionary activity in 1813, the Calcutta Coordinating Committee of the CMS had begun to cast about for places to station incoming missionaries. Some could work from Calcutta, but the motive behind Wilberforce's "pious clauses" in the new India Company charter was to evangelize India, not to stack missionaries in Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay like so much firewood.¹⁶⁵ Thomason, at the time more closely connected than Corrie with the Calcutta Corresponding Committee of the CMS, was personally involved in the process of laying plans for arriving missionaries. Like Corrie, and probably drawing on the reports Corrie submitted, Thomason saw Agra as a potential missionary station¹⁶⁶ Corrie would have learned of Thomason's thinking through the minutes of the Corresponding Committee, if not also by correspondence between the two chaplains. Thomason would also have expressed to Corrie his desire for Simeon's aid in recruiting CMS missionaries for Agra. Simeon's two letters to Thomason on the progress of the EIC charter renewal would have encouraged the chaplain's hopes for such assistance.¹⁶⁷

Within two months, however, Corrie and Thomason must have worked out their differences of opinion and harmonized their respective agendas. In an August 22 letter, Corrie appealed to Simeon to find catechists to serve as schoolmasters for

¹⁶⁵ Bishop Middleton eventually made this a matter of policy in India. In 1821 he declared that he would not license new missionaries for any station where chaplains or missionaries were already located. [Daniel Corrie to the CMS Secretary, January 16, 1821, as quoted in the Minutes of the Parent Committee, August 13, 1821, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/5.]

¹⁶⁶ A series of exchanges of correspondence between Thomason, on behalf of the Calcutta Corresponding Committee, and Josiah Pratt during 1813-1814 reveal the level of expectation in London and Calcutta. [CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E.]

¹⁶⁷ Simeon to Thomason, April 2 and May 16, 1813, as quoted in Carus: 257-60.

EIC stations such as Agra.¹⁶⁸ As the India Company did not employ catechists, Corrie must have had the CMS in mind as the channel through which these laity would work in India. Moreover, by the end of the year Corrie had approached the CMS directly with a request for a missionary to "take charge" of the native work at Agra.¹⁶⁹ While this reversal may have reflected the reticence of the India Company to have its chaplains undertaking ministry to natives, a distinction Bishop Middleton would also support, it definitely indicates that Corrie saw a valid role for CMS missionaries at Agra. This need was reinforced when Thomas Thomason, on behalf of the Calcutta Corresponding Committee, and Josiah Pratt, on behalf of the Parent Committee, explicitly asked Simeon to recruit CMS missionaries for Agra.¹⁷⁰

Three letters to Charles Grant highlight the intense efforts Simeon made to respond to Corrie, Pratt, and Thomason's unsolicited appeal for help. Despite the fact that Simeon approached "many to find a few for Agra," he was unsuccessful on both the missionary and chaplaincy fronts.¹⁷¹ As Simeon later wrote to Thomason, he found no prospective missionaries for Agra: "There is a sad want of Missionary zeal amongst us. I cannot find a [Henry] Martyn."¹⁷² The recruiting

¹⁶⁸ Corrie to Simeon, August 22, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E 15.

¹⁶⁹ Corrie to the CMS Secretary, December 31, 1813, as quoted in Corrie's *Memoirs*, op.cit.: 261-3.

¹⁷⁰ Simeon to Pratt, August 20, 1814; and Pratt to Simeon, August 22, 1814; CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.

¹⁷¹ Simeon to Grant, September 26, October 2, and October 31, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁷² Simeon to Thomason, August 8, 1817, as quoted in Carus: 282.

muddle of 1800-1805 was continuing. In point of fact, significant numbers of evangelical Anglican clergy did not begin to volunteer until the 1820s.¹⁷³

Charles Simeon was just unable to overcome the lack of interest of University students in missionary service.

Simeon's Further Efforts for the Society

Apart from Simeon's efforts to secure an appointment with the CMS for Samuel Lee and his attempts to find men for Agra, Charles Simeon made no other extended efforts to recruit missionaries for the Church Missionary Society.

However, some of his more limited attempts are worthy of note. These endeavours included the "missionary charge" given by Simeon to nineteen new missionaries in 1817.¹⁷⁴ The charge was characterized by two themes: the high calling of the apostolic office and, in contrast, the ease with which missionaries become critical of one another.¹⁷⁵ Simeon affirmed the first point and warned against the latter.

¹⁷³ Only three English clergy served with the CMS in 1815. The number had risen to nineteen by 1820. From the 1820s onward, the Society had to turn away many applicants for lack of funds.

Statistical source: Church Missionary Society, *The centenary volume of the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East, 1799-1899*, London, 1902: 618ff.

¹⁷⁴ Minutes of the Parent Committee, July 14, 1817, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/2; and Simeon to Thomason, August 8, 1817, as quoted in Carus: 318.

¹⁷⁵ Simeon, C., "Address to the missionaries," *The Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society on Tuesday, October 28, 1817, on the occasion of the departure of missionaries ...*, [London, 1817]: 80, 90-1.

Simeon's declaration of the honour due to the missionary was a regular theme in Simeon's preaching on missionary subjects:

The missionary approximates far more to the apostolic office; and is elevated in honour above the stationary minister, in proportion as his self-denial is greater and his work more arduous. And I cannot but earnestly recommend to those who are educating for the ministry, to consider ... that high employment of preaching the Gospel to some portion of the Gentile world.¹⁷⁶

Simeon's views on the missionary task were not shared by too many clergy of the Established Church, if their response to the needs of the CMS is any indication.

In 1820 Thomas Thomason again sought the help of his mentor in securing needed personnel. With the impending furlough of a fellow chaplain, Thomas Robertson, Thomason was to assume various additional responsibilities in Calcutta. Up to this point Thomason had served primarily as chaplain to the Old Mission Church.¹⁷⁷ His new duties would leave the Old Mission Church without a parish minister unless relief could be arranged. Thus Thomason asked Simeon to find an evangelical to take up the pulpit of the Mission Church.¹⁷⁸ Simeon's response

¹⁷⁶ Horae: Sermon 1923, "Ministering to the Gentiles, a good work," vol.15, 558.

¹⁷⁷ The Old Mission Church had been founded by the Danish missionary John Zachary Kiernander in 1770. When the Danish mission found itself unable to operate the Mission Church in 1787, Charles Grant bought the facility for Rs10,000. The Church was subsequently held in trust by David Brown, William Chambers, and Grant on behalf of the SPCK. From that point forward, one of the evangelical India Company chaplains was designated to serve the congregation. The Old Mission Church became known for its evangelical pulpit, in contrast with the Presidency Church. Trusteeship of the Church was transferred to Britain when Grant returned home in 1790 and Charles Simeon was made one of the new trustees. See Sandys, E.T., *One hundred and forty-five years at the Old or Mission Church, Calcutta*, Calcutta, 1916: 27.

¹⁷⁸ Thomason to Simeon, July 12, 1820, as quoted in the Minutes of the Parent Committee, February 12, 1821, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/5.

(continued...)

Ch.5 Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

was an interesting one. On behalf of the trustees of the Old Mission Church, he offered to deed the Church to the Society if the CMS would agree to provide a parish minister in perpetuity.¹⁷⁹ The immediate response of the Parent Committee in London was positive, seeing the arrangement as the basis for the establishment of a mission station in Calcutta proper¹⁸⁰ However, judging by later correspondence between Thomason and his friend John Sherer, the arrangement with the CMS was still in the discussion stage in 1825.¹⁸¹ Temporary relief for Thomason had arrived in 1822 in the form of chaplain George William Crawford, but three years later Simeon would be working on a replacement for Crawford as well.¹⁸²

The records of the CMS indicate that Simeon was approached by the Society for personal references on five occasions. In fact there may have been more such instances, but only this handful is mentioned in the official accounts of the Society. In two cases Simeon was unable to give a recommendation because

¹⁷⁸(...continued)

This was actually the second time that Thomason had called on Simeon for help in this regard. In 1813-14 Simeon had met the need via the temporary reassignment of one of 'his' chaplains, i.e., Thomas Robertson. [See chapter 6, p.326.] Robertson's impending furlough in 1821 had once again created the need for a permanent assistant for Thomason.

¹⁷⁹ Simeon to the Secretary, January 29, 1821, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.

¹⁸⁰ Minutes of the Parent Committee, February 12, 1821, op.cit.

¹⁸¹ Thomason to Sherer, March 7, 1825, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁸² Ibid. Crawford was not one of Simeon's men, although he had Thomason's confidence. Crawford must have been an evangelical because he worked closely with Thomason at the Old Mission Church for six years. [Thomas Thomason to John Sherer, June 14, 1828, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.]

he said he had no knowledge of the former student. The name of the student in question in 1821 is unknown owing to damage to the manuscript.¹⁸³ In 1825, Simeon could not recall a Mr. [Anthony] Hammond who had made application to the CMS.¹⁸⁴ Hammond had been at Cambridge from 1816-1819, at Pembroke and then Emmanuel College. Simeon appears to have reacquainted himself with Hammond subsequent to the enquiry by the CMS. When Hammond was unsuccessful in his application to the Society, Simeon was able to send him Bengal as a chaplain in 1827. In the case of two references, in 1828 and 1835, the Minutes of the Parent Committee record a positive recommendation from Simeon.¹⁸⁵ On one occasion an adverse opinion from Simeon brought criticism to the effect that the applicant had been "spied on" by Simeon's minions while a student at Cambridge!¹⁸⁶

In financial terms Simeon's contributions to the CMS were also limited. It is true that Holy Trinity parish was the first to take a congregational collection for

¹⁸³ Simeon to Pratt, July 31, 1821, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3. The associated reference in the Minutes of the Parent Committee [August 31] only refer to "a candidate."

¹⁸⁴ Simeon to the Secretary, August 23, 1825, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3; also referenced in the Minutes of the Parent Committee, August 2 and September 23, 1825, G/C 1/7 and G/C 1/8, respectively.

¹⁸⁵ Minutes of the Parent Committee, January 8, 1828, and October 13, 1835, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/9 and G/C 1/14, respectively. The records make no mention of the names of the applicants.

¹⁸⁶ Minutes of the Parent Committee, January 13, 1824, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/6.

It is likely that the charge was not unfounded. As previously documented, Simeon relied on his close disciples for opinions on the fitness of students for his patronage. See chapter three, p.168.

the Society.¹⁸⁷ Moreover, an annual offering for the CMS was taken with regularity. But the records of the Society indicate major gifts from or through Simeon on only two occasions. In 1824 Simeon was appointed as a trustee for a £3,000 bequest designated for missionary work in India. When news of the appointment became known publicly, the Society approached Simeon for consideration.¹⁸⁸ In turn, Simeon wrote Thomas Thomason for advice on new work that the CMS might undertake with the funds. Said Simeon to his former curate, "I ... must have different options to choose from."¹⁸⁹ Three years later the CMS received £1,000 of the bequest for its use, as needed, in India.¹⁹⁰ Later, in 1832, the Society received another £1,000 from Simeon, representing one-third of the proceeds of the sale of the copyright of the *Horae homileticae*.¹⁹¹

Assessing Simeon's Impact on the Growth of the CMS

Upon receiving word of Charles Simeon's death in November 1836, the Parent Committee of the Church Missionary Society passed a motion of appreciation for a founder, a "country member" of the original Committee, a Life

¹⁸⁷ Hole, op.cit.: 104-5. The first such collection was taken in May 1804 in response to the Society's first "circular letter." The offering amounted to £50.

¹⁸⁸ Minutes of the Parent Committee, April 12, 1824, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/7.

¹⁸⁹ Simeon to Thomason, June 8, 1824, as quoted in Carus: 414.

¹⁹⁰ Simeon to the Secretary, May 29, 1828; and Minutes of the Parent Committee, June 9, 1828; CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3 and G/C 1/9, respectively.

¹⁹¹ Simeon to the Secretary, January 8, 1832; and Minutes of the Parent Committee, January 9, 1832; CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3 and G/C 1/12, respectively.

Governor, and a long-serving clerical advocate.¹⁹² Later publications by the Society credited Simeon and his EIC chaplains with "laying the foundation" for the Society's extensive work in India.¹⁹³ Eugene Stock, in his history of the Society in the nineteenth century, believed William Wilberforce and Charles Simeon to have been the two most important personalities in the formation of the CMS.¹⁹⁴ But did Charles Simeon help the CMS to grow in the terms most important to a nineteenth century voluntary missionary society? Did his efforts lead to an increase in the personnel or financial resources of the Society?

Max Warren, also a vicar of Holy Trinity Church [i.e., in the twentieth century] and the respected General Secretary of the CMS from 1942 to 1963, suggested that sixty CMS missionaries were former students of Simeon.¹⁹⁵ While this may have been the case in a factual sense, Simeon cannot be credited with recruiting these men for the Society. In his detailed study of the applications of missionary candidates to evangelical societies for the period 1789 through 1858, Stuart Piggin attributed only three CMS missionaries to Simeon's influence: William Jowett [Malta, 1815-30], Joseph Fenn [India, 1817-1826], and Robert

¹⁹² Minutes of the Parent Committee, November 14, 1835, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/15.

¹⁹³ Church Missionary Society, *The Church Missionary Society in 1837 and 1887*, London, 1887: 10.

¹⁹⁴ Stock, E., *The history of the Church Missionary Society: Its environment, its men, and its work*, 1899: vol.1, 261-2. Nevertheless, Stock noted that Simeon only attended four Anniversary [General] Meetings during his life.

¹⁹⁵ Warren, M.A.C., "Charles Simeon: His methods in the local church, the Church of England, and the nation," *Churchman* 92 (1978), 119.

Noble [1841-1865].¹⁹⁶ Piggin's findings are far more consistent with the chronology and findings of this study. Moreover, when Simeon's achievements in sending evangelical chaplains to India -- twenty-one men over thirty-six years -- is compared with his impact on the development of personnel for the CMS, Charles Simeon's preference becomes readily apparent.

Simeon and the Ecclesiastical Crises of the CMS

The case of Charles Simeon and the Church Missionary Society would not be complete without reference to some of the problems -- other than the need for personnel -- faced by the CMS during Simeon's life. These include the Society's tensions with the Indian bishops and the opposition from the English hierarchy to the CMS auxiliaries [Church Missionary Associations] and the "penny schemes." As Simeon had withdrawn from any major role in the governing of the Society prior to the development of these difficulties, the most we can expect to discover is Simeon's opinions or advice on these matters. However, his actions or comments on each subject reveal much about his view of the CMS and the missionary task in general.

¹⁹⁶ Piggin, S., *Making evangelical missionaries, 1789-1858*, Evangelicals and society from 1750, vol. 2, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, 1984: 88.

Simeon cannot be credited fully for Jowett's service with the Society. While Simeon exerted much influence on Jowett's decision to serve as the CMS's "literary agent" in Malta, Claudius Buchanan's encouragement must also be acknowledged. For example, Buchanan outlined the work of a chaplain for Jowett in a letter dated September 17, 1813. The letter gave Jowett some point of reference for beginning his work at Malta. [Buchanan to Jowett, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.]

Conflicts with the Indian Episcopate

It must be said from the first that the ecclesiastical difficulties experienced by the CMS in India from 1814 through 1840 were merely representative of the Society's troubles with the Established Church. However, the feud between the CMS and the first five Bishops of Calcutta was certainly the most notable of the Society's controversies during Simeon's life. From the standpoint of the Society, the crisis was yet another incidence of nonrecognition by the bishops of the Church. For a "Church" society, as the CMS claimed to be, it was a painful issue.

Recognition of the CMS by the hierarchy of the Church of England did not develop at all on schedule. As noted previously, the presidency of the Society had been left open for "some episcopal patron" in 1799.¹⁹⁷ The year 1813 arrived and the Society was still without its bishop. This was not for lack of effort. Wilberforce, for example, had approached the Bishop of Durham for his patronage of the Society when it seemed certain that missionary access to India would be secured in the renewal of the India Company's charter. The bishop declined. Josiah Pratt, aching for the name of any bishop for the annual report of the Society, asked Wilberforce to approach the Bishop of Durham once again.¹⁹⁸ He supposed that the confirmed victory in Parliament might prevail upon the diocesan. In a testy reply Wilberforce assured Pratt that nothing more could be done in this regard.¹⁹⁹ Clearly, nerves were on edge due to the inability of the CMS to secure

¹⁹⁷ See current chapter, p.243.

¹⁹⁸ Pratt to Wilberforce, July 13, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.

¹⁹⁹ Wilberforce to Pratt, July 14, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.

the approbation of the episcopate.²⁰⁰ A critical but anonymous retrospective on the Church Missionary Society, published in 1841, found that the "grand defect" of the Society was its failure to secure recognition by the bishops of the Church it supposedly served.²⁰¹ In the midst of this ecclesiastical dilemma the Society found itself face to face with a High Churchman as the first Bishop of Calcutta.

The immediate response of Pratt and the Parent Committee was concern that the non-evangelical bishop would inhibit the Society's newly-won freedom of activity in India. Pratt quickly urged the Calcutta Corresponding Committee to organize a formal auxiliary Society, believing that Middleton would be more likely to accept the existence of an established structure than approve the formation of a new one.²⁰² Henry Thornton and Thomas Babington were despatched to meet with Middleton and to share the "views of the Society," undoubtedly on matters touching on the stationing and supervision of missionaries, and the ordination of

²⁰⁰ The Society received its first support from the bench of bishops in 1815, with the patronage of Drs. Ryder of Gloucester and Bathurst of Norwich. It would be another half-decade, in 1820, before another bishop, Dr. Trench of Tuam [an archbishop!], would join the company of vice-patrons. Non-evangelical bishops dribbled in from 1823 onwards, beginning with Heber of Calcutta, but the Society did not receive wide episcopal support until 1842. This was arranged by Henry Venn through his "Concordat" of a year earlier, embodied in CMS Law 32. In this regulation the Society allowed that the bishops in England -- not the Society's governing body -- would have final word on conflicts between the CMS and the colonial bishops. See Shenk, W.R., *Henry Venn as missionary theorist and administrator*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1978: 252.

²⁰¹ [Anon.], *Brief statement of some objections entertained by certain members of the church to portions of the system and practice of the Church Missionary Society: By a clerical member of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1841: 5.

²⁰² Pratt to Thomas Thomason, March 29, 1814, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E 39.

native clergy. It was a hypothetical discussion, as the CMS had no missionaries in India at the time. The bishop was cordial but noncommittal.²⁰³

The key players in the Society became increasingly uncomfortable. For its part, the Parent Committee felt obliged to anticipate the worst:

Resolved, that in order to facilitate the Society's exertions in India, it appears expedient to take means for establishing there ... intelligent and pious Lutheran clergy; that, where circumstances may render it inconvenient or impracticable to procure Holy Orders for suitable natives from the Bishop of Calcutta, such natives may be admitted thereto by the nearest Lutheran clergy, according to the practice of the Lutheran Church, recognized and admitted by the Church of England.²⁰⁴

Suddenly the Lutheran missionaries serving with the Society took on even greater significance. Not only were they an answer to the dearth of English missionaries, they became a 'work-around' in case the Bishop of Calcutta "inconvenienced" the Society's plans for native clergy. While this action was entirely consistent with the

²⁰³ Apparently Simeon had access to Thornton and Babington's report, for he wrote of it to Thomason. [Simeon to Thomason, April 13 and May 24, 1814, as quoted in Carus: 274-5.]

²⁰⁴ Minutes of the Parent Committee, September 12, 1814, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/2: f.195.

When, in 1818, Middleton did indeed refuse to ordain native clergy and asserted his supervisory authority over all Anglican clergy in India, the Parent Committee asked for legal opinion on the extent of the Bishop's powers. The opinion confirmed Middleton's full power to "silence" ministers of the Church of England, re-station ordained [i.e., Anglican] missionaries within his diocese, and exert the same degree of control over those he ordained [i.e., native clergy]. See Minutes of the Parent Committee, July 13, 1818, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/3: ff.241-5.

In fairness to Bishop Middleton, his letters patent did not make clear provision for native ordinations. An Act of Parliament in 1824, in conjunction with Heber's appointment to the see of Calcutta, explicitly empowered colonial bishops to ordain native clergy. See Cnattingius, H., *Bishops and societies: A study of Anglican colonial and missionary expansion, 1698-1850*, London, 1952: 113.

voluntary nature of the CMS, it clearly jeopardized the Society's claim to be submitted to episcopal authority and provided the Society's opponents with all they required to claim that the CMS was no "Church" society at all.²⁰⁵

How did Charles Simeon respond to the impending crisis? Both Simeon and Charles Grant expressed their uncertainty as to Middleton's posture toward the CMS.²⁰⁶ They were definitely worried over the difficulties a High Church bishop could create for an evangelical and voluntary missionary society. However, Simeon's response was very different from that of the Society. His approach to bishops was to acknowledge their authority and act in such a way as to avoid confrontation and gain their confidence.²⁰⁷ In anticipation of Middleton's arrival in India, Simeon urged the Society and its leaders to give the Bishop no reason to oppose the CMS.

For example, Simeon wrote to Thomas Thomason in July of 1814 to rebuke him for failing to use the pulpit of the Old Mission Church to discourage the Baptist missionaries from violating the restrictions of the Indian Government on the publishing and distribution of certain religious tracts.²⁰⁸ This was a serious

²⁰⁵ See current chapter, pp.245-6, especially note 99.

²⁰⁶ Simeon to Grant, June 3, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge; Grant to Udny, June 8, 1814, as quoted in Morris, op.cit.: 333.

²⁰⁷ Simeon's views on the relationship of clergy to ecclesiastical powers has been examined in chapter three, pp.141-2.

²⁰⁸ Simeon to Thomason, September 26, 1814, as quoted in Carus: 277-8.

As a consequence of the incident at Vellore in 1807, the Indian Government of Lord Minto had imposed restrictions on the press, especially religious publishers. Lord Moira continued Minto's policies when he became Governor-General in 1813. Carey and the Baptists at Serampore, in good Dissenting fashion, often published religious material without prior permission of the Government.

(continued...)

matter as far as Simeon was concerned, so much so that he advised Thomason to resign his chaplaincy if his commitment to the missionary agenda did not permit him to carry out the instructions of his employer, viz., the India Company and Government. Simeon was concerned for Thomason personally,²⁰⁹ but wider considerations also motivated Simeon. With the new bishop due in Calcutta at any time, Simeon did not want evangelicals -- especially those connected with the CMS -- to be too closely associated with Nonconformist missionaries. Nor did Simeon desire Thomason's actions to adversely affect his [Simeon's] ability to send chaplains to India.

As for the Bishop of Calcutta's authority over Anglican clergy in India, Simeon was unequivocal. He affirmed the Bishop's traditional power to station and license [or not to license] his clergy.²¹⁰ Simeon commended Thomason for his submission to Middleton, which the chaplain had alluded to in a letter:

I highly approve of your conciliatory conduct towards the Bishop. Both duty and policy enjoin that; and I am greatly mistaken, if duty and policy are ever at variance.²¹¹

²⁰⁸(...continued)

[Sen Gupta, K.P., *The Christian missionaries in Bengal, 1793-1833*, University of London, Ph.D. thesis, 1966: 63-4, 73-83.] Apparently word had reached Simeon that in one instance Thomason had failed to "reprove" the missionaries.

²⁰⁹ Simeon inquired of Grant whether Thomason had been or would be censured by the Court of Directors. [Simeon to Grant, September 26, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.] It does not appear that the matter ever came before the Court.

²¹⁰ Simeon to Grant, March 3, 1815, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

²¹¹ Simeon to Thomason, March 8, 1816, as quoted in Carus: 301. The emphasis is Simeon's. Note the correlation between the maintenance of social order and Christian duty. This aspect of Simeon's world-view is taken up in detail in chapter two, pp.83ff.

This is not to suggest that Simeon believed that Middleton's support for the evangelical or missionary agenda would necessarily be secured by submission. Simeon's fears with respect to the corrupting nature of power, even the episcopal variety, have already been noted.²¹² Rather, Simeon's strategy for coping with a High Churchman as Bishop of Calcutta was to maintain personal commitment to evangelical ideals, to exercise trust in God's sovereignty, and to wait patiently for opportunity to act within the system.²¹³ This posture was entirely consistent with Simeon's world-view and his experience with High Church opposition in Cambridge. He advised Thomason, and the CMS through him, to act accordingly. Of course, this advice would have been painless for Simeon because his primary efforts for India [i.e., via chaplains] relied upon the status quo in India and did not require the approbation of the new diocesan.

Tensions over the Auxiliary Structure

When it became apparent, after its first half-decade, that the Church Missionary Society was stagnating for lack of personnel, two tactics were undertaken to improve the situation. First, Lutheran clergy were employed to give the CMS some missionaries through whom the overseas purposes of the Society

²¹² See current chapter, p.213. The comments quoted there are drawn from the same letter to Thomason, i.e., March 18, 1816.

²¹³ Simeon later affirmed the faithfulness of God in this regard in the appointment of Daniel Wilson to the Calcutta see. [Simeon to William Carus, August 21, 1835, Trinity College MSS, Add. MS b113 f.50.]

Simeon suggested Daniel Wilson as a candidate for Bishop of Calcutta to Robert Grant, but Wilson's name had already been suggested by Lord Glenelg [Charles Grant, junior]. [Glenelg to Simeon, March 30, 1832, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.] Wilson acknowledged Simeon's role in securing the see of Calcutta. [Wilson to Simeon, 1832, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.]

could be forwarded. Second, it was agreed by the General Committee that a broadly-based network of agents and supporters was needed in Britain.²¹⁴ As indicated previously, it was this infrastructure at home -- not the Society's operations overseas -- that gave the CMS its first successes.²¹⁵ What role did Charles Simeon play in this strategic development for the Society?

While the CMS was notable as a missionary society without many missionaries in its first decade and a half, it was also marked by an empty purse. The initial enthusiasm for the Society's formation brought £1,279 into the coffers of the CMS during the period of 1799 through 1802. Eleven years later, during its 1812-13 year, the total income for the Society was only £2,831 and operating at a deficit.²¹⁶ This was a genuine crisis that threatened the existence of the CMS. Fortunately, a solution had been provided in the example of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By establishing auxiliary societies to raise funds from local [i.e., county-wide] sources, the BFBS had solved its own financial problems. Bible Society income grew from £5,835 in 1808-9 to £14,284 the following year, with seventy per-cent of the increase due to income generated by just a handful of auxiliary societies.²¹⁷ By 1812-13, total income for the Bible Society had risen to £55,099, almost twenty times larger than that of the CMS. Based on this

²¹⁴ Minutes of the Parent Committee, April 6, 1807, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/1.

²¹⁵ See chapter four, pp.173ff.

²¹⁶ "Tabular view of the Society's income," *The jubilee volume of the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East, 1848-1849*, London, 1849: 266.

²¹⁷ British and Foreign Bible Society, *Summary account of the proceedings of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and of the beneficial effect which has resulted from its institution: By the Committee of the Society*, London, 1816: xlv-xlix.

performance, the CMS's Committee of Funds urged Josiah Pratt to draft an auxiliary plan for the Society.²¹⁸

Pratt's design for Church Missionary Associations [CMAs], the Society's version of the auxiliary structure, anticipated two outcomes. CMAs would "promote a missionary spirit in general" and they would raise funds, especially through the creation of "penny associations" designed to solicit small gifts from common working people. The plan was published in the premier issue of the *Missionary Register*, a Clapham-encouraged publication that was to report the progress of all of the evangelical missionary societies based in Britain.²¹⁹ The impact was almost immediate. By the time of the thirteenth Anniversary Meeting, in May 1813, over £2,500 had been raised by the London and Bristol auxiliaries alone. The financial results for the year 1813-14 showed a four-fold increase in income, including £7,322 from CMAs.²²⁰ It was success at last for the Church Missionary Society. Charles Simeon drew encouragement from these developments. He was in attendance at the 1813 Anniversary Meeting and moved the first resolution of thanks in response to the success of the Society's auxiliaries.²²¹ Euphorically, the third resolution of the meeting urged the Society to establish such associations "throughout the Empire."²²²

²¹⁸ The action was taken on September 17, 1812. [Hole, op.cit.: 230.]

²¹⁹ "An appeal, particularly to Churchmen, on the duty of propagating the Gospel," and "Plan of Church Missionary Associations," *Missionary Register* 1 (1813), 1, 21f.

²²⁰ "Tabular view of the Society's income," op.cit.

²²¹ Hole, op.cit.: 269.

²²² *Ibid.*

Ch.5 Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

Simeon's enthusiasm for Church Missionary Associations paralleled his zeal for the evangelical clerical societies that had long been an important activity for him. He appears to have been willing to attend CMA meetings whenever possible. Simeon addressed the founding meeting of the Association at Saffron-Walden on August 7, 1816, travelled to Ireland with William Marsh for the eighth anniversary of the Hibernian auxiliary in 1822, and participated in the seventh, ninth, and thirteenth anniversaries of the Norfolk and Norwich CMA.²²³ In the same way that clerical societies had provided a structure through which evangelical ministers in the Church of England could be encouraged in their work, so also the CMAs served as a means through which the Society's advocates -- clergy and laity -- could focus their promotional efforts. This made sense to Simeon.

However, Simeon was also mindful of the potential difficulties, especially the ecclesiastical ones, that might be engendered by the organization of a Church Missionary Association. This is not to suggest that Simeon shied away from evangelical 'organizing' merely because it would be opposed. He had been willing to risk much in being an outspoken supporter of the formation of the Bible Society auxiliaries, including one for Cambridge in 1812.²²⁴ Still, when Simeon

²²³ Minutes of the Parent Committee, October 14/1816, October 9/1820, July 8/1822, and October 14/1822, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/2-6.

²²⁴ Simeon's printed debates with Herbert Marsh during 1811-13, when Marsh was the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, surfaced out of Simeon's support for the Bible Society. Simeon also joined his evangelical colleagues in Cambridge in ensuring that Marsh was unable to block the formation of the Cambridge Auxiliary Bible Society in 1812.

A brief bibliography of primary sources: *An account of a meeting lately held at Cambridge, for the institution of an Auxiliary Bible Society: ... to which are subjoined, the address of Dr. Herbert Marsh, ... and the reply of the Right Hon. N. Vansittart, M.P.*, Glasgow, 1812; Marsh, H., *An inquiry into the consequences of neglecting to give the Prayer Book with the Bible ...*, Cambridge, 1812; Marsh, H., *A letter to the Rev. Charles Simeon ... in answer to his pretended congratulatory address, in confutation of his various misstatements, and in vindication of the efficacy ascribed by our Church to ... baptism*, Cambridge, 1813; Marsh, H., *A second letter to the Rev. Charles Simeon, in confutation of his various misstatements, and in vindication of the efficacy ascribed by our*

(continued...)

Ch.5 Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

was approached the following year by a number of University students in support of a Cambridge auxiliary for the CMS, he had to discourage them.²²⁵ The Bible Society controversy in Cambridge had depleted the reservoir of tolerance among University officials for public undertakings by evangelicals. Cambridge was still a centre of High Church sentiment. It would take some time before the environment would permit another evangelical association in the town.

The topic of a Cambridge CMA next arose in 1815. Daniel Corrie had returned from India for a brief furlough and Simeon had invited his former student to preach at Holy Trinity Church.²²⁶ The General Committee of the Society [i.e., Pratt] recognized the potential for the formation of an auxiliary society in the invitation. The Committee urged Pratt to accompany Corrie and use the opportunity for form a CMA for Cambridge.²²⁷ The date of the meeting was set for November 12, but Pratt was forced to take the sermon due Corrie's ill health. Following the service Simeon had arranged for Pratt to meet with the key evangelical leaders in Cambridge. The group agreed to render all possible aid to the CMS, to disseminate information actively about the Society in the town, and to form a Cambridge CMS Committee. But the group specifically asked Pratt to take

²²⁴(...continued)

Church to the sacrament of baptism, Cambridge, 1813; and Simeon, C., *Dr. Marsh's fact: or, A congratulatory address to the church members of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, 2nd ed., with an appendix in answer to Dr. Marsh's letters, Cambridge, 1813.

²²⁵ Hole, op.cit.: 276. These were some of the same students that had been instrumental in bringing the Bible Society crisis to a head.

²²⁶ Simeon to Pratt, October 9 and 17, 1815, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.

²²⁷ Minutes of the Parent Committee, October 23, 1815, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/2.

no further steps toward the formation of a CMA at that time.²²⁸ Simeon and company judged that the lingering effects of the Bible Society controversy were still too tangible. They would also have been concerned with the evident tensions between the Society and the new Bishop of Calcutta, an affair that would not play well in Cambridge.

Simeon and his colleagues did not judge that it was safe to form a Cambridge Church Missionary Association for another three years. No doubt their conservatism troubled Pratt and, perhaps, created uncertainty as to Simeon's interests. But the CMA was eventually formed in November of 1818 with Simeon's full support. The motion to establish the Association was seconded by Charles Simeon.²²⁹ While the matter of the Society's relationship with the Indian episcopate was nowhere near resolution, Simeon and company must have judged it to be important to have Cambridge join the growing list of auxiliaries. Apparently Simeon believed that there was, at last, enough evangelical momentum in Cambridge to deal with any opposition. As usual, Simeon's political sensors were correct. The Cambridge CMA never caused the kind of stir associated with the Bible Society auxiliary. No doubt the Cambridge evangelicals were glad of that.

²²⁸ Minutes of the Parent Committee, December 11, 1815, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/2.

²²⁹ Cambridge Association of the Church Missionary Society, *One hundred years: A short history of the Cambridge Association of the Church Missionary Society, 1818-1918*, Cambridge, 1918: 9-11.

Simeon's on-going support for the Cambridge CMA was made evident by his participation in the second, third, fourth, sixth, and seventh anniversary meetings. [Minutes of the Parent Committee, December 11/1820, June 11/1821, July 8/1822, June 14/1822, and May 9/1825, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/5-7.]

Simeon's Lingering Concerns

In the midst of his general and enthusiastic support for Church Missionary Associations, he also had some constructive criticisms. On more than one point Simeon was in tacit agreement with opponents of the CMS such as Josiah Thomas, Archdeacon of Bath. Simeon would never have openly embraced common cause with a High Churchman such as Thomas, but he did share a few of the Archdeacon's concerns. Here we have yet another paradox in Simeon's relationship to the evangelical movement of which he was a key leader.

The context for Thomas' *An address to a meeting ... in the city of Bath* was the founding of the Church Missionary Association for that city. Thomas' most significant charge was the ecclesiastical irregularity implied in the Society's unwillingness to submit its missionaries in India to the supervision of the Bishop of Calcutta.²³⁰ On this basis alone Thomas labelled the CMS as virtually an association of Dissenters and "no Church society" whatsoever.²³¹ While Simeon agreed fully with Daniel Wilson's *Defence* of the Society, i.e., that the CMS made a better claim as a missionary society of the Church of England than did the SPCK or the SPG,²³² the preceding section clearly demonstrates that Simeon's approach

²³⁰ Thomas, J., *An address to a meeting holden at the town-hall in the city of Bath ... for the purpose of forming a Church Missionary Society in that city ... with a protest against the establishment of such a society in Bath*, 5th edition, London, 1817, reprint, *Pamphleteer* 16 (1818), 213-23.

This matter has been briefly mentioned already in the current chapter, p.245, note 99.

²³¹ Op.cit.: 216.

²³² See Wilson, D., *A defence of the Church Missionary Society against the objections of the Rev. Josiah Thomas, M.A., Archdeacon of Bath*, 6th edition, London, 1818: 3-6, 12f.

to the conflict with the Bishop of Calcutta would have differed from the course taken by the CMS.

Thomas also found the ethos created by the auxiliaries and "penny associations" to be "unworthy of the Church of England."²³³ This was a critique of evangelical voluntaryism in general and one that other critics of the CMS joined Thomas in disparaging. G.R. Gleig deplored what he perceived as the CMS's constant cry for "Money! Money! Missionaries! Missionaries!"²³⁴ Further, Gleig judged the "penny scheme" to be a "positive evil" and a "vile system of wheedling" that preyed on the ignorant poor.²³⁵ J.B.S. Carwithen, another critic of the auxiliaries, became so irritated by the Society's insistence on the universal imperative of the missionary task -- on which the CMS based its appeals for funds and personnel -- that he urged every missionary advocate to cease asking for anything and just go forth:

If any man, in the present day, can think that the last command of our blessed Saviour to preach his gospel "to every creature" is in the same degree binding on Christians at the present time, as it originally was on the Apostles; that man is "conscientiously" obliged not to contribute, or to collect, but to go.²³⁶

²³³ Thomas, op.cit.: 216.

²³⁴ Gleig, G.R., *A letter to Sir Edward Knatchbull ... on his accepting the office of President, at a meeting of an auxiliary Church Missionary Association, held in the town hall of Maidstone, on the 14th of August last*, London, 1823: 71.

²³⁵ Gleig, G.R., *Some observations on the constitution and tendency of the Church Missionary Society*, 2nd edition, London, 1824: 66-7.

²³⁶ Carwithen, J.B.S., *A letter to the Reverend Daniel Wilson, M.A., in reply to his defence of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1818: 43.

Ch.5 Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

Simeon certainly did not share these precise sentiments, but he did express his concern with what he perceived to be a growing tendency to associate success for the Society with the attendance at meetings and the size of collections.²³⁷

The heart of Simeon's anxiety over the operation of the missionary societies in general, and the CMS in particular, was expressed in a letter to Thomas Thomason in 1824, in the midst of the criticism over the CMAs and the "penny associations":

[Missionary] societies are like the Cabinet of Ministers, who send out armies and sit at home, and get some credit: but it is the armies that strike the blow, and that are God's instruments to us for good. Yet the Cabinets are of use in their place, though they may sometimes be wrong in their judgment.²³⁸

Simeon was clearly concerned that the support infrastructure for a missionary society might become more important in the life of that voluntary society than the

²³⁷ Carus: 490; also cited as a concern of Simeon's in Ervine, W.J.C., *Doctrine and diplomacy: Some aspects of the life and thought of the Anglican evangelical clergy, 1797-1837*, Cambridge University, Ph.D. thesis, 1979: 230.

²³⁸ Simeon to Thomason, July 9, 1824, as quoted in Carus: 420. The points of emphasis are Simeon's.

work its missionaries accomplish. Moreover, Simeon believed that success at home in fundraising often created a vicious circle:

When the funds of the Missionary Societies rise in consequence of [one-off] circumstances, the Committees too often build on it, and sometimes go too far; and when [funds] fall to their reasonable level again, the Societies become embarrassed, and the public mind needlessly discouraged. Oh for more wisdom!²³⁹

The only recourse of a voluntary society at such a point is further appeals for public support. In a period when the triumphs for the Church Missionary Society were much more in the 'home' context than abroad, Simeon's constructive criticisms were relevant. They also shared content with those of the Society's sharpest critics in the Establishment.

The Need for Another Course

Where did these many facets of Simeon's relationship with the Church Missionary Society leave the Old Apostle of Cambridge? By 1824 how did he feel about the Society he was instrumental in founding? Charles Simeon was an advocate for the missionary cause and, therefore, a consistent supporter of the Society. Nevertheless, this is too simple and too incomplete an answer. The vicar of Holy Trinity Church was troubled by the progress of the Society for Missions to Africa and the East. Moreover, this reality has been understated by every account of Simeon's life and by every history of the CMS.

²³⁹ Simeon to one of his "Conversation Parties," undated, as quoted in Brown, A.W., *Recollections of the conversation parties of the Rev. Charles Simeon, M.A., Senior Fellow of King's College, and Perpetual Curate of Trinity Church, Cambridge*, London, 1863: 205.

Ch.5 Simeon and the Church Missionary Society

He was, first of all, troubled by his own inability to recruit missionaries for the Society. He was troubled by the rejection of the "catechist plan." He was troubled by the tendency of the Society's leaders to turn away from the Universities as a source of personnel. He was troubled by the General Committee's inability to recognize that salary comparisons with English clergy were relevant issues. He was troubled by interpersonal conflict with key personalities associated with the Society. He was troubled by the lack of interest of fellow clergy in the missionary cause. He was troubled by all the delays such indifference had produced. He was troubled by his geographical distance from the centre of the action in London. He was troubled by the opposition of the hierarchy of the Church toward the CMS. He was troubled by the Society's open challenges to the proper authority of the bishops. He was troubled by his success in recruiting chaplains for India and his failure to enlist missionaries for the country. He was troubled by the contrast between the access that chaplains had to India and the limits placed on missionaries. He was troubled by the nonchalance of the Society with respect to his few recommendations of personnel. He was troubled by the CMS's inability to assume responsibility for the Old Mission Church. He was troubled by the Society's promotional operations at home. And he was troubled by the ring of truth in the attacks of some of Society's harshest critics.

However speculative at points, these are the reasons why the relationship of Charles Simeon to the Church Missionary Society is such a strange case, a mixture of enthusiasm and criticism. It is not difficult -- in light of the facts presented -- to imagine all of these 'troubles' converging on Simeon. When he thought of the Church Missionary Society, he had reason to thank God for his part in it. He was thoroughly committed to the missionary movement, and the CMS was a channel through which Simeon expressed that commitment. But he also had reasons to be troubled. This sense of unrest moved Simeon to explore other avenues of missionary activity. It is to these alternative agendas that this study must now turn.

Chapter Six

The Missionary Agenda By Other Means

The East India Company did not fare very well in the eyes of evangelicals with regard to ecclesiastical and missionary matters. Typical views were expressed by the Eclectic Society in 1808 when the complaints of evangelical chaplains and Baptist missionaries in India came under discussion. As a consequence of the incident at Vellore in 1806, Lord Minto had restricted the publishing of religious material that he believed would incite similar turmoil. Claudius Buchanan and the Baptist press at Serampore were directly affected.¹ It was the consensus of the meeting of the Eclectic that evangelicals in India should continue to preach and publish while also avoiding confrontation and controversy.² Simeon, an attendee on this occasion, expressed common sentiment when he noted that "all difficulties" then facing evangelical chaplains and missionaries in India were the product of the actions or inactions of the East India Company.³ However fair or unfair a judgment, Simeon's comments reflected evangelical opinions of the Company.

¹ Lord Minto's policies and their impact on the evangelicals in India are discussed in a number of sources. See Davidson, A.K., *The development and influence of the British missionary movement's attitudes towards India, 1786-1830*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1973; and Sen Gupta, K.P., *The Christian missionaries in Bengal, 1793-1833*, University of London, Ph.D. thesis, 1966.

² Minutes of the meeting of January 25, 1808, as quoted in Pratt, J.H., ed., *Eclectic notes: or, Notes of discussions on religious topics at the meetings of the Eclectic Society, London, during the years 1798-1814*, 2nd edition, London, 1865: 425-6.

³ Ibid.

Nor were Simeon's criticisms of the Indian Establishment limited to civil affairs. The excerpt from his letter of 1816 to Thomas Thomason, noted previously, reveals Simeon's misgivings vis-à-vis the Indian episcopate.⁴ His concerns reflected general evangelical uncertainty over the appointment of a High Churchman, T.F. Middleton, as the first Bishop of Calcutta. When evangelical fears were realized in Middleton's refusal to ordain native clergy, the Church Missionary Society found itself in conflict with the new bishop. This state of affairs continued until Reginald Heber succeeded Middleton in 1822. Heber openly affirmed the work of the CMS in India and temporarily defused the tension between the Society and the Calcutta episcopate.⁵

Reconciliation with the Bishop of Calcutta, however, did not mean *rapprochement* between evangelicals and the Indian Establishment as a whole. Evangelical missionaries in India knew that they were tolerated by the India Company because of the mandates imposed by the EIC's charter of 1813. Nor was the marginalization of religious leaders limited to evangelicals. Even Bishop Heber, a nonpartisan clergyman with friends in the evangelical camp and among traditional Churchmen, was not immune. Despite an official status in India that was surpassed only by the Governor-General, Heber was treated as a virtual

⁴ See chapter five, p.213.

⁵ Ironically, the problem reappeared with even greater intensity upon the appointment of Daniel Wilson to the see of Calcutta in 1834. Wilson was a thorough evangelical and a steady supporter of the CMS. But Wilson also affirmed a bishop's prerogative to approve or disapprove the stationing of his clergy, in this case meaning India Company chaplains and ordained Anglican missionaries. It was a position that both Middleton and Heber would have approved. Wilson's claims were resisted by the Parent Committee of the CMS until 1838. Resolution came through discussions between Henry Venn and Bishop Wilson. In 1841 the Society agreed to settle disputes with the Calcutta episcopate by appeal to the bench of bishops in England. See Shenk, W.R., *Henry Venn as missionary theorist and administrator*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1978: 252; and Yates, T.E., *Venn and Victorian bishops abroad: The missionary policies of Henry Venn and their repercussions upon the Anglican episcopate of the colonial period, 1841-1872*, Uppsala, 1978: 33ff.

persona non grata by the civil authorities. The extent to which Heber was ignored by the Indian Government did not escape the Bishop's wife. Apart from Sunday services, there was little to take Heber away from home from his arrival in India in October 1823 until his first visitation in the following June.⁶ Amelia Heber found the social isolation disconcerting.

The extent of the India Company's disaffection with its ecclesiastical overhead was revealed in the EIC's response to the unexpected deaths of Bishops Heber and James in 1826 and 1828. Episcopal transitions in India produced great uncertainty among Anglican clergy in the region because the see was situated thousands of miles from the powers that were able to refill it. Every vacancy produced apprehension and confusion. Concerned at the loss of two bishops within a twenty-four month period, and by the ecclesiastical chaos created on each occasion, the Established Church immediately began to plead for more than one bishop for India. EIC resistance to the enlargement of the Indian episcopate was immediate. The prospect of further obligations for religious infrastructure turned

⁶ Mrs. Heber to her mother-in-law, March 31, 1824, as quoted in Chalmondeley, R.H., ed., *The Heber letters, 1783-1832*, London, 1950: 314.

Ch.6 The Missionary Agenda By Other Means

the Court of Directors against an expanded Church hierarchy in India. The Court protested the proposal then before Parliament:

Your petitioners [i.e., the Court of Directors], whilst they are sincerely desirous that adequate means should be provided for the spiritual instruction and consolation of all classes of the public servants stationed in India, must be permitted to remark that no evidence has been brought before them, which satisfies them of the necessity of adding to the establishment two suffragan bishops and two chaplains of the Church of Scotland, and that without such evidence they could not consider it just to employ the revenue of India in maintaining these officers.⁷

The Court's resistance gave rise to renewed questions as to the fitness of the India Company as the patron of an ecclesiastical establishment: "[The Court of Directors is] hardly ... a proper authority in which to invest the patronage and supreme control of the Indian Church."⁸

The matter of additional bishops for India was soon settled by the loss of another diocesan. With the death of Bishop Turner in 1831 -- the third in five years -- the decision was taken out of the hands of the EIC. The additional bishops were approved by Parliament in conjunction with the India Company's charter of 1833.⁹ Success was achieved primarily through the efforts of Lord Glenelg [Charles Grant, Jr.], then a Cabinet Minister and President of the Board of

⁷ As quoted in Kaye, J.W., *Christianity in India: An historical narrative*, London, 1859: 401 and note.

⁸ [Anon.], *A letter to a friend in England on the state and patronage of the Church of England in India: By a chaplain of the Bombay Establishment*, London, 1829: 14.

⁹ The most significant aspect of the 1833 charter was the transformation of the East India Company from a trading concern into a body of government in a formal sense. In this action Britain took another step toward direct rule of India.

Ch.6 The Missionary Agenda By Other Means

Control. Nevertheless, the India Company continued to resist. For example, when Daniel Corrie was recalled to London from Calcutta in 1834 for his consecration as Bishop of Madras, the EIC refused to defray the cost of his transport to England. Parliament's creation of the diocese of Madras required the India Company to make provision for the suffragan's passage to India, but the need to transport the bishop-elect to Britain had not been anticipated by Parliament. EIC officials in Calcutta were under no formal obligation to assist Corrie in his return to England. Corrie would have declined the appointment altogether had not Glenelg arranged for an £800 annual pension to be paid to Corrie during absences from India.¹⁰ The pension met the cost of Corrie's return to England and his living expenses while there. The EIC's actions toward the incoming Bishop of Madras did not endear the Company to evangelicals such as Simeon.

From the early days of the "1787 Plan" onward, the East India Company had made no effort to befriend evangelical causes. Nonetheless, Charles Simeon turned to the India Company for help. The EIC eventually became the primary channel through which Simeon's students were sent to the subcontinent. As noted in chapter five, this course of action was a direct consequence of Simeon's unproductive relationship with the Church Missionary Society. Within five years of the formation of the CMS, Simeon was actively seeking other means through which to express his commitment to the missionary movement. Recruiting chaplains for the India Company served precisely this purpose.¹¹ Moreover, these activities proved to be Simeon's most fruitful efforts as a mentor of third-generation evangelical Churchmen.

¹⁰ Macnaghten, A., *Daniel Corrie: His family and his friends*, London, 1969: 119.

¹¹ Simeon's involvement in the London Society for the Propagation of Christianity Amongst the Jews was another alternative course. This aspect of Simeon's work is not central to this study, but it will be touched on in the course of this chapter. See pp.378ff.

The Influence of Charles Grant

Charles Simeon first became involved in recruiting clergy for India Company chaplaincies as a consequence of the collapse of the "1787 Plan."¹² Simeon pursued his EIC connection in order to achieve what earlier efforts had failed to accomplish, viz., evangelical missionary work in India. Moreover, the events surrounding the "1787 Plan" affected Simeon's missionary agenda in more than one manner. Simeon's interest in the Church Missionary Society arose from tactical considerations, i.e., the need to find some means for sending evangelical Anglican missionaries to India. Recruiting for the EIC was an expedient alternative toward the same end, especially prior to 1813-14. However, Simeon's pursuit of men for religious service with the India Company was also an interpersonal matter. Simeon's labours to enlist evangelicals as EIC chaplains were greatly stimulated by his relationship with Charles Grant.

Grant and his activities as an evangelical during his second residence in India [1774-90], have been introduced in chapter five.¹³ It is also necessary to appreciate his secular duties in order to understand Grant's mission-related agenda. Until 1780 Grant served as secretary to the Board of Trade in Calcutta, a body that had been created to coordinate the Company's commercial operations in India. Tiring of an administrative role and looking for a more lucrative activity, Grant became Commercial Resident at Malda. While directing the Company's trading concerns in his territory, Grant was able to enter into a number of advantageous personal contracts. This was common practice for Company officials. By such

¹² See current chapter, pp.304,312-13.

¹³ Pp.220ff.

private trade Grant amassed a significant fortune and rose in influence among the Company's officials in India.¹⁴

In addition to increasing his wealth and status, Charles Grant also became a committed evangelical during his residency in India. His spiritual renewal originated out of the deaths of his brother, his uncle, and both of his daughters in 1775 and 1776. Grant's new faith had direct effect on the use of his fortune and his rank. As mentioned previously, Grant rescued Kiernander's Old Mission Church from a sheriff's sale in 1787. For Rs10,000 [then £1,000], Grant provided an evangelical pulpit for Calcutta.¹⁵ Grant also used his position to encourage Thomas Coke's plans to send Methodist missionaries to Bengal in 1784 and 1786.¹⁶ The "1787 Plan" was Grant's most involved evangelical effort in India. Upon the failure of the "Plan," Grant experimented with a personally-funded mission at Gomalty, where he owned an indigo concern. Grant's intention was to underwrite the mission with a portion of the profits of the factory. The Gomalty mission collapsed when Grant and his missionary, John Thomas, could not agree

¹⁴ Until prohibited by the reforms of Lord Cornwallis in the late 1780s, private trading by EIC employees was tolerated as a form of compensation for the risks taken in being resident in India. However, trading with the Dutch East India Company was deemed improper by the British EIC. Such transactions were highly lucrative. There has been some debate as to whether or not Grant entered into trade with the Dutch. Morris, in his sympathetic biography of Grant, concluded that he refused to make his fortune by such "illicit means" and that he quit India when private trade of any sort was outlawed. [Morris, H., *Charles Grant, the friend of William Wilberforce and Henry Thornton*, London, 1898: 19, 26.] In contrast, Furber suggested that Grant made large sums of money through illegal activities. [Furber, H., *John Company at work: A study of European expansion in India in the late eighteenth century*, Cambridge, Mass., 1948: 82-3, 337.] Similarly, Hess concluded that Grant gave up his private activities with the Dutch only when Cornwallis' reforms threatened to make public Grant's allegedly illegal activities. [Hess, W.R., *The religious policy of the British East India Company, 1806-1843*, University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. thesis, 1964: 20, 22.]

¹⁵ See chapter five, pp.273, note 177.

¹⁶ See chapter five, pp.220f.

Ch.6 The Missionary Agenda By Other Means

the latter's place of residence.¹⁷ Grant subsequently returned to England and Thomas eventually took up work with the Serampore Baptists.

This brief chronology of Grant's mission-related activities in India serves to illustrate the point made by Grant himself to Henry Creighton in 1793: He [Grant] desired to use a significant portion of his material resources and influence in support of missionary activity in India.¹⁸ To invest time, personal effort, and funds in distinctively Christian causes was characteristic of wealthy evangelicals in the Church of England. Grant had experimented with this principle while living in India, found it reinforced by elite evangelicals in England such as Wilberforce and the Thorntons, and was able to pursue this agenda with even greater effectiveness during his residence in London as an India Company official and in Parliament.¹⁹

Soon after his return to Britain in 1790, Grant joined the SPCK and attended a meeting of its General Committee on September 7.²⁰ However, the "Venerable Societies" were not the channels through which Grant expressed his interest in the progress of Christianity in India. Nor did the CMS serve as the

¹⁷ Thomas disliked the lack of a European community and its amenities in Gomalty, hence his desire to reside at Malda. Grant, on the other hand, wished his missionary to live among the native population. Grant discontinued his patronage of Thomas when the disagreement proved insoluble. Grant's view is told in Morris, H., *The life of Charles Grant: Sometime member of Parliament for Inverness-Shire and director of the East India Company*, London, 1904: 128ff. Thomas' sentiments are reflected in Marshman, J.C., *The life and times of Carey, Marshman, and Ward, embracing the history of the Serampore mission*, London, 1859: vol.1, 49ff.; and Hess, op.cit., 22ff.

¹⁸ Grant to Creighton, June 8, 1793, India Office Library and Records MSS, Eur.D.561.4.

¹⁹ Grant was Member for Inverness-shire from 1804 to 1818.

²⁰ Morris, H., *Charles Grant, the friend of William Wilberforce and Henry Thornton*, London, 1898: 36.

primary context for Grant's mission-related activities, although he did encourage its founding and served as a vice-president of the Society.²¹

India House and Parliament were the major settings for Grant's efforts on behalf of the Christianization of India. Much of Grant's time from his return to Britain through 1793 was given over to writing his *Observations on the state of society among the Asiatic subjects of Great Britain*, published in 1797.²² The *Observations* served as an argument in favour of Company support for missionary activity in India. Grant undoubtedly hoped that his writings would prove useful in securing support for the "pious clauses" Wilberforce intended to propose for the 1793 charter of the India Company. Neither Grant nor Wilberforce were successful, as has been observed previously.²³ Charles Grant was unable to significantly sway Company policy until his election to its Court of Directors in May 1794, but his influence after that date was immense.

Not unlike Simeon, Charles Grant exerted much of his influence on the "mission business" through various private discussions and meetings. One such engagement -- and a crucial one as far as this study is concerned -- was a dinner with Simeon in Cambridge in October of 1792. Claudius Buchanan of Queens'

²¹ Grant's relationship to the CMS, like Wilberforce's, was that of a patron and advisor. Both men lent their names to the Society and made annual donations, but their best contributions came in the form of introductions and advice. For example, as noted in chapter five [pp.245ff.], Wilberforce was called upon to present John Venn's *Account* of the formation of the CMS to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Grant, in turn, advised the CMS General Committee on its immediate plans vis-à-vis India in light of the EIC charter of 1813. [Minutes of the Parent Committee, various dates from July through December, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/2.]

²² Grant, C., *Observations on the state of society among the Asiatic subjects of Great Britain, particularly with respect to morals and the means of improving it: Written chiefly in the year 1792*, [London], 1797.

²³ See chapter five, p.227.

College, a student of Simeon's, was also present.²⁴ The meeting afforded an opportunity for Simeon to meet the senior author of the "1787 Plan" for the first time. Prospects for missionary activity in India were discussed, with Buchanan expressing his hope "to be qualified for [such] work." Moreover, it is certain that Grant and Simeon discussed ways and means for filling EIC chaplaincies with Simeon's students. Although Simeon and Grant shared Wilberforce's hope for the patronage of missionaries by the Indian Government, the two men had been considering alternatives for more than a year. In 1791 Simeon had inquired of Grant regarding a chaplaincy for Samuel Marsden. Grant declined the suggestion on the grounds that Marsden was too young, but he took the opportunity of his reply to specifically ask Simeon to help him to identify prospective chaplains.²⁵ Buchanan, for example, became one of the chaplains that Simeon helped to send to India in 1796.

Upon his election to the East India Company Court of Directors on May 30, 1794, Grant became one of the most influential evangelicals in London. William Wilberforce, for one, did not fail to recognize the significance of Grant's position for the missionary cause. In 1796, three years after the failed attempt to admit missionaries to India by amendment of the EIC charter, Wilberforce began to explore Government reaction to the prospect of voluntary missionary activity in India.²⁶ On December 22 Wilberforce discussed the subject with the Prime

²⁴ Pearson, H., *Memoirs of the life and writings of the Rev. Claudius Buchanan, D.D., late Vice-Provost of the College of Ft. William in Bengal*, 2nd edition, Oxford, 1817: vol.1, 77; and Morris, H., *Charles Grant, the friend of William Wilberforce and Henry Thornton*, London, 1898: 40.

²⁵ Grant to Simeon, March 17, 1791, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

²⁶ The transition in evangelical thinking from missionary activity patronized by the Establishment to purely voluntary activity is discussed in chapter five, pp.228ff.

Minister [Pitt] and Henry Dundas, President of the Board of Control.

Consultations continued the next day between Wilberforce, Dundas, Gilbert Elliot [later Lord Minto], and Grant. Grant, Elliot, and Thomas Babington joined Wilberforce for dinner on the 26th to further consider missionary work in India.²⁷

These attempts to secure the Government's views of missionary activity were followed in the succeeding year by three evangelical strategy conferences. Meeting at Clapham on July 20, July 22, and November 9, 1797, were Wilberforce, John Venn, Simeon, and Grant.²⁸ These gatherings laid the foundations for the voluntary society that was to become the CMS. It is significant that Wilberforce included Grant in discussions that touched on the civil and ecclesiastical implications of the developing British missionary movement. This was a measure of Grant's stature in political and religious terms.

An important outcome of the Clapham meetings was the on-going working relationship that was established between Grant and Simeon. The frequency of their contact stimulated common hope for a Christian India and created a mutual respect for what each could contribute to the cause. Grant and Simeon never shared the kind of intimate friendship that would mark the Cambridge minister's relationship with Henry Martyn and Thomas Thomason, but his association with Grant would prove to be Simeon's most fruitful vis-à-vis India.

²⁷ Brief accounts of these meetings may be found in Wilberforce's journal entries for these dates. See Wilberforce, R., and S. Wilberforce, *The life of William Wilberforce*, 2nd edition, 5 vols, London, 1838. The meetings are also summarized in Morris, H., *The life of Charles Grant: Sometime member of Parliament for Inverness-Shire and director of the East India Company*, London, 1904: 190ff.

²⁸ The substance of these meetings is discussed in chapter five, pp.234ff. See also: Morris, op.cit., 191.

In terms of vision for the progress of Christianity in India, Grant and Simeon had much in common. The overlap in principles between the two men made it possible for them to work together closely and to form an implicit trust in one another's judgments. For example, Grant acknowledged the work of the Baptists at Serampore and appreciated the interest of W.T. Ringletaube and his LMS colleagues in commencing efforts in Tranquebar.²⁹ But Grant also desired the Church of England to have "first place" in British India.³⁰ This hope revealed a churchmanship in Grant that was not unlike Simeon's. The Cambridge minister's appreciation for the work of evangelical Dissenters as well as foreign Protestants has been noted in chapter two, along with his confidence in the superior ideals of the Established Church.³¹

Consider also Grant's expectations vis-à-vis the evangelical presence in India. In common with Simeon and missionary advocates in England, Grant anticipated that evangelical missionaries would orient their work toward the preaching of the Gospel to Indian nationals. He had similar hopes for evangelical chaplains, although he recognized that the first objects of their efforts would be the European communities in India. Grant's frustration with John Thomas' place of residence [i.e., in Malda among the Europeans as opposed to the indigenous

²⁹ Grant to Henry Creighton, November 16, 1799, India Office and Library Records MSS, Eur.D.561.5.

Ringletaube, a Prussian, had briefly served with the SPCK in Calcutta in 1796, but resigned when it became apparent that the focus of his efforts would be the English-speaking community. After further training at Gosport, Ringletaube and two other LMS missionaries departed for Tranquebar in 1803. Ringletaube later pioneered the LMS's work in Travancore.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ See the section on "Plurality in the Wider Church," in chapter two, pp.112ff.

environment at Gomalty] was indicative of Grant's evangelistic orientation.³² Simeon also expected the progress of the Gospel among the native population of India to be the chief outcome of the work of missionaries. He also anticipated a profound impact by chaplains on the native community as well as among expatriates.

Grant and Simeon also shared similar values in assessing personnel. The circumstances surrounding the closure of Ft. William College provide an illustration. From its inception, Grant had been unsure of the need for the College as a centre for the training of new EIC employees. Along with many of his India House colleagues, Grant believed that such education could be undertaken more economically in England. Moreover, as Grant did not see how the College would enhance the proclamation of the Gospel in India, he was uncomfortable with the amount of time David Brown and Claudius Buchanan were giving to College business. Brown and Buchanan served as Provost and Vice-Provost, respectively.³³ Grant knew that the appointments had been duly made by Marquis Wellesley, as Governor-General, but Grant doubted the wisdom of the decision. Grant communicated his concerns to Buchanan in January of 1802, just as the Court of Directors was ordering the closure of the College.³⁴ Buchanan was

³² See chapter five, p.225, note 50; and the current chapter, p.302, especially note 17.

³³ [Buchanan, C., ed.], *The College of Ft. William in Bengal*, Calcutta, 1805: 40-1.

³⁴ Grant to Buchanan, January 1802, as quoted in Hess, W.R., *The religious policy of the British East India Company, 1806-1843*, University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. thesis, 1964: 42.

The EIC Court of Directors instructed the Governor-General to close the College with effect from December 31, 1803. The order was received by Wellesley on June 15, 1802. The Court took its action in view of the rising debts of the India Company and uncertainly as to the costs of the College. The EIC's operating deficit was no false crisis. The Company began 1802 with a cumulative debt of just under £19 million. The debt reflected the cost of various military activities over the previous two decades. Interest payments in 1801 were some £1.6 million and trading

(continued...)

extremely disappointed by the demise of the College. In turn, Grant found himself to be an object of the chaplain's sensitivities. Buchanan wrote to Grant in 1806 to express his dissatisfaction with various actions by the Indian Government and the Court of Directors, including the closure of Ft. William College.³⁵ Grant was not pleased with the tone of Buchanan's letter, nor was he alone in his opinion. Grant soon discovered that Buchanan would have been sacked for insubordination by Lord Minto had the Scot not resigned his chaplaincy.³⁶ Simeon fully shared Grant's point of view. As noted previously, Simeon was unsure of the value of all of Buchanan's plans for the evangelical agenda in India.³⁷ Moreover, Simeon joined Grant in serious concern over Buchanan's open criticism of his superiors in the EIC.³⁸

In general, Grant assumed a conservative posture toward social change, even if the tradition appeared to slow the progress of Christianity. For example, as a consequence of the 1806 incident at Vellore, Grant urged acting Governor-General Barlow to exercise great caution with regard to missionary activities within his jurisdiction. Grant believed that it would be better to postpone any efforts that

³⁴(...continued)

operations for that year had been in deficit. ["Secret Report on East India Company Affairs," submitted by Charles Grant and Edward Parry to Robert Dundas, January 26, 1808, India Office and Library Records MSS, Eur.D.1074.511-26.]

³⁵ Buchanan to Grant, March 1806, as quoted in Hess, *op.cit.*, 42.

³⁶ Robert Dundas to George Barlow, December 11, 1807, National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh, Ms. Add.11645, f.88.

³⁷ See chapter five, p.213, for Simeon's comments on Buchanan's vision for an ecclesiastical establishment in India.

³⁸ Simeon to Grant, April 26, 1809, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

might be perceived as an inducement to further political turmoil.³⁹ Grant and Edward Parry, his evangelical colleague on the Court of Directors, objected strenuously to the charge that missionaries had been the cause of the so-called mutiny at Vellore.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, Grant's letter to Barlow on the matter, referenced above, revealed his conviction that Christian activity should not adversely affect the stability of a government.⁴¹ Grant's treatment of the socioreligious tensions in India in the first decade of the nineteenth century reflected the kind of static social world-view for which Simeon was also famous.⁴² Further, Grant's deliberate and careful approach to fundamentally non-Christian societies was not unlike Simeon's. This can be seen in Simeon's posture toward efforts in the 1830s to rid the Indian Church of caste observation. Simeon

³⁹ Grant to Sir George Barlow, April 18, 1807, as quoted in Hess, op.cit.: 151. In terms of missionaries, Grant could only have meant English Nonconformists [such as the Baptists at Serampore] or non-British missionaries such as the SPCK's workers in the Madras Presidency. The CMS had not yet sent missionaries of any sort -- Lutheran or English -- to India. However, given his concern over Buchanan's behaviour, Grant may also have meant for Barlow to keep an eye on EIC chaplains.

⁴⁰ Draft version of a letter in the name of the Court of Directors, authored by Grant and Parry, to the Governor-General of British India, August 10, 1808. [India Office Library and Records MSS, Eur.G.92.1.]

The letter was disapproved by Robert Dundas, President of the Board of Control. Parry subsequently expressed disappointment over the letter that was eventually sent to Lord Minto. He and Grant believed that the dispatch did not sufficiently vindicate the missionary community in India. They had concluded that no evidence of missionary responsibility for the uprising at Vellore had been established. [Parry to [Dundas], August 11, 1808, India Office Library and Records MSS, Eur.G.92.1, ff.389-90.]

⁴¹ Grant's commitment to political and social stability placed limits on the religious utilitarianism that Grant had advocated in his *Observations* of a decade earlier. [See chapter five, pp.210-11.]

⁴² This aspect of Simeon's *Weltanschauung* is treated in chapter two, pp.68ff.

supported the anti-caste campaign in principle, but warned against disruption of the Hindu social structure.⁴³

Simeon and Grant also responded in a similar fashion to the appointment of Middleton as Bishop of Calcutta. As mentioned previously, Simeon expressed doubts about the prospects for friendly relations between the CMS and the new Bishop. Grant's parallel opinion has also been noted.⁴⁴ However, both men advocated conciliation -- rather than opposition -- as the best strategy for maximizing good relations. Thus Grant took initiative on two occasions to urge Middleton to openly embrace the missionary agenda.⁴⁵ The fact that neither letter received a reply did not surprise Grant, but he nonetheless believed that direct opposition to episcopal authority would be counter-productive.

Finally, Charles Grant embraced and utilized patronage in support of the evangelical agenda in India. He had become adept in the art while in India, as evidenced by Grant's relationship with David Brown while the two men were resident in Bengal. It was Grant who had enabled Brown to exchange the chaplaincy of the Military Orphan House in Calcutta for an EIC appointment to the garrison at Ft. William.⁴⁶ Grant's personal support of John Thomas at Gomalty also reveals a context in which Grant occupied the role of private patron. With his return to England and his election to the Court of Directors, further opportunities to

⁴³ See chapter five, pp.216-7.

⁴⁴ See chapter five, p.282.

⁴⁵ Grant to Middleton, January 1815 and August 1817, as quoted in Morris, H., *The life of Charles Grant: Sometime member of Parliament for Inverness-Shire and director of the East India Company*, London, 1904: 335-8.

⁴⁶ See chapter five, p.221, note 39, and related text.

exert influence as a patron arose. However, these occasions came in seasons, as David Brown learned after querying Grant on the lack of spiritual [i.e., evangelical] qualifications among new chaplains:

You complain of the chaplains sent out to India, and most justly. Do you think I have had any share in that patronage? No, I assure you, ... the patronage rests with the Chairs ... There are persons in the Court who would refuse a man merely on the ground of being recommended by me.⁴⁷

It was during Grant's turns in the rotating chair of the Court, or as vice-chairman to his evangelical colleague Edward Parry, that Grant had the greatest freedom to fill new or vacant chaplaincies with men of his choice. These years included 1805-6, 1809-10, and 1815-16.⁴⁸ Grant's chaplaincy appointments were integral to his hopes for shaping both the policy and personnel of the India Company and, in doing so, to create a foundation upon which the widespread introduction of Christianity in India could go forward. Grant's efforts may be understood as the "means of promoting some prior necessities" for the development of Christianity in the subcontinent.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Grant to David Brown, September 12, 1803, as quoted in Morris, H., *The life of Charles Grant: Sometime member of Parliament for Inverness-Shire and director of the East India Company*, London, 1904: 220.

⁴⁸ Morris, H., *Charles Grant, the friend of William Wilberforce and Henry Thornton*, London, 1898: 49.

⁴⁹ Cecil, R., "John Company and the evangelical influence," *History Today* 29 (1979), 441.

"The Chaplaincy Business"

Although the name of Charles Simeon is closely associated with the exercise of evangelical patronage through the Trust he created, the vicar of Holy Trinity Church was just beginning his career as a patron in 1805.⁵⁰ He was then an alternate trustee for the Thornton livings and as such he played no active role in the management of the Trust.⁵¹ Apart from an unofficial role in securing Clapham for John Venn in 1792, the exercise of patronage was a new sphere of activity for Simeon.⁵² His cooperation with Grant in the appointment of India Company chaplains was Simeon's true entry into the affairs of patronage. As is demonstrated in this section, it was an activity that admirably suited the mentor in Simeon. Nevertheless, it was Charles Grant who gave Simeon his first opportunities to develop an occupation for which the Cambridge minister became famous.

Simeon did have some idea of what was involved in recruiting chaplains for British colonies. As noted previously, Simeon had unsuccessfully tried to secure an EIC chaplaincy for Samuel Marsden in 1791.⁵³ He had assisted Marsden to secure a grant from the Elland Clerical Society for his university work and, thus,

⁵⁰ A summary of Simeon's development as a patron is included in chapter three, pp.156ff.

⁵¹ Upon John Venn's death in 1813, Simeon became an active trustee. See chapter three, p.156, for the particulars.

⁵² For an account of Simeon's role in Venn's candidacy for Clapham, see Hennell, M., *John Venn and the Clapham Sect*, London, 1958: 104-5.

⁵³ Marsden was a student at St. John's College. See current chapter, p.304.

had an interest in helping the man find an appropriate post.⁵⁴ With the door to India closed, Simeon aided Marsden with his appointment as chaplain to the penal colony in New South Wales.⁵⁵ Marsden arrived there in 1794. This was an experience that afforded Simeon a frame of reference for his cooperative efforts with Grant.

Simeon's views on preparation for ministry also helped pattern his approach to recruiting chaplains. As detailed in chapter three, Charles Simeon had many expectations for the character of evangelical clergy, whether employed as a parish minister, a chaplain, or a missionary.⁵⁶ It is informative to consider how Simeon applied such principles and criteria specifically to his efforts to recruit candidates for the Charles Grant's patronage. This task is made possible by the existence of a set of fifty-one letters from Simeon to Grant, written from 1805 to 1815, dealing primarily with India Company chaplaincies.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ Marsden expressed appreciation to Simeon for these services in a letter to his mentor. [Marsden to Simeon, September 7, 1792, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.]

⁵⁵ Marsden to Simeon, April 26, 1794, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

⁵⁶ See chapter three, pp.130ff.

⁵⁷ These letters are held in the Simeon MSS of Ridley Hall, Cambridge. Although they have been cited on a few occasions, it appears that no systematic study of the letters has been undertaken until this time.

Searching for Useful Men

Simeon's first consideration was "usefulness" when appraising a student for recommendation to Grant.⁵⁸ By this term Simeon implied both the willingness to carry out the ministerial office and the necessary capability to do so.⁵⁹ The candidate's need for employment or his personal connections [e.g., with Simeon] were of secondary concern. Simeon looked for men with the potential for longevity of service based on "disinterested" motives. Simeon characterized a good candidate in terms of "simplicity of mind ... singleness of heart ... and talent [for the work.]"⁶⁰ Simeon particularly avoided using Grant's name in making approaches to students. He wished to skirt enquiries based on the prospect of favour from a member of the EIC Court of Directors.⁶¹ Simeon's intense desire to serve as mentor and patron would also have caused him to refrain from using Grant's name. He would have desired the acknowledgement and appreciation of his students for their appointments. However egocentric were some of his motives, gratitude from 'his' chaplains was not misplaced. Few evangelical students at Cambridge would have had the opportunity to bring their names before Grant without the access provided by Simeon.

⁵⁸ Simeon to Grant, August 18, 1805, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge. The theme recurs throughout the Simeon-Grant correspondence.

⁵⁹ See chapter three, pp.144ff., for a discussion of Simeon's views on "diligent effort" as a professional qualification for evangelical clergy. Simeon believed "usefulness" to be a function of the union of exertion and faith.

⁶⁰ Simeon to Grant, July 10, 1809, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

⁶¹ Ibid.

Using the preceding criteria Simeon declined to endorse Robert Bromehead's application for lack of sufficiently detached motives.⁶² Bromehead, a student at St. John's from 1797 to 1802, found the prospect of a chaplaincy more promising than his curacy. Such motivations were unacceptable to Simeon.⁶³ In the same letter, however, Simeon was able to forward to Grant the name of Joseph Parson of Clare College. Parson took his B.A. in 1802, followed by the M.A. three years later. Through Simeon and Grant's aid, Parson arrived in India on December 12, 1805. He served as a chaplain for twenty-one years with postings at Berhampore, Agra, Meerut, the Presidency Church [St. John's] in Calcutta, and a term as Senior Presidency Chaplain.⁶⁴

Parson's case is curious. Simeon found Parson to be limited in evangelical piety.⁶⁵ This assessment may help explain why Parson never served the "evangelical pulpit" in Calcutta -- the Old Mission Church -- during his long residence in India.⁶⁶ Further, Parson's on-going contact with the most famous of

⁶² Simeon to Grant, August 18, 1805, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

⁶³ In gathering background information on students identified in Simeon's correspondence, use has been made of Venn, J.A., *Alumni Cantabrigienses: A biographical list of all known students, graduates, and holders of office at the University of Cambridge from the earliest times to 1900*, part 2, 1752-1900, 6 vols., Cambridge, 1940.

⁶⁴ Details on the careers of EIC chaplains are drawn from McNally, S.J., *The chaplains of the East India Company*, typescript, 1971, revised 1976, held by the India Office Library and Records in London, Eur.D.847.

⁶⁵ Simeon to Grant, August 18, 1805, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

⁶⁶ The evangelical character of Kiernander's church contrasted with the traditional Anglicanism of St. John's Cathedral. Reginald Heber, for example, was cognizant of the differences between the two congregations. He noted "the impenetrable boundary line" between the Old Mission Church and St. John's. [Heber to John Thornton, undated, as quoted in Sargent, J., *The life of the Rev. T.T. Thomason, M.A., late chaplain to the Honourable East India Company*, 2nd edition, London, 1834:
(continued...)]

Simeon's chaplains [Brown, Buchanan, Corrie, Martyn and Thomason] was limited. Martyn included Parson in the Simeon circle in 1807, but Parson's name rarely appears in the letters exchanged between them.⁶⁷ For these reasons Parson should not be numbered among the so-called "pious chaplains" of India. Their professional competency was high, but each one was also an ardent evangelical. Nevertheless, the fact of Parson's recommendation by Simeon and his appointment by Grant implies that the highest level of evangelical spirituality [e.g., that of a Martyn] was not an absolute requirement in Simeon's eyes.⁶⁸ Moreover, Parson's accomplished career as a chaplain suggests that Simeon and Grant were good judges of professional "usefulness" in this case.

Simeon's interest in the candidacy of a Mr. Jackson in 1805 reveals another of his concerns, a more worldly one in this occasion. Apparently the student had made an otherwise successful application because Simeon wrote to Grant as if

⁶⁶(...continued)
297-8.]

⁶⁷ Brown, Corrie, Martyn, and Parson agreed to consult with one another on a regular basis by post in 1807. A frequent circular letter was deemed to be a useful means of exchanging information and seeking advice. [Martyn to John Hensman, August 7, 1807, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.55/C2/4.] Corrie, Martyn, and Parson had arrived in Bengal in 1805 and 1806, proceeding to their various postings by 1807. No doubt the new chaplains were glad for some means to solicit advice from David Brown, who had been in India for almost two decades prior to their arrival. Buchanan was not in the circular list because he was en route to Britain by way of Malabar and Bombay. Thomason did not arrive in India until 1808, thus his name could not have appeared in Martyn's list.

⁶⁸ Simeon did not label Parson as impious. He merely found Parson's evangelical zeal to be less intense than that of the other chaplains he had placed or assisted. In 1805 these were Brown, Buchanan, Martyn and Corrie, i.e., four of the five "pious chaplains." It is not fair to charge Simeon with inconsistency in applying his criteria for approving prospective chaplains. Simeon was being honest with Grant in observing that few people could match a Henry Martyn or a Daniel Corrie in terms of evangelical fervour. Simeon's later correspondence with Thomason on September 7, 1814, states this fact explicitly: "There is a sad want of missionary zeal amongst us ... I cannot find a Martyn." [As quoted in Carus: 282.]

Jackson's candidacy had been progressing for some time.⁶⁹ Then, on the verge of appointment, Jackson withdrew. The prospective chaplain did not believe that the salary would be adequate. The student's decision did not disappoint Simeon. The vicar of Holy Trinity "respected" Jackson's honesty in recognizing that he would not be satisfied with a chaplain's salary.⁷⁰ Simeon's response was not an expression of relief at having avoided the appointment of a candidate with improper motives. Rather, Simeon shared Jackson's concern. Simeon had been shocked to discover that the costs associated with British standards of living [i.e., of beneficed clergy] were three times greater in India than in England.⁷¹ Despite the salaries then being paid to chaplains, of the order of £1,000 annually, Simeon recognized the sacrifice in purchasing power that a prospective chaplain must contemplate.⁷² While Simeon advocated salary rises for chaplains, he also

⁶⁹ Simeon to Grant, November 20, 1805, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge. The only personal data revealed in the letter is the student's last name. An earlier letter with more detail on Mr. Jackson must be missing from the collection at Ridley Hall.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Simeon asked Grant to correct these figures, if inaccurate. [Ibid.]

⁷² Henry Martyn's salary in 1805 was £1,000 p.a. [Martyn to John Hensman, August 7, 1807, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.55/C2/4.] Claudius Buchanan later assessed Indian living costs at twice those of Britain and believed £1,000 p.a. to be an appropriate salary for a resident chaplain. [Buchanan, C., *Colonial ecclesiastical establishment: Being a brief view of the state of the colonies of Great Britain, and of her Asiatic Empire, in respect to religious instruction* ..., London, 1813: 161.]

In a contrast that reveals a double standard, Buchanan advised the CMS that its minimum salary for missionaries in India need only be £100 a year. [Buchanan to Josiah Pratt, December 20, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.]

believed that chaplains must be able to live within the means afforded to them.⁷³ He accepted Jackson's decision as a wise one.

Crises of Uncertainty

A determination to pursue work in India was an attribute that Charles Simeon expected to find in candidates for EIC chaplaincies.⁷⁴ Simeon was particularly sensitive to the absence of this virtue. He termed such a deficiency as "versatility of mind" and generally associated it with efforts by parents, fiancées, and friends to dissuade prospective chaplains from a career in India. The equivocations of students was a recurring theme in Simeon's correspondence with Grant.

William Leeson took his B.A. and was elected a Fellow of Clare College in 1809. In the same year Simeon brought Leeson's name to Grant's attention, along with that of a student at St. John's, James Hearn.⁷⁵ Simeon's initiatives grew out of two sets of circumstances. First, Grant held the chair of the Court of Directors for the year. Second, it had become apparent that Claudius Buchanan would not be returning to India. Buchanan had resigned due to poor health and, as was known privately, the reticence of the Indian Government to forgive Buchanan's

⁷³ Simeon's corresponding concerns for missionary salaries have already been noted. See chapter five, pp.248-9, note 108.

⁷⁴ Simeon looked for the same consistency from candidates for the parish ministry, ergo his emphasis on a sense of "call" to ministry and "fidelity" to God. See chapter three, pp.131ff.

⁷⁵ Simeon to Grant, September 10, 1809, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge. The letter also makes reference to William Bolland and a Mr. Smith as possible candidates. Smith's name does not recur in subsequent mss. and Bolland of Trinity College [B.A., 1806; Fellow, 1808; M.A., 1809] chose to pursue parish ministry.

conflicts with the administration of Lord Minto.⁷⁶ Thus 1809-10 was an important window of opportunity for strengthening the evangelical presence in the corps of India Company chaplains.

Unfortunately the window shut before success could be achieved. Simeon discovered such "uncertainty" in Hearn with regard to employment in India that no action could be taken on his behalf.⁷⁷ Hearn subsequently chose to enter parish ministry. Leeson also demonstrated a marked apprehension in his discussions with Simeon. As a result he expressed certain doubts to Grant about the student's fitness.⁷⁸ A subsequent letter attributed Leeson's volatility of mind to immaturity.⁷⁹ Despite Simeon's fears that Leeson was too young, he was nominated to a Bengal chaplaincy in 1810. It is difficult to imagine that Grant would have proceeded with Leeson's application over a direct objection from Simeon; thus the two men must have agreed to take the risk in appointing a man who had some misgivings about the work he was to undertake. It was a mistake. Leeson resigned his appointment just before sailing for India.⁸⁰ He, too, sought an English pulpit.

⁷⁶ The extent to which Buchanan had become *persona non grata* in Calcutta may be seen in Robert Dundas' "secret" letter to George Barlow, dated December 11, 1807, National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh, Ms. Add.11645, f.88.

⁷⁷ Simeon to Grant, September 10, 1809, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Simeon to Grant, December 17, 1809, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

⁸⁰ McNally, op.cit.

The debacle over Leeson was not the end of Simeon's frustrations with ambivalent candidates. In 1813-14 Daniel Corrie and Thomas Thomason asked Simeon to recruit catechists to serve with the CMS at Agra as schoolmasters.⁸¹ In addition Corrie had encouraged Simeon to redouble his efforts to recruit evangelicals for Grant's patronage.⁸² Corrie's request was particularly timely as Grant was scheduled to take his next [and final] turns as Vice-Chairman and Chairman of the Court in 1814-15 and 1815-16, respectively. As noted in the previous chapter, Simeon laboured in earnest to locate prospective missionaries for the CMS.⁸³ He also approached a number of students as prospective chaplains, including Thomas Robertson, Joseph Crosthwaite, Thomas Carr, Henry Harper, John Jones, Charles Norman, and Robert King. With the exception of Robertson and Crosthwaite, each one -- in Simeon's view -- had the obstacle of "versatility" to overcome.

Thomas Robertson was Simeon's first successful candidate since Thomas Thomason had been sent to India in 1808. Thomason was the last of the "pious chaplains."⁸⁴ Robertson, the first of a number of prospects at St. John's College,

⁸¹ Corrie and Thomason's plans were premised on the willingness of the incoming Bishop of Calcutta to ordain such men in due course. Middleton proved unwilling to do so. See chapter five, pp.268ff., for a discussion of the CMS's plans for schoolmasters at Agra. The Society's conflict with Middleton vis-à-vis native and catechist ordination receives attention in the same chapter, pp.279ff. Thomason's "schoolmasters plan" receives further attention later in this chapter, p.372.

⁸² Corrie to Simeon, August 22, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E 15.

⁸³ The "appeal for Agra" was Simeon's most pronounced effort in 1814-16. See pp.268ff.

⁸⁴ Brown, Buchanan, Martyn, Corrie, and Thomason are special cases because of Simeon's intimate relationship with each man. His connection with their service in India is treated later in this chapter, pp.330ff.

was brought to Grant's attention by Simeon in 1812.⁸⁵ Appointed to Bengal in the following March, Robertson served as an EIC chaplain for twenty-seven years.⁸⁶ Another apparent success came in the person of Joseph Crosthwaite, a fellow student of Robertson's. Crosthwaite was an ideal candidate as far as Simeon was concerned. The man was a keen evangelical, his determination to serve in India was steady, and he had a particular interest in a Bombay posting.⁸⁷ Through Grant's influence Crosthwaite was appointed to a chaplaincy, albeit to Bengal, on December 6, 1814.⁸⁸ Then his health faltered. Despite a year's recuperation in England, Crosthwaite never recovered. He died en route to India in 1816.⁸⁹ Simeon afterward referred to him as "poor Mr. Crosthwaite."⁹⁰

After Robertson's and Crosthwaite's successful candidacies, the "versatility" problems began to show. Henry Harper, another St. John's man, first attracted Simeon's attention in 1812.⁹¹ Thomas Carr was also at St. John's at the time and did not escape Simeon's eye. Harper later migrated to Queens' College. His commitment as an evangelical flourished under the nurture of Simeon and Isaac

⁸⁵ Simeon to Grant, December 16, 1812, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

⁸⁶ McNally, *op.cit.*

⁸⁷ Simeon to Grant, July 11 and October 18, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

⁸⁸ McNally, *op.cit.*

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰ From Simeon's list of his EIC chaplains in his letter to Thomas Thomason, March 8, 1816, as quoted in Carus: 300.

⁹¹ Simeon to Grant, December 16, 1812, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

Milner, but Simeon was troubled by a subtle arrogance in the man. Equally disturbing to Simeon, both Carr and Harper suffered from too many interests. They were torn between competing prospects for ministry, including India. By 1814 Simeon believed that Harper had improved in his humility but vocational indecision still marked both men.⁹² Nevertheless, Simeon urged Grant to find places for these men in India.⁹³ He feared that they would be lost to India by any delay. Harper was appointed to Madras on November 25 and Carr for Bombay five days later.⁹⁴

Despite their appointments, Simeon found the two men to be ambivalent and cavalier toward their new responsibilities with the India Company. This struck Simeon as preposterous. He vented his abhorrence of the "lamentable versatility" of Carr and Harper in a furious letter to Grant.⁹⁵ To Simeon's relief, the two new chaplains resolved their uncertainties. This may have occurred as a result of severe words from Grant and their Cambridge mentor. In professional terms, Harper and Carr were among the most successful of Simeon's candidates. Carr served the Bombay Presidency as a chaplain from 1816 to 1833, followed by three years as archdeacon of the diocese. Carr concluded his service in India as suffragan Bishop of Bombay from 1837 to 1851.⁹⁶ Harper, in turn, held various chaplaincies in the Madras Presidency from 1817 to 1836 and served as archdeacon during his final

⁹² Simeon to Grant, October 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

⁹³ Simeon to Grant, October 31, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

⁹⁴ McNally, *op.cit.*

⁹⁵ Simeon to Grant, December 17, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

⁹⁶ McNally, *op.cit.*

decade in India, retiring in 1846.⁹⁷ The careers of Carr and Harper must have brought a great deal of satisfaction to Simeon in his later years.

Nevertheless, Simeon's recruiting woes continued. John Jones and Charles Norman were the next of the 1814-15 group to reach the point of decision. Simeon had to choose between affirming their candidacies or advising Grant to decline the applications. Jones' case resolved itself. Simeon had broached his name to Grant in October 1814 but he soon reported to Grant that the man's father opposed his son's interest in India.⁹⁸ Jones would not defy his parent's will and obediently took a curacy in England. As for Norman, who was in his final year at St. Catharine's College in 1814, Simeon deemed him ready for appointment in the autumn of that year.⁹⁹ Simeon was also willing to help Norman secure private ordination in spite of the ecclesiastical irregularity associated with such efforts.¹⁰⁰ This by itself was a measure of Simeon's confidence in Norman. It was ill-fated hope. Simeon had to report to Grant that Norman's friends had dissuaded him from pursuing an EIC chaplaincy. Norman eventually took a curacy in Essex.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Simeon to Grant, an October 21 and an incompletely dated November letter, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

⁹⁹ Simeon to Grant, October 21, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁰⁰ Simeon to Grant, November 24, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

Appointees to India Company chaplaincies did not have the same difficulties in securing ordination as did missionary candidates with the CMS. In contrast with missionaries [prior to 1819], an EIC chaplaincy was sufficient title for Anglican orders. [See chapter five, pp.265-6 and note 151, for a short discussion on the subject of missionary ordination.] Norman had been ordained deacon in 1812 by the Bishop of Norwich, Henry Bathurst, but some factor adversely affected his application to the Bishop of Ely for priest's orders. Simeon offered to arrange for ordination in another diocese, perhaps again from Bathurst.

Ch.6 The Missionary Agenda By Other Means

Partial relief was provided through a "substitute" for Norman in Robert Jarrold King. King, also of St. Catharine's, had already taken his degree. Simeon originally anticipated that King, already holding deacon's orders, might serve with the CMS as one of Thomason's schoolmasters at Calcutta or Agra.¹⁰¹ Simeon reasoned that priest's orders for King could be secured in India. King's ecclesiastical status also recommended his consideration as an EIC chaplain.¹⁰² Simeon believed King to be a very qualified candidate, noting to Grant that if there was no place for him in India then one easily would be found in England.¹⁰³ When Norman succumbed to peer pressure, Simeon recommended King as a replacement.¹⁰⁴ Unfortunately, for unknown reasons, King chose a Cambridgeshire curacy rather than the appointment offered by Simeon and Grant.

By the closing months of 1814, Simeon was troubled. Candidates were slipping away at the last moment at almost every turn. Recruiting chaplains was proving to be almost as unproductive as his past efforts to secure missionaries for the CMS. This set of circumstances prompted Simeon to change his approach. He pledged to consider only those candidates who were "perfectly [suited] to my mind."¹⁰⁵ Simeon commented on his new tactics in a retrospective letter to Grant later in 1815. He told Grant that he had chosen a firm line and required students

¹⁰¹ Simeon to Grant, October 31, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁰² Simeon acknowledged Grant's opposition to the use of catechists by the CMS. [Ibid.] Similarly, unordained chaplains were not acceptable to Grant and the India Company. For comparison, Simeon's views on catechist missionaries are treated in chapter five, pp.246-7.

¹⁰³ Simeon to Grant, November 24, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁰⁴ Simeon to Grant, December 17, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁰⁵ Simeon to Grant, June 21, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

interested in service in India to review fully and clarify their intentions before he would bring their names to Grant.¹⁰⁶ It proved to be a fruitful tactic. Of the seventeen men that Simeon subsequently discussed with Grant in 1815, six proved unqualified and were not recommended to Grant, only two good candidates were lost to parish work in England, and nine men went on to serve in India.¹⁰⁷ Simeon had finally made significant progress in selecting promising candidates.

Productive Efforts At Last

Charles Simeon viewed recruiting chaplains as an alternative to developing personnel for the CMS. The extent to which this was true is demonstrated by the well-planned nature of his efforts with Grant. The lack of success during Grant's 1809-10 term in the chair of the EIC Court, combined with Grant and Simeon's desire to increase the evangelical presence in India, caused Simeon to take a more calculated approach. He was also motivated by Buchanan's retirement and the prospect that ill health would rob India of the services of David Brown in the same way that a furlough had been forced on Henry Martyn.¹⁰⁸ Simeon offered to help Grant prepare a circular letter to alert evangelical clergy and students in England to

¹⁰⁶ Simeon to Grant, October 1, 1815, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁰⁷ Appendix A provides a summary of Simeon's efforts to recruit colonial chaplains. The figures give are drawn from this appendix.

¹⁰⁸ Simeon to Grant, August 7, 1812, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

Martyn had left Bengal for Arabia on October 1, 1810. His intention was to regain his health at sea but he eventually determined to take a lengthy furlough in England. Simeon was aware of Martyn's plans to return to England, as evidenced by this letter to Grant. Martyn died on his journey home, at Tokat, on October 16, 1812. Word of Martyn's death reached Simeon the following February. [See Sargent, J., ed., *Memoir of the Rev. Henry Martyn, late fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain to the Honourable East India Company*, 4th edition, London, 1820: 332ff.]

the opportunities in India for chaplains.¹⁰⁹ While there is no evidence that Grant ever took part in writing such an appeal, it is clear that Simeon became far more deliberate in his recruiting activities from that point onward. The significant increase in the number of prospective chaplains after 1812 is evidence. From 1805 to 1812, exclusive of the five "pious chaplains," Simeon considered eight men for recommendation to Grant; from 1813 to 1816, the number tripled to twenty-four.¹¹⁰

Nor was Simeon merely satisfied with bringing qualified names to Grant's attention. He took a very pro-active stance in their partnership. Among other propositions, Simeon urged Grant and the Court to increase the complement of chaplains. For example, in response to separate requests by Daniel Corrie and Thomas Thomason in 1813, Simeon asked Grant to consider appointing an assistant to Thomason at the Old Mission Church.¹¹¹ Simeon was unsuccessful in his attempt to secure a second chaplain for the Old Church, although he was able to arrange for one of 'his' chaplains -- Thomas Robertson -- to provide temporary relief.¹¹² Simeon also did not hesitate to attempt to influence the stationing of

¹⁰⁹ Simeon to Grant, February 22, 1812, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹¹⁰ See Appendix A.

¹¹¹ Simeon to Grant, March 15, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

Thomason's responsibilities as private chaplain to the Governor-General [Lord Moira] from 1813 to 1815 had decreased the time Thomason believed he could give to Calcutta's evangelical pulpit. His responsibilities with the Calcutta Corresponding Committee of the CMS also demanded attention. Corrie's appeal for relief for Thomason was made to Simeon on August 22, 1813 [CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E 15]. The location of Thomason's letter is unknown, but Simeon's reply to it [January 27, 1814] is quoted in Carus: 269f.

¹¹² Simeon reported to Grant that Robert Thornton had been able to secure Robertson's services for the Old Mission Church on a temporary basis. [Simeon to Grant, June 3, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.] Although the relief came late, Robertson served the "second Calcutta
(continued...)

candidates. This he did by alerting Grant to locales for which he believed he had interested men. A number of his students had a preference for Bombay.¹¹³ Simeon also made enquiries regarding needs for Canton and Macao.¹¹⁴

Similarly, Grant received a number of recommendations from Simeon that dealt with how chaplains might be employed. Simeon was particularly enamoured with Thomas Thomason's proposal to utilize CMS missionaries and EIC chaplains as instructors in "native schools."¹¹⁵ Simeon's hopes for 'missionary' work by chaplains are uncovered in his support for Thomason's plan.¹¹⁶ On one occasion

¹¹²(...continued)

church" [i.e., Kiernander's] from 1816 to 1818. [McNally, op.cit.] The Old Mission Church was, in fact, older than the Presidency Church [St. John's Cathedral], albeit second in status.

The matter of relief for Thomason at the Old Mission Church returned to Simeon's view in 1820. Simeon had hoped that the CMS would provide a permanent solution by stationing a missionary in Calcutta with responsibility for the parish. The discussions between Simeon and the CMS are recounted in chapter five, pp.273-4. The overture to the CMS was not a success. As late as 1828 Simeon was still searching for chaplains for the Calcutta parish. [Thomason to John Sherer, June 14, 1828, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.]

¹¹³ E.g., Mr. Crosthwaite in 1814. See current chapter, p.321.

¹¹⁴ Simeon to Grant, October 17 and November 2, 1815, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge. The letters refer to a series of exchanges with Grant in regard to Canton and Macao. Unfortunately the earlier mss. are missing from the collection.

¹¹⁵ Thomason's plans were communicated to Josiah Pratt in a series of letters. [Thomason to Pratt, June 26, 1813, February 2 and 14, May 9, 1814, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E 4, 13, 30, and 52.] Copies of some of these letters also came to Simeon. For example, Simeon wrote to Pratt to enquire into the receipt of the February 1814 letters. [Simeon to Pratt, August 20, 1814, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.] Pratt forwarded the correspondence to Simeon by return post. [Pratt to Simeon, August 22, 1814, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.]

¹¹⁶ Simeon made reference to Thomason's communications on "native schools" in his letters to Grant, dated March 15 and December 17, 1814, and July 1, 1815. [Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.]

he confessed to Grant that he was "anxious for [missionary activity in] India" and, thus, he hoped that Thomason's plan would be well received at India House.¹¹⁷

Finally, the depth of Simeon's concern for the appointment of evangelical chaplains was demonstrated in an uncharacteristic suggestion: Simeon urged Grant to look for men at Oxford as well.¹¹⁸ Without minimizing Simeon's intense desire to be Grant's chief clerical agent and to place his students in India, this remark revealed the depth of Simeon's genuine interest in the seeing evangelicals serve in India.

Simeon and Grant eventually turned their cooperative efforts into a productive science. The period of 1814-16 was particularly fruitful. Embarrassments and disappointments were avoided by eliminating questionable candidates before their names came to the attention of the Court of Directors. Pre-qualifying prospective chaplains was one of Simeon's essential duties.¹¹⁹ Successful applicants included Charles Church [Madras, 1816-22], James Hough

¹¹⁷ Simeon to Grant, August 5, 1815, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹¹⁸ Simeon to Grant, October 2, 1815, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹¹⁹ Men who either withdrew of their own accord or were discouraged by Simeon from 1814-16 include John Blackburn, a Mr. Dickson, John Howard, Henry Kebbel, George Mortimer, a Mr. Strapan, William Valentine, a Mr. Westerby, and a Mr. I. Wilson.

Mortimer was physically unable to contemplate residence in India [Simeon to Grant, May 31, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.] Valentine's father refused to allow his son to go to India. [Simeon to Grant, November 20, 1815, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.] Incidentally, these were Simeon's second attempts to place Mortimer and Valentine. He had unsuccessfully recommended them to the CMS five months earlier. [See chapter five, pp.263-4.]

The mss. do not address the reasons for the withdrawal or disapproval of the others, but none served as EIC chaplains. See Appendix A for further particulars.

[Madras, 1815-29],¹²⁰ Edward Martin John Jackson [Madras, 1816-21],¹²¹ William Malkin [Madras, 1816-32],¹²² Thomas Robinson [various postings, 1816-36],¹²³ Frederick Spring [Madras, 1816-43], James Traill [Madras, 1815-22], Bowater James Vernon [St. Helena, 1816-34],¹²⁴ and Christopher Winter [Ft.

¹²⁰ Hough had been "overwhelmed" by Simeon's aid during his candidacy. [Hough to Simeon, July 25, 1815, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.]

Hough was one of the two prolific writers among Simeon's chaplains, the other having been Claudius Buchanan. Hough later wrote: *A reply to the letters of Abbe Dubois*, London, 1824; *The missionary vade mecum: Containing information and suggestions for the use of missionaries, missionary candidates, and committees*, London, 1832; *The history of Christianity in India from the commencement of the Christian era*, 5 vols., 1839-1860; and *Memoir of an Indian chaplain, Charles Church ... on the Madras establishment of the East India Company*, London, 1859.

¹²¹ Jackson had some unusual "outfitting needs." Simeon brought this matter to Grant's attention on three occasions. [Simeon to Grant, August 5, September 23, and October 2, 1815, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.] Apparently these needs were met because Jackson arrived at Vellore in 1817.

¹²² Malkin was almost rejected by Simeon. It was rumoured that the candidate preferred Bengal "because of the greater salary [there]." [Simeon to Grant, November 2, 1815, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.] The rumour must have proved false because Malkin was appointed on Simeon's recommendation. However, Grant posted him to Madras.

¹²³ This was Thomas Robinson, Jr., son of the Leicester evangelical. Robinson had a distinguished career in India. He held postings in all three Indian presidencies, was domestic chaplain to Bishop Heber in 1826, and served as Archdeacon of Madras from 1828-36. It is likely that the reason Robinson was not tapped as the first suffragan of the diocese was Simeon's influence with Lord Glenelg [Charles Grant, Jr.]. Glenelg nominated Daniel Corrie, Archdeacon of Bengal, as the first Bishop of Madras. The younger Grant was Chairman of the Board of Control and Simeon undoubtedly used his influence with his former student and quasi-godson to swing the appointment in Corrie's direction. Simeon was forced to choose between two of 'his own' -- Corrie and Robinson -- and the bond with one of the five "pious chaplains" was the stronger. Nevertheless, Corrie was not the logical choice. Robinson knew the diocese well and Corrie had never before been to Madras. Corrie arrived at Madras in 1835 and Robinson retired the following year.

¹²⁴ Simeon's confidence in Vernon had been sorely tested. For example, Vernon declared his intention to marry and demanded at least £700 p.a. in salary. [Vernon to Simeon, September 28, 1815, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.] Simeon viewed marriage as a liability and he was uncomfortable with predetermined salary requirements. Moreover, Vernon's friends were hard at
(continued...)

Marlborough, 1816-22]. The hopes of Simeon and Grant for India, first embodied in the "1787 Plan" three decades earlier, had been realized.

The "Pious Chaplains"

The most prominent connection between Charles Simeon and British India was his relationship with five India Company chaplains in particular. David Brown, Claudius Buchanan, Henry Martyn, Daniel Corrie, and Thomas Thomason became known as the "pious chaplains of India."¹²⁵ The appellation reflected their standing in India as the foremost evangelicals of their day. In one sense they were simply among the first of Simeon's twenty-one EIC chaplains. This, however, is an incomplete assessment. The strength of the bond between Simeon and these five men suggests that something more than mere patronage was at work. Simeon's association with them reveals the true intensity of his work as a mentor and a patron. Moreover, Simeon's hopes for Brown and company illustrate a crucial fact: Charles Simeon considered the work of colonial chaplains to be genuinely missionary in nature.

¹²⁴(...continued)

work to dissuade him from employment in India. [Simeon to Grant, October 17, 1815, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.] Nor did Simeon know the man personally; he approved Vernon's application primarily on the strength of the recommendation of his friend, Professor William Farish, a Fellow and Tutor of Magdalene College. [Simeon to Grant, October 21, 1815, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.]

¹²⁵ The term has been employed widely. For example, see Sandys, E.T., *One hundred and forty-five years at the Old or Mission Church, Calcutta*, Calcutta, 1916: 14 and passim. The strong sense of identity for "Simeon's men" has been discussed by G.E. Long's "India and the evangelicals," *London Quarterly and Holborn Review* 32, 6th series (1963), 143.

Memoirs and biographies of each man were compiled by the end of the nineteenth century.¹²⁶ Their efforts in India also have been the objects of critical study.¹²⁷ In light of these sources it is not necessary to rehearse all the details. What is germane to this study is the nature of Simeon's relationship to each man and the impact of this tie on each one's work in India.

David Brown

Brown, from Yorkshire, was born in 1763. He entered Magdalene College in the same year [1782] that Simeon was made a Fellow of King's College and installed as perpetual curate of Holy Trinity Church. It is clear that Simeon knew

¹²⁶ The relevant nineteenth century accounts include: [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *Memoirs of the Right Rev. Daniel Corrie, first Bishop of Madras: Compiled chiefly from his letters and journals*, London, 1847; Pearson, H., *Memoirs of the life and writings of the Rev. Claudius Buchanan, D.D., late Vice-Provost of the College of Ft. William in Bengal*, 2nd edition, 2 vols, Oxford, 1817; Sargent, J., ed., *Memoir of the Rev. Henry Martyn, late fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain to the Honourable East India Company*, 4th edition, London, 1820; Sargent, J., *The life of the Rev. T.T. Thomason, M.A., late chaplain to the Honourable East India Company*, 2nd edition, London, 1834; [Simeon, C., ed.], *Memorial sketches of the Rev. David Brown: With a selection of his sermons preached at Calcutta*, London, 1816; Smith, G., *Henry Martyn, saint and scholar: First modern missionary to the Mohammedans, 1781-1812*, London, 1892; and Wilberforce, S., ed., *Journals and letters of the Rev. Henry Martyn, B.D., late fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain to the Honourable East India Company*, 2 vols, London, 1837.

¹²⁷ Modern studies that deal significantly with the "pious chaplains" include: Davidson, A.K., "A passage from India: Claudius Buchanan and his troublesome donation," *Aberdeen University Review* 45 (1973), 79-81; Davidson, A.K., *The development and influence of the British missionary movement's attitudes towards India, 1786-1830*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1973; Gash, I.J., *An historical survey and assessment of the ecclesiastical and missionary policy of the East India Company*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1968; Hess, W.R., *The religious policy of the British East India Company, 1806-1843*, University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. thesis, 1964; Laird, M.A., *Missionaries and education in Bengal, 1793-1837*, Oxford, 1972; and Macnaghten, A., *Daniel Corrie: His family and his friends*, London, 1969.

Brown during his student years.¹²⁸ Simeon also demonstrated significant support for Brown's decision to take up a chaplaincy in India. Simeon accompanied his student to London for his departure from the Tower dock on November 14, 1785, and then raced overland to meet the ship for a second farewell at Gravesend the next day.¹²⁹ Nevertheless, Simeon was not responsible for Brown's appointment to the Military Orphan House. The patronage came through the favour of a Major A. Mitchell of the India Company.¹³⁰

Simeon's relationship with Brown was more collegial than it was with any other EIC chaplain. The fact that Brown created the opportunity that launched Simeon into the chaplaincy business is a measure of the mutuality of their relationship. Simeon was invited to play a role in the "1787 Plan" on Brown's recommendation and this invitation proved to be the beginning of Simeon's

¹²⁸ Simeon made a positive reference to Brown in a letter to John Venn on April 13, 1784. [Venn MSS, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.81/C22.]

¹²⁹ Hole, C., *The early history of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1896: 10.

¹³⁰ Hyde, H.B., *Parochial annals of Bengal: Being a history of the Bengal ecclesiastical establishment of the honorable East India Company in the 17th and 18th centuries: Compiled from original sources*, published for private circulation, Calcutta, 1901: 247.

As noted in chapter five [p.216], Brown's appointment as chaplain to the brigade at Ft. William three days after his arrival was the work of Charles Grant. Brown subsequently served as Junior Presidency Chaplain from 1794 to 1796 and as Senior Presidency Chaplain from 1797 until his death in 1812. [Hyde, op.cit.: xvii.]

connection with India.¹³¹ Consequently, Simeon spoke of Brown in terms of great respect:

Mr. Brown, if not actually the founder of all the great missionary institutions which have been established of late years ... laboured in this field as much as any who have followed him ...¹³²

This was more than a mentor advertising a successful student. Brown, for his part, acknowledged a debt to Simeon for the Cambridge minister's friendship and care through the years.¹³³ The common bond between the two men is self-evident.

What gave great satisfaction to Simeon was the mission-focused work of David Brown. In a journal entry made shortly after his arrival in India, Daniel

¹³¹ See chapter five, pp.209-10.

¹³² From the preface to [Simeon, C., ed.], *Memorial sketches of the Rev. David Brown: With a selection of his sermons preached at Calcutta*, London, 1816: xii.

Interpreting Simeon's statement proved difficult for I.J. Gash in his *An historical survey and assessment of the ecclesiastical and missionary policy of the East India Company* [Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1968]. In attempting to connect events in India with the development of the CMS, he began with a valid point: "[The CMS'] formation ... was encouraged by the experience of many years' missionary activity in Calcutta. This is acknowledged in a private manuscript in the archives of this Society." [Op.cit.: 63; the "private ms." is not cited.] The reference must have been to the work of Kiernander. His efforts were certainly an example to the founders of the CMS.

Gash also concluded that the SPCK mission "is considered to have led to the formation of the Society for Missions to Africa and the East" and that David Brown was its "virtual founder." [Op.cit.: 169.] While Kiernander's work may have heartened those who brought the CMS into being, events in England -- not in India -- gave rise to the CMS. This is argued conclusively in chapter five of this study. Moreover, David Brown had no real part in the creation of the CMS. Gash directly connected the origin of the CMS with Brown's work in Calcutta on the strength of Simeon's figurative language. For example, he noted that the Old Mission Church should be regarded as the "birthplace" of the CMS and that Brown was "its true father." [Op.cit.: 170.] Gash erred in taking Simeon's exaggerated words of appreciation for Brown at face value.

¹³³ Brown to Simeon, December 1809, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

Corrie commented on Brown's conscious attempt to further the missionary cause. Corrie identified three aspects of Brown's missionary activity: participation in the Calcutta Bible Society [of which Brown was a founder], support for translation work [e.g., by William Carey], and reporting general "missionary intelligence" to the evangelical community in India and in Britain.¹³⁴ Not only did Brown embrace these missionary agendas, he also instilled a commitment to them in his colleagues. Corrie made a point of adopting the same three priorities as his own.¹³⁵ Brown thus showed himself to be a mentor of others. Without a doubt this dynamic also pleased Simeon and gave him confidence that men sent in Brown's direction would have guiding hands to receive them.

Henry Martyn also appreciated the counsel and the example given to him by David Brown. As mentioned previously, a circular letter was exchanged between Martyn, Henry Parson, Corrie, and Brown. Martyn was particularly concerned to have Brown's advice on their various doings.¹³⁶ In a later letter Martyn concluded that of the "Simeon men" only David Brown and he had sufficient command of the native languages to allow for public ministry to Indian nationals.¹³⁷ These were significant affirmations by the archetype of "pious

¹³⁴ Corrie's journal entry for September 21, 1806, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *Memoirs of the Right Rev. Daniel Corrie, first Bishop of Madras: Compiled chiefly from his letters and journals*, London, 1847: 54.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Martyn to John Hensman, August 7, 1807, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.55/C2/4.

¹³⁷ Martyn to T.M. Hutchins, October 10, 1809, as quoted in *Two sets of unpublished letters of the Rev. Henry Martyn, B.D., of Truro, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain on the Bengal establishment*, edited, with prefatory remarks, by ... H.M. Jeffery, Truro, 1883: 55.

chaplains." When Simeon learned of Brown's death at Calcutta [June 1812], after more than a quarter of a century in India, he wrote Charles Grant to express a sense of loss in two dimensions. He would miss Brown and, with Martyn ill and en route to England, there were no prospects for a worthy replacement.¹³⁸

Claudius Buchanan

Born at Cambuslang in 1766, Claudius Buchanan entered Queens' College in 1791. The Scot had come to Cambridge through an odd chain of events.¹³⁹ In 1787, following university work at Glasgow, Buchanan fled his country and his family in an attempt to chart an independent course in life.¹⁴⁰ Buchanan was alone, discouraged, and impoverished by the time he reached London. His existence in the capital city was one of hand-to-mouth until he landed a modest job as an attorney's clerk. In 1788 matters were made worse by the news of the death of his father. One of the by-products of this state of affairs was a personal spiritual awakening. Buchanan communicated something of his religious pilgrimage to his mother. In turn, she urged her son to seek out the only evangelical name in London that came to her mind: John Newton. In due course Buchanan sought out Newton and was taken under his wing. Newton tutored Buchanan in the evangelical faith, became impressed with Buchanan's intellectual abilities, and arranged for him to go up to Cambridge under the sponsorship of

¹³⁸ Simeon to Grant, December 16, 1812, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge. At that point Simeon had seriously underestimated Daniel Corrie's potential.

¹³⁹ The events described briefly here are told in detail in Pearson, op.cit.: vol.1, 8ff.

¹⁴⁰ Buchanan had been at Glasgow University in 1782-84 and 1786, first matriculating at the age of sixteen. This was not unusual in Buchanan's day.

Henry Thornton. Newton and Thornton agreed that the presence of Isaac Milner at Queens' made that college their choice for Buchanan.

The connection between Buchanan and Simeon developed soon thereafter. On Milner's recommendation, Buchanan attended Simeon's "conversation parties" and sat his "Lectures on Revealed Religion."¹⁴¹ These factors, by themselves, began to establish Buchanan as one of Simeon's men. Buchanan did not hesitate to affirm this fact in his own journal.¹⁴² Moreover, Buchanan's growing interest in an ecclesiastical career in Asia provided Simeon with further opportunity to shape the course of his student's career. Simeon's relationship with Buchanan was mentorial from the outset, in contrast with the collegial nature of the link between Simeon and David Brown.

As mentioned at an earlier point in this chapter, Simeon had tried to secure an Indian Company chaplaincy for Samuel Marsden in the same year that Buchanan came to Cambridge. Grant declined Marsden but asked for Simeon's help in locating more qualified candidates. That overture led to the October 1792 dinner meeting between Simeon and Grant. Buchanan was also a guest of Simeon's at dinner and the meal proved to be the Scot's first step toward

¹⁴¹ Pearson, H., *Memoirs of the life and writings of the Rev. Claudius Buchanan, D.D., late Vice-Provost of the College of Ft. William in Bengal*, 2nd edition, Oxford, 1817: vol.1, 57, 76-7.

Simeon's lectures on the contrasts between natural and revealed theology, offered on several occasions in the early 1790s, were as close as the Cambridge minister ever came to a systematic approach to the Christian faith. As noted previously, Simeon's theological formation was a product of his personal study of the Scriptures rather than systematic material. [See chapter one, pp.44ff., and chapter three, p.124.] Dogmatics did not interest Simeon: "... I never wish to find any particular truth in any particular [biblical] passage." [Simeon to Bishop Burgess, October 24, 1820, as quoted in Carus: 376.] Simeon's notes for the lectures that he gave to Buchanan, et al., are held in the Simeon MSS of Ridley Hall, Cambridge. Their content, being very uncharacteristic of Simeon, makes them an interesting part of the Ridley Hall collection.

¹⁴² Pearson, op.cit., vol.1, 76-7.

appointment with the India Company.¹⁴³ Although Buchanan was not nominated for another four years, this was Simeon's first real success in channelling evangelical clergy to India. It must be said that Simeon's influence on Buchanan's candidacy was not total. In a grand display of calculated submissiveness, Buchanan left the course of his career in the hands of Grant, Thornton, and Newton.¹⁴⁴ This was a politically astute move on Buchanan's part. Between them the three men were able to secure Buchanan's appointment to Bengal. Simeon did not develop an equivalent capability until Grant began his turns in the chair of the EIC Court of Directors in 1805.¹⁴⁵ Nevertheless, Simeon could claim credit for bringing Grant and Buchanan together in the first instance.

Buchanan's postings in India included a period of orientation in Calcutta in 1796-7, chaplain to the garrison at Barrackpore in 1797-9, Senior Presidency Chaplain in 1799, and Vice-Provost and a professor at the College of Fort William from 1800 to 1807.¹⁴⁶ Simeon came to appreciate Buchanan's efforts as much as he did those of Brown, albeit for different reasons. While Brown excelled as a missionary-minded chaplain, Buchanan was ecclesiastically-focused. In many respects, Buchanan became the "Charles Simeon" of British India. A number of illustrations demonstrate the remarkable similarity between the development of Buchanan's churchmanship and Simeon's.

¹⁴³ See current chapter, pp.303-4.

¹⁴⁴ One of Buchanan's journal entries for 1794, as quoted in Pearson, *op.cit.*: vol.1, 100.

¹⁴⁵ Henry Martyn, Daniel Corrie, and Joseph Parson -- all appointed in 1805 -- were the first of Simeon's men to be appointed directly through Grant's patronage as chairman of the Court.

¹⁴⁶ McNally, *op.cit.*

Buchanan started out on a footing that would have been familiar to Simeon: controversy and conflict within his 'parish.'¹⁴⁷ Soon after his arrival at Barrackpore, his first chaplaincy posting, Buchanan complained to Simeon that he was "frequently prevented from conducting public worship."¹⁴⁸ By Buchanan's own admission he did not mix well with enlisted men or officers. His reputation in this regard provided ammunition to Buchanan's critics in Lord Minto's administration. For example, Buchanan was labelled as an incompetent chaplain by India Company officials as a result of his difficulties with military personnel.¹⁴⁹ The criticism had some validity when Buchanan's performance as a chaplain is compared with that of Henry Martyn or Daniel Corrie. Gash, for instance, considered Buchanan's incompetency to have been proven by Martyn's relative success in his EIC postings.¹⁵⁰ Even Simeon recognized that Buchanan had allowed his personality to inhibit the discharge of his duties in the military community. Upon Buchanan's return to England, Simeon observed that Buchanan would need to moderate his abrasive style if he hoped to remain useful.¹⁵¹ Simeon was able to attest to some progress after much exhortation and three months of efforts, although poor health prevented Buchanan from returning to

¹⁴⁷ Simeon's difficulties in the early years of his ministry at Holy Trinity Church are the subject of chapter two, pp.74ff.

¹⁴⁸ Buchanan to Simeon, from Barrackpore in July 1798, as cited in Pearson, *op.cit.*: vol.2, 162.

¹⁴⁹ Robert Dundas to George Barlow, December 11, 1807, National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh, Add.11645, f.88.

¹⁵⁰ Gash, *op.cit.*: 51.

¹⁵¹ Simeon to Grant, April 26, 1809, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

India.¹⁵² Buchanan's dilemmas, and the need for intervention by elder evangelicals, would have reminded Simeon of his former struggles with his character and with the churchwardens of Holy Trinity Parish.¹⁵³

Like Simeon, Buchanan held missionaries in high esteem. His sentiments even included William Carey and the Serampore Baptists until the events of 1807, as noted shortly.¹⁵⁴ Buchanan also openly affirmed the contributions of Roman Catholic and Lutheran missionaries to India, noting that their efforts had produced "thousands of Christians" in the subcontinent.¹⁵⁵ But, also like Simeon, Buchanan had his conflicts with Nonconformists over ecclesiastical matters. For example, Buchanan's plans for an ecclesiastical establishment in India frightened the Baptists. They feared that Anglican ascendancy in India would severely limit their work. In reaction the Serampore press refused to publish Buchanan's *Memoir* on the subject in 1807.¹⁵⁶ David Brown, who had been at odds with the Baptists since his incident with Carey in 1794, joined Buchanan in decrying the "bigotry" of

¹⁵² Simeon to Grant, July 2, 1809, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁵³ See chapter two, pp.74ff.

¹⁵⁴ Buchanan spoke well of Carey in a letter to John Newton, dated October 1798, as quoted in Pearson, op.cit.: vol.1, 163-6. Simeon's affirmation of the Serampore Baptists has already been noted in chapter five [pp.210-11 and 222].

¹⁵⁵ Buchanan, C., *The star in the East: A sermon preached in the parish-church of St. James, Bristol, on Sunday, February 26, 1809, for the benefit of the "Society for Missions to Africa and the East."*, 2nd cheap edition, corrected, Greenock, 1809: 17-20, 26.

¹⁵⁶ Henry Martyn to Simeon, April 26, 1807, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge. The publication in question was Buchanan's *Memoir of the expediency of an ecclesiastical establishment for British India*, 1805, 2nd edition, London, 1812.

the Baptists.¹⁵⁷ Much debate over modes of baptism and church polity followed. As late as December 1809, two years after Buchanan had left Bengal, the denominational tensions between the two camps were still palpable.¹⁵⁸ The intensity and longevity of Buchanan's conflicts with the Serampore Baptists were not dissimilar to Simeon's tensions with Robert Hall and the Cambridge Baptists in August of 1795.¹⁵⁹

In another similarity with Simeon, Buchanan perceived that a secure social order contributed to the progress of the Gospel. In his *The College of Ft. William*

¹⁵⁷ For example, John Thomas and Brown were constantly at odds. Thomas had sharply criticized Brown's "1787 Plan" in a letter to Charles Grant. [Thomas to Grant, January 11, 1787, as quoted in Morris, H., *Charles Grant, the friend of William Wilberforce and Henry Thornton*, London, 1898: 104.] The disagreement between Grant and 'his' missionary John Thomas [see current chapter, p.302, note 17] further exercised Brown. He resented the willingness of the Baptists to employ Thomas after he had shown bad faith with Grant. Hinson hypothesized that Brown's frustration over Thomas manifested itself in Brown's inhospitable reception of William Carey on January 24, 1794. [Hinson, E.G., "William Carey and ecumenical pragmatism," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 17 (1980): 79.] By Carey's account, Brown would not even give him a cup of cold water after a blistering walk in the heat of the day. [Marshman, J.C., *The life and times of Carey, Marshman, and Ward, embracing the history of the Serampore mission*, London, 1859: vol.1, 64.]

¹⁵⁸ Brown to Simeon, December 1809, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁵⁹ As Hopkins noted, Simeon's relationship with Robert Robinson and the Baptist Chapel had been cordial during his first decade at Holy Trinity Church. Robinson encouraged Simeon in his itinerant preaching and even invited the Churchman to "'come out from the ungodly'" and dissent. [Hopkins, H.E., *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*, London, 1977: 192.] Simeon's friendly reply was "'The Lord will provide.'" [Ibid.] By 1795, however, circumstances had changed. Robinson had been succeeded by Robert Hall and Simeon had clarified his churchmanship. On August 3 Simeon preached a sermon at Holy Trinity Church that charged the Baptists in Cambridge with sowing discord in the community. He objected to their theology [i.e., adult baptism by immersion] and their politics [i.e., calls for repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts]. Hall responded in a letter that was reprinted in the *Cambridge Intelligencer* on August 8. He countered Simeon's charges by observing that Baptist sermons were no more political than those of certain Churchmen [i.e., Simeon]. Simeon and the Cambridge Baptists never restored the mutual respect that Simeon and Robinson had shared. [See Flower, B., ed., *National sins considered in two letters to the Rev. Thomas Robinson ... to which are added a letter from the Rev. Robert Hall to the Rev. Charles Simeon, and reflections on war, by the late Rev. W. Law*, Cambridge, 1796: 73ff.]

in Bengal [1805] the governments of Lord Cornwallis and Marquis Wellesley were affirmed for the stability they brought to India and for the beneficial impact of such a state of affairs on the spiritual condition of the native population.¹⁶⁰

These sentiments were a mirror of Simeon's social world-view.¹⁶¹ Buchanan also responded to the failure of the Indian Establishment to embrace his evangelical agenda in a Simeon-like fashion. Simeon had initially turned to voluntary effort as it became clear that the India Company and the Established Church would not patronize evangelical missionaries.¹⁶² When the EIC Court of Directors closed Ft. William College in 1803 and, thereby, rebuffed a major component of Buchanan's ecclesiastical infrastructure in India, Buchanan drew the conclusion that his mentor had drawn thirteen years earlier: The Christianization of India would only go forward by voluntary methods.¹⁶³ Buchanan and Simeon had shared similar hopes for the Indian and English Establishments, respectively. They also experienced the frustration of their hopes and believed that they had been forced to turn to voluntaryism as a consequence.

The legacies of the two men were also remarkably parallel. For his part, the Cambridge minister sought to make evangelical values intrinsic to the Established Church and, thus, to confront what he perceived as the nominal Christianity of the land. Simeon hoped to achieve this outcome by encouraging

¹⁶⁰ [Buchanan, C., ed.], *The College of Ft. William in Bengal*, Calcutta, 1805: 2.

¹⁶¹ Simeon's convictions regarding social structures are studied in detail in chapter two, pp.83ff.

¹⁶² Parliament's last-minute rejection of Wilberforce's "pious clauses" in 1793 was a turning point for evangelicals such as Simeon. They became voluntaryists as a result. See chapter five, pp.228-9.

¹⁶³ Buchanan to Marquis Wellesley, March 5 and 15, 1806, British Library Western MSS, Add.37284, f.35, and Add.37281, f.174.

Cambridge students to embrace evangelical distinctives and then, by means of patronage, to place such men in significant and influential parishes.¹⁶⁴ Like Simeon, Buchanan's work was essentially ecclesiastical rather than evangelistic or missionary. His personal ambitions were embodied in a blueprint for an ecclesiastical establishment in India. Buchanan had learned his churchmanship from Simeon and he applied it in a way that was strikingly similar to Simeon's 'mission' in England.

Buchanan's vision is best apprehended from his prolific writings. In *The three eras of light* [1811], Buchanan framed a mission statement for Great Britain with respect to its Indian possessions. Buchanan believed that the advance of the Gospel had been chiefly realized in "eras of light." The apostolic age was one such period, as was the Reformation. Buchanan expected the Church of England in the nineteenth century to provide the third era.¹⁶⁵ In contrast with "apostate" French society, as demonstrated in the chaos of the Revolution and their subsequent military aggressions, Britain should choose to "honour Christianity in the sight of the nations."¹⁶⁶ Let her Universities be religious "lights" as well as scientific ones, and let her establish a Protestant ecclesiastical establishment in India.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁴ This strategy has been documented in chapter three, pp.156ff.

¹⁶⁵ Buchanan, C., *The three eras of light: Two Discourses preached before the University of Cambridge ... July 1, 1810 ...*, Boston, 1811: 10.

¹⁶⁶ Op.cit.: 29-30, 39.

¹⁶⁷ Op.cit.: 34, 39.

The details of Buchanan's plan varied slightly over the years. Buchanan's first scheme was reflected in *Memoir of the expediency of an ecclesiastical establishment for British India* [1805]; his last design appeared in *Colonial ecclesiastical establishment* [1813]. Each form of the plan would
(continued...)

With respect to the missionary agenda, Buchanan's famous *Christian researches* led him to connect directly the prospects for Christian mission in India with an evangelical Anglican infrastructure in the subcontinent.¹⁶⁸ These demographic and cultural studies were Buchanan's unique contributions to the missionary movement. They demonstrated genuine skill in observation and analysis.¹⁶⁹ His argument was not unlike that of Charles Grant in his *Observations*: Christianity offers India a civilized and moral alternative to Hindu traditions.¹⁷⁰ In addition to the prospect of 'civilizing' the native population, the religious needs of the European community in India also made an ecclesiastical

¹⁶⁷(...continued)

have significantly augmented the religious complement of the EIC. The final version included three bishops [up from one], three archdeacons [versus one], forty European chaplains [an increase of five], sixty native "country curates" [new], one hundred catechists [new], and three colleges [versus one closed institution] to train these people. [Buchanan, C., *Colonial ecclesiastical establishment: Being a brief view of the state of the colonies of Great Britain, and of her Asiatic Empire, in respect to religious instruction* ..., London, 1813: 146.]

¹⁶⁸ Buchanan, C., *Christian researches in Asia: With notices of the translation of the Scriptures into the Oriental languages*, 3rd edition, Edinburgh, 1812: 257.

¹⁶⁹ Buchanan's writings were well received by sympathetic readers such as Daniel Corrie. [Corrie to John Buckworth, April 25, 1808, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *Memoirs of the Right Rev. Daniel Corrie, first Bishop of Madras: Compiled chiefly from his letters and journals*, London, 1847: 115.] Buchanan's work was also praised by less biased readers such as Beilby Porteus, Bishop of London. [McKelvie, G.D., *The development of official Anglican interest in world mission, 1783-1809: with special reference to Bishop Beilby Porteus*, Aberdeen University, Ph.D. thesis, 1984: 46-7, 887.] Of course, Buchanan had his critics. Major John Scott Waring believed Buchanan's criticisms of the India Company, especially its alleged support for the temple tax, to be cheap propaganda designed to capture public opinion. [See Scott Waring, J., *Remarks on the Rev. Doctor Buchanan's Christian researches in Asia*, London, 1812.]

¹⁷⁰ See chapter five, pp.210-11, for a discussion of Grant's *Observations on the state of society among the Asiatic subjects of Great Britain, particularly with respect to morals and the means of improving it: Written chiefly in the year 1792*, [London], 1797.

establishment a moral necessity in Buchanan's view.¹⁷¹ In addition, Buchanan believed that a more developed religious infrastructure would force the EIC to integrate the interests of Church and State. Buchanan believed that these interests had been segregated by the "mercenary spirit" of the East India Company.¹⁷²

For all of his creativity and thoughtfulness, the practical and missiological implications of Buchanan's ecclesiastical plans proved to be unworkable. As noted previously, the India Company believed the cost of an ecclesiastical establishment to be excessive in light of the Company's deficits.¹⁷³ Moreover, pleasing the expatriate community and the Hindu majority proved impossible for cultural and political reasons.¹⁷⁴ Buchanan's idealism vis-à-vis India mirrored the idealism of evangelicals in England such as Charles Simeon and William Wilberforce. Neither vision for "a Christian nation" -- in Britain or in India -- was realized.

When one considers the full dimensions of Buchanan's dreams for an evangelical Church and society in India, the affinity with Simeon's churchmanship and social world-view becomes readily apparent. Buchanan's scheme for India was

¹⁷¹ Buchanan, C., *Memoir of the expediency of an ecclesiastical establishment for British India*, 1805, 2nd edition, London, 1812: 3; and Buchanan, C., *Colonial ecclesiastical establishment: Being a brief view of the state of the colonies of Great Britain, and of her Asiatic Empire, in respect to religious instruction ...*, London, 1813: 3.

¹⁷² Buchanan, C., *Colonial ecclesiastical establishment: Being a brief view of the state of the colonies of Great Britain, and of her Asiatic Empire, in respect to religious instruction ...*, London, 1813: 118. Buchanan developed this sentiment after his conflict with Lord Minto's administration and his departure from India. Simeon's scepticism of the EIC's religious competence has already been noted in this chapter [p.289].

¹⁷³ See current chapter, pp.307-8, note 34.

¹⁷⁴ See Frykenberg's excellent article, "Religion and Company Raj in South India," *Fides et Historia* 17 (1985), 13 and passim.

Simeon's conception of the Established Church adapted to another context. It is also necessary to give Simeon some of the credit for the missionary aspects of Buchanan's proposals. Cnattingius suggested that Buchanan's design for an ecclesiastical establishment in India was based primarily on Wilberforce's "pious clauses" of 1793.¹⁷⁵ While this may have been true to some extent, it must also be recalled that Wilberforce's India-related efforts in 1792-3 were a refinement of the "1787 Plan," an undertaking in which Charles Simeon played a major part.¹⁷⁶ It is reasonable to assume that Claudius Buchanan departed for Calcutta in 1796 with many of his hopes for India already developed. The content of those expectations and the nature of Buchanan's relationship with Simeon suggests that the vicar of Holy Trinity Church had contributed significantly to the formulation of that vision.

Henry Martyn

The most famous of Simeon's India Company chaplains was Henry Martyn. Indeed, Martyn's own name is far better known today than that of his mentor. Nevertheless, Martyn's brief but illustrious career in India was Simeon's most significant success in the "chaplaincy business." It was a hard-won achievement for both men, as a selected chronology of Martyn's days at Cambridge illustrates.

Henry Martyn was born at Truro in 1781. He entered St. John's College, Cambridge, at the unusually young age of sixteen, an achievement that reflected

¹⁷⁵ Cnattingius, H., *Bishops and societies: A study of Anglican colonial and missionary expansion, 1698-1850*, London, 1952: 65-6.

¹⁷⁶ The connection between the events of 1787 and 1793, vis-à-vis the missionary movement, is considered in chapter four [p.190] and chapter five [pp.223-4].

Martyn's genuine intellectual brilliance. He took his degree in 1802 as Senior Wrangler -- another measure of his scholarly ability -- and was immediately made a Fellow of his college. Martyn's contact with Simeon did not commence until his final undergraduate year. He participated in Simeon's preaching classes and the "conversation parties," noting that his mentor's rooms always appeared to be full.¹⁷⁷

Martyn's enduring impression of his Cambridge days was one of spiritual inadequacy. Moreover, his feelings of flawed spirituality were not relieved by his encounters with Simeon. The opposite was the case. Martyn was made aware of the dearth of "spiritual" people at Cambridge as a result of Simeon's instruction, and Martyn included himself in the "unspiritual" majority.¹⁷⁸ Even the affirmation of his appointment as Simeon's second curate did not relieve Martyn's sense of failure in piety.¹⁷⁹ His journal entry for April 22, 1803, included an admission of shame for being known as Simeon's curate.¹⁸⁰ While Martyn's self-doubt was a preoccupation, it also made him a charitable man with others and guileless. Simeon considered Martyn's humility to have been an asset that foreshadowed his "usefulness."¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁷ Henry Martyn to Rev. Henry Godfrey, December 6, 1802, and June 22, 1803, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.55/C1/1-2.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.

¹⁷⁹ Thomas Thomason had been Simeon's curate from 1796 and continued in that role until his departure for India in 1808.

¹⁸⁰ As quoted in Smith, G., *Henry Martyn, saint and scholar: First modern missionary to the Mohammedans, 1781-1812*, London, 1892: 27.

¹⁸¹ Carus: 254. Simeon's concerns for the development of the personal character of his students has been examined in chapter three, pp.130ff. Humility was one such character trait. It's
(continued...)

Martyn discussed prospects for future ministry with Simeon on numerous occasions during the course of his curacy. Martyn's facility with languages had convinced Simeon that his curate should consider missionary service with the CMS.¹⁸² China was among the destinations they considered.¹⁸³ Two events intervened. Simeon had hoped that William Mandell, one of his students, would agree to be sent to Calcutta as chaplain to the Old Mission Church. The patronage was being arranged by Grant, then a member of the EIC Court albeit not one of the "Chairs" at the time. But Mandell chose to accept a curacy with Thomas Robinson in Leicester.¹⁸⁴ Then Martyn and his family were shocked by the unexpected death of his father in early 1804. This left Henry as provider for his mother and sister. The salary of a CMS missionary -- at roughly £100 a year -- would have been wholly inadequate. An EIC chaplain would earn ten times that amount. With Simeon's encouragement, and motivated by Mandell's change in plans and his family's needs, Martyn chose to pursue a chaplaincy with the East India Company.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸¹(...continued)

connection with "usefulness" has been touched on at an earlier point in this chapter [p.307].

¹⁸² Martyn had offered himself to the CMS in late 1802 as a result of Simeon's endorsement of Carey's work in Bengal. See Hole, C., *The early history of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1896: 86.

¹⁸³ Martyn to Henry Godfrey, June 22, 1803, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.55/C1/2.

¹⁸⁴ Martyn to Godfrey, December 27, 1803, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.55/C1/4.

¹⁸⁵ Martyn to Godfrey, March 22, 1804, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.55/C1/5.

Simeon arranged for Martyn to interview with Grant and Wilberforce in June 1804, in anticipation of an appointment by Grant during his chairmanship of the Court the following year.¹⁸⁶ The meeting was a success. Grant agreed to keep his eyes open for an appropriate post. Four months later Martyn was still waiting for word from Grant. Despite Simeon's exhortations to patience, Martyn was so anxious to be off to India that he contemplated making the voyage to Bengal without an appointment. Simeon was adamantly opposed to such an action.¹⁸⁷ The formal assignment to Bengal came at the end of January 1805 but his departure had to be deferred until March to allow for his ordination.¹⁸⁸ When transport arrangements required a delay of another four months, Martyn's frustrations reached a peak. He confessed to his friend John Hensman that he was "not quite satisfied with Mr. G[rant]" and the constant string of postponements.¹⁸⁹ To his relief, Martyn set sail from Falmouth on September 10, 1805, arriving in India in April of the following year.

In addition to mentoring Martyn in terms of vocation, Simeon also exerted a significant influence on Martyn's relationship with Lydia Grenfell. The Cambridge minister's opinion of marriage was well-known and unambiguous: Although it is an honourable institution, marriage is a hindrance to the Christian ministry.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁶ Martyn to John Hensman, June 2, 1804, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁸⁷ Martyn to Hensman, October 3, 1804, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁸⁸ Sargent, J., ed., *Memoir of the Rev. Henry Martyn, late fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain to the Honourable East India Company*, 4th edition, London, 1820: 96.

¹⁸⁹ Martyn to Hensman, March 26, 1805, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁹⁰ Carus: 164-5. The context for Simeon's editorial comment is Martyn's agitation over Lydia. H.E. Hopkins further documented Simeon's views on marriage in *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*,
(continued...)

Martyn's responsiveness to Simeon inclined him to agree intellectually, but his emotions were captive to his love for Lydia.¹⁹¹ Martyn vacillated between embracing singleness and marriage throughout his curacy with Simeon. The two men discussed Martyn's quandary on numerous occasions. At the last, with Lydia's family unwilling to allow her to accompany Martyn to India in any event, he resigned himself to the life of an unmarried clergyman.¹⁹²

Putting to sea at Truro quickly challenged Martyn's conclusion. In a letter to Simeon, posted en route from Falmouth, Martyn confessed that he was desperately in love with Lydia.¹⁹³ Thoughts of her troubled him for the entire voyage. Even his arrival at Calcutta [May 1806] and the privilege of being met at the dock by William Carey did not free him from thoughts of Lydia. A desperate Martyn made every mental attempt to lose himself in India: "Now let me burn out for God."¹⁹⁴ Nevertheless, his resolve again failed. With the encouragement of

¹⁹⁰(...continued)
London, 1977: 68.

¹⁹¹ The story of their relationship is told more fully in later biographies of Martyn, such as Smith's *Henry Martyn, saint and scholar* [London, 1892]. The earliest account, Sargent's *Memoir of the Rev. Henry Martyn* [1820], only makes anonymous references [e.g., p.107] to Lydia or to Martyn's struggle with his feelings for her. This may be attributed to the fact that John Sargent was another of Simeon's disciples and he would have been influenced by his mentor's view of women and marriage.

¹⁹² Martyn to Rev. Henry Godfrey, October 8, 1804, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.51/C1/8.

¹⁹³ Martyn to Simeon, July 26, 1805, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁹⁴ Martyn's journal entry for May 17, 1806, as quoted in Smith, G., *Bishop Heber, poet and chief missionary to the East, second Lord Bishop of Calcutta, 1783-1826*, London, 1895: 27.

David Brown and the Baptist missionaries, Martyn wrote to Lydia to ask her to join him in Calcutta.¹⁹⁵

Still, the matter was not settled. Delays and distance produced vacillation once more. Fearing Simeon's disapproval and that of Lydia's family, Martyn again attempted to give up all hope for marriage to Lydia.¹⁹⁶ This was fortunate for Martyn. In response to Martyn's letter of the previous September, Simeon paid a visit to the West Country to see Lydia and her family. He found her mother adamantly opposed to the marriage on account of Martyn's residence in India. Simeon believed that this factor alone was an insurmountable barrier. Martyn never learned of Simeon's unsolicited visit to Truro. Lydia exacted a promise of silence from Henry Martyn's mentor.¹⁹⁷ In 1808 Martyn was able to write to Simeon and declare that the matter of Lydia was "settled," although his love for her was still unfailing.¹⁹⁸

Henry Martyn has generally been labelled as a "saint" in modern histories of Christian mission in India. He is frequently characterized as a man whose piety and dedication to his work cost him his life. While this interpretation of Martyn's life is not incorrect, it tends to minimize his missionary achievements, especially in relation to those of the Serampore Baptists. The fact that Martyn was an EIC chaplain has frequently been employed as the explanation for his limited

¹⁹⁵ Martyn to Simeon, September 1, 1806, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁹⁶ Martyn to Simeon, April 26, 1807, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁹⁷ Ms. extract from Simeon's journal for the trip, dated April 1807, probably on the 25th, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

¹⁹⁸ Martyn to Simeon, January 1808, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

missionary impact.¹⁹⁹ While it is beyond the scope of this study to assess the missiology and missionary activity of Martyn in a rigorous fashion, one fact is clear: Charles Simeon and Henry Martyn's colleagues viewed Martyn's work as decidedly missionary. Moreover, Martyn did not disagree.

Henry Martyn was a genuine Churchman. Evidence for this conclusion includes his refusal to preach in a Methodist chapel while a curate to Simeon.²⁰⁰ Nevertheless, Martyn visualized his work in India in the context of an on-going and ecumenical Christian effort. Agreeing with Claudius Buchanan, Martyn affirmed the contribution of Roman Catholic missionaries to the progress of Christianity in India. Martyn believed that Roman Catholic efforts had cleared the way for an "Indian Luther" and that the Catholic presence in India had served the missionary cause far better than the expatriate Protestant community.²⁰¹ To another correspondent Martyn testified of his common cause with the Baptist missionaries.²⁰² Like his mentor, Martyn held the work of the Serampore Baptists in high regard. Shortly after his arrival he expressed to Simeon his appreciation for Carey and company, especially their emphasis on translation work

¹⁹⁹ For example, this position was taken by M.A. Laird [*Bishop Heber in Northern India: Selection's from Heber's journal*, The European Understanding of India, Cambridge, 1971: 5] and I.J. Gash [op.cit.: 49].

²⁰⁰ Martyn's journal entry for September 2, 1804, as quoted in Elliott-Binns, L., *The evangelical movement in the English Church*, The faiths: Varieties of Christian expression, edited by L.P. Jacks, London, 1928: 114.

²⁰¹ Martyn to Rev. Thomas Martyn Hutchins, February 19, 1811, India Office Library and Records, Eur.A.87.

²⁰² Martyn to an unnamed recipient, September 15, 1806, as quoted in Martyn, H., *Two sets of unpublished letters of the Rev. Henry Martyn, B.D., of Truro, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain on the Bengal establishment*, edited, with prefatory remarks, by ... H.M. Jeffery, Truro, 1883: 37, 39. At that point questions of polity and baptism had not yet arisen.

and literature.²⁰³ The exposure to Carey's linguistic work, plus Martyn's similar interests, influenced the course of Martyn's 'extra-curricular' activities. His Hindustani and Persian translations of the New Testament and his apologetic encounters with Islamic scholars in Arabia were genuine missiological achievements in the early nineteenth century. These were undertaken in addition to his responsibilities as a military chaplain and are an important measure of the missionary nature of his efforts in Asia.

During the course of his postings in Bengal, and particularly at Dinapore and Cawnpore, Martyn applied himself to a task that he had learned from Simeon, viz., mentoring others. An early effort was with a Muslim convert known as Sabat. Martyn and Sabat met while the Englishman was stationed at Dinapore in 1807. Martyn received Sabat as a genuine convert and he commended the former Muslim to his colleagues.²⁰⁴ Owing to Martyn's endorsement and the assistance that Sabat gave to Martyn in his translation work, Daniel Corrie expressed "no doubt of the grace of God being in [Sabat]."²⁰⁵ Seventeen months later, however, both Martyn and Corrie had become disillusioned with Sabat. When his embrace of Christianity failed to raise his social and economic status to that of a European, Sabat apparently became disenchanted with his new faith. Sabat and Martyn parted company in October 1810 and Corrie alerted David Brown to Sabat's alleged

²⁰³ Martyn to Simeon, September 1, 1806, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

²⁰⁴ Martyn to [Rev. T.M. Hutchins], 1807, as quoted in Martyn, H., *Two sets of unpublished letters of the Rev. Henry Martyn, B.D., of Truro, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain on the Bengal establishment*, edited, with prefatory remarks, by ... H.M. Jeffery, Truro, 1883: 47-8.

²⁰⁵ Corrie to David Brown, May 11, 1809, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *Memoirs of the Right Rev. Daniel Corrie, first Bishop of Madras: Compiled chiefly from his letters and journals*, London, 1847: 129.

opportunism.²⁰⁶ The criticism quite naturally caused Sabat to abandon his new faith and to subsequently oppose it.²⁰⁷

A subsequent attempt by Martyn to mentor in a cross-cultural context was more fruitful on a long-term basis. Abdul Masih, also a Muslim, came into contact with Martyn at Cawnpore in 1809.²⁰⁸ Owing to popular interest [i.e., in the prospect of the distribution of alms] a large crowd gathered outside Martyn's house every Sunday. One of Martyn's sermons had an impact on Abdul Masih.²⁰⁹ The Muslim converted to Christianity, became a disciple of Martyn's, and was employed by the CMS as a catechist in 1812. He accompanied Daniel Corrie to Agra and served there as an evangelist and pastor.²¹⁰ During his work with Corrie, Abdul Masih followed Martyn's discipline of keeping a daily journal. These volumes were regularly copied and forwarded to the CMS in London as

²⁰⁶ Corrie to Brown, October 4, 1810, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *Memoirs of the Right Rev. Daniel Corrie, first Bishop of Madras: Compiled chiefly from his letters and journals*, London, 1847: 173-4.

²⁰⁷ According to Thomas Thomason, Sabat was "ruined" by the publicity given to his ministry with Martyn. As a consequence, the man's hopes for greater status and remuneration grew. When those expectations were not met, Sabat recanted and became an opponent of Christianity. [Thomason to Josiah Pratt, February 5, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E 4.]

²⁰⁸ European primary sources have also spelled his name as "Abdool Messeh" or "Musseeh," etc.

²⁰⁹ Sherwood, [M.M.], *Indian orphans, a narrative of acts: Including many notices of the Rev. Henry Martyn, B.D., and of the Right Rev. Daniel Corrie, Lord Bishop of Madras, etc*, Berwick, 1839: 142.

²¹⁰ Corrie to Simeon, June 23, 1813, and Corrie to Josiah Pratt, December 31, 1813; as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *Memoirs of the Right Rev. Daniel Corrie, first Bishop of Madras: Compiled chiefly from his letters and journals*, London, 1847: 248, 261-3.

evidence of the former Muslim's ministry.²¹¹ Simeon read Abdul Masih's journals with great interest and cherished a portrait of Martyn's most well-known disciple. After Martyn's death Simeon always referred to Abdul Masih as the self-evident indication of Martyn's fruitfulness in India.²¹²

Despite the precedents of his efforts with Sabat and Masih, Martyn was generally discouraged with the impact of EIC chaplains on Indian society. In letters to Corrie, Martyn revealed his discouragement with the apparent "lack of ... fruit[fulness]" of fellow chaplains.²¹³ In a subsequent letter Martyn decried the general ineffectiveness of the EIC's investment in the corps of chaplains.²¹⁴ Nor were Simeon's chaplains exempt from Martyn's criticism. He noted that Thomas Thomason and Joseph Parson were hard at work in India but their language skills limited them to ministry to English-speaking people. He concluded that Thomason was "best kept in Calcutta" for the benefit of the European population.²¹⁵ Martyn

²¹¹ The ms. journals are held by the CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E [various accessions].

Thomason advised the CMS to not publish the journals. He feared that notoriety would create the same tensions for Abdul Masih as it had for Sabat. [Thomason to Josiah Pratt, February 5, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E 4.] Although these did not materialize for Abdul Masih, the CMS faced a set of Sabat-like problems with one of Corrie's converts in 1818. [See Corrie to Pratt, January 5, 1818, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C/I1/E1/100.]

²¹² Simeon to Thomas Thomason, April 13 and May 24, 1814, as quoted in Carus: 274-5.

²¹³ Martyn to Corrie, December 14 and 28, 1807, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.54/C1/3-4.

²¹⁴ Martyn to Hutchins, October 10, 1809, as quoted in Martyn, H., *Two sets of unpublished letters of the Rev. Henry Martyn, B.D., of Truro, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain on the Bengal establishment*, edited, with prefatory remarks, by ... H.M. Jeffery, Truro, 1883: 55.

²¹⁵ Ibid.

believed that only Daniel Corrie had any appreciable facility in native languages in addition to himself.

Martyn's work was so significant in Simeon's eyes that the mentor described his student's work in biblical terms: "The histories of Joseph and Esther are yet passing before our eyes every day."²¹⁶ Reginald Heber, second Bishop of Calcutta, shared Simeon's opinion. He believed Martyn and Corrie's work in India to have been the Church of England's first genuine missionary efforts in India.²¹⁷ Martyn's efforts were described by Heber in terms that were as 'missionary' as those of any of the CMS's workers. This affirmation reinforced Simeon's conviction that the missionary potential of EIC chaplains could be significant, Martyn's own criticisms notwithstanding.

The final measures of Simeon's commitment to Henry Martyn were the Cambridge minister's efforts to arrange for a furlough for his former student. By 1812 Simeon was aware of the toll that the South Asian climate had taken on Martyn's health.²¹⁸ Simeon expressed his desire to help Martyn get the furlough he needed in an urgent letter to Grant.²¹⁹ The news of David Brown's untimely

²¹⁶ Simeon to Thomas Thomason, November 25, 1811, as quoted in Carus: 219.

²¹⁷ Heber to Rev. Charles W. Williams Wynn, March 1, 1825, as quoted in Heber, R., *Narrative of a journey through the upper provinces of India, from Calcutta to Bombay, 1824-1825, [with notes upon Ceylon], an account of a journey to Madras and the southern provinces, 1826, and letters written in India*, 4th edition, edited by A. Heber, London, 1829: vol.3, 339.

²¹⁸ Martyn was candid with Corrie on this subject in his letter from Persia, dated May 28, 1812, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, Acc.54/C2/1. That Simeon was aware of Martyn's circumstances -- and his request for a furlough -- is evident in Simeon's letter to Grant on June 10, 1812, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

²¹⁹ Simeon to Grant, August 7, 1812, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

death in 1812 further reinforced Simeon's determination to avert the same fate for Martyn.²²⁰ Simeon was so concerned for Martyn that he wrote to Grant three times in December of that year to urge the EIC Directors to expedite Martyn's furlough.²²¹ Nevertheless, best efforts in England were without effect. In February 1813 Simeon informed Grant of Martyn's death at Tokat four months earlier.²²² To many observers Simeon's grief was like that of a father for a son.²²³

Daniel Corrie

If Henry Martyn was the most famous of the "pious chaplains," then Daniel Corrie was the most successful in clerical terms. Corrie, a Scot, was born at Ardchaton, Argyllshire, on April 10, 1777. He arrived at Cambridge in 1799 to study law. Corrie came under Simeon's influence while he was a student at Clare College and, from 1800, at Trinity College. Simeon's impact on Corrie was profound. The Scot attributed his evangelical conversion to Simeon and later wrote of him as "that 'Father in Israel.'"²²⁴ Corrie further acknowledged his spiritual

²²⁰ Simeon to Grant, December 16, 1812, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

²²¹ Simeon to Grant, December 9, 21, and 26, 1812, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

²²² Simeon to Grant, February 11, 1813, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

²²³ Carus: 254.

²²⁴ Corrie's journal entry for April 10, 1804, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *Memoirs of the Right Rev. Daniel Corrie, first Bishop of Madras: Compiled chiefly from his letters and journals*, London, 1847: 13; and Corrie to John Sargent, November 1, 1811, op.cit.: 258-9.

indebtedness to Simeon in a letter to his mentor in 1816.²²⁵ In addition to his spiritual formation, Simeon helped to shape Corrie's vocational intentions. Corrie made a commitment to pursue the Christian ministry in 1802, as evidenced by his decision to secure deacon's orders. After two curacies, at Buckminster and Stoke Rochford, Corrie was ordained as a priest on June 10, 1804.

Simeon's impact on Corrie followed the pattern evident with many of Simeon's disciples. In addition to imparting spiritual underpinnings to Corrie and directing him toward a clerical vocation, Simeon also pointed Corrie toward India. Shortly after taking his law degree, Corrie resolved to seek employment with the East India Company as one of its chaplains.²²⁶ Through Simeon's influence with Charles Grant, then in the chair of the Court of Directors, Corrie was appointed to Bengal in 1805. He and Joseph Parson embarked for India on March 30, 1806, arriving at Calcutta on September 21. The two men were met at the docks by Henry Martyn.

Corrie's first assignment was at Chunar, which he reached in February 1807. Ensuing postings included Cawnpore [1810-13] in relief of the ailing Martyn, and at Agra [1813-14]. Following a health-related furlough in England during 1815-17, Corrie resided at Benares for two years. His assignment to the spiritual capital of Hindu culture profoundly affected Corrie. His subsequent letters and reports reflected an intense concern for the cross-cultural communication of the Gospel in the Hindu context. In 1819 Corrie returned to Calcutta as Senior Presidency Chaplain, a position that he held until he was made Archdeacon of Calcutta by Bishop Heber in 1823. Corrie and Joseph Parson, who became Senior

²²⁵ Corrie to Simeon, April 15, 1816, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

²²⁶ Corrie's journal entry for July 25, 1805, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *op.cit.*: 19.

Chaplain when the former was made Archdeacon, also served as "Commissioners of the See" during the ensuing vacancies created by the deaths of Bishops Heber, James and Turner. Corrie was Calcutta's virtual diocesan from Heber's death in 1826 until Daniel Wilson's arrival in 1834. Corrie's final responsibility in India was as suffragan Bishop of Madras from 1835. When Daniel Corrie died unexpectedly in 1837, the Indian Church lost its most experienced Anglican cleric of the day.

Daniel Corrie's contributions to the religious and missionary establishment in British India were characterized by three qualities: good Anglican churchmanship, evangelicalism, and keen organization. The similarity between these values and those of Simeon demonstrates the extent to which Corrie was mentored by the vicar of Holy Trinity Church. These aspects of the Simeon stamp on Daniel Corrie are worth brief investigation.

Corrie's intense commitment to the Established Church had developed at Cambridge under Simeon's influence. For example, as a curate Corrie lamented the "defections" to Methodism of many evangelical Churchmen.²²⁷ His loyalty to the Church of England was further demonstrated in his assessment of Marquis Wellesley's administration of India. Corrie, like Buchanan, expressed genuine appreciation for Wellesley's plans [e.g., Ft. William College] because of the emphasis placed on strengthening the Anglican presence in British India.²²⁸ Corrie's dismay at the closing of the College and his endorsement of Buchanan's subsequent proposals for an ecclesiastical establishment were further manifestations

²²⁷ Corrie to John Buckworth, February 14, 1804, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *op.cit.*: 11-12.

²²⁸ Corrie to his father, December 16, 1806, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *op.cit.*: 56.

of his Anglican churchmanship.²²⁹ Corrie's sermons in India also reveal his Simeon-like churchmanship. In an 1826 sermon at the Presidency Church in Calcutta, Corrie found reason to affirm the work of Roman Catholic missionaries in one key regard: They had introduced episcopacy in Asia, although "it is now being improved" [i.e., in the Anglican variety].²³⁰ In a subsequent address [1830] as Archdeacon of Calcutta, on the occasion of Bishop Heber's primary visitation, Corrie embraced the need for order in society in general. He found Anglican churchmanship and polity as a most suitable means toward this end.²³¹

As with his mentor, Corrie's commitment to regular churchmanship was not unaccompanied by tension. His loyalty to the religious establishment was tested in 1819 when he was re-posted from Benares to the Presidency Church at Calcutta. As mentioned previously, his work at Benares had deepened his commitment to impacting indigenous Indian society. Corrie feared that his work in the spiritual capital of India was being terminated prematurely, but he acknowledged that his status as a chaplain "and not a missionary" required him to comply with his ecclesiastical and political superiors.²³² While Corrie's comment might suggest that he believed that Anglican missionaries enjoyed a more independent status than EIC chaplains, he joined Simeon in urging the CMS to submit the stationing of its

²²⁹ Corrie to John Buckworth, April 25, 1808, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], op.cit.: 115.

²³⁰ Corrie, D., *A sermon preached in the cathedral church of St. John, in Calcutta, on Sunday, April 23, 1826: On the occasion of the death of the Right Reverend Reginald, Lord Bishop of the diocese*, Calcutta, 1826: 6.

²³¹ Corrie, D., *A sermon preached at the primary visitation of the Lord Bishop of Calcutta, at the cathedral church of St. John, Calcutta, on Wednesday, January 6, 1830*, Calcutta, [1830]: 1.

²³² Corrie to Simeon, undated, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], op.cit.: 321.

missionaries in India to the Bishop of Calcutta.²³³ However, Corrie expected the Society to continue to play the part of "lay patron" through the appointment of its missionaries.²³⁴ Corrie believed that such control was necessary in order to limit CMS employees to evangelicals. As noted in chapter five, Corrie and Simeon were in agreement on the balance between missionary appointment by the Society and the stationing of missionaries by the bishop.²³⁵

In the same way that Charles Simeon's evangelicalism contradicted his churchmanship to some extent, Corrie's evangelical presuppositions defined much of his agenda as a chaplain and set boundaries to his commitment to Anglican order. A journal entry during Corrie's first year in India documented the lack of interest of the European community [i.e., in Calcutta] in the evangelization of Indian nationals.²³⁶ This perceived deficiency gave rise to a distinctively evangelical strategy that was embraced by David Brown and Corrie in particular: aid the organization of a Bible Society auxiliary in Calcutta, cooperate with the Serampore Baptists in the translation of the Scriptures into native languages, and create a support structure [i.e., the circular letter] to encourage evangelical chaplains in evangelistic work at their stations.²³⁷ Corrie, like Brown, remained

²³³ Corrie to Josiah Pratt, April 12, 1821, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I1/O76; also quoted in the Minutes of the Parent Committee, October 8, 1821, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/5.

²³⁴ Ibid.

²³⁵ See pp.283-4.

²³⁶ Corrie's journal for September 5, 1806, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *op.cit.*: 39.

²³⁷ Corrie's journal for September 21, 1806, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *op.cit.*: 54; also see the current chapter, p.334.

faithful to these emphases during his tenure in India. Corrie's commitment to the evangelical cause was also manifested in his significant involvement with the CMS, in England and in India. The particulars will be noted shortly.

Corrie's evangelicalism also limited his enthusiasm for the newly-created Indian episcopate. As noted above, he did not question episcopal authority, but Corrie was certain that T.F. Middleton would be no friend to the evangelical cause in India. Corrie warned Josiah Pratt that the CMS should expect "nothing from the Bishop of Calcutta."²³⁸ Cnattingius overstated the case when he asserted that Corrie was in agreement with Middleton's intention to prohibit the assignment of missionaries from more than one Anglican society to the same station.²³⁹ While Corrie was no advocate of head-to-head competition between the CMS and the "Venerable Societies," he disapproved of and distrusted Middleton's policies. Corrie believed that the bishop's determination to "license ... or silence" the missionaries in his diocese would adversely affect the posting of all CMS missionaries in India regardless of their proximity to SPCK or SPG personnel.²⁴⁰ Nor did he accept Middleton's conclusion that a growing missionary force would inhibit the appointment of chaplains by the EIC Court of Directors.²⁴¹ Corrie feared that the bishop's true object was to limit the evangelical Anglican

²³⁸ Minutes of the Parent Committee, April 20, 1818, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/3.

²³⁹ Cnattingius, H., *Bishops and societies: A study of Anglican colonial and missionary expansion, 1698-1850*, London, 1952: 88, 96. Cnattingius believed that Middleton wished to avoid inter-society competition.

²⁴⁰ Corrie to his brother, undated, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], op.cit.: 329. The bishop's quote is taken from a letter of Middleton's, dated March 8, 1821, as found in Le Bas, C.W., *The life of the Right Rev. Thomas Fanshaw Middleton ...*, London, 1831: vol.1, 402-3.

²⁴¹ [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], op.cit.: 329.

missionary presence in India. He believed that his point was proven by the unwillingness of Middleton to admit evangelical Churchmen -- Europeans or Indian nationals -- to Bishop's College, despite the CMS's gift of £5,000 to the institution.²⁴²

These tensions with Middleton caused Corrie to resist the bishop's request that the Calcutta Corresponding Committee of the CMS resign its labours to the Diocesan Committee.²⁴³ Moreover, upon Middleton's death, Corrie also urged the Parent Committee of the CMS to press for a new bishop who recognized the Society from the outset.²⁴⁴ While this hope was realized in Reginald Heber, the strain between the CMS and Bishop's College reappeared after Heber's untimely death. When the principal of the College, W.H. Mill, refused to admit a student approved by Heber prior to his death, Corrie recommended that the CMS discontinue its financial support of the College.²⁴⁵ At issue in these conflicts with the hierarchy of the Indian Church was the status of evangelicals in India. The stationing of CMS missionaries and the Society's access to Bishop's College were cases in point. Whenever Corrie was required to choose between his

²⁴² Corrie to [Josiah Pratt], January 25 and November 20, 1820, as quoted in Minutes of the Parent Committee, June 20, 1820, and June 11, 1821, respectively, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/4-5.

²⁴³ Corrie to [Josiah Pratt], January 10, 1821, as quoted in Minutes of the Parent Committee, August 13, 1821, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/5.

²⁴⁴ Corrie to [Josiah Pratt], July 9, 1822, as quoted in Minutes of the Parent Committee, February 5, 1823, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/6.

²⁴⁵ Corrie to Edward Bickersteth, August 14 and 17, 1827, as quoted in Minutes of the Parent Committee, December 18, 1827, and January 29, 1828, respectively, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/9.

The student in question was a Mr. Thompson, nominated by the Madras Coordinating Committee of the CMS under terms agreed by Bishop Heber with the Anglican missionary societies.

evangelical roots and the contrary inclinations of the official ecclesiastical structure, Corrie consistently chose to put his evangelicalism first.

In terms of Corrie's immediate contributions to the evangelical missionary movement in India, a comment by Reginald Heber is intriguing. The bishop viewed the work of Corrie [and Henry Martyn] as the first missionary efforts in India by the Church of England.²⁴⁶ While Heber's compliment cannot be accepted uncritically, it should not be dismissed altogether. As one would expect, Corrie the chaplain never characterized himself as a missionary. Moreover, Henry Martyn's appraisal of Corrie's cross-cultural skills was reserved.²⁴⁷ Nevertheless, some years later Thomas Thomason and the Calcutta Coordinating Committee of the CMS warmly affirmed Corrie's rapport with Indian nationals.²⁴⁸ Simeon would have been pleased and unsurprised. As noted previously, Simeon expected 'his' chaplains to contribute significantly to the missionary cause. This Daniel Corrie did in organizational terms if not also in personal practice.

²⁴⁶ Heber to Rev. Charles W. Williams Wynn, March 1, 1825, as quoted in Heber, R., *Narrative of a journey through the upper provinces of India, from Calcutta to Bombay, 1824-1825, [with notes upon Ceylon], an account of a journey to Madras and the southern provinces, 1826, and letters written in India*, 4th edition, 3 vols., edited by A. Heber, London, 1829: vol.3, 339.

²⁴⁷ Martyn to T.M. Hutchins, October 10, 1809, as quoted in Martyn, H., *Two sets of unpublished letters of the Rev. Henry Martyn, B.D., of Truro, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain on the Bengal establishment*, edited, with prefatory remarks, by ... H.M. Jeffery, Truro, 1883: 55.

²⁴⁸ Thomason to [Josiah Pratt], October 20, 1817, February 18, 1818, and July 21, 1818, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C II/E 2.

In fairness, it must be noted that Thomason was not known for his ability to work directly with Indian nationals. [Martyn to T.M. Hutchins, October 10, 1809, as quoted in Martyn, H., *Two sets of unpublished letters of the Rev. Henry Martyn, B.D., of Truro, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain on the Bengal establishment*, edited, with prefatory remarks, by ... H.M. Jeffery, Truro, 1883: 55.]

Corrie often used his leadership and analytical skills in support of Christian mission in India. One of his fields of constant endeavour was an increase in the evangelical presence in the Bengal presidency. For example, Corrie considered an appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury for more chaplains, hoping that support from that quarter would create new opportunities for action by Simeon and Charles Grant.²⁴⁹ Corrie also encouraged his friend John Buckworth in his attempts to mentor candidates for the CMS.²⁵⁰ Corrie's requests to Simeon for men for Agra and for the Old Mission Church in Calcutta have already been noted.²⁵¹ His medical furlough in 1815-17 also afforded Corrie an opportunity to strengthen the Church Missionary Society. He consented to preach in Simeon's pulpit on behalf of the Society in November of 1815.²⁵² Corrie aided the CMS in the development of its auxiliary structure and preached the first anniversary sermon for the Birmingham Church Missionary Association.²⁵³ He also agreed to serve as a representative for the CMS during his furlough, as opposed to the common course of a temporary curacy.²⁵⁴ Corrie's activism on behalf of the evangelical

²⁴⁹ Corrie to David Brown, July 11, 1811, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *op.cit.*: 203. Corrie would also have been motivated in this instance by Brown's failing health. Brown died in the following year.

²⁵⁰ Corrie to Buckworth, July 20, 1811, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *op.cit.*: 232.

²⁵¹ See chapter five, pp.268ff.

²⁵² An illness prevented him from fulfilling his commitment. See chapter five, p.288.

²⁵³ Minutes of the Parent Committee, December 12, 1815, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/2.

²⁵⁴ Minutes of the Parent Committee, January 8 and 22, 1816, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/2.

missionary movement was clear, genuine, and consistent with the values Simeon imparted to him during his Cambridge years.

Corrie's concern for the progress of Christianity in India also led him to constructively criticize the missionary movement on occasions. For example, Corrie joined Simeon in pleading with the CMS to increase its minimum monthly salary. Good men were being lost for lack of adequate means. Corrie recommended at least Rs80 a month for single men and Rs120 for a married missionary, noting that these amounts would be "barely sufficient."²⁵⁵ As Bishop of Madras, Corrie also studied missionary methods with a critical eye. In his visitation to Tanjore, for instance, he found the churches established by Schwartz to be languishing.²⁵⁶ Moreover, he concluded that C.T.E. Rhenius had attracted converts by securing rent relief for them from their landlords.²⁵⁷ He also joined Daniel Wilson in criticizing the apparent willingness of church and mission structures to accommodate caste practices for the sake of attendance and financial support by higher caste converts.²⁵⁸

In considering the character and work of Daniel Corrie, one is once again struck by the similarities with Simeon. Corrie and Simeon shared a common

²⁵⁵ Minutes of the Parent Committee, January 21, 1817, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/2. The figures suggested would have doubled CMS salaries in India.

²⁵⁶ Corrie to John Gordon, March 17, 1836, King's College MSS, Misc 12'(8).

²⁵⁷ Ibid.

²⁵⁸ Corrie to a native catechist, December 29, 1835, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], op.cit.: 550; see also Corrie, D., *Sermons, with a charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Madras [on August 26, 1836], and addresses before and after confirmation*, edited by H[enry] C[orrie], Madras, 1837: 423-4, 426, 433.

concern for Anglican churchmanship. They were both driven by evangelical principles. Each man applied their leadership and organizational skills to the creation of infrastructure for Christian mission in India. When these resemblances are seen against the backdrop of Corrie's years in Cambridge as a student of Simeon, Daniel Corrie becomes more than the most successful of Simeon's India Company chaplains. Simeon's genuine skill and achievements as a mentor also become strikingly clear.

Thomas Thomason

Charles Simeon exerted his most profound mentorial influence on the last of his five "pious chaplains," Thomas Truebody Thomason. This was a function of the closeness of their relationship and the length of time over which it developed. Thomason remained under Simeon's immediate direction and care longer than any other of Simeon's disciples and the effect was pronounced on both men.

Thomason was born on June 7, 1774, at Plymouth. Following an unremarkable English upbringing, Thomason shocked his family by embracing the Wesleyan movement. His first missionary venture was also a product of his encounter with Methodism. In 1789 Thomason accompanied Thomas Coke on one of his trips to the West Indies as a French interpreter.²⁵⁹ Thomason, however, was a Churchman at heart. When Methodism was forced to register its chapels as dissenting places of worship he left the movement for the "excellence and

²⁵⁹ Some details are provided in Sargent, J., *The life of the Rev. T.T. Thomason, M.A., late chaplain to the Honourable East India Company*, 2nd edition, London, 1834: 4. See Vickers, J., *Thomas Coke: Apostle of Methodism*, London, 1969, for a thorough treatment of Coke's travels to the West Indies.

economy" of the Established Church and its evangelical wing.²⁶⁰ With the help of the Elland Clerical Society Thomason entered Magdalene College, Cambridge, in 1792. He took his B.A. four years later, was made a Fellow of Queens' in 1797, and received his M.A. in 1799.

As a Magdalene evangelical Thomason quickly came into contact with Simeon through his sermon classes and conversation parties. Thomason's observations on these subjects have already been noted.²⁶¹ Thomason proved to be extremely responsive to his mentor, so much so that Simeon made Thomason his first curate in 1796. Thomason also served the country parishes of Stapleford and Shelford, the latter providing Simeon with a venue for his "summer house parties" for clergy and their wives.²⁶² Thomason's assistance was especially providential for Simeon in 1807. Simeon was seriously ill for seven months of the year owing to the physical and emotional stresses of his early years at Holy Trinity Church. Thomason supplied the pulpit at Holy Trinity in addition to his other curacies.²⁶³ Thomason's dedication endeared him to Simeon and they became the closest of friends.

²⁶⁰ Sargent, op.cit.: 16-19.

²⁶¹ Quotes from Thomason's letters to his mother were included by Carus in the *Memoirs* [of Simeon] and have been referenced in chapter three, p.167.

²⁶² See chapter three, pp.167-8; and Hopkins, H.E., *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*, London, 1977: 119-20.

²⁶³ Brown [p.191] recorded a discussion between Simeon and his students on the subject of his 1807 illness. The duration and seriousness of his disability profoundly affected Simeon. As a consequence he determined to watch his health carefully and to urge his students to do likewise. Simeon never again suffered a major illness or impediment until the last five months of his life.

Being an early student of Simeon's and his first curate, Thomason saw the most famous of his mentor's Indian Company chaplains come to Cambridge and depart for Bengal. Buchanan was Thomason's contemporary at Cambridge and Corrie, Martyn, and Parson came under Simeon's influence during Thomason's curacy. Unsurprisingly, Thomason also developed an early interest in India. Grant had approached Thomason in 1796 with an appointment to serve the Old Mission Church in Calcutta.²⁶⁴ Thomason was unable to accept Grant's offer because his mother would not give her permission for the appointment unless he married. In turn, Thomason's fiancée adamantly refused to reside in India.²⁶⁵ It was Sargent's opinion that Buchanan was appointed by Grant when Thomason had to decline.²⁶⁶ Thomason's ambitions were realized in 1808 when he was able to accept Grant's appointment to a Bengal chaplaincy. Thomason arrived at Calcutta in November of that year. Despite losing the company of his close friend and the services of an invaluable curate, Simeon fully supported Thomason's ambition to serve the evangelical cause in India.

The primary focus of Thomason's twenty-one year career in India was the European congregation of the Old Mission Church in Calcutta. David Brown was the first to note how well-suited Thomason was to his charge. He found Thomason's "peaceful temper" to be a soothing influence on the competitive strife

²⁶⁴ Sargent, J., *The life of the Rev. T.T. Thomason, M.A., late chaplain to the Honourable East India Company*, 2nd edition, London, 1834: 62-3.

²⁶⁵ Ibid. She died unexpectedly in 1797.

²⁶⁶ Ibid. Sargent's assertion is not consistent with the nature of Buchanan's initial assignment in Bengal. He was posted to the garrison at Barrackpore not to Kiermander's church. It is more likely that Grant made offers to both Thomason and Buchanan.

that had broken out between the evangelical chaplains and the Serampore Baptists.²⁶⁷ Henry Martyn drew the same conclusion, but on a less charitable basis. He reasoned that Thomason was "best kept in Calcutta" for lack of any ability in native languages.²⁶⁸ Daniel Corrie also recognized the limits to Thomason's understanding of the native situation, suggesting to Simeon that he [Simeon] and Thomason were equally informed on the subject.²⁶⁹ This reality, however, did not diminish the value of Thomason's work in Simeon's eyes. In appraising the work of 'his' chaplains -- including Thomason -- Simeon found "[the] histories of Joseph and Esther ... passing before our eyes every day."²⁷⁰ A brief review of Thomason's accomplishments in Bengal bears out Simeon's judgment and expectation.

Being fixed in Calcutta made Thomason a stable point of reference for Simeon in his attempts to send evangelical men to India. On numerous occasions Thomason and Simeon exchanged letters that dealt with the Cambridge minister's efforts to augment the complement of evangelical men already in India. These

²⁶⁷ Brown to Simeon, December 1809, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

²⁶⁸ Martyn to H.M. Hutchins, October 10, 1809, as quoted in Martyn, H., *Two sets of unpublished letters of the Rev. Henry Martyn, B.D., of Truro, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain on the Bengal establishment*, edited, with prefatory remarks, by ... H.M. Jeffery, Truro, 1883: 55.

²⁶⁹ Corrie to Simeon, June 23, 1813, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *Memoirs of the Right Rev. Daniel Corrie, first Bishop of Madras: Compiled chiefly from his letters and journals*, London, 1847: 248.

²⁷⁰ Simeon to Thomason, November 25, 1811, as quoted in Carus: 219. The quotation also appears earlier in this chapter, p.355.

efforts include the appeal for Agra,²⁷¹ the need for an assistant [to Thomason] at the Old Mission Church,²⁷² Simeon's interest in completely "new work" for his students,²⁷³ and replacements for Simeon's men who were furloughing or retiring, such as G.W. Crawford.²⁷⁴ Whenever Simeon required an Indian perspective on the need for EIC chaplains, particularly after Charles Grant's retirement from the Court of Directors, Thomason was almost always consulted.²⁷⁵

Thomason also played an important part in the CMS's operations in India. How this role developed for Thomason is pertinent. The Calcutta Coordinating Committee [CCC] of the CMS had been informally created in 1806 to represent the Society's interests in India.²⁷⁶ The original CCC was comprised of David Brown, George Udny, and Claudius Buchanan. The CCC received its formal

²⁷¹ Simeon to Thomason, January 27, 1814, as quoted in Hole, C., *The early history of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1896: 422.

²⁷² Simeon to Grant, March 15, 1814, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge. Simeon refers to correspondence with Corrie and Thomason on the subject.

The subject was revived by Thomason in 1820. [Thomason to Simeon, July 12, 1820, as quoted in Minutes of the Parent Committee, February 12, 1821, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/4.]

²⁷³ Simeon to Thomason, June 8, 1824, as quoted in Carus: 414.

²⁷⁴ Thomason to John Sherer, March 7, 1825, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

²⁷⁵ This study identified fifty-two letters that were exchanged between Simeon and Thomason during the latter's residence in India. These letters form the largest block of Simeon's correspondence with India.

²⁷⁶ Hole, C., *The early history of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1896: 171.

constitution in 1809, with Brown, Henry Martyn, and Daniel Corrie as members.²⁷⁷ With the prospect of the admission of missionaries to India through the impending revision of the EIC's charter, and with the expected establishment of the Indian episcopate, the Parent Committee believed that further organizational actions in India were required. In order to promote the cause of missionary access for British India and to demonstrate some meaningful activity by the Society in the subcontinent, the Parent Committee encouraged David Brown and Daniel Corrie in early 1813 to transform the CCC into an autonomous Auxiliary Church Missionary Society.²⁷⁸ Pratt and his colleagues deemed that a well-established structure would be needed to receive and guide the Society's Lutheran missionaries, the first of whom were in training and would arrive in India in 1814. Further, it was the judgment of the Parent Committee that an existing auxiliary would have a better chance of securing episcopal approval from Middleton than a proposed structure.

Owing to Brown's unexpected death in 1812, a development that was unknown to Pratt when he wrote to Brown and Corrie [i.e., in March 1813], no material action was taken on the CMS auxiliary. However, Thomason was added to the CCC and Corrie assumed the role of secretary.²⁷⁹ When Corrie furloughed

²⁷⁷ Ibid. While the "Parent Committee" in London served as the chief governing body of the Society, it was anticipated that oversight of CMS missionaries in India would be undertaken by "Corresponding Committees" in Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay. These committees were to be comprised of evangelical clergy and laity drawn from the European communities in each presidency. The committees were to station and supervise the missionaries within their territories, serve as the primary communication link between field and the Parent Committee, and secure local financial support [i.e., from Europeans] for expenses other than salaries, outfitting, and passage to/from India.

[See Hole, C., op.cit.: 1896: 298, 425; and Stock, E., *The history of the Church Missionary Society: Its environment, its men, and its work*, 1899, vol.1, 192ff.]

²⁷⁸ Josiah Pratt to Corrie, March 22, 1813, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E 8.

²⁷⁹ As with the Parent Committee and its subcommittees, the CCC chair rotated from person to person with each meeting. The position of power in such bodies was the secretary. This person
(continued...)

to England in 1815-17, Thomason served as the CCC's secretary until Corrie's return. This chain of events put Thomason at the centre of the Society's affairs in India from that point onward.

Thomason's correspondence with the Parent Committee of the CMS included such matters as prospects for the Society's relationship with Bishop Middleton,²⁸⁰ a request for missionaries in Lutheran orders in light of Middleton's refusal to ordain Europeans or natives,²⁸¹ recommendation of a £5,000 gift for the Calcutta Bible Society to match the contribution to Bishop's College,²⁸² the positive effect of the Bishop's College grants on the Society's public image in Calcutta,²⁸³ and the recruitment of CMS missionaries, especially for assignment to the Old Mission Church.²⁸⁴ There is also evidence that Thomason entered into discussions with Bishop Heber on the possibility of

²⁷⁹(...continued)

managed the agenda and correspondence of the committee, thus exerting great influence over its decisions.

²⁸⁰ Thomason to Josiah Pratt, November 1, 1815, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I1/E1/7.

²⁸¹ Thomason to Pratt, July 21, 1818, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I1/E2/13.

²⁸² Thomason to Pratt, December 29, 1819, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I1/O 286.

²⁸³ Thomason to Pratt, October 16, 1825, as quoted in Minutes of the Parent Committee, August 14, 1826, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/8.

²⁸⁴ Thomason to John Sherer, June 14, 1828, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

As noted in chapter five, Thomason and Simeon were unsuccessful in their attempt to interest the CMS in staffing the Old Mission Church in exchange for the transfer of its ownership to the Society. [See pp.273-4.]

merging the CMS with the "Venerable Societies," a prospect of great interest to Heber but without support among the leaders of the various societies.²⁸⁵ And, as summarized previously, Thomason's most significant CMS-related activity was the development of a plan for the on-site training of European and native schoolmasters and their use as teachers, evangelists, and catechists.²⁸⁶ In M.A. Laird's modern study, *Missionaries and education in Bengal* [1972], the author concluded that Thomason's plan was the first to be brought forward under British rule on behalf of the educational needs of Bengal.²⁸⁷

On two occasions Thomason widened the scope of his efforts and attempted to influence government policy. The first instance, in 1812-13, found Thomason acting as peacemaker between Lord Minto's administration and the evangelical chaplains. As mentioned previously, the incident at Vellore had prompted Minto to restrict the publication of religious material deemed likely to incite political and social unrest in the native community.²⁸⁸ The press regulations affected the Baptists and Claudius Buchanan in particular. In an effort to gain Minto's favour, Thomason responded obediently to the Governor-General's request to suspend the distribution of another piece of evangelical literature. Ironically, the suppressed

²⁸⁵ Reginald Heber to Archdeacon Barnes, November 12, 1823, as quoted in [Heber, A.], *The life of Reginald Heber ...*, D.D., *Lord Bishop of Calcutta*, London, 1830: vol.2, 157.

²⁸⁶ Key ms. sources include: Thomason to Pratt, May 9, 1814, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, C I/E 52; and Simeon's various letters with Thomason and Grant, from October 1814 through August 1815. [See chapter five, pp.268ff.]

²⁸⁷ Laird, M.A., *Missionaries and education in Bengal, 1793-1837*, Oxford, 1972: 74-5.

²⁸⁸ This matter has been discussed briefly at an earlier point in this chapter, p.295. Evangelicals in India and Britain were persistent in claiming that no connection between the Vellore mutiny and Christianization had been proven.

publication was Simeon's *The churchman's confession!*²⁸⁹ Thomason subsequently attempted to use his presumed influence with Lord Minto to make an appeal on behalf of the American missionary Adoniram Judson and a colleague of his, then in Bombay.²⁹⁰ He sought permission for them to remain in the country to undertake missionary work. Thomason's attempt to influence the Governor-General was not successful.²⁹¹

Thomason's second encounter with higher political powers occurred some two years later. At the time Thomason was serving as private chaplain to the new Governor-General, the Earl of Moira. His responsibilities included accompanying the Governor-General on a lengthy tour of the United Provinces [now Uttar Pradesh] in 1814. During the course of the outward trip, the Governor-General chose not to attend the Sunday service that Thomason had officiated. In Simeon-like fashion Thomason confronted the Governor-General with his impiety and poor example. Thomason was promptly dismissed from the travelling party and returned to Calcutta, although the Governor-General later acknowledged that he had been

²⁸⁹ [Lord Minto] to Thomason, February 17, 1812, and Thomason's reply of the same date, National Library of Scotland MSS, Add.11300, f.68., and Add.11333, f.23, respectively.

Thomason's posture toward the Governor-General was more solicitous than Simeon's demeanour toward British politicians. For example, see Simeon's exchange of letters with Lord Palmerston in 1811 on the occasion of his election to Parliament. Palmerston wrote to Simeon on April 8 to express appreciation for his support during the election. Simeon's reply of April 9 made no attempt to trade political support for favour. Simeon characterized his involvement in the election as a function of social duty. The tone of Simeon's letter was entirely consistent with the Cambridge minister's scepticism about politicians. [See chapter two, pp.100-1.]

²⁹⁰ Thomason to Lord Minto, November 2, 1812, National Library of Scotland MSS, Add.11224, f.73.

²⁹¹ This outcome is noted on the ms. letter. See also Sargent, J., *The life of the Rev. T.T. Thomason, M.A., late chaplain to the Honourable East India Company*, 2nd edition, London, 1834: 205. Judson and his colleague subsequently took up work in Burma.

remiss in his religious duties on the occasion.²⁹² Thomason's term as private chaplain to the Earl of Moira ended without further incident and he returned to the relative political quiet of the Old Mission Church and the Calcutta Coordinating Committee of the CMS.

Thomas Thomason was, first to last, Simeon's man. The reality of this fact is demonstrated in the frequency of exchanges between the two men during Thomason's residence in India.²⁹³ There were few subjects upon which Simeon and Thomason did not consult one another. Moreover, Simeon remained dedicated to his first curate to the end of Thomason's life. When Simeon learned of Thomason's plan to return to England for health reasons, he wasted no time in assuring Thomason that Thomas Burgess, then Bishop of Salisbury, would have a living for him upon his arrival.²⁹⁴ Simeon also helped manage many of Thomason's affairs during his recuperation, especially as they related to the CMS.²⁹⁵ Thomason also attributed to Simeon an informal approach by Sir Robert Inglis in 1827 to ascertain the chaplain's interest in the vacant Calcutta episcopate.²⁹⁶

²⁹² As told in Thomason's letter to John Sherer, August 7, 1814, quoted in Sargent's *The life of ... Thomason*, op.cit.: 229.

²⁹³ As mentioned previously, fifty-two letters between the two men were examined in the course of this study. Overall, Thomas Thomason was Simeon's most frequent correspondent. This fact is consistent with the spirit of Simeon's letters to and from his first curate.

²⁹⁴ Thomason to John Sherer, July 12, 1826, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

²⁹⁵ For example, when Thomason was too ill to preach the CMS's Anniversary Sermon in 1827, it was Simeon that sought the chaplain's release from the commitment. [Minutes of the Parent Committee, April 9, 1827, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/9.]

²⁹⁶ Thomason to John Sherer, March 20, 1827, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge. The vacancy in the see had been created by Heber's death. In a subsequent letter to Sherer [March 27],
(continued...)

When Thomas Thomason died unexpectedly in 1829, just eight months after his return to India, Simeon immediately offered to undertake the care of his friend's second wife and son. This action alone demonstrated the depth of Simeon's commitment to those he mentored. His efforts on behalf of men such as Thomason and Henry Martyn make this fact unmistakably clear.

The End of an Era for Simeon

The conclusion of Grant's final term as chairman of the EIC Court of Directors marked a major change in the pace of Simeon's efforts to recruit chaplains for India.²⁹⁷ Without the control of official patronage that Grant's station provided, Simeon lost the ability to secure posts in India for his students. He might encourage men to consider an overseas chaplaincy, but he could no longer place them in such positions with ease.

This was not for lack of needs. Wilberforce asked Simeon to help find clergymen for Haiti in 1817 and Daniel Corrie appealed for aid in securing a replacement chaplain for Cawnpore in the following year.²⁹⁸ With Simeon's

²⁹⁶(...continued)

Thomason acknowledged that the prospects for his appointment were nil. Inglis had discovered that Thomason's reputation as an evangelical made his candidacy impossible.

²⁹⁷ Grant stepped down from the chair on April 11, 1816, and did not return to it. He retired from Parliament in 1818 and died in 1823 at age 77. [Morris, H., *Charles Grant, the friend of William Wilberforce and Henry Thornton*, London, 1898: 49ff.]

²⁹⁸ Wilberforce to Simeon, 1817, as quoted in Wilberforce, R., and S. Wilberforce, *The life of William Wilberforce*, 2nd edition, London, 1838: vol.4, 355; and Corrie to Simeon, June 16, 1818, as quoted in [Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *Memoirs of the Right Rev. Daniel Corrie, first Bishop of Madras: Compiled chiefly from his letters and journals*, London, 1847: 311.

reputation for supplying chaplains at its peak, the Cambridge minister could not have wanted for requests. After Grant's retirement, however, Simeon lacked access to the patronage that was required to respond to such entreaties. Simeon's correspondence and writings, after 1816, make mention of only three additional "Simeonite" chaplains: Anthony Hammond [Bengal, 1827-49], Thomas Dealtry [Bengal and Madras, 1828-1861],²⁹⁹ and Henry Cotterill [Madras, 1836-48].³⁰⁰

With Grant's retirement, Simeon's influence at India House had run its course. As if to compensate, he began in earnest to develop his trust of English livings.³⁰¹ While this new direction afforded Simeon the increasing ability to situate his students in good parishes, it did nothing to help with overseas placements. While he kept in touch with 'his' chaplains in India and offered them support and advice as he could, a clear transition had taken place and an era had ended. Nevertheless, it had been a fruitful eleven years. Through his partnership with Charles Grant, Simeon had been able to achieve a personal ambition, "to suit men to situations" of great significance.³⁰² This object was entirely consistent with Charles Simeon's determination to serve as both mentor

²⁹⁹ Dealtry was the son of William Dealtry, Rector of Clapham and a close friend of Simeon's. The younger Dealtry served as Archdeacon of Madras from 1835 to 1850 and as diocesan from 1850 until his death in 1861. [McNally, op.cit.]

³⁰⁰ Simeon recommended Cotterill in response to a request presented to him by Thomas Robinson, then Archdeacon of Madras. The appointment was facilitated at India House by Dr. William French, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge. [Simeon to French, March 6 and August 27, 1835, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.]

³⁰¹ There is no explicit evidence to suggest that this was a calculated decision on Simeon's part. Nevertheless, clerical patronage did fill the mentorship gap left by the demise of Simeon's partnership with Grant. The strategic turning point vis-à-vis ecclesiastical patronage occurred during 1822. Samuel Thornton offered the Thornton livings to the highest bidder. Simeon could not resist the opportunity. [See the introduction, pp.18-19, and chapter three, pp.156ff.]

³⁰² Simeon to Grant, October 21, 1815, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

and patron to his most promising students. It also yielded to Simeon the very success that had been denied him in his efforts on behalf of the Church Missionary Society.

The Jewish Alternative

No study of the connection between Charles Simeon and the British missionary movement would be complete without reference to the London Society for the Propagation of Christianity Amongst the Jews [LSPCJ]. Simeon's involvement with the "Jews Society," as he called it, provided a third and distinct component to his missionary agenda. While his efforts on behalf of the CMS and "the chaplaincy business" were a reflection of his inclination to mentor others, the starting point for Simeon's work for the LSPCJ was more philosophical. This is not to suggest that training men for ministry and exercising patronage on their behalf were mechanical processes without theoretical roots. Multiplying the number of English clergy who were committed to the "distinguishing doctrines" of evangelicalism underlay all of Simeon's disciplines for his students.³⁰³ Nor were Simeon's efforts on behalf of the Jews Society devoid of his characteristic pragmatism, as will be seen. Nevertheless, there was a unique theological foundation to Simeon's concern for the evangelization of the Jewish people.

Not unlike his evangelicalism, Simeon's interest in the Jewish people developed in the course of his study of the Scriptures.³⁰⁴ The earliest of his "skeletons," written during the 1790s and published as *Helps to composition* in 1800, include a number of sermon outlines on the role of the Jewish nation during

³⁰³ Simeon's evangelicalism is the subject of chapter one and his application of these principles to his ministry is the focus of chapter three.

³⁰⁴ The origins of Simeon's theological convictions receive attention in chapter one, pp.44-5.

the period of history preceding the parousia.³⁰⁵ These passages shaped Simeon's understanding of eschatology and increased his sympathy for millennial issues. Simeon never embraced premillennialism, as evidenced by his firm rejection of the teachings of Edward Irving.³⁰⁶ Still, his confidence in the imminence of the Kingdom by means of the Church was modified. While the [Gentile] Church had become the people of God through the spiritual abdication of the Jews, it is the destiny of the Jewish people to be recalled as a nation in order to call the Gentiles to faith.³⁰⁷ This argument persuaded Simeon that the evangelization of the Jewish people was strategic and essential to the ultimate progress of the

³⁰⁵ For example: Horae: Sermon 37, "Abraham's promised seed," vol.1, 191; Sermon 1025, "The Jews to convert the Gentiles," vol.8, 651; and Sermon 1251, "The connexion between the conversion of the Jews and the Gentiles," vol.10, 489.

³⁰⁶ Brown: 205. Simeon believed premillennialism to be damaging to the missionary cause.

See also: Gidney, W.T., *The history of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, from 1809-1908*, London, 1908: 211.

³⁰⁷ Simeon, C., *The Jews provoked to jealousy: A sermon preached on Wednesday, June 5, 1811, at the church of the united parishes of St. Antholin and St. John Baptist, Watling Street*, London, 1811: 15; and Simeon, C., *Sovereignty and equity combined: or, The dispensations of God towards the Jews and Gentiles illustrated: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, on May 5, 1822*, Cambridge, 1822: 3-4.

The development of millennialism and its relationship to the missionary movement is the subject of J.A. de Jong's *As the waters cover the sea, Millennial expectations in the rise of Anglo-American missions, 1640-1810*, Kampen, 1970.

Gospel.³⁰⁸ It was on this philosophical basis that Simeon's involvement with the LSPCJ was founded.³⁰⁹

The London Society for Propagating Christianity Amongst the Jews was formed in 1809. The intent of the founders was to engender the support of evangelical Churchmen and Dissenters for the evangelization of Jewish people. The "undenominational" character of the LSPCJ was patterned after the British and Foreign Bible Society and with its successes in view. However, the Jews Society struck Churchmen as more akin to the LMS than to the Bible Society. The fact that the LSPCJ intended to found chapels for Jewish converts in London and other European cities raised the matter of doctrine and polity [e.g., baptism and episcopacy]. These issues created the same problems for the Jews Society as they had for the LMS. As a result most evangelical Churchmen -- including Simeon --

³⁰⁸ Simeon and Edward Bickersteth entered into an extended discussion on this point during Bickersteth's tenure as secretary of the CMS. Bickersteth could not accept that the evangelization of the Jews in Britain and Continental Europe was as important as missionary efforts among the vast populations of Africa and Asia. [See Gidney, op.cit., 273.]

Ironically, by the late 1830s Bickersteth embraced millennialism with an even greater intensity than Simeon. Like Irving, Bickersteth had become discouraged with the limited success of the missionary movement to impact Africa and Asia. It is also possible that his abrupt departure from the CMS, owing to overwork, may also have contributed to his Irving-like criticisms of the missionary movement. Bickersteth's ardent millennialism is evident in: *A practical guide to the prophecies ...* [6th edition, London, 1839] and *The signs of the times in the East* [London, 1845]. Compare these works with the very bland eschatology of Bickersteth's "Practical remarks on the prophecies ..." in *A Scripture help ...* [12th edition, London, 1825, pp.113-154].

³⁰⁹ W. Wilson Cash attributed Simeon's support of the LSPCJ to a spirit of "evangelical equity," viz., an awareness that the Gospel is a message for both Jew and Gentile. [*Charles Simeon: An interpretation: Addresses delivered at the Centenary Celebrations, Cambridge, November 1936*, London, 1936: 87.] While Simeon did employ this argument, it does not sufficiently take into account the development of his millenarianism.

did not participate in the founding of the LSPCJ despite their support for its agenda.³¹⁰

Two factors intervened. First, Simeon's growing theological convictions vis-à-vis the Jews and Christian mission overcame his reluctance. He joined the LSPCJ in 1810.³¹¹ Second, the threat of the Society's collapse for lack of financial resources drew Simeon into a leadership role within the LSPCJ. The risk of dissolution was very real. Consider, for example, the dilemma posed by "Palestine Place," the Jews Society's chapel in London. As mentioned previously, the support of Churchmen for the LSPCJ had been limited by its "undenominational" constitution.³¹² Nevertheless, in 1811 the Society had taken a ninety-nine year lease on a proprietary chapel in Bethnal Green that had been built with the aid of evangelical Churchmen. As a result the lease stipulated that

³¹⁰ See Gidney, *op.cit.*, pp.46ff., for a discussion of the denominational tensions that accompanied the founding and early years of the LSPCJ.

Simeon also had been unsure of the propriety of support by Churchmen for the Bible Society in its earliest years. He did not join the BFBS immediately. The open support of Wilberforce and the Clapham evangelicals was instrumental in bringing Simeon into the Bible Society camp. Simeon eventually became a vocal advocate for the BFBS in Cambridge, answering Herbert Marsh's objections to the Bible Society and taking a key role in the formation of its Cambridge auxiliary. [See Browne, G., *The history of the British and Foreign Bible Society from its institution in 1804, to the close of its jubilee, 1854: Compiled at the request of the Jubilee Committee*, 2 vols, London, 1859; and the brief bibliography on Simeon and the BFBS in chapter five, pp.287-8, note 224.]

³¹¹ A detailed chronology of Simeon's involvement with the Jews Society may be found in Cartwright, J.B., *Love to the Jewish nation: A sermon preached at the Episcopal Jews' Chapel, Bethnal Green, London, on Sunday morning, November 27th, 1836, on the occasion of the death of the Rev. Charles Simeon*, 2nd edition, London, 1836: 31-43.

³¹² For example, the Bristol Eclectic Society concluded that it could not recommend the Jews Society to Churchmen on account of its close association with Dissenters. This action was taken at a meeting on December 6, 1814. [Hole, C., *The early history of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1896: 590.]

Dissenting ministers could not officiate at the chapel.³¹³ This development immediately undercut the LSPCJ's remaining source of funds, i.e., from evangelical Dissenters. A series of annual financial crises ensued.

In 1815 the governing committee of the Jews Society turned to evangelical Churchmen to rescue the LSPCJ. Simeon proposed that the Society be reorganized along the lines of the CMS, as an association "operated by Churchmen." This was not an entirely novel idea. A year earlier Josiah Pratt had suggested that the Jews Society be merged into the CMS as a means toward the rescue of the LSPCJ.³¹⁴ While a merger did not suit Simeon or the Jews Society, the LSPCJ was transformed into an organization led by Churchmen by 1819. The key constitutional change engineered by Simeon was the requirement that all members of the LSPCJ be members of the Church of England or a foreign Protestant church.³¹⁵ In 1818, during the organization's transition, Simeon was made a "country director" of the LSPCJ.³¹⁶ This event marked Charles Simeon's full embrace of the work of the Jews Society.

³¹³ Gidney, op.cit.: 41.

³¹⁴ Hole, op.cit.: 590.

³¹⁵ Gidney, op.cit.: 46-8, 53. See also: London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, *The tenth report of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews ...: To which is prefixed A sermon preached before the Society, May 8, 1818, at the parish church of St. Paul, Covent Garden, by the Rev. C. Simeon*, London, 1818; and Martin, R.H., *The pan-evangelical impulse in Britain, 1795-1830: With special reference to four London societies*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1974: 352-3.

The tolerance of Churchmen for non-episcopal churches overseas was once again contrasted with their intolerance of Dissent at home.

³¹⁶ Gidney, op.cit.: 54.

Not being a missionary-sending society in the normal sense, Simeon's activities with the LSPCJ were not primarily in the area of recruitment. However, they were no less pragmatic than his labours on behalf of the CMS or EIC chaplaincies. Cartwright's chronology of Simeon's endeavours for the Jews Society demonstrates the Cambridge minister's willingness to itinerate on behalf of the Jewish cause.³¹⁷ According to Cartwright, Simeon attended or addressed various public meetings of the Jews Society on forty-six occasions between 1811 and 1836, far exceeding his equivalent activities with the CMS.³¹⁸ Simeon also assisted in the formation of a "foreign corresponding committee" of the LSPCJ in Cambridge in 1811.³¹⁹ This committee informally represented the Jews Society in Cambridge and aided the Society in the coordination of its work abroad.

Simeon also involved himself in personal, direct, and on-going fundraising for the LSPCJ. For example, over a period of five years Simeon sent a series of eight personally-written reports on the work of the Jews Society to a Mrs. T. Bowdle of London.³²⁰ Each letter expressed appreciation for her gifts to the LSPCJ, provided information on recent developments in the work of the Society, and expressed hope for her continued support. There is no record of any similar effort by Simeon on behalf of any other cause, including the Bible Society or the

³¹⁷ Cartwright, *op.cit.*, 31-43; see also Gidney, *op.cit.*: 60-1.

³¹⁸ By comparison, records of the CMS indicate that Simeon participated in only seventeen public meetings of the Society or its auxiliaries during the same period.

³¹⁹ Gidney, *op.cit.*: 38.

³²⁰ Simeon to Mrs. Bowdle; May 8, 1823; May 19, July 11, and October 21, 1825; April 7, 1826; January 26 and October 23, 1827; and November 14, 1828; King's College, Cambridge, Mss. Coll.34.18.

CMS. These letters are clear evidence of the intensity of Simeon's commitment to the LSPCJ.

Simeon was also credited with helping the Jews Society develop its ministry strategy for Continental Europe. He urged the Society's workers to seek individual converts among the Jews, baptize them, join them in witness to their families, and assist them with vocational training. Such education was deemed to be necessary in view of the loss of status and employment that generally accompanied a profession of Christian faith in a Jewish community.³²¹ This last component of the scheme reveals the careful thought that Simeon gave to the cultural implications of Jewish evangelism.

The intensity and thoroughness of Simeon's efforts on behalf of the LSPCJ were measures of his commitment to the Jewish cause. The evangelization of the Jewish people had become an authentic priority for the Old Apostle of Cambridge. In turn, Simeon had identified another genuine alternative course for his contributions to the British missionary movement.

Agenda Achieved

The association of Charles Simeon with the British missionary movement has generally been described in terms of his relationship with the Church Missionary Society. As has been argued in chapter five, the Simeon-CMS connection was a real one, and he was a true founder of the Society, but it was not a fruitful relationship from Simeon's point of view or that of the Society.

³²¹ Dr. A. Tholuck of Halle attributed the LSPCJ's strategy to Simeon. [Dr. Tholuck to Simeon, November 24, 1831, Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.]

Simeon's missionary concerns had to be addressed by other means. His participation in the formation of the Cambridge auxiliary of the British and Foreign Bible Society was one provisional outlet for his global interests. The reorganization of the Jews Society provided another avenue for the expression of his missionary hopes and expectations. But Simeon's primary missionary agenda -- to place some of 'his' men in India -- was achieved by his partnership with Charles Grant in appointing chaplains for the East India Company.

Charles Simeon's vision for India grew directly out of his inclusion in the workings of the "1787 Plan." As noted previously, Simeon's epilogue on his efforts for India may be found in his own handwriting on his copy of the memorandum that set all in motion: "It merely shows how early God enabled me act for India ..." ³²² As Simeon penned these words he was not thinking of missionaries serving with the Church Missionary Society. In his mind were the names of more than twenty men who made their impact on India as EIC chaplains. These men owed at least part of their success to the efforts of the eccentric Cambridge minister who was their mentor and friend. This is how Charles Simeon's missionary agenda was accomplished.

³²² "Plan for a Mission to Bengal and Behar," Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

CONCLUSION

The legacy of Charles Simeon as a nineteenth century evangelical Anglican has traditionally been described in terms of his churchmanship or his exercise of patronage. Daniel Wilson, the evangelical Bishop of Calcutta from 1832 to 1853, characterized Simeon's thought and work as a balance between two values: evangelical principles and the order of the Established Church.¹ In comparison, Thomas Babington Macaulay's reference to the wide extent of Simeon's "authority and influence ... to the remote corners of England" was a recognition of the constituency Simeon had built by means of ecclesiastical patronage.²

A century later these contemporary impressions of Charles Simeon were merged in Canon Charles Smyth's study of Simeon and the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge. Smyth compared Simeon's evangelicalism to that of John Berridge, but found two important contrasts between the itinerant clergyman from Everton and the vicar of Holy Trinity Church. Whereas Berridge forwarded the evangelical agenda through irregular means, i.e., itinerant preaching, Simeon sought to deepen the commitment of evangelical Anglicans to the order and discipline of the Church of England. Further, while Berridge's evangelical influence was exerted through his widespread preaching in addition to his parish ministry, Simeon augmented his parochial work with a carefully-focused exercise of patronage. By these means, Smyth asserted, Simeon addressed the two most significant challenges facing

¹ Carus: 597-8; see also chapter two, p.120.

² The full quotation is found in the introduction, p.17, note 44.

second-generation evangelical Churchmen: their reputation for ecclesiastical irregularity and their inability to secure prominent Church livings.³ This is the traditional view of Simeon's life and work.

Wilson, Macaulay, Smyth, and those who have agreed with them are not incorrect. Simeon's commitment to the "distinguishing doctrines" of evangelicalism has been documented in this study. The regularity of Simeon's churchmanship, with the exception of his early years at Cambridge, has been reaffirmed by this inquiry. Moreover, this survey of Simeon's accomplishments verifies his interest in clerical patronage. Nevertheless, evangelicalism, churchmanship, and patronage do not fully account for the nature of Simeon's involvement in the British missionary movement. Simeon was not as predictable as first impressions might suggest.

As has been demonstrated in the main body of this work, Charles Simeon became a voluntaryist. His intense efforts on behalf of the formation of the Society for Missions to Africa and the East, later renamed as the Church Missionary Society, reveal Simeon's willingness to rely on voluntary means in order to forward the missionary agenda. Simeon's role in the creation of the CMS established him as a voluntaryist to no lesser extent than Wilberforce and the Clapham Saints. That Simeon's work in support of the CMS was consistent with his evangelicalism does nothing to lessen the tension between his voluntary activities and his churchmanship. If anything, it gives the impression that Church order was a subordinate concern to Simeon.

³ See Smyth, C.H.E., *Simeon and church order: A study of the origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the eighteenth century*, The Birkbeck Lectures for 1937-1938, Cambridge, 1940: 250; see also chapter two, pp.65-6.

The standard secondary sources on Charles Simeon, such as those by Smyth, Pollard and Hennell, and Hopkins, do not attempt to resolve this tension. Simeon's missionary agenda is not a major consideration in these accounts of his life and work. The fact that Simeon's involvement with the CMS had greatly diminished by 1804 may have caused these authors to connect his embrace of the CMS's voluntary principles with the other irregularities of his "early years." Moreover, the limited emphasis on Simeon's work with the CMS in these studies is consistent with their ecclesiastical [versus missionary] focus. However, it would be a mistake to relegate Simeon's missionary efforts to the periphery of his agenda. The frequency with which missionary affairs -- and not merely CMS matters -- were addressed in Simeon's correspondence, sermons, autobiography, and Carus' *Memoirs* suggests that the global progress of the Gospel was a central concern to Charles Simeon. Thus the tension between Simeon's voluntaryism and his churchmanship demands closer attention than it has received in the past.

As argued in chapter two, the apparent contradiction between Simeon's care for church order and his involvement with voluntary missionary societies may be resolved by a close examination of his world-view. Simeon's evangelicalism predisposed him in favour of missionary activity. The failure of the Established Church to embrace the missionary agenda in evangelical terms caused Simeon, and most evangelical Anglicans, to turn to voluntary methods. For Simeon this was not an absolute contradiction because church order was a subset of an even higher value, viz., general order in society. Simeon expected voluntary missionary activity by evangelical Anglicans to proceed in an orderly fashion and to circumvent the discipline of the Established Church only to the minimum extent necessary. Simeon's efforts to form a missionary society for Churchmen, as opposed to support for the LMS, is one example of this principle. His expectation that the CMS should cooperate with the Bishop of Calcutta in the stationing of its missionaries in India [i.e., those under Anglican orders] reinforces the limits to

Simeon's voluntarism. Charles Simeon advocated voluntary methods only to the extent necessary to prevent churchmanship from undermining his evangelically-motivated missionary agenda. At the same time, he was not prepared to allow missionary activity to produce social disorder or to take the evangelical Anglican missionary movement out of the sphere of the Established Church.

As demonstrated in chapter five, Simeon's efforts on behalf of the CMS began to decline even as the Society was formed in 1799. By 1804 Simeon's involvement with the Society had become minimal. The initial causes for this astonishing change of course were the rejection of his "catechist plan"⁴ and criticisms of his unsuccessful efforts to recruit University men for the Society. Initiatives by Simeon in 1813-14 to aid the Society in recruiting men for India were rebuffed. Moreover, Simeon's disaffection with the CMS was reinforced by what he perceived to be unnecessary violations of Anglican order by the Society. The direct and constant conflicts between the CMS and Bishop Middleton struck Simeon as ill-advised. The Society's actions were too voluntary for Simeon.

For these reasons, and combined with his desire to mentor students for ministry in India, Simeon turned to a partnership with Charles Grant [senior] as the chief means of accomplishing his missionary agenda. Beginning in 1804 and reaching a peak in 1814-16, Simeon encouraged over forty of his students to consider an East India Company chaplaincy through the patronage of Grant. Twenty-one of his students were successful in reaching India in this fashion, as

⁴ Simeon's "catechist plan" presumed the oversight of lay workers by ordained clergy. This principle is treated in chapter two, pp.106ff., with respect to his "parish society". When he first proposed the "catechist plan" to the CMS, two of Simeon's student's under holy orders were already in Calcutta -- David Brown and Claudius Buchanan. No doubt Simeon expected that Brown and Buchanan could provide the required supervision for CMS catechists sent to Bengal. In fact, Brown and Buchanan were two of the original members of the Calcutta Corresponding Committee of the CMS, the body created in 1807 to supervise CMS missionaries in Bengal.

documented in chapter six and the appendix. For every student of Simeon's who served with the CMS through his encouragement, seven other students of his were appointed as EIC chaplains through the partnership of Simeon and Grant. It is in this sense that Simeon's missionary ambitions were accomplished by an alternative means.

The Consequences of a Finished Agenda

The retrospective comment penned by Simeon in 1830 on David Brown's invitation to participate in the "1787 Plan" has already been noted.⁵ Simeon believed that God had enabled him to act in a fruitful fashion on behalf of India for a period of forty-two years. These were the sentiments of a satisfied man. When Charles Simeon died on November 9, 1836, after fifty-four years of ministry, he departed peacefully and with an apparent sense of personal fulfillment.⁶ It is reasonable to conclude that Simeon believed that he had achieved his missionary agenda.

What was the legacy of Simeon's accomplishments with respect to the British missionary movement as it entered the Victorian era? Are there any unanswered questions in this regard? Further, do Simeon's achievements, or disappointments, address Christian mission in the twenty-first century in a meaningful way? Charles Simeon earned the right to have these questions asked in light of his missionary thought and work. Responses to these enquiries fall into

⁵ See chapter five, p.209.

⁶ The account of Simeon's death is brief in comparison with the memoirs of others. See Carus: 551ff.

two domains: leadership development and the resolution of church-mission tensions.

The Priority of Leadership Development

As noted at the beginning of this study, the chief outcome of the eighteenth century Evangelical Revival was the spiritual awakening and renewal of many of the inhabitants of Great Britain. The Revival is best measured in human terms, as opposed to intellectual ones. So it was with Charles Simeon. With the possible exception of his toleration of paradox, which was not an intellectual achievement in any event, Simeon's theology was unremarkable for an evangelical Anglican. His opus, the *Horae homileticae*, went into disuse almost immediately after its publication. Simeon's preaching classes and 'conversation parties' were not continued by another evangelical don at Cambridge after his death. Simeon's legacy should not be measured in these terms.

What Charles Simeon did leave behind him was a third and fourth generation of evangelicals in the Church of England. Many of these personalities had a direct impact on the British missionary movement, as has been documented throughout this study and especially in chapters five and six. Like the first-generation of evangelical Anglicans, Charles Simeon made disciples and influenced a wide range of people. This was the essence of Charles Wordsworth's opinion when he compared Simeon's "following" with that of John Henry Newman, and found the Cambridge minister's influence to have been the greater of the two.⁷ An affirmation of Simeon's consummate skills as a mentor underlay Max Warren's

⁷ See chapter three, p.170, note 159.

observation that more than sixty of the CMS's missionaries had been tutored by the vicar of Holy Trinity Church.⁸

The chief unanswered question that arises out of Simeon's human legacy deals with the general course of evangelicalism in the Church of England as the Victorian era commenced. The definition of an evangelical Churchman diffused during the third and fourth generations of the movement. Ecclesiastically and socially conservative evangelicals, in the fashion of Simeon and Thomas Robinson, may be found in the ensuing era. Daniel Wilson was a prime example of a third-generation evangelical who was as conservative as Simeon -- if not more so -- in terms of the religious and social order. Clapham-style evangelicals, whose conservatism was more political and social than ecclesiastical, were also present in the Victorian Church of England and its missionary movement. Henry Venn [the younger] and Lord Glenelg [Charles Grant, junior] are good examples of the Clapham legacy.

Third-generation evangelicalism in the Established Church also had its radical elements. As noted in chapters four and six, dissatisfaction with the global progress of the Gospel by "the use of [human] means" led John Haldane Stewart and Edward Bickersteth toward spiritual radicalism and premillennial eschatology.⁹ The economic disaster of the Napoleonic Wars also produced some political and

⁸ Warren was correct and careful not to attribute their connection with the CMS to Simeon. He merely observed that the Christian formation of a large number of CMS missionaries occurred under Simeon's care. See chapter five, p.277.

⁹ Stewart's influence is considered in chapter four, pp.204-5. Bickersteth's movement from Clapham-style evangelicalism into the Irving camp is mentioned in chapter six, p.380, note 308.

social radicalism among evangelical Churchmen.¹⁰ Clapham evangelicals such as Glenelg and Robert Grant were manoeuvred into supporting the reform movement, although evangelical Anglicans were never as committed to reordering society as were the Methodists and the radical Dissenters.¹¹ Finally, as a counter to disestablishmentarianism -- the logical end of the reform cause -- a number of evangelical Churchmen such as John Henry Newman were active in the formation of the Oxford Movement and gave rise to the Anglo-Catholic tradition.

As evangelical Anglicans diversified during the middle decades of the nineteenth century, how did Simeon's disciples fare? Did they reproduce themselves? To what extent did Simeon's students, especially those who were mission-focused, also make disciples? What manner of evangelicalism was inculcated?¹² What social views and strategies for exerting influence were propagated? Most important, what connection did Simeon's spiritual grandchildren have with the on-going British missionary movement? As noted in chapter six, it is clear that David Brown, Henry Martyn, and Daniel Corrie attempted to reproduce a Simeon-like world-view in others. Their efforts gave Simeon confidence that additional evangelical chaplains sent to India would have

¹⁰ As a measure of dissatisfaction with the status quo, the ranks of Nonconformity began to swell late in the second decade of the nineteenth century. This growth continued in the 1820s and 1830s, thus creating enormous popular demand for social and political reforms. The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Parliamentary reform, and Roman Catholic emancipation were among the reforms achieved.

¹¹ See chapter two, p.74, and note 30.

¹² Tolley touches on this subject with respect to the descendants of the Clapham Saints. See Tolley, C.J., *The legacy of evangelicalism in the lives and writings of certain descendants of the Clapham Sect, with special reference to biographical literature*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1980.

experienced hands to guide them.¹³ However, it has been beyond the scope of this particular study to trace rigorously the mentorship work of Simeon's students in England and India. This is an investigation that warrants attention.

In one important regard Simeon's efforts as a mentor serve as a positive example for Christian mission today. In the century and a half since Simeon's death the missionary movement has achieved a particular success. Decades of evangelistic effort by expatriate and national Christians have produced a genuinely global Church. This is William Temple's "great new fact of our time." Nevertheless, the productivity of the Church in evangelism and the multiplication of Christian congregations depends on the development of leaders in each generation. This is the primary task of discipleship and it depends on the work of mentors. Although Simeon's clericalism, static social values, and ethnocentricity do not serve as relevant patterns for Christian mission in the twenty-first century, Charles Simeon's commitment to leadership development for the Church and its mission serves as a touchstone for the continued progress of the Christian movement.

Resolving Church-Mission Tensions

The definition of voluntaryism employed in chapter four [i.e., self-directed effort by those who share a common purpose or mission] infers that voluntary structures will probably act without reference to the views of the establishment. Further, as discussed in chapter two, the sectarian tendencies of voluntary religious associations require that they view themselves in ideal terms; viz., as a means of

¹³ See chapter six, pp.333-4, with reference to Brown's skills as a mentor. Similar efforts by Martyn and Corrie are treated on pp.352-5 and pp.363ff., respectively.

compensating for the deficiencies of the larger church. These dynamics invariably cause voluntary religious movements to take independent initiatives vis-à-vis their stated purposes. Moreover, such initiatives are generally seen by official church structures as challenges to proper order and authority. Thus there is a natural tension between the agenda of the 'mission structure' and the agenda of the 'church structure'. The former seeks to bring change to the status quo and the latter seeks to maintain it.

The conflicts between the Church Missionary Society and the hierarchy of the Church of England that have been mentioned in this study illustrate these dynamics. Evangelical principles and philosophical romanticism stimulated evangelicals such as Simeon to contemplate a role for the Established Church in the global propagation of the Gospel. The "1787 Plan" and Wilberforce's "pious clauses" for the EIC charter of 1793 were attempts to introduce the missionary agenda into the value system of the Establishment. These attempts failed.

As a result evangelical Anglicans began to pursue a voluntary course of action. In turn, that course was resisted by the hierarchy of the Established Church. For example: The CMS was formed by an ad hoc group of evangelical Churchmen; the Archbishop of Canterbury refused to recognize the Society. The CMS proposed to make use of lay missionaries; the tactic was labelled as nonconformist by High Churchmen. The CMS endeavoured to recruit University men as missionary candidates; canon law refused to recognize missionary appointment as sufficient title for ordination. Evangelical clergy offered curacies to the CMS's candidates; the bishops of the Church refused to ordain such men unless they committed themselves to stay in their curacies for two full years. The CMS began to establish Church Missionary Associations for public relations and fundraising purposes; the hierarchy of the Church attacked the plan as uncanonical, "half-Dissenting," and subversive of authority of parish priests and their bishops.

The CMS proceeded to appoint, fund, send, and station its missionaries [e.g., in India]; the episcopate refused to recognize [i.e., license] missionaries with the CMS who were in Anglican orders. This state of affairs continued in varying degrees until Henry Venn of the CMS and Daniel Wilson, as Bishop of Calcutta, negotiated their "Concordat of 1841".

How should Simeon's missionary efforts be interpreted in light of the CMS's ecclesiastical tensions from its inception until the early 1840s? As documented in chapter five, Charles Simeon aided and endorsed the creation of the Society as a voluntary structure, was one of the authors of its "catechist plan", laboured to recruit University students for the Society, and was prepared to offer a curacy to more than one missionary candidate in order to provide a title for ordination. Simeon must have considered these steps to be ecclesiastically regular, neutral in this regard, or -- at worst -- somewhat irregular but within the limits set by his commitment to social order in general. However, Simeon was sensitive to the fact that the Society's aggressive development of CMAs was drawing criticism from mainstream Anglicans.¹⁴ Moreover, as noted on more than one occasion, Simeon was not satisfied with the posture of the CMS with regard to the Bishop of Calcutta. He explicitly urged a more conciliatory stance toward the bishops of the Church.¹⁵

Conciliation and negotiation is precisely the posture taken by Henry Venn when he began his negotiations with Daniel Wilson in 1836. Venn, like Simeon before him, did not advocate capitulation to the bishops. On the contrary, both men had occasion to assert the rights of the CMS to control the appointment of its

¹⁴ See chapter five, pp.292-3.

¹⁵ See chapter three, pp.141-2, and chapter five, pp.283-4.

missionaries, analogous to the prerogatives of clerical patrons. Nevertheless, Simeon did not question the right of bishops to station and license clergy within their jurisdiction. To have denied this principle would have threatened an aspect of the fundamental order of British society that Simeon had bound himself to observe. Perhaps as a result of Simeon's mentorial influence on him as a Cambridge student, Venn eventually affirmed the same principle. He agreed on behalf of the CMS to allow the bishops in England to arbitrate differences of opinion with Bishop Wilson and his successors.¹⁶ If the CMS had taken Simeon's advice [by way of his letters to Daniel Corrie and Thomas Thomason] in 1814-15, it is entirely conceivable that the Society could have achieved reconciliation with the Bishop of Calcutta -- and the bishops in England -- more than two decades earlier than it did.

It is pertinent that Simeon's alternative course of 'missionary' effort, recruiting EIC chaplains, also reflected his tactics vis-à-vis church-mission tensions. In negative terms, Simeon pursued his partnership with Charles Grant to distance himself from the problems -- personal, inter-personal, and ecclesiastical -- that he associated with the CMS. More positively, Simeon found "the chaplaincy business" to be a course of action that allowed him to take evangelical and mission-focused initiatives in a manner that was unassailable by the Establishment.

The India Company was mandated by its charter to provide chaplains for its employees, those chaplains were appointed through the patronage of the Chairman or Vice-chairman of the Court of Directors, and Simeon had the ear of "the chairs" on three occasions. Simeon's work with Grant in appointing evangelicals to EIC chaplaincies was thoroughly regular in ecclesiastical terms and allowed him great

¹⁶ In so agreeing Venn brought the bishops into membership in the Society. This proved to be a 'win-win' solution to the CMS's ecclesiastical problems. Both Venn and Wilson achieved their objectives. See the introduction, pp.29-30, especially note 69.

freedom of action as a mentor and quasi-patron of his students. The access to India afforded to EIC chaplains also circumvented the restrictions on missionaries prior to 1813, thus minimizing certain church-mission tensions in India, such as those experienced by the Serampore Baptists. Moreover, as noted in Corrie's letters to Simeon from Agra, the evangelical chaplains -- even after 1813 -- were able to undertake 'missionary' activities without arousing the suspicion of the Indian Government. Simeon's "chaplaincy business" did not merely resolve church-mission tensions; it avoided them.

Another consideration for further study also deals with the work of Simeon's followers. How should one characterize the churchmanship of the third- and fourth-generation evangelical Anglicans who were discipled by Simeon? It is reasonable to assume that the majority of Simeon's students followed Daniel Wilson in very regular churchmanship, or emulated the pragmatic and Clapham-like ecclesiology of Henry Venn [of the CMS]. Nevertheless, it would be revealing to see if any of Simeon's former pupils embraced disestablishmentarianism or the counter-reactions of Newman or Pusey. The former situation was highly unlikely, but Newman's connection with the CMS while at Oxford suggests that the migration of some of Simeon's students into the Oxford Movement would not have been inconceivable.¹⁷ Once the ecclesiology of Simeon's followers has been identified, it would be possible to trace the impact of their churchmanship on the Victorian missionary movement and its interaction with the Established Church.

A final question with respect to church-mission tensions takes the subject in a more current direction. Almost every conflict between 'mission structures' and

¹⁷ Stunt's article provides a starting point for this subject. See Stunt, T.C.F., "John Henry Newman and the evangelicals," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 21 (1970), 65-74.

'church structures' in Simeon's day arose in the 'home' context, i.e., in Britain or in the infrastructure of its colonies. Thus the CMS found itself at odds with the 'sending church'. This is a partial contrast with church-mission tensions in the twentieth century. While modern voluntary missionary societies and 'home' churches and denominations do struggle over matters of priorities and initiative, it is often from the existing or emerging churches of the non-western world that western 'mission agencies' encounter their greatest opposition. The appropriateness of independent action by expatriate Christian workers is widely questioned by the churches of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Oceania.

Tensions between western 'mission structures' and non-western 'church structures' did not figure prominently in the early decades of the British missionary movement. In Simeon's day there were few indigenous churches that British voluntary societies could encounter and conflict with. However, the work of the CMS in India from the 1820s onward did provide just such an opportunity.

As the British administration of India expanded south and west, CMS missionaries in the Madras Presidency had increasing contact with the ancient Syrian Church on the Malabar coast.¹⁸ By the early 1820s the CMS and the Calcutta episcopate found itself in the midst of a growing controversy over the episcopal succession in the Syrian Church.¹⁹ One of the CMS personalities involved in the Society's work in Travancore and Malabar was Joseph Fenn, one of the few CMS missionaries who attributed their connection with the Society to

¹⁸ Claudius Buchanan visited Malabar in 1806. His complimentary observations of the Syrian Church are included in Buchanan, C., *Christian researches in Asia: With notices of the translation of the Scriptures into the Oriental languages*, 3rd edition, Edinburgh, 1812.

¹⁹ The details are documented in Ten Brink, E.L., *The CMS mission of help to the Syrian Church in Malabar, 1816-1840: A study in Protestant-Eastern Orthodox encounter*, Hartford Seminary Foundation, Ph.D. thesis, 1960.

Simeon.²⁰ In 1819 Fenn wrote to Simeon for advice on the subject of the increasing tensions in the Syrian Church. In turn, Simeon corresponded with Josiah Pratt of the CMS.²¹ Although the subject seems to disappear from Simeon's correspondence after his letter to Pratt, further contact with Fenn on the subject may have occurred. A careful examination of Fenn's role in the dispute in Malabar, and Simeon's part in it, would serve as a study of church-mission tensions with relevant value to Christian mission today.

The Legacy of Charles Simeon

The first decades of the evangelical Anglican missionary movement were marked by significant challenges. Chief among these were the need for missionary personnel and the necessity of a solution to the church-mission tensions faced by the movement. Both of these difficulties were created in one way or another by the opposition of the Established Church to the initiatives taken by the progenitors of the CMS and the other evangelical voluntary societies. As documented in this study, Charles Simeon's world-view -- his evangelicalism, his concern for order in society, and his commitment to mentor others -- allowed him to embrace the voluntary missionary movement while also addressing the challenges to its progress.

²⁰ A large number of ms. sources on the CMS's Malabar controversy, including a number of reports by Fenn, are held in the manuscript archive of King's College Library, Cambridge, Misc. 12(4).

²¹ Simeon to Pratt, January 1, 1820, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/AC 3.

Incidentally, Pratt became frustrated with Fenn for discussing "field matters" with his mentor. [Minutes of the Parent Committee, January 12, 1820, CMS Archives, University of Birmingham, G/C 1/4.]

Simeon's contemporary legacy to the British missionary movement was two-fold. First, Simeon made disciples and thereby helped to people the evangelical Anglican missionary movement. His most fruitful efforts in this regard came in the form of a partnership with Charles Grant in sending evangelicals to Asia as India Company chaplains. Second, Simeon exemplified limited voluntarism. He recognized when voluntary principles threatened to produce social disorder or excessive ecclesiastical irregularity. His voluntary efforts always stopped short of such a point. Moreover, Simeon urged evangelical Anglicans to assume a conciliatory posture toward the hierarchy of the Church. He believed that such an attitude would enable evangelical Churchmen to negotiate frameworks within which limited voluntary activity would be possible.

No evangelical Anglican in the early nineteenth century exercised a greater strategic influence on the course of the British missionary movement than did Charles Simeon of Cambridge. The fact that he did so while maintaining his reputation as a committed Churchman is the measure of his uniqueness.

APPENDIX I

Simeon's East India Company Chaplains

Listed below are the names and selected particulars of Simeon's students who were encouraged by him to consider employment with the East India Company [EIC] as a chaplain. The sources of the names are the list of Simeon's chaplains in his letter to Thomas Thomason in 1816 [Carus: 300], the Simeon-Grant or Thomason-Sherer correspondence [Ridley Hall, Cambridge], or other ms. sources. The specific sources have been cited in the course of chapter six.

Name	Cambridge Details ¹	Connection with the EIC ²
BLACKBURN, John (d.1870)	St. John's (1811-15) B.A., 1815; M.A., 1817	None -- entered parish ministry
BOLLARD, William (1785-1840)	Trinity Coll. (1802-06) B.A., 1806; M.A., 1809	None -- entered parish ministry
BROMEHEAD, Robert (d.1841)	St. John's (1797-1802) B.A., 1802; M.A., 1816	None -- entered parish ministry
BROWN, David (1763-1812)	Magdalene (1782-85) B.A., 1785	Bengal chaplain (1785-1812) Ft. William, Calcutta, 1786-94 Sr. Chaplain, ³ Calcutta, 1794-1812 Provost, Ft. Wm. College, 1800-07

¹ For these details use has been made of Venn, J.A., *Alumni Cantabrigienses: A biographical list of all known students, graduates, and holders of office at the University of Cambridge from the earliest times to 1900*, part 2, 1752-1900, 6 vols, Cambridge, 1940.

² These details are taken from McNally, S.J., *The chaplains of the East India Company*, typescript, 1971, revised, 1976, held by the India Office Library and Records, Eur.D.847. McNally employs nineteenth century British spelling of Indian place names, as found in the primary documents from which the list of chaplains was compiled. The same convention has been preserved in this appendix.

³ The "Presidency Church" in Calcutta, i.e., St. John's Cathedral, was served by two clergymen, a Senior and Junior Presidency Chaplain. Madras and Bombay also had their "Presidency" churches and chaplains.

Appendix I -- Simeon's East India Company Chaplains

Name	Cambridge Details	Connection with the EIC
BUCHANAN, Claudius (1766-1815)	Queens' (1791-96) B.A., 1796; D.D., 1811	Bengal chaplain (1796-1808) Barrackpore, 1797-99 Jr. Chaplain, Calcutta, 1799-1800 Vice-Provost, Ft. Wm. College, 1800-07
CARR, Thomas (1788-1859)	St. John's (1809-13) B.A., 1813	Bombay chaplain (1814-36) Sr. Chaplain, Bombay, 1816 Surat, 1817-22 Sr. Chaplain, Bombay, 1823-36 Acting Archdeacon of Bombay, 1825 & 1830 Archdeacon of Bombay, 1833-36 Bishop of Bombay (1837-51)
CHURCH, Charles (d.1822)	(c.1812-15)	Madras chaplain (1816-22) Cuddalore, 1818-19 Vizagapatam, 1820 Black Town Chapel, 1820-22
CLARKSON, John (d.1847)	Trinity Coll. (1801-05) B.A., 1805; M.A., 1808	None -- entered parish ministry
CORRIE, Daniel (1777-1837)	Clare (1799) Trinity Coll. (1800-05) LL.B., 1805	Bengal chaplain (1805-35) Chunar, 1807-09 Cawnpore, 1810-13 Agra, 1813-14 Furlough in England, 1815-17 Benares, 1817-1819 Sr. Chaplain, Calcutta, 1819-23 Archdeacon of Calcutta, 1823-35 Bishop of Madras (1835-37)
COTTERILL, Henry (d.1886)	(c.1832-35)	Madras chaplain (1836-48) Vepery, 1837-45 Furlough, 1845-48
CROSTHWAITE, Joseph (d.1816)	St. John's (1809-13) B.A., 1813	Bengal chaplain (1814-16) Died en route to India, 1816
DEALTRY, Thomas (d.1872)	Trinity Coll. (1823-27) B.A., 1827	Bengal chaplain (1828-50) Old Church, Calcutta, 1829-35 Archdeacon of Calcutta, 1835-48 Furlough, 1848-50 Bishop of Madras (1850-61)
DICKSON (Uncertain vitals)	(c.1815)	[Uncertain]
FAWCETT, Thomas (d.1872)	Trinity Coll. (1814-15) Clare (1816-19) B.A., 1819; M.A., 1822	[Uncertain]

Appendix I -- Simeon's East India Company Chaplains

Name	Cambridge Details	Connection with the EIC
HAMMOND, Anthony (1797-1855)	Pembroke (1814) Emmanuel (1815-19) B.A., 1819	Bengal chaplain (1827-49) Berhampore, 1827 Old Church, Calcutta, 1828 Benares, 1829-36 Patna, 1837 Army of the Indus, 1838 Allahabad, 1840 Furlough, 1841-44 Meerut, 1845-49
HARPER, Henry (1785-1865)	St. John's (1809-10) Queens' (1811-13) B.A., 1813; M.A., 1826	Madras chaplain (1814-46) Chittoor, 1817-20 Secunderabad, 1820-22 St. Thomas Mountain, 1823 Furlough, 1824-26 Bellary, 1827-28 Vizagapatam, 1829 Black Town Hospital, 1829 Jr. Chaplain, Madras, 1830-32 Sr. Chaplain, Madras, 1833-35 Archdeacon of Madras, 1836-46
HEARN, James (1785-1864)	St. John's (1806-10) B.A., 1810	None -- entered parish ministry
HOUGH, James (1789-1847)	Queens' (1808-12) B.A., 1812; M.A., 1815	Madras chaplain (1815-29) Palamcottah, 1817-19 Masulipatam, 1820 Poonamallee, 1821 Furlough, 1822-24 Sr. Chaplain, Madras, 1825-26 Furlough, 1827-29
HOWARD, John Garton (1786-1862)	Queens' (1804-09) B.A., 1809; M.A., 1812	[Uncertain]
JACKSON, Edward (d.1821)	St. John's (1812-16) B.A., 1816	Madras chaplain (1817-21) Vellore, 1817-21
JONES, John (1791-1889)	St. John's (1811-15) B.A., 1815; M.A., 1819	None -- entered parish ministry
KEBBEL, Henry (1772-1868)	Sidney Sussex (1803-10) LL.B., 1810	None -- entered parish ministry
KING, Robert Jarrold (1788-1854)	St. Catharine's (1810-14) B.A., 1814	None -- entered parish ministry
LEESON, William (d.1824)	Clare (1805-09) B.A., 1809; M.A., 1809; B.D., 1819	None -- entered parish ministry
MALKIN, William (1791-1874)	Magdalene (1811-16) B.A., 1816	Madras chaplain (1816-32) Poonamallee, 1817-19 Bangalore, 1820-32 Furlough, 1832

Appendix I -- Simeon's East India Company Chaplains

Name	Cambridge Details	Connection with the EIC
MARTYN, Henry (1781-1812)	St. John's (1797-1802) Simeon's curate (1803-04) B.A., 1802; M.A., 1804	Bengal chaplain (1805-12) Dinapore, 1806-08 Cawnpore, 1809-10 Furlough, 1810-12
MORTIMER, George (d.1847)	Queens' (1807-11) B.A., 1811; M.A., 1815	None -- entered parish ministry
NORMAN, Charles (1786-1867)	Pembroke (1811) St. Catharine's (1811-15) B.A., 1815	None -- entered parish ministry ⁴
PARSON, Joseph (d.1836)	Clare (1797-1802) B.A., 1802; M.A., 1805	Bengal chaplain (1805-26) Berhampore, 1807-10 Agra, 1811 Meerut, 1812-17 Jr. Chaplain, Calcutta, 1818-21 Sr. Chaplain, Calcutta, 1822-23 Furlough, 1824-26
ROBERTSON, Thomas (1788-1846)	St. John's (1809-13) B.A., 1813; M.A., 1822	Bengal chaplain (1813-40) Jr. Chaplain, Calcutta, 1814-15 Old Church, Calcutta, 1816-17 Dum Dum, 1818-20 Furlough, 1821 Sr. Chaplain, Calcutta, 1822-25 Calcutta Jail, 1826-31 Jr. Chaplain, Calcutta, 1832-37 Furlough, 1838-40
ROBINSON, Thomas (1790-1873)	Trinity Coll. (1808-13) B.A., 1813; M.A., 1816	Bombay chaplain (1816-25) Poonah, 1817 Serroor, 1818-20 Poonah Division, 1821-25 Bengal chaplain (1826-27) Chaplain to the Bp. of Calcutta, 1826-27 Madras chaplain (1828-36) Archdeacon of Madras, 1828-36
SMITH (Uncertain vitals)	(c.1809)	[Unknown]
SPRING, Frederick (d.1843)	(c.1812-15)	Madras chaplain (1816-43) Tellichery, 1818-23 Furlough, 1824-25 Quilon, 1826-28 Poonamallee, 1829 Black Town Hospital, 1830-32 Jr. Chaplain, Madras, 1833-36 Sr. Chaplain, Madras, 1837-43
STRAPAN (Uncertain vitals)	(c.1815)	[Unknown]

⁴ Norman was appointed to a chaplaincy by Grant in 1814 but resigned before sailing.

Appendix I -- Simeon's East India Company Chaplains

Name	Cambridge Details	Connection with the EIC
THOMASON, Thomas (1774-1829)	Magdalene (1792-6) Curate to Simeon (1796-1807) B.A., 1796; M.A., 1799	Bengal chaplain (1808-29) Old Church, Calcutta, 1808-26 Chaplain to the Governor-General, 1814-15 Furlough, 1827-28 Old Church, Calcutta, 1829
TRAILL, James (Uncertain vitals)	(c.1814-18)	Madras chaplain (1815-22) Vizagapatam, 1817-18 Furlough, 1819-22
VALENTINE, William (1790-1873)	Magdalene (1813) Trinity Coll. (1814-15) B.A., 1815; M.A., 1819	None -- entered parish ministry
WESTERBY (Uncertain vitals)	(c.1815)	[Unknown]
WILSON (Uncertain vitals)	(c.1815)	[Unknown]
WINTER, Christopher (d.1822)	(c.1812-15)	Ft. Marlborough chaplain (1816-22)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Sources:

British Library, Western Manuscripts Room, London [9 items]

Cambridgeshire Public Record Office, Cambridge [2 items]

Cambridge University Library, Manuscript Room

"Simeon Trustees papers" [Add.8293, Box 4]

"Dispute of 1822 between Simeon and Samuel Thornton" [9 items]

"Original Simeon letters re: purchase of livings" [1 item]

"Simeon's personal commitment to trustees and notebook" [2 items]

"Some personal letters of Charles Simeon" [10 items]

"Thornton Trust matters" [3 items]

Various other letters [8 items]

Church Missionary Society Archives, University of Birmingham:

"Calcutta Church Missionary Association" [C I1/O 6/4]

"Calcutta Corresponding Committee minutes" [C I1/O 1]

"Calcutta Corresponding Committee reports" [C I1/O 2]

"Ceylon, early correspondence, 1815-20" [C CE/E1]

"Correspondence with Bishops of Calcutta" [C I1/O 8]

"Home correspondence, 1799-1816" [G/AC 3]

"Home correspondence letter book[s], 1824-36" [G/AC 1/1-2]

"[Index to] home correspondence, 1824-36" [G/AC 1/1-2]

"India, early correspondence, 1811-15" [C I/E]

"Letters out, North India, 1820-36" [C I1/L1-2]

"Minutes of the General Committee, 1799-1836" [G/C 1/1-15]

Church Missionary Society Archives, University of Birmingham: [continued]

- "North India mission, early correspondence, 1815-20" [C I/E1-2]
- "Papers from Daniel Corrie" [C I1/O 76]
- "Papers from Thomas Thomason" [C I1/O 286]
- "South India mission, early correspondence, 1815-20" [C I2/E1-3]
- "Venn MSS" [Acc.81]
- "Unofficial papers" [Acc.55]
- "Unofficial papers on Henry Martyn" [Acc.54]

Edinburgh University Library Manuscript Room, Edinburgh [7 items]

India Office Library and Records, Manuscript Collection, London [19 items]

King's College Manuscript Archive, Cambridge [21 items]

National Library of Scotland, Manuscript Room, Edinburgh [5 items]

New College Manuscript Archive, Edinburgh [8 items]

St. John's College Manuscript Archive, Cambridge [7 items]

Trinity College Manuscript Archive, Cambridge [7 items]

Simeon MSS, Ridley Hall, Cambridge:¹

- "Charles Grant correspondence" [63 items]
- "Charles Simeon miscellanea" [12 items]
- "Daniel Corrie's visitation journals (copy)" [2 items]
- "Henry Martyn correspondence" [22 items]
- "Letters addressed to the Rev. Charles Simeon, 1782-1835" [67 items]
- "Letters of J.W. Sherer from Thomas Thomason, 1815-1828" [42 items]
- "Notes for twenty-two lectures on 'Natural and revealed religion'"
- Untitled group of ms. letters [14 items]
- Untitled group of ms. letters [11 items]
- Untitled group of ms. letters [7 items]

¹ The collection does not employ accession numbers, etc.

Works By Charles Simeon:

- British and Foreign Bible Society, *British and Foreign Bible Society controversy: Consisting of the Rev. C. Simeon's letter on prayer and tests, Dr. Dealtry's speech at the 27th anniversary of the Society, ... G. Noel's letter to Lord Teignmouth, etc*, reprinted from the *Christian Advocate* (June 13, 1831), London, [1831].
- London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, *The tenth report of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews ...: To which is prefixed A sermon preached before the Society, May 8, 1818, at the parish church of St. Paul, Covent Garden, by the Rev. C. Simeon*, London, 1818.
- Simeon, C., "Address to the missionaries," *The Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society on Tuesday, October 28, 1817, on the occasion of the departure of missionaries ...*, 79-93, [London, 1817.]
- , *An appeal to men of wisdom and candour: or, four discourses, preached before the University of Cambridge, in November, 1815*, London, 1816.
- [--], "Balaam's character," *Theological Miscellany* 2 (1785), 358-64.
- , *The Churchman's confession: or, An appeal to the Liturgy: Being a sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, December 1, 1805*, Cambridge, [1805].
- , *Christ crucified: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, on Sunday, March 17, 1811*, Cambridge, 1811.
- , *Christ is in all: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, on Oct. 31, 1830, in aid of the funds of the Old Charity-Schools*, Cambridge, 1830.
- , *The cities of refuge ...: An Assize sermon preached at Cambridge ... on the 26th day of July, 1803, ...*, Cambridge, 1803.
- , *A collection of psalms and hymns from various authors, chiefly designed for the use of public worship*, Cambridge, 1820.
- , *The conversion of the Jews: or, Our duty and encouragement to promote it: Two discourses preached before the University of Cambridge, on February 18th, and 20th, 1821*, London, 1821.

- Simeon, C., *The danger of neglecting the Great Sacrifice: A sermon preached at the Assizes at Cambridge, August 22, 1797*, Cambridge, 1797.
- , *Dr. Marsh's fact: or, A congratulatory address to the church members of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, 2nd ed., with an appendix in answer to Dr. Marsh's letters, Cambridge, 1813.
- , *Evangelic and pharisaic righteousness compared: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on Sunday, November 26, 1809*, Cambridge, [1809].
- , *Evangelical religion: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge*, Cambridge, 1837.
- , *The excellency of the Liturgy in four discourses ...: To which is prefixed an answer to Dr. Marsh's inquiry, respecting "The neglecting to give the Prayer Book with the Bible."*, Cambridge, 1812.
- , *Extracts from Simeon's memoirs on the composition and delivery of sermons*, edited by W. Carus, London, 1887.
- , *The fountain of living waters: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, on Sunday, May 14th, 1809*, [Cambridge, 1809.]
- , *Fresh cautions to the public: or, A letter to the Rev. Edw. Pearson ... in reply to his Cautions to the readers of Mr. Simeon's sermon, entitled, "Evangelic and pharisaic righteousness compared"*, Cambridge, [1810].
- , *The Gospel message: A sermon preached before the University, November 13, 1796: To which are annexed four skeletons of sermons upon the same text, ... with a view to illustrate all Mr. Claude's rules of composition ...*, 6th edition, Cambridge, 1798.
- , *Helps to composition: or, Five hundred skeletons of sermons, several being the substance of sermons preached before the University*, 4 parts in 2 vols, Cambridge, 1801-1802.
- , *Horae homileticae: or, Discourses digested into one continued series, and forming a commentary upon every book of the Old and New Testament ...*, 7th edition, 21 vols., with indexes by T.H. Horne, London, 1845.
- , *The Jews provoked to jealousy: A sermon preached on Wednesday, June 5, 1811 ...*, London, 1811.

- Simeon, C., *Let wisdom judge: University addresses and sermon outlines by Charles Simeon*, edited with an introduction by A. Pollard, London, 1959.
- , *Letter to ... Lord Teignmouth ... of the British and Foreign Bible Society, in vindication of the proceedings of that Society against "The Statement of the Edinburgh Bible Society Relating to the Circulation of the Apocrypha"*, London, 1825.
- [--, ed.], *Memorial sketches of the Rev. David Brown: With a selection of his sermons preached at Calcutta*, London, 1816.
- , *The objection of the Jews to Christianity, founded on Deut. 13.1-3, answered, and faith in Christ shown not to be prohibited in that passage: In a sermon preached at Ely Chapel, Ely Place, Holborn, April 24, 1817 ...*, London, 1817.
- , *On the King's accession: Prayer for the king the duty ... of the people: A sermon delivered (in substance) at Trinity Church, Cambridge, February 20, 1820*, London, 1820.
- , *A pastoral admonition to an affectionate flock: Delivered October 1, 1832*, London, 1832.
- , *The royal edict: Being a sermon preached at the English Episcopal Church at Amsterdam, June 18, 1818*, Amsterdam, 1818.
- , *A sermon preached at the parish church of St. Andrew by the Wardrobe and St. Anne, Blackfriars ... June 8, 1802, before the Society for Missions to Africa and the East ... being their second anniversary, ...*, London, 1802.
- , *Sovereignty and equity combined: or, The dispensations of God towards the Jews and Gentiles illustrated: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, on May 5, 1822*, Cambridge, 1822.
- , *Substance of an address ... in behalf of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, on ... October the 27th, 1834: Communicated as a letter to the Rev. J.B. Cartwright, M.A., Secretary of the Society*, London, 1837.
- , *To the noblemen and gentlemen appointed as a special committee to consider and report to the General Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society what is expedient to be done under the existing circumstances of that Society ...*, [London, 1825.]

Simeon, C., *The true test of religion in the soul: or, Practical Christianity delineated: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, March 9, 1817*, Cambridge, 1817.

Walker, S., *The Christian: A course of practical sermons: ... with an introductory essay, by the Rev. Charles Simeon, Cambridge*, Glasgow, 1825.

Contemporary Accounts of Simeon's Life and Thought:

Brown, A.W., *Recollections of the conversation parties of the Rev. Charles Simeon, M.A., Senior Fellow of King's College, and Perpetual Curate of Trinity Church, Cambridge*, London, 1863.

Cartwright, J.B., *Love to the Jewish nation: A sermon preached at the Episcopal Jews' Chapel, Bethnal Green, London, on Sunday morning, November 27th, 1836, on the occasion of the death of the Rev. Charles Simeon*, 2nd edition, London, 1836.

Carus, W., *Memoirs of the life of the Rev. Charles Simeon, M.A., Late Senior Fellow of King's College and Minister of Trinity Church, Cambridge*, 3rd edition, London, 1848.

Close, F., *A brief sketch of the character and last days of the Rev. C. Simeon, A.M., being the substance of a sermon, preached in ... Cheltenham on Sunday morning, Nov. 27, 1836: With additional matter and original memoranda*, 2nd edition, Cheltenham, [1836].

Dealtry, W., *Honour for God the sure portion of them that honour him: A sermon preached at Trinity Church, Cambridge, Sunday, November 20, 1836, on the death of the Rev. Charles Simeon*, Cambridge, 1836.

"Death of the Rev. C. Simeon," *Christian Observer* 37 (1837), 94-108.

Gurney, J.J., *Reminiscences of Chalmers, Simeon, and Wilberforce*, [1835.]

Hodgson, G., *Elisha at the waters of Jordan: A sermon preached in Trinity Church, Cambridge, on the evening of Sunday, November 20, 1836, on occasion of the death of the Rev. Charles Simeon*, Cambridge, 1836.

Mandell, W., *The example of eminent Christians a pattern for imitation: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge ..., November 20, 1836, on occasion of the death of the Rev. Charles Simeon*, Cambridge, 1836.

"Obituary: Rev. Charles Simeon," *Christian Observer* 37 (1837), 56-62, 235-41, 353-8.

Preston, M.M., *Memoranda of the Rev. Charles Simeon, M.A., late Minister of Trinity Church, and Fellow of King's College, Cambridge*, London, 1840.

"Review of sermons on the death of the Rev. C. Simeon," *Christian Observer* 37 (1837), 43-56.

"Review of Simeon's *Horae Homileticae*, vols. 1-6," *Christian Observer* 19 (1820), 337-47.

"Review of Simeon's *Horae Homileticae*, vols. 7-11," *Christian Observer* 19 (1820), 761-72.

Scholefield, J., *A zealous ministry the safeguard of a nation: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on Sunday, November 20, 1836, on occasion of the death of the Rev. Charles Simeon*, Cambridge, 1836.

Thodey, S., *The honour attached to eminent piety and usefulness: A sermon preached at Downey Street Meeting-house, Cambridge, Sunday, November 20, 1836, on occasion of the death of the Rev. Charles Simeon*, London, 1836.

Webster, T., *God glorified in his faithful ministers: A sermon preached at St. Botolph's, Cambridge, on the morning and evening of November 20, 1836, on occasion of the death of the late Rev. Charles Simeon*, London, 1836.

Secondary Sources on Simeon:

Balda, W.D., "Simeon's 'Protestant Papists': A sampling of moderate evangelicalism within the Church of England, 1839-1865," *Fides et Historia* 16 (1984), 55-67.

--, "*Spheres of Influence*": *Simeon's Trust and its implications for evangelical patronage*, Cambridge University, Ph.D. thesis, 1981.

Bennett, A., "Charles Simeon: Prince of evangelicals," *Churchman* 102 (1988), 122-42.

Charles Simeon: An interpretation: Addresses delivered at the Centenary Celebrations, Cambridge, November 1936, London, 1936.

- Coggan, F.D., "Great Preachers IV: Charles Simeon," *Theology* 54 (1951), 136-40.
- , *These were his gifts: A trio of Christian leaders*, The Bishop John Prideaux Lectures for 1974, Exeter, 1974: 11-20.
- Heinze, R.W., "Charles Simeon - through the eyes of a American Lutheran," *Churchman* 93 (1979), 240-52.
- Henson, H.H., *Sibbes and Simeon: An essay on patronage trusts*, London, 1932.
- Hobson, S., *What mean ye by this service? The question discussed in the trial of George Herbert, Richard Hooker, Charles Simeon, Reginald Heber, and Thomas Scott, on the charge of heresy*, London, 1850.
- Hopkins, H.E., *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*, London, 1977.
- , *Charles Simeon: preacher extraordinary*, Grove liturgical study no. 18, Bramcote, Nottinghamshire, 1979.
- , *Charles Simeon, the old apostle: A sermon preached in Holy Trinity Church, Cambridge, ... 29 August, 1976*, [Cambridge, 1976.]
- Macleod, J., "Charles Simeon," *Evangelical Quarterly* 9 (1937), 46-63.
- Moule, H.C.G., *Charles Simeon, Leaders of Religion*, edited by H.C. Beeching, London, 1892.
- Noel, H., *Charles Simeon of Cambridge*, 1890.
- Pollard, A., and M. Hennell, eds., *Charles Simeon (1759-1836): Essays written in commemoration of his bicentenary by members of the Evangelical Fellowship for Theological Literature*, Great Anglicans, London, 1964.
- Reeve, R., "John Wesley, Charles Simeon, and the Evangelical Revival," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 2 (1956), 203-14.
- Seeley, M., *The latter evangelical fathers, John Thornton, John Newton, William Cowper, Thomas Scott, Richard Cecil, William Wilberforce, Charles Simeon, Henry Martyn, Josiah Pratt*, London, 1879.
- Simpkinson, C.H., *Charles Simeon, Little books on religion*, London, 1927.

Smyth, C.H.E., *Simeon and church order: A study of the origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the eighteenth century*, The Birkbeck Lectures for 1937-1938, Cambridge, 1940.

Swift, D.E., "Charles Simeon and J.J. Gurney: A chapter in Anglican-Quaker relations," *Church History* 29 (1960), 167-86.

Tait, A.J., *Charles Simeon and his Trust*, London, 1936.

Warren, M.A.C., *Charles Simeon, 1759-1836, Fellow of King's College and Vicar of Holy Trinity Church, Cambridge*, Great Churchmen No. 11, London, 1949.

--, "Charles Simeon: His methods in the local church, the Church of England, and the nation," *Churchman* 92 (1978), 112-24.

--, *An essay on the Rev. Charles Simeon, M.A., 1759-1836 ...*, [1979.]

Webster, D., "Charles Simeon and the Liturgy," *Theology* 44 (1951), 296-301.

Williamson, J., *A brief memoir of the Rev. C. Simeon ...*, London, 1848.

Other Primary Sources Consulted:

[Allestree, R.], *The whole duty of man laid down in a plain and familiar way for the use of all, but especially for the meanest reader ...: Necessary for all families: With private devotions for several occasions*, 1658, reprint, London, 1888.

An account of a meeting lately held at Cambridge, for the institution of an Auxiliary Bible Society: ... to which are subjoined, the address of Dr. Herbert Marsh, ... and the reply of the Right Hon. N. Vansittart, M.P., Glasgow, 1812.

"An account of the anti-sectarian sect," *Christian Observer* 1 (1802), 708-11.

[Anon.], *The accuracy of the Rev. C. Simeon's "True test of religion in the soul" questioned: and "Practical Christianity delineated," with some shades of difference: By a member of the Church of England*, London, 1817.

- [Anon.], *Brief defence of the Archdeacon of Bath, against the vehement attack of the Rev. Daniel Wilson ...: By the author of Free Thoughts on the Bath Missionary Society*, 4th edition, London, 1818.
- , *Brief statement of some objections entertained by certain members of the church to portions of the system and practice of the Church Missionary Society: By a clerical member of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1841.
- , *Candid thoughts, respectfully submitted to the proprietors of East India stock, occasioned by Mr. Twining's Letter to the chairman, and Observations on the present state of the Company*, London, 1808.
- , *Consideration on the probable effects of the opposition of the orthodox clergy to their evangelical brethren: Occasioned by the late protest against the Church Missionary Society ...: By an orthodox clergyman*, London, 1818.
- , *David and Jonathan: An account of a conversation, occasioned by a sermon, preached in the Chapel in New Street, Canongate, on Mark xvi.15.16, by Charles Simeon ... and since published under the title of The Gospel Message*, Edinburgh, 1797.
- , *An enquiry into the causes which oppose the conversion of the Hindus of India to Christianity, and render the attempt ... extremely hazardous to the interest of the East India Company, and the nation, ...*, London, 1808.
- , *An essay to shew that no intention has existed, or does exist of doing violence to the religious prejudices of India*, London, 1808.
- , *Free thoughts on the Bath missionary society, and on the address to that assembly by the Rev. Josiah Thomas, A.M., Archdeacon of Bath: By "A friend to Consistency."*, 4th edition, London, 1818.
- , *A letter ... on the state and patronage of the Church of England in India: By a chaplain of the Bombay Establishment*, London, 1829.
- , *A letter to a friend on the duty of Great Britain to disseminate Christianity in India: Occasioned by the proposed renewal of the charter of the East India Company*, London, 1813.
- , *A letter to John Scott Waring, Esq., in refutation of his Observations on the present state of the East India Company ... with strictures on his illiberal and unjust conduct towards the missionaries in India*, London, 1808.

- [Anon.], *A letter to the President of the Board of Control, on the propagation of Christianity in India, to which are added hints to those concerned in sending missionaries thither*, London, 1807.
- , *A letter to the ... President, Vice-presidents, and Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society ... on the ... question respecting their systematic omission of prayer, and union with Socinians*, 2nd edition, [London, 1831.]
- , *The marrow of modern divinity*, London, 1645 and 1648, edited by C.G. M'Crie, Glasgow, 1902.
- , *Observations addressed to the Trinitarian friends ... of the Bible Society ... in support of the proposed alteration in the constitution of the Society: By a clerical member of the Provisional Committee*, 2nd edition, London, 1831.
- , *Observations on Mr. Daniel Wilson's defence of the Church Missionary Society against the objections of the Rev. Josiah Thomas, Archdeacon of Bath*, London, 1818.
- , *Observations on the defence of the Church Missionary Society against the objections of the Archdeacon of Bath, etc: By Pileus Quadratus*, Oxford, 1818.
- , *Prayer and religious tests, in connection with the British and Foreign Bible Society, considered in two letters addressed to the Right Hon. Lord Teignmouth ...: By Sexagenarius*, London, 1831.
- , *Remarks on the Bible Society controversy*, London, [1832].
- , *Remarks on the protest of Archdeacon Thomas, and the defence of the Church Missionary Society, by the Rev. Daniel Wilson: By a country vicar*, Bath, 1818.
- , *A reply to Mr. Wilson's defence of the Church Missionary Society*, Norwich, 1818.
- , *Review of the Apocrypha controversy, containing supplementary catechism addressed to the London Committee ...*, 1826.
- , *Review of the statements by the dissident members of the Committee of the Glasgow Auxiliary Bible Society, of the grounds of their dissent from the resolution to separate from the British and Foreign Bible Society*, 1826.

- [Anon.], *A second letter to a member of the Committee of the Berwick Auxiliary ... containing a brief selection of facts, illustrative of the conduct of the ... Bible Society, in reference to the circulation of the Apocrypha*, 1827.
- , *The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge vindicated from the charge of inconsistency and contradiction ...: By another member of the Society*, London, 1816.
- , *Two letters to the proprietors of East India stock, occasioned by Mr. Twining's late letter to the chairman: and ... observations on ... the recall of the missionaries*, London, 1807.
- , *Vindication of the Hindoos from the aspersions of the Reverend Claudius Buchanan, M.A., with a refutation of the arguments exhibited in his memoir, on the expediency of an ecclesiastical establishment for British India ...*, London, 1808.
- , *A vindication of the Hindoos: Part the second, in reply to the observations of the Christian Observer, of Mr. Fuller ..., and of his anonymous friend ...*, London, 1808.
- , *Zeal without innovation: or, The present state of religion and morals considered, with a view to the dispositions and measures required for its improvement: To which is subjoined, An address to young clergymen ...*, 2nd edition, London, 1809.
- Bartlett, T., *An examination of the alterations and appendix of the Rev. G.R. Gleig, M.A., in his observations on the constitution and tendency of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1824.
- , *A letter to Sir Edward Knatchbull ... in reply to the charges brought by the Rev. G.R. Gleig ... against the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1823.
- Baxter, R., *A call to the unconverted to turn and live and accept of mercy while mercy may be had: Containing directions and persuasions to a sound conversion*, 1658, Reprint, Edinburgh, 1787.
- Berridge, J., *The Christian world unmasked: Pray come and peep*, new edition, London, 1822.
- , "Copy of a letter of the Late Rev. John Berridge, of Everton, Bedfordshire, to the Rev. Mr. -----, a Gospel clergyman at C-----," *Evangelical Magazine* 2 (1794), 198-200.

Bickersteth, E., *Address in behalf of the London Society for the Propagation of Christianity Amongst the Jews*, London, [1838].

--, *The Christian hearer: Designed to shew the importance of hearing the Word, and to assist Christians in hearing with profit*, 4th edition, London, 1829.

--, *The Christian student: Designed to assist Christian in general in acquiring religious knowledge: With lists of books adapted to various classes of society*, 3rd edition, London, 1832.

--, *A practical guide to the prophecies, with reference to their interpretation, fulfillment, and to personal edification*, 6th edition, London, 1839.

--, "Practical remarks on the prophecies, with reference to efforts to spread the Gospel and to personal edification," *A Scripture help: designed to assist in reading the Bible profitably*, 12th edition, 113-154, London, 1825.

--, *The signs of the times in the East: A warning to the West: Being a practical view of our duties in light of the prophecies which illustrate the present and future state of the church and of the world*, London, 1845.

"The Bishop of Rochester - evangelical criticism," *Churchman's Magazine* 1 (1801), 240-1.

Bogue, D., *A sermon preached at Salter's Hall, March 30, 1792*, London, 1792.

--, *The theological lectures of the late Rev. David Bogue, D.D.*, 2 vols., edited by J.S.C.F. Frey, New York, 1849.

--, "To the evangelical Dissenters who practice infant baptism," *Evangelical Magazine* 2 (1794), 378-80.

Buchanan, C., *An address, delivered before the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East, to the Revd. Messrs. Greenwood and Norton ... and to the Rev. Messrs. Schnarre and Rhenius ...: On ... January 7, 1814 ...*, London, 1814.

--, *An apology for promoting Christianity in India: ..., a memorial in defense of the Christian missions in India, ... [and] the letter [of] the Bengal government to the Court of Directors ...*, London, 1813.

--, *Christian researches in Asia: With notices of the translation of the Scriptures into the Oriental languages*, 3rd edition, Edinburgh, 1812.

Buchanan, C., *The College of Ft. William in Bengal*, Calcutta, 1805.

- , *Colonial ecclesiastical establishment: Being a brief view of the state of the colonies of Great Britain, and of her Asiatic Empire, in respect to religious instruction ...*, London, 1813.
- , *The healing waters of Bethesda: A sermon preached at Buxton Wells to the company assembled there for the benefit of the medicinal waters, on Whitsunday, June 2, 1811*, London, 1811.
- , *Memoir of the expediency of an ecclesiastical establishment for British India*, 1805, 2nd edition, London, 1812.
- , *A sermon, preached at the New Church of Calcutta, before the Right Honorable the Earl of Mornington, Governor General ... on Thursday, February 6th, 1800: Being the day appointed for a general thanksgiving ...*, Calcutta, 1800.
- , *The star in the East: A sermon preached in the parish-church of St. James, Bristol, on Sunday, February 26, 1809, for the benefit of the "Society for Missions to Africa and the East."*, 2nd cheap edition, corrected, Greenock, 1809.
- , *The three eras of light: Two Discourses preached before the University of Cambridge ... July 1, 1810 ...*, Boston, 1811.
- , *Three sermons on the Jubilee, preached at Welbeck Chapel, London*, London, 1810.

Buckworth, J., *Memoir of the Rev. J. Buckworth, M.A., late vicar of Dewsbury, Yorkshire*, London, 1836.

Burke, E., *Reflections on the Revolution in France and on the proceedings on certain societies in London relative to that event: In a letter intended to have been sent to a gentleman in Paris*, London, 1790, reprint, edited by R. Scott, Bombay, 1910.

Butler, J., *The analogy of religion, natural and revealed, to the constitution and course of nature*, London, 1736.

Carey, W., *An enquiry into the obligation of Christians to use means for the conversion of the heathen*, Leicester, 1792, reprint, London, 1891.

Carwithen, J.B.S., *A letter to the Reverend Daniel Wilson, M.A., in reply to his defence of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1818.

--, *A second letter to the Reverend Daniel Wilson, M.A., on the hostility of the Church of England Missionary Society towards the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel ... and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, London, 1818.

Chalmers, T., *The application of Christianity to the commercial and ordinary affairs of life*, 1820.

--, *The Christian and civic economy of large towns*, 3 vols., Glasgow, 1821-1826.

--, *The influence of Bible Societies on the temporal necessities of the poor*, Cupar, 1814.

--, *Lectures on the establishment and extension of national churches, delivered in London from April 25th - May 12th, 1838*, Glasgow, 1838.

--, *On the use and abuse of literary and ecclesiastical endowments*, Glasgow, 1827.

Church Missionary Society, *A brief view of the principles and proceedings of the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East*, London, 1840.

--, *The centenary volume of the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East, 1799-1899*, London, 1902.

--, *The Church Missionary Society in 1837 and 1887*, London, 1887.

--, *Instruction of the Committee of the Church Missionary Society, to missionaries proceeding to North and South India ... November 19, 1819, etc*, London, [1819].

--, *The jubilee volume of the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East, 1848-1849*, London, 1849.

- Church Missionary Society, *The proceedings of the Church Missionary Society on Tuesday, October 28, 1817, on occasion of the departure of missionaries to ... Madras and Travancore, and Ceylon*, London, 1817.
- , *The proceedings of the Church Missionary Society ... [in] 1826, on occasion of the departure of missionaries to ... North- and West-India*, London, 1826.
- , *Regulations for the Church Missionary Society's institution at Islington*, London, 1830.
- , *Summary view of the designs and proceedings of the Society for Missions to Africa and the East*, London, 1812.
- Corrie, D., *On the advantages of Christian instruction to the young: A sermon preached at the opening of the Free School Church, November 20, 1831*, Calcutta, 1831.
- , "A sermon, preached at the Old Church for the benefit of the Society, on Whit-Sunday, May 29, 1822," *Fifth report of the Calcutta Committee of the Church Missionary Society* (1822), 1-15.
- , "A sermon preached at the parish church of St. Andrew by the Wardrobe and St. Anne Blackfriars, on ... April 30, 1816, before the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East," *Church Missionary Society Proceedings* (1816).
- , *A sermon preached at the primary visitation of the Lord Bishop of Calcutta, at the cathedral church of St. John, Calcutta, on Wednesday, January 6, 1830*, Calcutta, [1830].
- , *A sermon preached in the cathedral church of St. John, in Calcutta, on Sunday, April 23, 1826: On the occasion of the death of the Right Reverend Reginald, Lord Bishop of the diocese*, Calcutta, 1826.
- , *Sermons, with a charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Madras [on August 26, 1836], and addresses before and after confirmation*, edited by H[enry] C[orrie], Madras, 1837.
- Cunningham, J.W., *Christianity in India: An essay on the duty, means, and consequences of introducing the Christian religion among the native inhabitants of the British dominions in the East*, London, 1808.

- Cunningham, J.W., *Church of England missions*, London, 1814.
- , *General objections against missions for the conversion of the heathen considered ...*, London, 1818.
- [-], *The velvet cushion*, London, 1814.
- Dallas, A.R.C., *The missionary crisis of the Church of England: The substance of two addresses ... in May and June, 1842, to the friends of the Church Missionary Society, etc*, London, 1842.
- Dealtry, W., *An examination of Dr. Marsh's "Inquiry" relative to the British and Foreign Bible Society, in a series of letters to the Reverend Dr. E.D. Clarke, Professor of Mineralogy in the University of Cambridge*, London, 1812.
- , *Duty and policy of propagating Christianity: A discourse delivered before the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East, May 4, 1813*, London, 1813.
- , *The importance of the Established Church: A sermon preached at the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, on Thursday, May 17, 1832, at the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy ...*, London, 1832.
- , *Religious establishments tried by the word of God: A sermon preached in St. John's Chapel, Bedford Row, on Wednesday, May 1, 1833, before the Prayer Book and Homily Society*, London, 1833.
- Doddridge, P., *The rise and progress of religion in the soul: Illustrated in a course of serious and practical addresses*, 1745, reprint, London, 1892.
- Edwards, J., *An humble attempt to promote explicit agreement and visible union of God's people in extraordinary prayer ...*, The works of President Edwards, new edition, vol. 2, 424-541, 1747, reprint, London, 1817.
- Flower, B., ed., *National sins considered in two letters to the Rev. Thomas Robinson ... to which are added a letter from the Rev. Robert Hall to the Rev. Charles Simeon, and reflections on war, by the late Rev. W. Law*, Cambridge, 1796.

- Fuller, A., *An apology for the late Christian mission to India: Comprising an address to the Chairman of the East India Company in answer to Mr. Twining, and strictures on the preface of a pamphlet by Major Scott Waring ...*, Dunstable, 1808.
- , *An apology for the late Christian missions to India: part the second. Containing remarks on Major Scott Waring's letter to the Rev. Mr. Owen, and on a Vindication of the Hindoos by a Bengal officer*, Dunstable, 1808.
- , *An apology for the late Christian missions to India: part the third. Containing strictures on Major Scott Waring's third pamphlet, ... and on the propriety of confining missionary undertakings to the Established Church ...*, Dunstable, 1808.
- , *The Gospel worthy of all acceptance: On the obligation of men fully to credit, and cordially to approve, whatever God makes known*, Northampton, 1796.
- Gleig, G.R., *A letter to Sir Edward Knatchbull ... on his accepting the office of President, at a meeting of an auxiliary Church Missionary Association, held in the town hall of Maidstone, on the 14th of August last*, London, 1823.
- , *Some observations on the constitution and tendency of the Church Missionary Society*, 2nd edition, London, 1824.
- Goode, W., *A memoir of the late Rev. William Goode, M.A., ...*, 2nd edition, London, 1828.
- Gorham, G.C., ed., *Proceedings of the public meeting at the town hall, Cambridge, on Thursday, 18th November, 1813: Being the second anniversary of the Cambridge Auxiliary Bible Society: ... with ... the resolutions, the second report, etc., ...*, Cambridge, 1813.
- , *Statement to the British and Foreign Bible Society regarding circulating the Apocrypha with the inspired writings*, 2nd edition, London, 1825.
- Grant, C., *Observations on the state of society among the Asiatic subjects of Great Britain, particularly with respect to morals and the means of improving it: Written chiefly in the year 1792*, [London], 1797.
- Haldane, R., *Review of the conduct of the directors of the British and Foreign Bible Soc., relative to the Apocrypha and to their administration on the Continent: With an answer to C. Simeon, and observations on the Cambridge remarks*, Edinburgh, 1825.

Haldane, R., *Review of the conduct of the Rev. Daniel Wilson, on the Continent, and as a member of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and of his manner of preaching the Gospel ...*, Edinburgh, 1829.

--, *Second review ... containing an account of the religious state of the continent: In answer to a letter addressed to the author, by the Rev. Dr. Steinkopff*, Edinburgh, 1826.

[Haweis, T.], "Review of Melville Horne's *Letters on Missions*," *Evangelical Magazine* 2 (1794), 476-8.

Horne, M., *Letters on missions addressed to the Protestant ministers of the British churches*, London, 1794, Andover, 1815.

Irving, E., *For missionaries after the apostolical school: A series of orations*, London, 1825.

Law, W., *A serious call to a devout and holy life adapted to the state and condition of all orders of Christians*, 1729, 5th edition, London, 1912.

Mandell, W., *The duty of promoting Christian missions as connected with the peculiar character of the present times: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, on Sunday, December 4, 1814*, Cambridge, 1814.

Marsh, H., *An inquiry into the consequences of neglecting to give the Prayer Book with the Bible ...*, Cambridge, 1812.

--, *A letter to the Rev. Charles Simeon ... in answer to his pretended congratulatory address, in confutation of his various misstatements, and in vindication of the efficacy ascribed by our Church to ... baptism*, Cambridge, 1813.

--, *A second letter to the Rev. Charles Simeon, in confutation of his various misstatements, and in vindication of the efficacy ascribed by our Church to the sacrament of baptism*, Cambridge, 1813.

Martyn, H., *Christian India: or, An appeal on behalf of 900,000 Christian in India, who want the Bible: A sermon, preached at Calcutta, on Tuesday, January 1, 1811, for promoting the objects of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, Calcutta, 1811.

- Martyn, H. *Five sermons (never before published): With a prefatory letter on the past, the present, and the future of missionary enterprise, addressed to the Rev. Henry Venn, B.D., ...*, London, 1862.
- , *Two sets of unpublished letters of the Rev. Henry Martyn, B.D., of Truro, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain on the Bengal establishment*, edited, with prefatory remarks, by ... H.M. Jeffery, Truro, 1883.
- , *Twenty sermons*, Calcutta, 1822, 2nd edition, London, 1822.
- Mundy, G., *The servant of God: A funeral sermon, occasioned by the lamented death of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Madras: Preached at the mission chapel, Chinsurah, on Sunday morning, April 9, 1837*, London, 1837.
- Owen, J., *An address to the Chairman of the East India Company, occasioned by Mr. Twining's letter ... on the danger of interfering in the religious opinions of the natives of India, and on the views of the ... Bible Society ...*, [3rd edition.] London, 1807.
- , *Brief strictures on the "Preface" to Observations on the present state of the East India Company*, London, 1807.
- Pearson, E., *Cautions to the hearer and reader of the Reverend Mr. Simeon's sermon entitled Evangelic and pharisaic righteousness compared*, Broxbourn, [1810].
- , *A letter, addressed to the editor of the Orthodox Churchman's Magazine, containing remarks of the Rev. Mr. Simeon's sermon, entitled, The churchman's confession*, Broxbourn, [1806].
- , *Remarks on the Reverend Mr. Simeon's Fresh cautions to the public*, Broxbourn, [1810].
- Plees, W.G., *Observations on the late protest of the Rev. the Archdeacon of Bath, and the defence of the Church Missionary Society, by the Rev. Daniel Wilson, M.A.*, London, 1818.

- [Pratt, J.], *Propaganda: Being an abstract of the designs and proceedings of the the incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts: With extracts from the annual sermons*, 2nd edition, London, 1820.
- , *Sermon preached in the chapel of Lambeth Palace, on Sunday, June 14, 1835, at the consecration of the Right Reverend Daniel Corrie, LL.D., Lord Bishop of Madras*, London, 1835.
- Pryme, G., *Counter protest of a layman in reply to the protest of Archdeacon Thomas against the formation of an association at Bath, in aid of the Church Missionary Society*, Cambridge, 1818.
- "Review of an ordination sermon by Daniel Wilson," *Christian Observer* 33 (1833), 603-21.
- "Review of pamphlets, etc., on the Peterborough Questions," *Christian Observer* 20 (1821), 160-90, 235-58, 295-316.
- "Review of A vindication of the Hindoos, by a Bengal Officer, with an appendix containing a review of remarks on the *Christian Observer*, subjoined to A reply to a letter addressed to J.S. Waring ... by Major Scott Waring," *Christian Observer* 7 (1808), 104-123.
- Scholefield, J., *An argument for a church establishment: A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on Sunday afternoon, November 24, 1833*, Cambridge, 1833.
- , *A sermon preached at the Episcopal Jews' Chapel, Cambridge Heath, Bethnal Green, on ... May 4, 1837, before the London Society for the Propagation of Christianity Amongst the Jews*, [London, 1837.]
- Scott, T., *The force of truth. The works of the Late Rev. Thomas Scott*, vol. 1, edited by J. Scott, London, 1823.
- Scott Waring, J., *A letter to the Rev. John Owen, A.M., in reply to the "Brief strictures on the preface to Observations on the present state of the East India Company": To which is added ... remarks on a note in the Christian Observer for Dec. 1807*, London, 1808.
- , *Observations on the present state of the East India Company: With prefatory remarks on the alarming intelligence lately received from Madras, as to the general disaffection prevailing amongst the natives of every rank, ...*, 4th edition, London, 1808.

Scott Waring, J., *Remarks on the Rev. Doctor Buchanan's Christian researches in Asia*, London, 1812.

[Shore, J. first Baron Teignmouth], *Considerations on the practicability, policy, and obligation of communicating to the natives of India the knowledge of Christianity: With observations on the "prefatory remarks" to a pamphlet published by Major Scott Waring*, London, 1808, [Published pseudonym, "A late resident in Bengal."]

--, *A letter to the Rev. Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., in reply to his strictures on the British and Foreign Bible Society*, London, 1810.

Sims, T., *Lay-helpers: or, A plea for the cooperation of the laity with the clergy*, London, 1831.

--, *A model of non-secular episcopacy, including reasons for the establishing of ninety-four bishoprics in England and Wales*, London, 1832.

Smith, S., "Indian Missions," *Edinburgh Review* 12 (1808), 151-81.

Stewart, J.H., *Thoughts on the importance of special prayer for the general outpouring of the Holy Spirit*, London, 1821.

Thomas, J., *An address to a meeting holden at the town-hall in the city of Bath ... for the purpose of forming a Church Missionary Society in that city ... with a protest against the establishment of such a society in Bath*, 5th edition, London, 1817, reprint, *Pamphleteer* 16 (1818), 213-23.

--, *Strictures on subjects chiefly relating to the established religion and the clergy: ... from a country clergyman*, 2nd edition, London, 1809.

Thomason, T.T., "A sermon preached at the Old Church, for the benefit of the Society, on Whitsunday, 8th May, 1819," *Second report of the Calcutta Committee of the Church Missionary Society* (1819), 1-18.

[Twining, T.], *A letter to the Chairman of the East India Company, on the danger of interfering in the religious opinions of the natives of India: and on the views of the British and Foreign Bible Society, as directed to India: By a proprietor*, London, 1807.

Vaughan, E.T., *A letter to the Rev. Edward Bickersteth, principal Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, on the lawfulness, expediency, conduct, and expectation of missions*, Leicester, 1825.

- Venn, H. [of Huddersfield], *The complete duty of man: or, A system of doctrinal and practical Christianity with prayers for families and individuals*, Select Christian authors, no. 53, with an introductory essay by the Rev. J. Brown, 1763, reprint, Glasgow, 1829.
- Venn, H. [of the CMS], *The treasure in earthen vessels: A sermon preached ... at the consecration of ... the Lord Bishop of Norwich ...: To which is appended, an historical sketch of the revival of evangelical preaching in the Church of England*, London, 1857.
- Wesley, J., *An extract of the Rev. John Wesley's journal*, 21 vols, London, 1794-1797.
- Wesley, J., *Plain account of Christian perfection*, Entire Sanctification, 1765, reprint, London, 1898.
- Whitehead, W.B., *A letter to the Reverend Daniel Wilson, A.M., ... in reply to his defence of the Church Missionary Society and in vindication of the Reverend the Archdeacon of Bath ...*, 2nd edition, Bath, 1818.
- Wickliffe, J. [Pseudonym], *Anti-apocryphal observations upon the King's College letter to Lord Teignmouth, of July, 1825, in favour of printing the Apocrypha: In a letter addressed to the ... President of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, London, [1825].
- Wilberforce, W., *A practical view of the prevailing religious system of professed Christians in the higher and middle classes in this country contrasted with real Christianity*, 1797, 6th edition, Glasgow, 1837.
- , *Speeches of William Wilberforce, Esq., on the clause in the East India Bill for promoting the religious instruction and moral improvement of the natives of the British dominions in India [in] ... June and ... July, 1813*, London, 1813.
- Wilson, D., *The apostolical commission: A sermon delivered at the cathedral church of St. John, by Daniel, Bishop of Calcutta, at an ordination holden on Sunday, January the sixth, 1833, being the feast of Epiphany*, Calcutta, 1833.
- , *A charge delivered to the clergy of the archdeaconry of Bombay ... December, 1835*, Calcutta, 1836.

- Wilson, D., *A charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Calcutta at the visitation ... July 6th, 1838*, Calcutta, 1838.
- , *A charge delivered to the clergy of the three dioceses of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, at the primary metropolitcal visitation in the autumn of the year 1842, and the spring of 1843*, London, 1843.
- , *A defence of the Church Missionary Society against the objections of the Rev. Josiah Thomas, M.A., Archdeacon of Bath*, 6th edition, London, 1818.
- , *The guilt of forbearing to deliver our British colonial slaves: A sermon*, London, 1830.
- , *Letter from the Lord Bishop of Calcutta to the Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*, [London], 1844.
- , *On the distinction of castes in India*, extract from an unidentified periodical, vol. 7, July, 1834, [493]-496.
- , "A sermon [on John 4.35-36] preached ... May 6, 1817, before the Church Missionary Society," *Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society* 5 (1817).
- , "A sermon [on Romans 11.25-27, preached 3 May 1816, on the present state and future prospects of the Jews]," *Report of the London Society for the Propagation of Christianity Amongst the Jews* 8 (1816).
- , *A sermon preached at the parish church of St. Bride, Fleet Street, on ... November 10, 1814, before the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East, on the occasion of the departure of ... missionaries to ... Africa*, London, [1814].
- , *A sermon preached before the [Prayer Book and Homily] Society, at Christ Church, Newgate Street, on Thursday, May 6, 1819*, London, 1819.
- , *Two charges delivered to the clergy in the diocese of Calcutta*, London, 1835.
- Wordsworth, C., *A letter to the Right Hon. Lord Teignmouth ... in vindication of his "Reasons for declining to become a subscriber," etc*, 1810.
- , *Reasons for declining to become a subscriber to the British and Foreign Bible Society, stated in a letter to a clergyman of the diocese of London*, 2nd edition, London, 1810.

Other Autobiographies, Memoirs, and Personal Accounts:

Bateman, J., *The life of the Right Rev. Daniel Wilson ...: With extracts from his journals and correspondence*, 2 vols., London, 1860.

Benner, G., *Memoir of Reginald Heber*, 1833.

Birks, T.R., *Memoir of the Rev. Edward Bickersteth ...*, 2nd edition, 2 vols., 1852.

Bonney, H.K., *Memoirs of the life of Thomas Fanshaw Middleton, D.D., Lord Bishop of Calcutta*, London, 1824.

Carey, E., *Memoir of William Carey ...*, London, 1836.

[Corrie, G.E., and H. Corrie, eds.], *Memoirs of the Right Rev. Daniel Corrie, first Bishop of Madras: Compiled chiefly from his letters and journals*, London, 1847.

Hanna, W., *Memoirs of the life and writings of Thomas Chalmers*, 4 vols, Edinburgh, 1850-1852.

Hawkesworth, J., *An account of the voyages, undertaken ... by Comm. Byrom, Captain Wallis, Capt. Carteret and J. Cook*, 3 vols, London, 1773.

[Heber, A.], *The life of Reginald Heber ...*, D.D., Lord Bishop of Calcutta, 2 vols., London, 1830.

Heber, R., *Narrative of a journey through the upper provinces of India, from Calcutta to Bombay, 1824-1825, (with notes upon Ceylon), an account of a journey to Madras and the southern provinces, 1826, and letters written in India*, 4th edition, 3 vols., edited by A. Heber, London, 1829.

--, *Some account of the life of Reginald Heber, D.D., Bishop of Calcutta*, London, 1829.

Hodgson, R., *The life of the Right Rev. Beilby Porteus, D.D., late bishop of London*, 2nd edition, London, 1811.

Kelly, S., ed., *The life of Mrs. Sherwood (chiefly autobiographical) with extracts from Mr. Sherwood's journal during his imprisonment in France & residence in India*, London, 1854.

- Knight, W., ed., *Memoir of the Rev. Henry Venn: The missionary secretariat of Henry Venn, B.D.*, London, 1880.
- Le Bas, C.W., *The life of the Right Rev. Thomas Fanshaw Middleton, late Lord Bishop of Calcutta*, 2 vols., London, 1831.
- Milner, M., *The life of Isaac Milner, D.D., F.R.S., Dean of Carlisle, President of Queen's College, and Prof. of Mathematics in the University of Cambridge: Comprising a portion of his correspondence and other writings hitherto unpublished*, London, 1842.
- Owen, J., *Memoir of Rev. Thomas Jones, late of Creaton, Northamptonshire*, London, 1851.
- Pearson, H., *Memoirs of the life and writings of the Rev. Claudius Buchanan, D.D., late Vice-Provost of the College of Ft. William in Bengal*, 2nd edition, 2 vols, Oxford, 1817.
- Pratt, J.H., and J. Pratt., *Memoir of the Rev. Josiah Pratt, B.D., ...*, London, 1849.
- Sargent, J., ed., *Memoir of the Rev. Henry Martyn, late fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain to the Honourable East India Company*, 4th edition, London, 1820.
- , *The life of the Rev. T.T. Thomason, M.A., late chaplain to the Honourable East India Company*, 2nd edition, London, 1834.
- Sherwood, [M.M.], *Indian orphans, a narrative of acts: Including many notices of the Rev. Henry Martyn, B.D., and of the Right Rev. Daniel Corrie, Lord Bishop of Madras, etc.*, Berwick, 1839.
- Shore, C., second Baron Teignmouth, *Memoir of the life and correspondence of John Lord Teignmouth*, 2 vols, London, 1843.
- Taylor, T., *Memoirs of the life and writings of the Right Reverend Reginald Heber, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Calcutta*, 2nd edition, London, 1835.
- Venn, H. [of the CMS], *The life and a selection of the letters of the late Rev. Henry Venn*, edited by J. Venn and H. Venn, London, 1834.
- Wilberforce, R., and S. Wilberforce, *The life of William Wilberforce*, 2nd edition, 5 vols, London, 1838.

Wilberforce, R., and S. Wilberforce, eds., *The correspondence of William Wilberforce*, 2 vols, London, 1840.

Wilberforce, S., ed., *Journals and letters of the Rev. Henry Martyn, B.D., late fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and chaplain to the Honourable East India Company*, 2 vols, London, 1837.

Other Secondary Sources [Except Journal Articles]:

Abbey, C.J., and J.H. Overton, *The English Church in the eighteenth century*, a new edition, revised and abridged, London, 1887.

Allen, W.O.B., and E. McClure, *Two hundred years: The History of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1698-1898*, London, 1898.

Baker, F., *John Wesley and the Church of England*, London, 1970.

Balleine, G.R., *A history of the evangelical party in the Church of England*, London, 1908.

Baptist Missionary Society, *The centenary volume of the Baptist Missionary Society, 1792-1892*, London, 1892.

Bearce, G.D., *British attitudes toward India, 1784-1858*, London, 1961.

Bennett, G.V., and J.D. Walsh, eds., *Essays in modern English church history: In memory of Norman Sykes*, London, 1966.

Best, G.F.A., *Temporal pillars: Queen Anne's Bounty, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and the Church of England*, Cambridge, 1964.

Bevington, M., ed., *Memoirs of James Stephen*, 1954.

Beyer, J., *Patronage and education in the East India Company civil service, 1800-1857*, University of Edinburgh, M.Litt. thesis, 1966.

Binfield, C., *So down to prayers: Studies in English Nonconformity, 1780-1920*, London, 1977.

Booty, J., "Reformers and missionaries: The Bible in eighteenth and early nineteenth century England," *Anglicanism and the Bible*, edited by F.H. Borsch, 117-42, Wilton, Conn., 1984.

- Bradley, I., *The politics of godliness: Evangelicals in Parliament, 1784-1832*, Oxford University, D. Phil. thesis, 1974.
- Brown, F.K., *Fathers of the Victorians: The age of Wilberforce*, Cambridge, 1961.
- Brown, S.J., *Thomas Chalmers and the Godly Commonwealth in Scotland*, Oxford, 1982.
- Browne, G., *The history of the British and Foreign Bible Society from its institution in 1804, to the close of its jubilee, 1854: Compiled at the request of the Jubilee Committee*, 2 vols, London, 1859.
- Buckland, C.E., ed., *Dictionary of Indian biography*, London, 1906.
- Bullock, F.W.B., *A history of training for the ministry of the Church of England in England and Wales from 598 to 1799*, St. Leonards-on-Sea, 1969.
- , *A history of training for the ministry of the Church of England in England and Wales from 1800 to 1874*, St. Leonards-on-Sea, 1955.
- Cambridge Association of the Church Missionary Society, *One hundred years: A short history of the Cambridge Association of the Church Missionary Society, 1818-1918*, Cambridge, 1918.
- Canton, W., *A history of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, 5 vols, London, 1904-1910.
- Carpenter, S.C., *Church and people, 1789-1889: A history of the Church of England from William Wilberforce to "Lux Mundi"*, London, 1933.
- , *Eighteenth century Church and people*, London, 1959.
- Chadwick, O., *The Victorian Church*, 2 vols, London, 1969-1970.
- Chalmondeley, R.H., ed., *The Heber letters, 1783-1832*, London, 1950.
- Chatterton, E., *A history of the Church of England in India since the early days of the East India Company*, London, 1924.
- Cheriyian, J.P., *The Malabar Syrians and the Church Missionary Society, 1816-1840*, Kottayam, 1935.

- Church Missionary Society, *Catalogue of the papers of the missions of the West Asia (Group 2) Committee*, vols. 1-4, catalogued by R.A. Keen, photocopy, London, 1983-7.
- , *Register of missionaries ... and native clergy from 1804 to 1904, in two parts*, printed for private circulation, no date.
- Clarke, W.K.L., *A History of the SPCK*, London, 1959.
- Cnattingius, H., *Bishops and societies: A study of Anglican colonial and missionary expansion, 1698-1850*, London, 1952.
- Collinson, P., *The Elizabethan Puritan movement*, Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1967.
- , *The religion of Protestants: The Church in English society, 1559-1625*, The Ford Lectures, 1979, Oxford, 1982.
- Cormack, P., *Wilberforce: The nation's conscience*, Basingstoke, 1983.
- Cornfold, J., ed., *The book of common prayer with historical notes*, London, [1892].
- Coupland, R., *Wilberforce*, 2nd edition, London, 1945.
- Cragg, G.R., *The church and the age of reason, 1648-1789*, London, [1966].
- , *From Puritanism to the Age of Reason: A study of changes in religious thought within the Church of England, 1660-1700*, Cambridge, 1950.
- Cross, F.L., ed., *The Oxford dictionary of the Christian Church*, London, 1957.
- Dale, R.W., *The Evangelical Revival and other sermons ...*, London, 1880.
- , *The old evangelicalism and the new*, London, 1889.
- Darton, F.J.H., ed., *The life and times of Mrs. Henry Sherwood from the diaries of Captain and Mrs. Sherwood*, London, 1910.
- Davidson, A.K., *The development and influence of the British missionary movement's attitudes towards India, 1786-1830*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1973.

- Davis, W.B., *A study of missionary policy and methods in Bengal, 1793-1905*, University of Edinburgh, Ph.D. thesis, 1942.
- de Jong, J.A., *As the waters cover the sea, Millennial expectations in the rise of Anglo-American missions, 1640-1810*, Kampen, 1970.
- Dodwell, H.H., ed., *British India, 1497-1858*, The Cambridge history of India, vol. 5, Cambridge, 1929.
- Elliott-Binns, L., *The early evangelicals: A religious and social study*, Lutterworth Library, vol. 41, London, 1953.
- , *The evangelical movement in the English Church*, The faiths: Varieties of Christian expression, edited by L.P. Jacks, London, 1928.
- Embree, A.T., *Charles Grant and British rule in India*, London, 1962.
- Ervine, W.J.C., *Doctrine and diplomacy: Some aspects of the life and thought of the Anglican evangelical clergy, 1797-1837*, Cambridge University, Ph.D. thesis, 1979.
- Evershed, W.A., *Party and patronage in the Church of England, 1800-1945: A study of patronage trusts and patronage reform*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1985.
- Every, G., *The High Church Party, 1688-1718*, London, 1956.
- Fawcett, A., *The Cambuslang Revival: Scottish evangelical revival of the eighteenth century*, London, 1971.
- Findlay, G.G., and W.W. Holdsworth, *The history of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society*, 5 vols, London, 1921-1924.
- Foster, C.I., *An errand of mercy: The evangelical united front, 1790-1837*, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1960.
- Foster, J., ed., *Alumni Oxonienses: The members of the University of Oxford, 1715-1886 ...: Being the matriculation register of the University, alphabetically arranged, revised, and annotated ...*, 4 vols., Oxford, 1887-1888.
- Furber, H., *John Company at work: A study of European expansion in India in the late eighteenth century*, Cambridge, Mass., 1948.

- Furber, H., ed., *The private record of an Indian Governor-Generalship: The correspondence of Sir John Shore, Governor-General, with Henry Dundas, President of the Board of Control, 1793-1798*, Cambridge, Mass., 1933.
- Furneaux, R., *William Wilberforce*, London, 1974.
- Gash, I.J., *An historical survey and assessment of the ecclesiastical and missionary policy of the East India Company*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1968.
- Gidney, W.T., *The history of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, from 1809-1908*, London, 1908.
- Gladstone, W.E., "The evangelical movement: its parentage, progress and issue," *Gleanings from past years*, vol. 7, 201-41, London, 1879.
- Goodall, N., *A history of the London Missionary Society, 1895-1945*, Oxford, 1954.
- Gray, A.B., *Cambridge revisited*, Cambridge, 1921.
- Green, V.H.H., *Religion at Oxford and Cambridge*, London, 1964.
- Halévy, E., *The birth of Methodism in England*, Paris, 1906, translated and edited by Bernard Semmel, Chicago, 1971.
- , *England in 1815*, A history of the English people in the nineteenth century, vol. 1, London, 1949.
- , *A history of the English people in 1815-1830*, A history of the English people in the nineteenth century, vol. 2, 1949.
- , *A history of the English people in 1830-1841*, A history of the English people in the nineteenth century, vol. 3, 1949.
- Harford, J.S., *Recollections of Wilberforce*, London, 1864.
- Hart, A.T., *The curate's lot: The story of the unbeneficed English clergy*, London, 1970.
- Hennell, M., *John Venn and the Clapham Sect*, London, 1958.
- Henriques, U., *Religious toleration in England, 1787-1833*, London, 1961.
- Henson, H.H., *The Church of England*, Cambridge, 1935.

- Hess, W.R., *The religious policy of the British East India Company, 1806-1843*, University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. thesis, 1964.
- Hinchliff, P., "The selection and training of missionaries in the early 19th century," *Studies in Church History, vol.6: The mission of the Church and the propagation of the faith*, edited by G.J. Cuming, Cambridge, 1970, 31-5.
- , "Voluntary absolutism: British missionary societies in the nineteenth century," *Studies in Church History, vol.23: Voluntary Religion*, edited by W.J. Sheils and D. Wood, Oxford and New York, 1986, 363-9.
- Hjerjle, B., *The social policy of the East India Company with regard to sati, slavery, thagi, and infanticide, 1772-1858*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1958.
- Hole, C., *The early history of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1896.
- Howse, E.M., *Saints in politics: The "Clapham Sect" and the growth of freedom*, Toronto, 1952.
- Hulbert, C.A., *A review of the origin and history of the Elland Clerical Society*, Huddersfield, 1868.
- Hyde, H.B., *Parochial annals of Bengal: Being a history of the Bengal ecclesiastical establishment of the honorable East India Company in the 17th and 18th centuries: Compiled from original sources*, published for private circulation, Calcutta, 1901.
- Ingham, K., *Reformers in India, 1793-1833: An account of the work of Christian missionaries on behalf of social reform*, Cambridge, 1956.
- Kadenge, L.T.C., *The origins and the early development of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society*, University of Aberdeen, M.Th. thesis, 1986.
- Kaye, J.W., *The administration of the East India Company: A history of Indian progress*, London, 1853.
- , *Christianity in India: An historical narrative*, London, 1859.
- Keen, R., *A survey of the archives of selected missionary societies*, [London], 1968.

- Kiernan, V., *The lords of human kind: European attitudes towards the outside world in the imperial age*, London, 1969.
- Laird, M.A., ed., *Bishop Heber in Northern India: Selection's from Heber's journal*, The European Understanding of India, Cambridge, 1971.
- , *Missionaries and education in Bengal, 1793-1837*, Oxford, 1972.
- Latourette, K.S., *The great century in Europe and the United States of America, 1800-1914*, A history of the expansion of Christianity, Zondervan CEP edition, vol. 4, Grand Rapids, 1970.
- , *The great century in Northern Africa and Asia, 1800-1914*, A history of the expansion of Christianity, Zondervan CEP edition, vol. 6, Grand Rapids, 1970.
- , *The great century in the Americas, Austral-Asia, and Africa, 1800-1914*, A history of the expansion of Christianity, Zondervan CEP edition, vol. 5, Grand Rapids, 1970.
- Lawson, A.B., *John Wesley and some Anglican evangelicals of the eighteenth century*, University of Sheffield, Ph.D. thesis, 1973.
- Lee, S., ed., *Dictionary of national biography index and epitome*, London, 1903.
- Lewis, D.M., *The evangelical mission to the British working class: A study of the growth of Anglican support for a pan-evangelical approach to evangelism, with special reference to London, 1828-1860*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1981.
- Long, J., *Handbook of Bengal missions, in connexion with the Church of England*, London, 1848, microfilm.
- Lovett, R., *The history of the London Missionary Society, 1795-1895*, London, 1899.
- Maclear, G.F., and W.W. Williams., *An introduction to the Articles of the Church of England*, London, 1896.
- Macnaghten, A., *Daniel Corrie: His family and his friends*, London, 1969.
- Madden, A.F., *The attitude of the evangelicals to the Empire and Imperial problems, 1820-1850*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1950.

- Marshman, J.C., *The life and times of Carey, Marshman, and Ward, embracing the history of the Serampore mission*, 2 vols., London, 1859.
- Martin, R.H., *The pan-evangelical impulse in Britain, 1795-1830: With special reference to four London societies*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1974.
- Mayhew, A., *Christianity and the government of India: An examination of the Christian forces at work in the administration of India and of the mutual relations of the British government and Christian missions, 1600-1920*, London, 1929.
- McKelvie, G.D., *The development of official Anglican interest in world mission, 1783-1809: with special reference to Bishop Beilby Porteus*, Aberdeen University, Ph.D. thesis, 1984.
- McNally, S.J., *The chaplains of the East India Company*, typescript, 1971, revised, 1976, held by the India Office Library and Records in London, Eur.D.847
- Meacham, S., *Henry Thornton of Clapham, 1760-1815*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1964.
- Morris, H., *Charles Grant, the friend of William Wilberforce and Henry Thornton*, London, 1898.
- , *The governor-generals of India*, 2 vols, London, 1907.
- , *The life of Charles Grant: Sometime member of Parliament for Inverness-Shire and director of the East India Company*, London, 1904.
- Moule, H.C.G., *The evangelical school in the Church of England*, 1901.
- Neill, S.C., *Anglicanism*, 3rd edition, Harmondsworth, 1965.
- , *Colonialism and Christian missions*, Foundation of the Christian mission, London, 1966.
- , *A history of Christian missions*, Harmondsworth, 1964.
- Nuttall, G.F., *The Holy Spirit in Puritan faith and experience*, Oxford, 1946.
- , *Richard Baxter*, London, 1965.

- Nuttall, G.F., *The significance of Trevecca College, 1768-1791*, Cheshunt College, Cambridge, Bicentenary Lecture Delivered at Westminster and Cheshunt Colleges, 18 May 1968, London, 1969.
- Orchard, S.C., *English evangelical eschatology, 1790-1850*, Cambridge University, Ph.D. thesis, 1969.
- Overton, J.H., *The English Church in the nineteenth century*, London, [1894].
- , *The Evangelical Revival in the eighteenth century*, 1900.
- Pascoe, C.F., *Two hundred years of the SPG: An historical account of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701-1900: Based on a digest of the Society's records*, London, 1901.
- Philips, C.H., *The East India Company, 1784-1834*, Manchester, 1940, Reprint, Manchester, 1961.
- Piggin, F.S., "Assessing nineteenth century missionary motivation: Some considerations of theory and method," *Religious motivation: Biographical and sociological problems for the church historian*, edited by D. Baker, 327-37, Studies in Church History, vol. 15, Oxford, 1978.
- , *The social background, motivation, and training of British Protestant missionaries to India, 1789-1858*, University of London, Ph.D. thesis, 1974.
- Piggin, S., *Making evangelical missionaries, 1789-1858*, Evangelicals and society from 1750, vol. 2, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, 1984.
- Piggin, S., and J. Roxborough, *The St. Andrews seven: The finest flowering of missionary zeal in Scottish history*, Edinburgh, 1985.
- Potter, S.C., *The social origins and recruitment of English Protestant missionaries in the 19th century*, University of London, Ph.D. thesis, 1974.
- Potts, E.D., *British Baptist missionaries in India, 1793-1837: The history of Serampore and its missions*, Cambridge, 1967.
- Powicke, F.M., ed., with the assistance of W.J. Harte and C. Johnson, *Handbook of British Chronology*, Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks No. 2, London, 1939.

- Pratt, J.H., ed., *Eclectic Notes: or, Notes of discussions on religious topics at the meetings of the Eclectic Society, London, during the years 1798-1814*, 2nd edition, London, 1865.
- Rennie, I.S., *Evangelicalism and English public life, 1823-1850*, Toronto University, Ph.D. thesis, 1962.
- Rooy, S.H., *The theology of missions in the Puritan tradition: A study of representative Puritans: Richard Sibbes, Richard Baxter, John Eliot, Cotton Mather, and Jonathan Edwards*, Delft, 1965.
- Rosman, D.M., *Evangelicals and culture in England, 1790-1833*, Keele University, Ph.D. thesis, 1979.
- Roxborough, W.J., *Thomas Chalmers and the mission of the Church, with special reference to the rise of the missionary movement in Scotland*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1978.
- Sandys, E.T., *One hundred and forty-five years at the Old or Mission Church, Calcutta*, Calcutta, 1916.
- Sen Gupta, K.P., *The Christian missionaries in Bengal, 1793-1833*, University of London, Ph.D. thesis, 1966.
- Shenk, W.R., *Henry Venn as missionary theorist and administrator*, University of Aberdeen, Ph.D. thesis, 1978.
- Smith, G., *Henry Martyn, saint and scholar: First modern missionary to the Mohammedans, 1781-1812*, London, 1892.
- Smyth, C.H.E., *Church and parish: Studies in church problems, illustrated from the parochial history of St. Margaret's, Westminster*, The Bishop Paddock Lectures for 1953-4, London, 1955.
- Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, *Subscription and assent to the Thirty-nine Articles*, London, 1968.
- Stanley, B., *Home support for overseas missions in early Victorian England, c. 1838-1873*, Cambridge University, Ph.D. thesis, 1979.
- Stephen, J., *Essays in ecclesiastical biography*, 2 vols, London, 1849.

- Stephen, L., and S. Lee, eds., *Dictionary of National Biography*, 63 vols, London, 1885-1900.
- Stock, E., *The history of the Church Missionary Society: Its environment, its men, and its work*, 4 vols, 1899.
- Stokes, E.T., *The English utilitarians and India*, Oxford, 1959.
- Storr, V.F., *The development of English theology in the nineteenth century, 1800-1860*, London, 1913.
- , *Freedom and tradition: A study of liberal evangelicalism*, The Burroughs Memorial Lectures (first series), London, 1940.
- Sykes, N., *Church and state in England in the XVIIIth century*, 1934.
- Ten Brink, E.L., *The CMS mission of help to the Syrian Church in Malabar, 1816-1840: A study in Protestant-Eastern Orthodox encounter*, Hartford Seminary Foundation, Ph.D. thesis, 1960.
- Thompson, D.M., *Denominationalism and Dissent, 1795-1835: A question of identity*, London, 1985.
- , *Nonconformity in the 19th century*, London, 1972.
- Thompson, E.P., *The making of the English working class*, London, 1963, reprint, London, 1988.
- Thompson, H.P., *Into all lands: The history of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*, 1951.
- , *Thomas Bray*, London, 1954.
- Tolley, C.J., *The legacy of evangelicalism in the lives and writings of certain descendants of the Clapham Sect, with special reference to biographical literature*, Oxford University, D.Phil. thesis, 1980.
- Trevelyan, G.M., *English social history: A survey of six centuries: Chaucer to Queen Victoria*, London, 1942.
- Trevelyan, G.O., *Life and letters of Lord Macaulay*, 2nd edition, 2 vols, London, 1877.

- van den Berg, J., *Constrained by Jesus' love: An enquiry into the motives of the missionary awakening in Great Britain in the period between 1698 and 1815*, Kampen, 1956.
- Venn, J.A., *Alumni Cantabrigienses: A biographical list of all known students, graduates, and holders of office at the University of Cambridge from the earliest times to 1900*, part 2, 1752-1900, 6 vols, Cambridge, 1940.
- Venn, J., *Annals of a clerical family: Being some account of the family and descendants of William Venn, Vicar of Otterton, Devon, 1600-1621*, Cambridge, 1904.
- Vickers, J., *Thomas Coke: Apostle of Methodism*, London, 1969.
- Walsh, J.D., "The origins of the Evangelical Revival," *Essays in modern English church history in memory of Norman Sykes*, edited by G.V. Bennett and J.D. Walsh, 132-62, London, 1966.
- , *The Yorkshire evangelicals in the 18th century, with special reference to Methodism*, Cambridge University, Ph.D. thesis, 1956.
- Ward, W.R., *Religion and society in England, 1790-1850*, London, 1972.
- Warren, M.A.C., "The missionary expansion of Ecclesia Anglicana," *New Testament Christianity for Africa and the world*, edited by Glasswell, M.E., and F.W. Fashole-Luke, 124-40, London, 1974.
- , *The missionary movement from Britain in modern history*, London, 1965.
- , *Social history and Christian missions*, London, 1967.
- , ed., *To apply the Gospel: Selections from the writings of Henry Venn*, Grand Rapids, 1971.
- Watt, H., *Thomas Chalmers and the Disruption*, incorporating the Chalmers Lectures for 1940-44, Edinburgh, 1943.
- Weber, M., *The sociology of religion*, translated by Ephraim Fischhoff, London, 1965.
- Wilberforce, A.M., ed., *Private papers of William Wilberforce*, London, 1897.

Willmer, H., *Evangelicalism, 1785-1835*, Hulsean Prize Essay, Cambridge University, 1962.

Winstanley, D.A., *The University of Cambridge in the eighteenth century*, Cambridge, 1922.

--, *Unreformed Cambridge: A study of certain aspects of the University in the eighteenth century*, Cambridge, 1935.

Wood, A.S., *Thomas Haweis, 1734-1820*, London, 1957.

Wordsworth, C., *Scholae academicae: Some account of the studies in the English universities in the eighteenth century*, Cambridge, 1877.

--, *Social life at the English universities in the eighteenth century*, Le Bas Prize Essay, Cambridge, 1874.

Yates, T.E., *Venn and Victorian bishops abroad: The missionary policies of Henry Venn and their repercussions upon the Anglican episcopate of the colonial period, 1841-1872*, Uppsala, 1978.

Young, Jr., H.V., *The evangelical clergy in the Church of England, 1790-1850*, Brown University, Ph.D. thesis, 1958.

Young, A., *Autobiography of Arthur Young with selections of his correspondence*, edited by M. Bentham-Edwards, London, 1898.

Journal Articles:

Beaton, D., "The Marrow of Modern Divinity and the Marrow Controversy," *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 1 (1926).

Benz, E., "Pietist and Puritan sources of early Protestant world missions: Cotton Mather and A.H. Francke," *Church History* 20, No. 2 (1950), 28-55.

Best, G.F.A., "The evangelicals and the Established Church in the early 19th century," *Journal of Theological Studies* 10, new series (1959), 63-78.

Bradley, I., "The English Sunday," *History Today* 22 (1972), 355-64.

Briggs, A., "Middle class consciousness in English politics, 1780-1846," *Past and Present* 9 (1956), 65-74.

- Brown, C.J., "Divided loyalties? The evangelicals, the Prayer Book, and the Articles," *The Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 44 (1975), 189ff.
- Cecil, R., "John Company and the evangelical influence," *History Today* 29 (1979), 441-7.
- "Church livings," *British Magazine and Monthly Register* 9 (1836), 549-50.
- Coxon, A.P.M., "Patterns of occupational recruitment: The Anglican ministry," *Sociology* 1 (1967), 73-9.
- Davidson, A.K., "Claudius Buchanan and the American missionary movement," *Occasional Bulletin from the Missionary Research Library* 22:10 (October 1971).
- Davidson, A.K., "A passage from India: Claudius Buchanan and his troublesome donation," *Aberdeen University Review* 45 (1973), 79-81.
- Fisch, J., "A pamphlet war on Christian missions in India, 1807-1809," *Journal of Asian History* 19 (1985), 22-70.
- Frykenberg, R.E., "Religion and Company Raj in South India," *Fides et Historia* 17 (1985), 6-37.
- Hinson, E.G., "William Carey and ecumenical pragmatism," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 17 (1980), 73-83.
- Hobsbawm, E.J., "The British standard of living, 1790-1850," *Economic Historical Review* 10 (1957), 46-58.
- Ingham, K., "The English evangelicals and the pilgrim tax in India, 1778-1829," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 3 (1952), 191-200.
- Kiernan, V., "Evangelicalism and the French Revolution," *Past and Present* 1 (1952), 44-56.
- Long, G.E., "India and the evangelicals," *London Quarterly and Holborn Review* 32, 6th series (1963), 140-7.
- Manor, J., "The coming of Britain's age of empire and Protestant mission theology, 1750-1839," *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 61 (1977), 38-54.

- Manson, W.M., "Mission and eschatology," *International Review of Missions* 42 (1953), 390-7.
- Martin, R.H., "The Bible Society and the French connection," *Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society* 3 (1985), 278-90.
- Meacham, S., "The evangelical inheritance," *Journal of British Studies* 3 (1963), 88-104.
- Mechie, S., "The Marrow Controversy reviewed," *Evangelical Quarterly* 22 (1950), 20-31.
- Morris, R., "Voluntary societies and British urban elites, 1780-1850: An analysis," *The Historical Journal* 26 (1983), 95-118.
- Munden, A.F., "Evangelical in the shadows: Charles Jervis of Cheltenham," *Churchman* 96 (1982), 142-50.
- Nuttall, G.F., "Northamptonshire and *The Modern Question*: A turning-point in eighteenth century Dissent," *Journal of Theological Studies* 16 (April 1965), 101-23.
- Pathak, S.M., "Attitudes of the British and American missionaries towards the growth of English education in India in the 1st three quarters of the 19th century," *Journal of Indian History* 48 (1970), 103-15.
- Piggin, F.S., "Religion and the Industrial Revolution: An analysis of E.P. Thompson's interpretation of Methodism," *University of Wollongong Historical Review* 2 (1978), 8-37.
- , "Sectarianism versus ecumenism: The impact on British churches of the missionary movement to India, c. 1800-1860," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 27 (1976), 387-402.
- Pinnington, J., "Church principles in the early years of the Church Missionary Society: The problem of the 'German' missionaries," *Journal of Theological Studies* 20, new series (1969), 523-32.
- Pollard, A., "Evangelical parish clergy, 1820-1840," *Church Quarterly Review* 159 (1958), 387-95.
- Porter, A., "'Commerce and Christianity': The rise and fall of a nineteenth century missionary slogan," *The Historical Journal* 28 (1985), 597-621.

- Potter, S.C., "The making of missionaries in the nineteenth century: Conversion and convention," *Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain* 8 (1975), 103-24.
- Rayner, K., "The home base of missions of the Church of England, 1830-1850," *Journal of Religious History* 2 (1962-1963), 29-48.
- Roberts, M.J.D., "Private patronage and the Church of England, 1800-1900," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 32 (1981), 199-223.
- Schneider, F.D., "Parliament, the East India Company, and the Calcutta bishopric," *Journal of Church and State* 16 (1974), 51-71.
- Shenk, W.R., "'T'owd trumpet': Venn of Huddersfield and Yelling," *Churchman* 93 (1979), 39-54.
- Smith, D., "Bishop Heber as an Anglo-Indian Churchman," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 42 (1973), 367-402.
- Smyth, C.H.E., "The evangelical movement in perspective," *Cambridge Historical Journal* 7 (1943), 160-74.
- Spring, D., "The Clapham Sect: Some social and political aspects," *Victorian Studies* 5 (1961), 35-48.
- Stowell, T.A., "The Elland Clerical Society," *The Churchman* 10, new series (1896), 417-26.
- Stunt, T.C.F., "John Henry Newman and the evangelicals," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 21 (1970), 65-74.
- Sugeno, F.E., "The establishmentarian ideal and the mission of the Episcopal Church," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 53 (1984), 285-92.
- Tucker, W., "Life in the Old Court, King's College, Cambridge, 1822-1825," *Etoniana* 32-35 (1923), 497-501, 513-8, 539-51.
- Vreté, M., "The restoration of the Jews in English Protestant thought, 1790-1840," *Middle Eastern Studies* 8 (1972), 3-50.
- Walls, A.F., "Missionary societies and the fortunate subversion of the Church," *Evangelical Quarterly* (88) 1988, 141-55.

Walsh, J.D., "The Magdalene evangelicals," *Church Review Quarterly* 159 (1958), 499f.

Ward, W.R., "The tithe question in England in the early 19th century," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 16 (1965), 67-81.

Wilson, H.A., "The development of evangelicalism," *Liberal evangelicalism: An Interpretation*, edited by T.G. Rogers, 1-27, London, [1923].