

1972

Pub And Parish--the Beginnings Of Temperance Reform In The Church Of England, 1835-1875

Gerald Wayne Olsen

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/digitizedtheses>

Recommended Citation

Olsen, Gerald Wayne, "Pub And Parish--the Beginnings Of Temperance Reform In The Church Of England, 1835-1875" (1972). *Digitized Theses*. 573.
<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/digitizedtheses/573>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Digitized Special Collections at Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Digitized Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact tadam@uwo.ca, wlsadmin@uwo.ca.

The author of this thesis has granted The University of Western Ontario a non-exclusive license to reproduce and distribute copies of this thesis to users of Western Libraries. Copyright remains with the author.

Electronic theses and dissertations available in The University of Western Ontario's institutional repository (Scholarship@Western) are solely for the purpose of private study and research. They may not be copied or reproduced, except as permitted by copyright laws, without written authority of the copyright owner. Any commercial use or publication is strictly prohibited.

The original copyright license attesting to these terms and signed by the author of this thesis may be found in the original print version of the thesis, held by Western Libraries.

The thesis approval page signed by the examining committee may also be found in the original print version of the thesis held in Western Libraries.

Please contact Western Libraries for further information:

E-mail: libadmin@uwo.ca

Telephone: (519) 661-2111 Ext. 84796

Web site: <http://www.lib.uwo.ca/>

PUB AND PARISH --
THE BEGINNINGS OF TEMPERANCE REFORM
IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,
1835 - 1875

by
Gerald Wayne Olsen
Department of History

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Graduate Studies
The University of Western Ontario
London, Canada
December 1971

© Gerald Wayne Olsen 1971

ABSTRACT

The Church of England Total Abstinence Society was founded in 1862 by Evangelical teetotal clergymen who feared that industrial society was upsetting the traditional balance between parish and pub as community centres. The Church teetotal society, which from 1864 to 1873 was called the Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, represented its founders' attempts to reclaim working-class parishioners from the pub, the symbol of their social and ideological disorientation. This declaration of war by the parish against the pub had often been suggested to clergymen by workingmen.

Evangelical clergymen who endorsed teetotalism frequently had to overcome fears that in accepting a movement which was largely working-class and deeply-rooted in liberal philosophy they might threaten the customary downward direction of their philanthropy and the traditional upward thrust of their teleology. By theologizing teetotalism, Evangelicals reasserted their own social leadership and the primacy of spiritual practices and aims. Evangelical teetotalism, however, retained much of its secular legacy and was at the centre

of clerical attempts to combine Christian and liberal principles in order to attract and reform potential working-class parishioners. The latter, once reformed, continued to influence in some ways the conduct of parish teetotal societies.

Evangelical teetotalers, as had the workingmen who led them to the movement, tried to win support from their own ecclesiastical and social superiors. Promoters of the Church teetotal society not only resolved to convert the Church to teetotal principles, but at the same time to save it from disestablishment. They argued, after years of co-operating with Nonconformists in anti-drink movements, that the Church's continuing social utility could be demonstrated if its resources were used in an inter-denominational campaign against intemperance.

After 1869, important prelates, including Archbishops A.C. Tait of Canterbury and William Thomson of York, took their argument seriously. They were encouraged to do so by the conjunction in the first Gladstone ministry of the drink question with that of Irish disestablishment. Important Anglicans, however, still proved unwilling to stop drinking in order to qualify for membership in the Church teetotal society. Chastened by their past failures to win the Church to teetotal principles, ignored by an 1869 Convocation of Canterbury Committee on intemperance and threatened by a rival Anglican temperance organization, the

clerical abstainers finally endorsed the Church of England Temperance Society which was founded in 1873 with sections for both teetotalers and non-abstainers. They thereby made possible establishment of the most prestigious temperance organization to date and one of the most extensive religious social agencies of late Victorian Britain. The C.E.T.S. won official approval from both the Anglican Establishment and the Crown and initiated important social agencies, including the Police Court Mission which pioneered the modern British probation system.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Although it is unfortunately impossible to acknowledge all those who somehow contributed to this thesis, the following must be especially thanked.

Professor A.V. Tucker, formerly of the University of Western Ontario and now Principal of Glendon College, York University, has accorded me insight and patient understanding well beyond a supervisor's normal obligations. Dr. Brian Harrison, now of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, first advised me to concentrate my attention on the Anglican branch of the temperance movement and for years has given me the benefit of his belief in "scholarly free trade". Professors F.A. Dreyer, Patrick Kyba, Murray Elliott, Elwood Jones and Carman Miller also gave useful suggestions.

I am grateful to Rev. J. Benson Harrison of the Church of England Temperance Society for his many generous favours especially for donating to the University of Western Ontario Libraries extensive records of Anglican temperance work. Many C.E.T.S. supporters throughout England gave me greatly appreciated aid. I hope they will not think my thesis has treated their organization unfairly. The staff at Church House, Westminster, including Miss Jean Murchison, helped

make enjoyable as well as productive my sixteen months of research there. T. Garth Waite of the United Kingdom Alliance provided needed data. The Lord Bishop of Chester, Walter Ellison, Esq. and Randall Ellison, Esq. made available information about their grandfather, Henry Ellison chairman of Anglican temperance organizations from 1862 to 1891.

Librarians on both sides of the Atlantic cheerfully rendered me their indispensable services. His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury and the staff at the Lambeth Palace Library merit special acknowledgement. William Urry, Keeper of Manuscripts at Canterbury Cathedral, was remarkably helpful as were Messrs. H.M.G. Baillie and Richard Storey of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, and personnel at the British Museum, the Institute of Historical Research, the Public Record Office, the Church House Library and the Goldsmiths' Library, University of London. I am indebted to Mr. John Macpherson, Miss Lillian Benson, Dr. Margaret Banks and others at the University of Western Ontario Libraries and to librarians at the University of Michigan, Wayne State University, the Detroit Public Library, the University of Windsor, the University of Toronto, the Toronto Public Library and the National Library of Canada.

Administrators of the Queen Elizabeth II (Ontario) Scholarships, the Canada Council, the Province of Ontario Graduate Fellowships and the University of Western Ontario

Fellowships made this thesis financially possible and I thank them.

I have benefitted from the typing skills of the staff at "In-sten", Mrs. Flora Moore and Mrs. Janet Fleming.

Inge (Rumler) Olsen has, as librarian, proof-reader and wife, helped and inspired me to an extent impossible to express here.

None of the above is in any way responsible for any errors or omissions in style or content. These are entirely my own contribution.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Certificate of Examination	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION--PUB AND PARISH	1
CHAPTER I - NOTES	17
CHAPTER II - WORKINGMEN, TEETOTALERS AND CLERICS, 1835-1855	19
CHAPTER II - NOTES	68
CHAPTER III - THE GROWTH OF EVANGELICAL TEETOTALISM, 1855-1862	76
CHAPTER III - NOTES	126
CHAPTER IV - THE THEORY OF EVANGELICAL TEETOTALISM, 1855-1873	135
CHAPTER IV - NOTES	173
CHAPTER V - THE CHURCH TEETOTAL SOCIETY AND THE NONCONFORMISTS, 1857-1869	179
CHAPTER V - NOTES	230
CHAPTER VI - CLERICAL ABSTAINERS AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1862-1872	240
CHAPTER VI - NOTES	276

	page
CHAPTER VII - TEMPERANCE AND THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY, 1868-1872	285
CHAPTER VII - NOTES	310
CHAPTER VIII - FROM PARISH TO PALACE: THE PARLIA- MENTARY DRINK QUESTION AND THE FOR- MATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TEM- PERANCE SOCIETY, 1869-1875	315
CHAPTER VIII - NOTES	338
CHAPTER IX - EPILOGUE, SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS ...	345
CHAPTER IX - NOTES	388
BIBLIOGRAPHY	397
APPENDICES	420
Appendix A - Map Showing the Location of Clerical Abstainers in England and Wales in 1864	420
Appendix B - The Positions Held by Teetotal Clerics in the English and Welsh Dioceses in 1864	424
Appendix C - Distribution of Teetotal Clerics in 1864 as Compared with Strength of Anglican Church in Proportion to Other Denominations and to Total Population, as well as with Rate of Population Increase.	427
Appendix D - Changes in the Number of Teetotal Clerics in England and Wales from 1864 to 1872 - According to Dioceses	429

	page
Appendix E - Outline of Main Proposals for Licensing Legislation in 1871-1872	431
Appendix F - Social Agencies of two C.E.T.S. Diocesan Branches in 1883	436
VITA	438

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION -- PUB AND PARISH

In May, 1862 over fifty Anglican teetotal clergymen gathered at the London Coffee House, Ludgate Hill, to declare war on the pub.¹ The following October, a committee which had been appointed at that meeting announced formation of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society.² Although its name was changed in 1864 to the Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, the organization continued until 1873 to represent the single-minded attack of teetotal clerics on the drinking habits of both Church and nation. In 1873, a reconstituted Church of England Temperance Society permitted for the first time full membership to non-abstainers as well as to teetotalers. Before then the Church teetotal society, as the association may be conveniently called from 1862 to 1873, demanded from its members strict total abstinence.

The Church teetotal society represented the attempts of clerical abstainers to co-ordinate their local efforts and to extend the struggle of the parish against the pub throughout England and Wales. The teetotal clergy often described the pub as competing with the parish for their people's allegiance.

Sometimes the publicans were seen waging direct and

deliberate competition. A correspondent to the Convocation of York Committee on Intemperance wrote about 1871 that a large number of young women brought up in Sunday-schools were being bribed to sing hymns and anthems at pub doors on Sundays.³ Another from an unnamed large town sent the Committee an advertisement used to lure the faithful from the parish to the pub: "Wanted, Sunday scholars with good voices to sing sacred music on Sunday evenings. Liberal payments will be given."⁴ Usually, however, the publican's influence was described more indirectly. A man who had been drinking to a late hour on Saturday night, even if he had not been drunk, was not much inclined for public worship the next morning. As one clerical abstainer wrote, "The working man who spends his evening in the tap-room is beyond the reach of the clergy and Scripture Reader" ⁵

The publican himself was sometimes regarded as the minister's rival. Thomas Richardson, a London parish clergyman and an official of the Church teetotal society, found that publicans refused to see him, his District Visitors and his Scripture Readers. On the rare occasions they attended church, publicans hurried from the service to go back behind the bar. In Richardson's experience, publicans neither supported parish charities nor taught Sunday-school. He described "the whole tendency" of the liquor trade as "immoral" and damaging to both the spiritual and temporal

welfare of his parishioners.

Parochially speaking, I am convinced that every public-house, beer-shop and gin-palace, is an open opponent to my spiritual work and could these houses be closed, my people would be more happy, better clothed, and the Ragged School needless....⁶

The declaration of war by the parish on the pub represented something more than rhetoric. It resulted from clerical fears that the balance between those two traditional centres of English community life was being upset in favour of the pub. Both the parish and the pub had had long histories as community centres. The mediaeval village usually had no other places where residents could meet in common and this situation continued virtually unchanged until the Industrial Revolution.

The pub had been frequently used for the administration of public duties and as the social centre for various public and voluntary organizations. W. Branch Johnson has searched Hertfordshire records for examples of community life exercised in inns.⁷ His findings no doubt indicate practices which existed in pubs or inns all over England. The Oath of Allegiance demanded by George I's act of 1722 was administered at pubs. Local collectors of taxes and other public monies used pubs when submitting receipts to higher officials. Inquests were often held in pubs and Quarter Sessions, Petty Sessions, the annual dinners of Corporations, official inquiries of various sorts and other public meetings were sometimes held there. There were even instances of pubs

being used as schools. The local pub often provided a stage for theatre, a forum for public discussion and meeting-rooms for voluntary organizations: theatrical touring companies almost invariably used the assembly rooms of pubs or the barns behind them for their performances; political meetings were held there, current controversial subjects discussed and protests formulated; and various voluntary clubs also met in the pub.

Despite the heavy concentration of community activities in the pub, the parish probably exerted a more formative influence on pre-industrial England. Like the pub, it afforded rural England a centre for many social and civic functions. The parish also performed the more fundamental purposes of both reflecting and defining the ethos of the rural community. It provided the rural Englishman with a creed which gave his life meaning by directing it towards a more important future life, and offered him a liturgy which resembled in its regularity and connection with the seasons the rhythm of rural life itself.

Local government was connected with the parish much more intimately than with the pub. Judicial sessions, or inquests or civic social functions might be held in the pub, but this was primarily for the convenience of accommodation. The administration by the parish, however, of such civic functions as superintending poor relief and providing for the upkeep of roads, bridges, prisons, the parish fabric and other

installations of common concern reflected an organic institutional connection between the ecclesiastical and the secular in pre-industrial England. The parish was, according to the Webbs,

a many-sided instrument by which the National Government and the Established Church sought to arrange for the due performance of such collective regulations and common services as were deemed necessary to the welfare of the State.⁸

The vestry might retire to the pub for dinner and drinks after a meeting, but the very name of that unit of local administration revealed its intimate connection with the parish. Although there were isolated instances of schools being held in pubs, their more usual location was near the parish church.

The parish was the real centre of rural life in great part because parochial activities were closely tuned to the rhythm of the rural setting. The agricultural worker, like his forefathers, followed a pattern of life which was relatively predictable, both in the long-range and from day to day. Barring plagues, floods, famines and poor markets, his life could be as consistent as the seasons which determined when his duties should be performed. The religious life of the parish church reflected this rural rhythm with a liturgy closely related to the seasons and with ceremonies to mark the special occasions of birth, marriage and death.

The Industrial Revolution did much to weaken the parish's hold on English life. Industrialized society was too complex to continue its dependence on archaic parochial administrative machinery; internal migration produced serious problems in accommodating potential worshippers; new ways of life often made the liturgical and social character of the parish seem obsolete; and gaps left by the failure of the parish to adapt fully to the new society were being partially filled by Nonconformity and various kinds of secularistic allegiance. A fuller discussion of these causes for the decline in parochial influence may help determine the reasons why Anglican clerics thought teetotalism could help reverse this decline.

With the coming of the Industrial Revolution the parish lost many of the civic responsibilities which it had previously performed. Administrative reformers, inspired by an irreverent but efficient Benthamite influence, gladly replaced the creaky parochial machinery of local administration with new secularized organs such as the Poor Law Unions, which were established in 1834. As the Webbs have written:

it is not too much to say that, with the passing of the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 and the successful 'passive resistance' to the levying of the Church Rate, the parish, as a unit of local government in the England outside the Metropolitan area, came virtually to an end.⁹

But the declining importance of parochial administration, although symptomatic of a changing society, did not preclude the possibility of the Church adapting itself liturgically

and socially in ways which would attract the personal commitment of the industrial classes.

One difficulty obstructing such adaptation was the problem of church accommodation in quickly growing industrial centres. Internal migration changed the demographic concentration of England so that expanding cities had too few churches to serve a vastly increased population.¹⁰ As the various exponents and executors of church building programmes were to find, however, the absence of workers from parish activities could not be solved simply by building new churches.

The most fundamental reason for declining parochial influence was that the parish church had not sufficiently adapted itself to the transition from rural to industrial life. Once the rural migrant settled in the industrial town, not only his mode of working changed, but the whole rhythm of his life. The relative predictability of rural life had given way to uncertainty. The industrial worker could foresee less confidently how long he was going to work or if he was going to work at all. The Manchester economists claimed to see patterns in economic life, but the workings of raw nature were probably simpler to divine for a rural migrant than the workings of natural economic law: it was easier to adjust one's living pattern to the seasons than to the vagaries of supply and demand.

The parish church, with its prayers for a good harvest

and its liturgy based on the seasons, must have reminded the new town dweller of a past rhythm of life, now no longer relevant. This is not to say that religion could have no appeal to the industrial worker, but that the kind of religion which had degenerated into an automatic cycle of liturgical observance often suited him no longer.

Those Anglican parishes which were successful in attracting workingmen appealed to the immediacy of their condition. The appeal could be liturgical or doctrinal. The Evangelical who emphasized the special act of conversion which would ensure salvation or the Ritualist who dramatically emphasized a liturgical ceremony as a special occurrence could both evoke immediate responses in the workingman. Conversion and flamboyant ritualistic experiences were to be felt with deep emotion immediately and could be appreciated by workingmen whose experiences of good and bad times, of employment and unemployment, of high and low wages had become all too immediate. The appeal could also come from some kind of social programme which directly met the special difficulties that workingmen found in the industrial town. In such ways, the parish could adjust itself to the new rhythm of industrial life. The frequent alienation of workingmen from the parishes of industrial centres showed, however, that this adjustment was far from universal.

Churchmen were alarmed to find that workingmen were often attracted by Nonconformists, especially Methodists,

and by rational secularists of various sorts. The workingman in industrial England who ignored the Anglican church had three possible choices of commitment. At one extreme were the conservative Nonconformists, most notably the Wesleyan Methodists, who told the workingman to forget the pains of living in sub-human industrial conditions and to concentrate on preparation for the next life while he received some immediate emotional satisfaction from vigorous preaching of the gospel. He was to do nothing, however, to upset the social balance of this life. At the other extreme, the workingman could reject religion altogether and associate with some secularist movement which might suggest a number of wide-ranging answers to his social predicament from self-help to revolution. A third possibility, a middle ground, was advocated by Radical Nonconformists, particularly Primitive Methodists, who offered workingmen both assurance of salvation and the possibility of pursuing radical goals. The Census of 1851 showed that many in the industrial towns had chosen either the conservative extreme or the middle ground, both of which implied allegiance to Nonconformity.¹¹ The popularity of various radical movements in the 'thirties and 'forties indicated that a good number of workingmen had chosen the other extreme.

To say that many workingmen had become Nonconformists and that others had associated with radical movements does not fully account for the disposition of the industrial classes. The Census of 1851 showed that of 12,549,326

people, who were calculated as able to attend services, 5,288,294 did not.¹² Recognizing the difficulty radical working-class movements had in attracting consistent support it is improbable that all of the latter were permanently committed to such causes. More likely, a good number of workingmen were uncommitted to any positive system of thought which gave form or meaning to their lives. Some no doubt were entirely and most at least partially suffering from what has been described in another context as severe conditions of social or ideological disorientation.¹³ The values which had given meaning to their lives in the rural setting, as formulated by the parish church, and the social relationships through which these values were expressed had now become irrelevant or at least partially lost and until they found replacements for them workingmen might lead lonely, meaningless lives.

Growth in the pub's influence could be regarded as symptomatic of these severe states of disorientation. Ignoring the necessity of learning new spending patterns suitable to industrial society, workingmen often spent surplus income which was unfamiliarly high in good times on drink just as they had spent their lesser surplus income in the country. Greater living stress in the demographically more concentrated urban centres probably led many workers to seek the negative solace of intoxication. The personal loneliness of their newly-uprooted lives must have sent many to the pub in search of personal relationships. It is not even surprising that many organizations of a positive character,

such as benefit societies, tended to gather in pubs since they were the meeting places for the disoriented, those who most needed the security such organizations offered. These reasons for the increased importance of the pub in an expanding industrial society should now be more closely examined.

Peter Mathias has blamed the increased drinking of industrial society on the rural migrant's failure to adjust his spending habits to new economic patterns.¹⁴ The rural worker had suffered comparatively less fluctuation of income and enjoyed little economic surplus. He had developed habits of expenditure suitable to a relatively consistent income at the subsistence level. The little money which he managed to accumulate at infrequent times of surplus was quickly and riotously spent in leisure and drink. This habit of spending extra money on enjoyment was carried by the internal migrant from the country to the industrial town. His pattern of expenditure, however, did not correspond to the new, often unstable, economic cycles which now determined his income. Good times meant good money; bad times unemployment or at least lower wages. The worker ideally should have saved the surplus income which he earned in periods of prosperity to cushion the effect of bad times, but too frequently, he continued the accustomed habit of quickly spending extra money on enjoyment, particularly on drink. Because in good times surplus income was greater than the new industrial worker had enjoyed in the country, his consumption of alcohol

increased. Publicans seemed to have had less reluctance than parish clergymen to build new establishments for the increased industrial population. The growing number of pubs became refuges for disoriented people trying to drown their sorrows.

Many conditions in the new industrial society, to use General Booth's expression, made workers desirous of seeking their own Lethe. Confronted with long tedious work often performed under inhuman conditions, the worker cannot be too severely blamed for seeking alcoholic solace in his non-working hours. Poor houses, dismal and overcrowded, must have helped drive him from his home to the pub. Long and tedious work and overcrowded and inadequate housing were of course not introduced by the Industrial Revolution: they had certainly been present in the country. But there was probably less significance attached to the home in industrial society than there had been in rural communities and, consequently, a greater desire to escape to the pub. The rural home had been the centre of agricultural or manufacturing activities; in new industrial areas it frequently became only a depressing place where one ate and slept and reproduced to whatever extent these human functions were allowed. The higher density of urban misery must have made it even more onerous and more often provoked visits to the pubs. The common absence of pure water and safe milk and the limited choice of other drinks also made the pub more attractive in early industrial

centres.¹⁵

The industrial worker had to contend as well with greater personal anonymity and loneliness. Relatives and family friends of generations' standing were now either at distant farm homes or dispersed here and there all over the new industrial map. New friends had to be made and partners for either short or long-term intimacy had to be found. Unaccustomed loneliness must have driven many rural migrants to seek the camaraderie of the town pub.

When special organizations were devised to alleviate the disorientation from which workingmen suffered by institutionalized appeals to solidarity, friendship, self help, social insurance, or thrift, they often developed around the pub. Trade unions, friendly societies, benefit societies, such as sick and burial societies, and even thrift societies used to meet in the pub.¹⁶ They were sometimes organized by publicans themselves, apparently as a combination of public service and a clever means of deriving extra revenue in fees and increased business. In some places it was customary for their publicans to collect rental fees for the use of their premises and they sometimes took a percentage of benefit society funds. More usually, publicans expected members of various workingclass organizations to consume the products of their trade. In at least one place, the amount of beer which had to be drunk in an evening was specified, which led to a clergyman's complaint that if only a small number

of club members appeared they were urged to drink the greater volume of beer which had been put aside for the larger number.¹⁷ Ironically, public-house mutual assistance clubs sometimes went bankrupt owing to the tempting possibilities of squandering funds in their meeting-places.¹⁸

Although pubs had often served as meeting-places for organizations in pre-industrial England, there had probably never been before such an intimate connection between the pubs and the associations which met there. Traditionally, groups had used pubs for the convenience of accommodation. The pub in the industrial town, as a centre of ideological or social disorientation, was a natural breeding-ground for organizations which might help relieve confused new workingmen. For severe disorientation, in addition to producing in its sufferers the immediate effect of "apathy and complete detachment", also produces "anxiety and readiness to do something, to do anything."¹⁹ Positive responses to disorientation could be expressed in various forms of Nonconformity or secularism. Or if there was no positive response, disorientation would still prevail. In either case, the parish church would have surrendered the function which it had in pre-industrial England of reflecting and determining the community ethos.

In the context just outlined, the parish clergyman had two alternatives. He could go to the pub as the centre of disorientation and attempt in dialogue with its patrons to

form a new Christian ethos which more clearly met the changed needs of an industrial society; or he could attack the pub which represented to him the alienation of workingmen from the parish. The former choice, which would have produced a more sanctified version of the traditional ale-drinking parson, had few proponents. One was Canon Francis W. Harper who initiated such a movement in his parish at Selby. Harper believed that the clergyman should join with the publican in a common attempt to christianize parish inhabitants. In a controversial sermon, he preached at York Cathedral in 1877, Harper maintained that publicans should "at once give public invitation to the clergy of their several parishes to come as welcome visitors to their smoke-rooms and other public rooms at whatever hours these rooms are open" and that clergymen should accept the invitation.²⁰

After 1876 another clergyman, as Norman Longmate has shown, even went so far as to manage a pub which had been left in his care.²¹ By then, however, most Anglican ministers who saw the problem of declining parochial influence in terms of the relationship between pub and parish had adopted the second alternative. They somewhat naively attempted to reclaim the disoriented by rescuing them from the centre of their disorientation. That they met with considerable success in this attempt poses an interesting line of historical enquiry. Teetotalism, according to the invitation sent clergymen for the 1862 London Coffee House Conference, had

opened a "door of usefulness" to Anglican ministers "among many who have long been beyond our reach."²²

NOTES

CHAPTER I

¹See "Church of England Conference on Temperance", Weekly Record of the Temperance Movement, No. 319 (10 May, 1862), pp. 163-165.

²The formation and development of the Church teetotal society are discussed in chapters five and six.

³Convocation of York, Lower House, Report by The Committee on Intemperance, (Manchester, 1873), p. 10.

⁴Loc. cit.

⁵Rev. John Colbourne, in Rev. Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, (London, 1867), no. 8, p. 43.

⁶Thomas Richardson, "Parochial Temperance Societies, A Paper read at the meeting of the Rural Deanery of Limehouse", in Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. I (August 1864), 249.

⁷"The Inn as a Community Centre," Amateur Historian, II (April-May, 1955), 134-137. The information in the following paragraph is derived mainly from Johnson's article. Johnson wrote specifically about inns, but for consistency of style, I have substituted the word pub. One of the definitions of public house which includes in its meaning the word inn. See J.A. Murray et. al., eds., The Oxford English Dictionary, V, 1560.

⁸Sidney and Beatrice Webb, The Parish and The County, Vol. 1 of English Local Government (London, 1963), p. 40.

⁹Ibid., p. 172.

¹⁰See Desmond Bowen, The Idea of the Victorian Church, A Study of the Church of England 1833-1889 (Montreal, 1968), p. 14.

¹¹K.S. Inglis, "Patterns of Religious Worship in England and Wales", Journal of Ecclesiastical History, XI (April, 1960), 74-86.

¹²Ibid., 78-79.

¹³Zevedei Barbu, Democracy and Dictatorship: Their Psychology and Patterns of Life (New York, 1956), pp. 124-130. Barbu was describing the psychological attitudes of German converts to National Socialism. I have tried to find English equivalents for his terms, anomie and meinungschaos.

¹⁴"The Brewing Industry, Temperance and Politics", The Historical Journal, Vol. 1 (no. 2, 1958), 97-114. The following paragraph is based on his article.

¹⁵Brian Harrison, Drink and the Victorians The Temperance Question In England 1815-1872 (London, 1971), pp. 37-39.

¹⁶See Convocation of Canterbury, Lower House, Report by the Committee on Intemperance (London, 1869), pp. 34-36.

¹⁷Convocation of York, Lower House, Report by the Committee on Intemperance, p. 6.

¹⁸Loc. cit.

¹⁹Zevedei Barbu, Democracy and Dictatorship, p. 126.

²⁰Letter from Canon Harper, in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, V (1 October, 1877), 155.

²¹The Waterdrinkers (London, 1968), p. 234. The clergyman was Osbert Mourdant of Hampton Lucy, Warwicks.

²²"Proposed Conference of Clergymen of the Church of England", Weekly Record of the Temperance Movement, no. 318 (3 May, 1862), p. 150.

CHAPTER II

WORKINGMEN, TEETOTALERS AND CLERICS, 1835-1855

I

The declaration of war by the parish against the pub in the mid-thirties could be easily dismissed as a clerical attempt to win the allegiance of the working classes with minimum effort. It could be regarded as a regression to the puritanism of the seventeenth century or as simply an extension of regular pastoral condemnations of drunkenness rather than as a progressive realization of working-class needs and an attempt to do something to meet them. With contemporary hindsight, Anglican teetotalism may seem to have been a tyrannical imposition of overly strict Christian moral principles on an unwilling working class.

In order to prove such an interpretation, it would have to be shown that Anglican teetotalism was derived primarily from the Anglican pastoral tradition, that because of this, Anglican clerics easily accepted total abstinence and that in the relationship between the clergy and working-class teetotalers, the latter were reluctantly converted to total abstinence by the former.

The purpose of this chapter will be to examine these questions by treating the teetotal movement in the context of the wider temperance movement and by discussing the reaction of Anglican clerics to teetotalism. It will be argued that, in contrast to the moderate temperance movement, the teetotal movement raised many difficulties, the most important of which were social and theological, which helped to prevent most Anglican clergymen from approving teetotalism in its early phase.

There were, in fact, two temperance movements in nineteenth-century England. The first, which employed the word temperance in its original meaning of moderation in alcoholic consumption was transplanted from the United States to England during the years from 1826 to 1830 and was adopted by moderate reformers throughout the century.¹ The most important difference between the first temperance movement and earlier traditional attempts to preach moderation was that for the first time intemperance had been singled out as a special evil which required special organizations to combat it. Whereas previously intemperance had been the object of pastoral concern along with the full range of vices, the temperance movement made it the object of specialized and organized interest. The temperance movement in its second and more modern sense, implying teetotalism or total abstinence, is usually said to have begun in 1832 when seven men signed a teetotal pledge in Preston.²

The superficial distinction between the two movements

concerning the question of moderation or total abstinence masked more fundamental differences. These involved the relationship of each to the mainstream of Anglican pastoral work, their varying social and metaphysical positions and their different degrees of acceptance in the Church.

II

Precedents in Anglican pastoral work for the first temperance movement are easily found. Condemnation of drunkenness, one of the seven deadly sins, often occurred wherever Christianity and excessive drinking happened to coincide. Nineteenth-century temperance enthusiasts were fond of reviving homilies from the past both to inspire and supplement their own ever-growing corpus of anti-drink material and to establish a Christian pedigree for their movement. The puritanism of the seventeenth century and the eighteenth-century reaction to the flood of spirits to English gin lanes made these two centuries particularly rich in temperance sermons. A suggestion which was probably not unusual in the history of the Anglican Church was made by Bishop Thomas Wilson of the Isle of Man in a 1744 letter to his clergy in which he warned them of the large quantities of spiritous liquors which were being imported to the island.

I hope every clergyman in the diocese will take this occasion in Sunday evening's catechetical lectures to exhort both young and old of the danger of coming within the Borders of this destructive [sic] Poyson [sic], as they value the health of their bodys [sic], or the salvation of their souls.³

There were several characteristics of Bishop Wilson's traditional pastoral appeal which made it compatible with the character of the nineteenth-century moderation movement. Distilled beverages were singled out for a special attack. The emphasis was on influence from above: clergymen were paternalistically to ensure that their flock were not harmed by the imported liquors. And the reason for the appeal was to avoid particular impediments to physical and spiritual health. Wilson made no ambitious promises that any social or spiritual utopias would result from such abstinence.

A description of the British and Foreign Temperance Society, which epitomized many qualities of the early moderation society, will reveal its connection with this traditional pastoral approach. The British and Foreign Temperance Society, which resulted from the re-organization on 27 July, 1831, of the London Temperance Society founded the previous year, displayed an attitude similar to Bishop Wilson's in its special condemnation of distilled beverages. Their pledge simply stated: "We agree to abstain from distilled spirits, except for medicinal purposes, and to discountenance the causes and practices of intemperance".⁴ There was no mention of abstinence from beer or wine, an apparent acceptance of the common opinion that the distress caused by drinking should be attributed to artificially-distilled drinks of foreign origin rather than to naturally-fermented beverages, such as beer, supported by a hearty and

healthy English tradition; and wine, sanctioned by the dinner tables of the influential. Nor were members of the British and Foreign Temperance Society prohibited from offering their guests their favorite refreshment or from drinking distilled beverages themselves, for medicinal purposes.

The British and Foreign Temperance Society also displayed the customary attitude of influence from above. Aristocrats and prominent gentlemen headed a membership roll which also included representative middle-class temperance reformers and the usual complement of ladies and Quakers who supported such societies. The beneficiaries of temperance reform were to be the working classes, but the control or direction of the movement was firmly in the hands of the more illustrious notables at the head of the membership rolls. The latter were expected to advance the temperance reformation by sermons and personal example and by contributing generously to finance the educational work of the Society. This largely implied the wide-spread distribution of tracts to the working classes. In 1835 it was reported that 3,832,800 temperance tracts had been distributed since the founding of the Society and that in 1835 half a million had been printed in London alone.⁵

Heavy reliance on the distribution of tracts emphasized that the well-heeled patrons of the British and Foreign Temperance Society were trying to extend their influence across the chasm which separated them from the working

classes without directly doing anything to eliminate that chasm. There was nothing more intimate involved in the relationship between the distributor of a tract and its recipient than an assumption on the part of the former that he is privy to some kind of superior knowledge of which the latter would be well-advised to avail himself. The distribution of tracts implied a kind of moral superiority which to patrons of the British and Foreign Temperance Society complemented their assurances of their own social superiority. Temperance of this sort implied no promises of social utopia. The spirit of the British and Foreign Temperance Society was more in keeping with the traditional pastoral approach to drunkenness--the elimination of immediate impediments to physical and spiritual health--than with the far-reaching ambitions of the teetotalers.

Consequently, the British and Foreign Temperance Society had no difficulty attracting a number of high-ranking Anglican prelates. During the first two years of the Society's operation, it became customary for bishops to serve as chairmen or speakers at its meetings. Bishops Charles Blomfield of London, Henry Ryder of Lichfield, Charles Richard Sumner of Winchester and James Henry Monk of Gloucester most frequently performed one or the other of these functions.⁶ Although there were some prominent Nonconformist supporters of the British and Foreign Temperance Society, the organization seems to have been primarily a product of the Anglican establishment. As if in recognition

of this in 1837, the young Queen made the movement even more respectable by granting it her patronage.⁷

The teetotal movement can be contrasted in every important respect with the moderation movement. Not only did the newer movement prohibit all drinking, but it was unrelated to the mainstream of Anglican pastoral attitudes towards drinking; by concentrating its efforts on working-class self-help it threatened the traditional Evangelical reliance on reform from above; it implied metaphysical assumptions which contradicted traditional Christian teleology and it attracted few prominent supporters.

III

The English teetotal movement is usually said to have begun at Preston in 1832 when Joseph Livesey, a self-made cheesemonger and advocate of most liberal reform measures, joined with six other Preston temperance enthusiasts in a pledge totally to abstain from all alcoholic beverages.⁸ The pledge-taking by the seven men of Preston was regarded by early total abstinence advocates as a kind of symbolic rite which initiated the true creed of the temperance movement--the complete personal rejection of all kinds of alcoholic drinks except for medicinal purposes.⁹ By 1839, the ban had been extended to include alcoholic beverages taken medicinally and those offered as refreshment to guests.¹⁰

There seems to have been little connection between the rise of teetotalism and traditional Anglican pastoral

attitudes toward drunkenness. If there had existed in traditional Anglican pastoral theology a bias against drink sufficient in force to account for the spread of teetotalism in the 'thirties and 'forties, it surely would have been reflected in one or both of the great Anglican renewal movements of that time. In fact, teetotalism cannot be attributed to the mainstreams of either Evangelical or Oxford Anglicanism.

Prior to the initiation of teetotal societies in 1832, the most celebrated and influential Anglicans were the Evangelicals at Clapham and Cambridge. Either of these two Evangelical centres might have spawned teetotalism. Puritanism and pastoral concern which had been the immediate inspiration for campaigns against drunkenness in the past were clearly present among the followers of Wilberforce and Simeon and theoretically these strains might have caused the transformation of temperance into total abstinence. They did not.

Evangelicals of the Clapham Sect seldom let excessive pleasure interfere with their temporal or eternal destinies and they tried to transmit the same discipline to their immediate and more remote charges. William Wilberforce used to complain of the vanity of the many dinner parties he had to attend or give. He would not go to the theatre and tried to avoid playing cards.¹¹ Hannah More, the energetic and maternalistic Clapham spinster, warned the girls of Cheddar that dancing might lead to dishonour.¹² Yet drink was

accepted among members of the Clapham Sect as one of the ordinaries of life, worthy of no special condemnation. Wilberforce was known to forget to eat his chicken and to drink his wine because he was too preoccupied with higher things, but there is no evidence that he found the wine any less worthy of consumption than the chicken.¹³ He resolved, in 1823, that he would no longer offer claret to his guests, not because he was opposed to the drinking of claret, but because claret at that time was too expensive, and he wanted to devote more money to charitable concerns.¹⁴ Presumably, Wilberforce continued to offer less expensive wines to his guests.

That drinking was no special taboo in the Wilberforce circle is illustrated by a letter from Wilberforce's friend, the clerk of parliament, George Rose, who quite openly admitted

I have actually been drunk ever since ten o'clock this morning, and have not quite the use of my reason, but I am

Yours most faithfully and cordially,
George Rose.¹⁵

There is no record of how Wilberforce reacted to Rose's admission. No doubt Wilberforce did not find the sin of drunkenness as amusing as Rose had anticipated, but that Rose felt free to write in such a way at least indicates that he was not violating a principle about which Wilberforce was especially sensitive.

Wilberforce was quite concerned about the moral and spiritual welfare of his son, Sam, when he was a student at

Oxford. He wrote him long letters inquiring about the state of his soul and warning him especially of the morally fatal consequences of the sin of impurity, but he had no objection to Sam gathering after dinner with his friends in the college rooms to eat fruit and drink wine.¹⁶ There was to be no excessive drinking or undue waste of time and Sam was to avoid undergraduates who were likely to speak obscenely or profanely. But he could attend these gatherings, lest by absenting himself he might open himself to "the charge of moroseness or any other evil imputation".¹⁷

Hannah More was not above imbibing even a little excessively to obtain more important results. She complained that on one of her excursions, undertaken to win support from local notables for her projected Sunday-schools, she had to tame the insolence of too many "petty tyrants", praise too many "ugly children", commend too much cider and swallow too much wine.¹⁸ She does not appear to have been concerned about the danger of setting a bad example by her drinking. Indeed, as a matter of economy, Hannah and her sister Patty taught the housewives of Somerset how to brew their own beer.¹⁹

Wine was not even denied to young ladies of the Clapham Sect. Marianne, the twenty-year-old daughter of Henry Thomson, the wealthy banker and Evangelical philanthropist, on a trip to the Low Countries with her Uncle in 1817, commemorated the battle of Waterloo by sitting on the Duke's chair and drinking the Duke's wine which, she wrote to her

Aunt "is capital [and] only 2 francs a bottle even now".²⁰

The wine drinking continued throughout that day and was the indirect cause of Marianne's party being late arriving at the Forest of Soignies "as", Marianne explained to her aunt

one of our horses came down three times, owing to the bon vin de Vellinton as I rather suspect, wh[ich] we had given to our Postillon, desiring him to drink to the Health of our Duke [and] his Prince, I told him not to forget poor Louis dixhuit, he laughed [and] said il ne vaut pas la peine, so he had another Glass to encourage him in such good sentiments.²¹

The other branch of Evangelicals, at Cambridge, was not known for principles of total abstinence either. A friend of the Rev. Charles Simeon remembered his hospitality as being so liberal that he "was like one coming forth from Canaan well laden with grapes for his own refreshment, and for that of all his brethren". Simeon used to justify his splendid hospitality by remembering that Jesus had turned the water at the marriage feast into the very best wine and that He often used to bless by his presence many a well-laden table.²²

Some opponents of both Oxford Anglicanism and of teetotalism saw a connection between the two movements partly, perhaps, because they arose at the same time and more importantly because their opponents attributed the denial implicit in teetotalism to the same asceticism which they condemned in the Oxford Movement.²³ The charge was unfair. Although the catholic revival associated with Oxford Anglicanism frequently tended towards asceticism,

this spawned no discernible movement towards teetotalism. Ascetic principles might lead an Oxford Anglican to deny himself alcoholic beverages temporarily for a particular penitential purpose. For example, in 1846, Edward Pusey proposed for the approval of his reluctant confessor, John Keble, a prescription of penance for himself which included the wearing of a hair shirt and the use of uncomfortable furniture, as well as abstinence from beer and wine, to the extent that his physician would allow.²⁴ This self-inflicted penitential regime, although it included virtual abstinence from alcoholic drink, did not imply a general condemnation of alcohol. It was part of a specific programme of expiation from sin adopted by Pusey to relieve the guilt he had felt since his wife's death six years before.²⁵ Penance to be effective required abstinence from something which was generally considered good. And Pusey's reservation that he would abstain, according to his doctor's advice, revealed a respect for alcohol as a medical necessity.

Others in the Oxford Movement also displayed considerable respect for drink. John Newman in his Evangelical youth disapproved of the theatre, but was considered the best judge of wine at Oriel even though he would not tolerate drinking to excess.²⁶ His attitudes in these matters did not change after his conversion to Oxford Anglicanism: he still shunned the theatre as an unnecessary amusement, but could still identify "the most delicious wine". Even

Hurrell Froude, perhaps the most ascetic of the early Oxford Anglicans, when he was not fasting for reasons of penance or illness, could enjoy a good bottle of wine.²⁷

Not only did teetotalism not grow out of either Evangelical or Oxford Anglicanism, it seemed to contradict the social and religious conservatism implicit in both. Although the theological emphases of Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic were quite different, both factions agreed on the necessity of resisting both the social and metaphysical implications of liberalism. The Evangelical and the Anglo-Catholic might arrive at their social conservatism by different routes--the former emphasizing the leading role which had to be taken by authorities in church and state to effect by their example a moral reformation, the latter relying on a sacramental view of hierarchical authority. Both found, however, that God had designed a stratified society and that in recognition of this the proper direction for reforming influences was from top to bottom. Both also shared the proposition that owing to the damaging effects of original sin human nature was corrupt. Because they differed in their conception of the individual's relationship to God and the Church, Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals had different spiritual formulas for relief from this spiritual corruption. They nonetheless, agreed that because of man's inherent tendency towards evil human perfection in a worldly sense was impossible; and together they condemned the liberal humanitarians for their worldly optimism.

The early teetotalers seemed to challenge both the religious and social conservatism which prevailed in the Church by promising that an earthly utopia would result from the elimination of drink and by entrusting the task of achieving this end to the working classes themselves.

Socially, the development of teetotalism represented a rejection by workingmen of reform from above and a resolution to make themselves sober in their own way. Teetotalism was considered with some justification by both its proponents and enemies to be a working-class movement. Henry J. Ellison, then the Vicar of Windsor, who was later to lead the Church temperance effort, said at the 1862 Church Congress at Oxford that teetotalism as a remedy for drunkenness had been "struck out first by the chief sufferers, the working classes themselves".²⁸ Ellison's observation was supported by many others including American teetotalers who found that their frequent missionary efforts in Britain on behalf of teetotalism had usually been met with enthusiasm by the working classes and with hostility or indifference by the "influential classes". Neal Dow, the sometime governor of the sometime prohibitionist state of Maine, writing of his several forays to Britain recalled that "One of the most gratifying of my experiences in Great Britain was the manifestation of the friendliness on the part of the working people for the temperance movement".²⁹

On at least one occasion, Dow made use of this strong working-class sentiment in favour of teetotalism to silence

opposition from higher quarters. At his last meeting in 1857 at the Manchester Free Trade Hall, Dow was interrupted by the hissing of a nobleman on the platform with him who claimed that gin palaces were permitted because workers wanted them. Dow, addressing the working-class audience, asked them: "Working men of England I am told that you want, you demand, you will have the publicans. Tell me is this so?" According to Dow's account, the audience answered with a resounding "No!" which ended the hisses.³⁰

Dow most certainly exaggerated the degree to which the workingmen of England accepted the teetotal answer to their problems. Teetotalism was only one of the solutions available to workingmen to provide relief from the disorientation which they felt in the face of an advancing and often unfamiliar industrial society. To the large number of disorientated who presumably allowed themselves to stay in that state, teetotalism must have represented a threat to the alcoholic solace which they felt they needed. It would be mistaken, however, to characterize all working-class opponents of teetotalism in this way. Some workingmen conscientiously opposed teetotalism because they thought the movement would distract the energies of their class from what they regarded as surer means to improvement. Feargus O'Connor was no friend of working-class intemperance, but he wrote articles in the Northern Star on 13 March and 3 April, 1841, warning against a plan to establish teetotal chartist organizations. He was afraid that the proposal would

fragment the chartist movement, diverting its adherents from their true course and justifying the possibility that only teetotal workingmen might be given the franchise.³¹

In any case, whether they co-operated for conscientious reasons or not, there was always a generous supply of workingmen available to the drink interests, the radical anti-teetotalers or political opportunists to protest any infringement on their right to drink. This opposition was expressed in a variety of ways. Before the Reform Bill of 1867 gave workingmen a parliamentary channel to express opposition, their protests took the form of abusing teetotal advocates as they spoke or of rioting against legislative restrictions on drinking. One of the best examples of the latter were the 1855 Hyde Park Sunday Trading Riots, against recent temperance and sabbatarian legislation, which Marx over-sanguinely regarded as the beginning of the English Revolution.³² After 1867, anti-teetotal feeling among workingmen was exploited by various political groups. The encouragement by some Conservatives of working-class antipathy to Liberal licensing legislation gave some credence to R.C.K. Ensor's somewhat exaggerated observation that after the early 'seventies public-houses became Conservative Committee rooms.³³ Similar use was made of anti-teetotal feeling among the working classes by such groups as Lord Bramwell's Liberty and Property Defence League, who in the last third of the nineteenth century were as critical as the Tories of Liberal licensing proposals.³⁴

The lack of unanimity among workingmen on the teetotal question cannot obscure the fact that teetotalism originated and was developed primarily by men of the working class. Brian Harrison's research into the origins of teetotalism has shown that in addition to Joseph Livesey, the cheese-monger, the "Seven men of Preston" who in 1832 initiated the English teetotal movement included a carder, a clogger, a roller-maker, a plasterer, a shoe-maker and a tailor.³⁵

Three years after their pledge-taking, Livesey and his supporters, many of whom were workingmen, had succeeded in spreading the teetotal movement throughout the north of England, to London, and to the Midlands.³⁶ Livesey was helped to do this by men like Thomas Swindlehurst, "king of the Preston drunkards"; John Cassell, the Manchester carpenter who was later to build a publishing fortune on teetotal literature; "Dicky" Turner, a fish hawkker who had introduced the word teetotal to the movement in 1832; Joseph Leicester, a Warrington glass-blower; John Hockings, a Birmingham blacksmith and Thomas Whittaker, a Blackburn cotton mill worker. Some Nonconformist ministers also co-operated with Livesey in his teetotal apostolate, including the Rev. Francis Beardsley, a pioneer in the sale of unfermented communion wine and Rev. Joseph Barker of Chester, then a Methodist of the New Connexion. There were also some professional men and others of the middle class in Livesey's teetotal campaign, such as the physicians R.B. Grindrod, from near Runcorn, Cheshire and later of Manchester,

Thomas Beaumont of Bradford and John Higginbottom of Nottingham, and the lawyer F.R. Lees, as well as a number of prominent Friends, including John Cadbury, and some business men and industrialists.

Apart from the few influential supporters of teetotalism in the early period, P.T. Winskill remembered that the usual teetotal advocates could be seen "wearing moleskin or cord trousers, and their toes peeping through the fronts of their boots", or could be heard "making music as they walked with the soles and iron-tipped heels of their clogs".³⁷ Working-class teetotalers arrived in town advertising their mission "with a spring rattle, an old drum, or a handbell and a small flag over their shoulders. . . ." ³⁸

The radicalization of the temperance movement, represented by the shift from moderation to teetotalism, reflected a broader transformation of English social relations in the 'thirties and 'forties. The temperance movement became socially more radical as working-class movements in general became more radical. There were parallels in the development of the temperance movement and that of better known political movements both in the character of their adherents and the nature of their aims. The ad hoc alignment between men of the upper, middle and working classes which produced the Reform Bill of 1832 had its equivalent in the connection between supporters of the British and Foreign Temperance Society which, in 1832, was at the peak of its influence. The essential moderation of the reform bill agitation and

the control and direction from above of popular impulses also paralleled the character of the British and Foreign Temperance Society. Working-class disillusionment both with vertical social alliances and with moderation in demands, which expressed itself in chartism, had its counterpart in the rejection by workingmen of the socially-stratified British and Foreign Temperance Society and its "moderate" pledge in favour of their own quasi-independent teetotal movement. Indeed, in some instances, the chartist and teetotal movements merged in the teetotal chartist movement.

Even before teetotal chartist societies were instituted in 1841, however, chartist leaders had taken a peculiar working-class approach to the temperance question. William Lovett's interest in temperance predated the development of teetotalism; nonetheless his attitude towards temperance in the early period already contradicted some prejudices of the respectable moderationists. In sharp contrast with the sabbatarian bias of many moderationists, Lovett, in an 1829 petition to open on Sundays the British Museum and other places of exhibition, claimed that sabbath drunkenness among the working classes stemmed more from "a desire of participating in agreeable pastime than from a love of drink".³⁹ His solution to the drink problem, in contrast to the more negative approaches of the early moderationists was,

That if useful knowledge was extensively disseminated among the industrious classes, if they were encouraged to admire the beauties of nature, to cultivate a taste for the arts and sciences, to seek for rational instruction and amusement, it would soon be found that their vicious habits would yield to more rational pursuits . . .;⁴⁰

Lovett later more fully emphasized temperance in his crusade for working-class equality. By 1836, he was convinced that drunkenness among workingmen was one of the most serious obstacles to their progress, as it left them open to the bribes and treating of political candidates who exploited them and left them "to croak over their grievances with maudlin brains, and to form and strengthen their appetites for drink amid the fumes of the tap-room".⁴¹ So he and the other founders of the London Working Men's Association, in an effort to create for workingmen a more respectable image and to lessen the possibilities of their being the drunken victims of corrupt governors, resolved to bar from the association "the drunken and immoral" in favour of a "close compact with the honest, sober, moral, and thinking portion of our brethren".⁴²

The possibilities of using teetotalism as a weapon in the working-class struggle for equality were realized by Henry Vincent who more than anyone else linked the chartist and the teetotal movements. As soon as possible after his imprisonment in August 1839, Vincent had written a temperance address to the workingmen of England with the observation that "No Government can long withstand the just claims of a people who have the courage to conquer their own vices".⁴³

Soon after his release from prison, in 1841, he repeated his plea for working-class sobriety, while sharing a platform with Father Mathew, the Irish temperance apostle who was then conducting a rather successful teetotal campaign in England.⁴⁴ Vincent also published an Address to the Workingmen of England, Scotland and Wales in which he asked them "to form themselves into Chartist Teetotal societies in every city, town and village".⁴⁵ He was supported in his plan for teetotal chartism by Joseph Barker, who in the same year was expelled by officials of the Methodist New Connexion partly because they were irked with his teetotal principles; by Thomas Cooper; and by the Rev. William Hill, the editor of the Chartist Circular. Chartist teetotal societies sprang up quickly at the beginning of 1841, particularly in the north of England and in London.⁴⁶

The purposes of the chartist teetotal societies represented a continuation and development of Lovett's plan to press teetotalism into the service of those seeking working-class liberty. Teetotal chartism incorporated into its aims Lovett's desires to improve the image of the working-man by making him more sober and at the same time to lessen the possibility that he might be exploited by his governors. Additionally, in 1841, teetotal chartists wanted to deprive the government treasury of excise taxes levied on alcoholic drinks to force government misrule to a halt.⁴⁷

The analogy between teetotalism and chartism is entirely appropriate only in the case of the teetotal chartists. The

attitudes of teetotalers in the mainstream of the movement, men who saw in teetotalism the primary solution to England's social problems, differed in two important respects from those of the teetotal chartists. Mainstream teetotalers saw the drink problem as the key both to the understanding and the solution of social problems: if drink were eliminated most of society's ills would vanish. For the teetotal chartist, teetotalism was primarily an auxiliary in promoting the real chartist end, extension of political rights for the working class. Whereas the mainstream teetotaler had a substantial interest in teetotalism, the chartist had more a tactical interest. Consequently, when serious questions were raised as to the efficacy of employing teetotalism as an aid in gaining a workingman's franchise, as O'Connor did in March and April 1841, chartist interest in teetotalism began to decline. Shortly after O'Connor expressed his fear that if chartists insisted on working-class sobriety they might fragment the chartist movement and might furthermore justify the possibility that the franchise would be granted only to temperate workingmen, there were no reports of new chartist teetotal societies.⁴⁸ The second fundamental difference between chartist and mainstream teetotal societies involved their varying approach to class relations. The teetotal chartists used teetotalism as one of the weapons in their class struggle. Mainstream teetotalers, however, actively sought the support of their social superiors for a national temperance reformation.

The associations which working-class teetotalers most commonly used in this attempt to extend their movement upwards were the national teetotal organizations which by 1835 had developed in Manchester and London. From the beginning, working-class teetotalers in Manchester and London tried without sacrificing any of their teetotal principles to attract to their movement the kind of influential support which the moderates had enjoyed. The dual character of this goal was shown in the 1835 resolution adopted by the Manchester-based British Temperance Association.

That the dreadful effects of intemperance throughout the kingdom are such as to render it incumbent upon all classes to unite in promoting a temperance reformation; and for effecting this object this Conference recommends that in future all Temperance Societies should be formed on the principle of abstinence from all intoxicating beverages.⁴⁹

Similar attitudes were displayed by London teetotalers in 1836 when, in an obvious bid to capture the support of moderates for the teetotal movement, they changed the name of the organization they had founded the previous year to the "New British and Foreign Temperance Society for the Suppression of Intemperance".⁵⁰

However until the establishment of the Church of England Temperance Society in 1873, the influential people who supported the socially hierarchical British and Foreign Temperance Society generally stayed away from the new national teetotal organizations. Some remained with the British and Foreign Temperance Society, but as the teetotalers

became more militant that Society became increasingly irrelevant. By 1848, it had virtually disappeared and within the next two years was disbanded altogether.⁵¹ The British Temperance Association and the New British and Foreign Temperance Society managed to nonetheless attract a considerable number of middle-class supporters. The desire to see a sober working class was after all attractive to efficient employers who complained about loss of man-hours, owing to the drunkenness of the labourers, and to the puritanical Nonconformist whose sense of propriety was offended at the drunken excesses of the lower orders.

Despite their more substantial commitment to teetotalism and their greater willingness to co-operate in anti-drink movements with men from other classes, mainstream teetotalers resembled chartists in insisting on the right to determine the manner in which workingmen would achieve sobriety. Any support which working-class teetotalers received from outside their ranks was accepted only on their own terms. At the root of the teetotal movement was the determination of its working-class proponents to make themselves sober in strict conformity with uncompromising teetotal principles. As anxious as they were to attract support in this goal from other classes, they would tolerate no weakening of these principles.

This observation is supported by the behaviour of teetotalers in the so-called long and short pledge controversy.⁵² In 1839, at the annual meeting of the New British

and Foreign Temperance Society, militant teetotalers succeeded in making a condition of membership in the Society subscription to the "Long" or "American" pledge which prohibited members from taking alcoholic beverages as medicine or offering them to their guests. Some of the more refined teetotalers, including the Earl of Stanhope who had become associated with the teetotal movement in 1831, frightened of possible damages to their health and their hospitality, insisted on retaining the "Short" pledge which demanded only personal abstinence. Earl Stanhope finally led the supporters of the "Short" pledge into a new schismatic organization which allowed freedom of hospitality also and, as its name indicated, the use of alcoholic beverages medicinally and sacramentally: it was called "The British and Foreign Society for the Suppression of Intemperance on the Principle of Abstinence from all Intoxicating Liquors, except Medicinally or in a Religious Ordinance". The schism lasted until 1843 when the financial strain of maintaining rival teetotal organizations necessitated some kind of reunion. The reunion was effected only on the terms of the militant working-class teetotalers who insisted on retention of the "Long" pledge. Earl Stanhope and other prominent supporters of the schismatic group consequently left the organization and ceased to have any connection with the teetotal movement. A similar degree of intransigence, with equally divisive effects was displayed by northern militant working-class supporters of the long

pledge in the British Temperance Association.

Socially, then, when teetotalism was not being employed in the Chartist manner as a weapon in a class war, it was being used by mainstream working-class teetotalers as the unshifting basis for a self-directed campaign to make themselves sober and to influence their social superiors. In either case, working-class teetotalers represented an attempt to reverse the traditional downward direction of Evangelical reforming influences.

In addition to differences in social orientation between the temperance and teetotal movements, there were significant differences in their metaphysical foundations. The underlying attitude toward temperance of the British and Foreign Temperance Society did not differ fundamentally from the earlier Christian pastoral approach. In Bishop Wilson's words, temperance was preached to heavy drinkers to protect ". . . the health of their bodys [sic], or the salvation of their souls". Immediate physical and spiritual impediments would be removed to prevent further harm. There was nothing inconsistent in such an approach with the teleological orientation of Christianity: there was no suggestion that perfection could be found anywhere but in the next world. This, however, was not true of the teetotal appeal which was based on metaphysical assumptions more in line with eighteenth-century rational humanitarianism than with traditional Christianity. Implicit in the teetotal appeal were the assumptions that society could be perfected and social evil

eradicated if only drink were eliminated. These assumptions were at distinct variance with Evangelical beliefs that man had a pronounced tendency towards evil, that social distress was the result of sin, that Christ's salvation was the only remedy for the human predicament and that perfection was impossible in this life.

IV

The enthusiastic support given by the Anglican Establishment to the British and Foreign Temperance Society in the 'thirties and 'forties was withheld from the teetotal societies. According to a founder of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society, the teetotal movement "came to be, in fact, the only philanthropic movement that was represented in every town, and almost in every parish, but without the sympathy or co-operation of the parish clergyman".⁵³ Only 5% of the teetotal ministers counted by the London Temperance Intelligencer in 1837 were Anglicans; and only 4% of the 566 participants at the 1848 Manchester ministerial temperance conference.⁵⁴ Bishop Edward Stanley of Norwich was the only Anglican prelate who regularly appeared on teetotal platforms in the 'forties. On one occasion in 1843 Stanley welcomed to England Father Mathew and thereby simultaneously outraged opponents of both Catholicism and teetotalism.⁵⁵ Stanley, however, was not himself an abstainer and teetotalism was only one of several advanced causes he supported.⁵⁶

The few Anglican teetotal societies in the 'thirties and

'forties reflected the often isolated efforts of quite ordinary clergymen at the local level. Canon James Bardsley claimed at the Church of England Temperance Society annual meeting in 1872 that he had established the first Church of England Total Abstinence Society about twenty-six years before (1846), while he was a young curate at Burnley, Lancashire.⁵⁷ However, P.T. Winskill in his temperance history gives that credit to Joseph Livesey's friend, the physician R.B. Grindrod, who in 1835 founded an Anglican teetotal society at his own parish of St. Paul's in Manchester.⁵⁸ The first Anglican teetotal societies founded by clergymen were established in 1836 in Willsden by the Vicar, the Rev. J. Barker who severed his connection with the British and Foreign Temperance Society, and in the Isle of Man by the Rev. Thomas Caine who had taken the pledge a year earlier.⁵⁹ The Rev. Fielding Ould of Christ Church, Liverpool established the first recorded parochial teetotal society there in 1837, and in 1840 the first parochial teetotal society in metropolitan London was instituted by a minister at St. John's Church, Southwark.⁶⁰ The first known English clergyman to advocate total abstinence in the Empire was Archdeacon H. Jeffreys, who preached teetotalism "as early as 1834 while on a tour of inspection in Australia".⁶¹ Having been posted in India as Archdeacon of Bombay shortly afterwards, he worked particularly among the army stationed there, as a patron of the Bombay Temperance Union and a vice-president of the National Temperance Society.⁶²

Rev. W.W. Robinson the author of a rather widely distributed pamphlet, A Clergyman's Reasons for Teetotalism, was converted to total abstinence about 1841 and worked with a parochial temperance society in Yeovil.⁶³ Rev. Henry Moule, a divine and inventor who wrote on sanitary science, gardening and religious topics, became a teetotaler at an early date, probably in the late 'thirties.⁶⁴ Rev. Thomas Spencer, the uncle of his more famous namesake, broke from the British and Foreign Temperance Society in 1839, became a pledged abstainer and established a teetotal society at his parish of Hinton Charterhouse.⁶⁵ He was later secretary of the National Temperance Society and editor of the National Temperance Chronicle. Rev. Spencer Thornton, a country cousin of the Thorntons of Clapham, established a parish teetotal society at Wendover, Bucks., in 1841 and five years later persuaded twelve local publicans to close their businesses on Sunday mornings.⁶⁶ There were other early clerical supporters of the teetotal movement, including J. Lupton from near London, P. Penson of Durham and Theodore Dury of Keighley; but contemporary accounts indicate there were not many.⁶⁷ There was even a national Church of England Total Abstinence Society founded in London on 19 January, 1841, but there is no evidence that it survived beyond that year.⁶⁸

In summary, the different responses of Anglican clerics in the 'thirties and 'forties to the two temperance movements indicated more than simply their divergent attitudes toward

drink. They also revealed something of their disposition on metaphysical and social questions. The novelty of the first temperance movement was only that it was an organized and specialized extension of what had long been a pastoral concern. An Anglican cleric could espouse the moderation movement without changing his attitudes, not only toward drink itself, but concerning the social composition of England and the teleological orientation of Christianity. The first temperance movement emphasized the common English mistrust of distilled beverages and the traditional Christian emphasis on moderate drinking; it also exemplified the customary Anglo-Christian method of moral-social reform through influences which went from the top to the bottom of the social pyramid; and it made no exaggerated promises of the earthly millenium which might result from a sober England. Teetotalism, by contrast, not only challenged the Englishman's right to a glass of beer and the traditional Christian emphasis on moderation, but it was seen as a threat both to the English social structure and the theological and metaphysical foundations on which Anglican beliefs were thought to rest.

Anglican clerics who became total abstainers, in few numbers before 1855 and later in ever-increasing numbers, had first to overcome their own objections to teetotalism. The most serious of these usually involved either the relationship between teetotalism and religion or between working-class teetotalers and their clerical social superiors.

Additionally, the Anglican clergyman had to consider the possibilities of other effects which he knew or imagined might result from his embracing the teetotal movement. These could include: social ostracism, the withdrawal from his church of financial support from the liquor trade, fears for his health, and the possible charge that he was being disloyal to the Church by co-operating in what was considered by some to be an essentially Nonconformist movement. These penalties were no doubt sufficiently serious to keep some temporarily or permanently from the total abstinence cause.

There was a strong social pressure for the clergyman to drink, yet he could exercise only limited influence in the teetotal movement if he did not quit drinking. Pioneer teetotal parsons were fond of remembering in later years the social persecution which they felt they had suffered because of their total abstinence. William Caine, who followed his brother Thomas into teetotalism in 1836 at the age of eleven or twelve, could recount a long history of being hounded for his teetotal principles.⁶⁹ When he was sixteen, he entered a large boarding-school. For the next three years, in addition to achieving several academic distinctions, he devoted himself to teetotal proselytism among the older boys. Because of this, he had to suffer their jibes, particularly when he tried to reform the son of an unnamed "eminent clergyman". Caine continued to earn scholastic distinction and the sneers of other students

during nine years of study and teaching at Trinity College, Dublin, from 1845 to 1854. In 1855, after he had been ordained priest, he became curate in a rich Manchester suburban parish. Caine lasted at this post only two years, after which he felt obligated to resign because of the base treatment which he thought he suffered as a result of his teetotal principles. For the next seventeen years, Caine was without a parish. Apart from two years, from 1868 - 1869, when he was chaplain of New Bailey Prison in Salford, he had to support himself by tutoring students as he travelled the teetotal lecture circuit and worked for such organizations as the prohibitionist United Kingdom Alliance and the Church of England teetotal society. He did not return to parochial work until 1872.

If a teetotal cleric were to survive in his post, he risked the withdrawal of financial support from the distillers, brewers and publicans in his congregation. When the Rev. Fielding Ould established the first Anglican teetotal society in Liverpool, he was punished by the prominent liquor vendors in his congregation who withdrew their support from his church.⁷⁰

Anglican clergymen were also dissuaded from the teetotal movement by common medical myths of their day that alcohol was not only necessary to treat disease, but was essential on a daily basis to preserve health. Drink was considered especially necessary for those, like ministers, who were engaged primarily in mental work. Before he became

a total abstainer, Henry Moule believed that without two glasses of wine, he could not get through his Sunday duties.⁷¹ Another clergyman, from near Manchester, wrote that shortly after his ordination in 1832 he was advised by an "excellent clergyman",

You must get your warden to let you have a bottle of wine in the vestry, and when you go to change your surplice for your gown, always take a glass, I always do so, and have done for years, couldn't get through without it.

Unfortunately, the young man had been appointed minister to a poor country village and could only afford a glass of wine after dinner and some home-brew with dinner and supper.⁷² Because of medical myths, teetotalers sometimes found it difficult to obtain life insurance or had to pay higher premiums.⁷³

Finally, some Anglican clerics transferred much of their ill will towards Nonconformists to the teetotal movement which they closely associated with Nonconformity. W.W. Robinson, writing of his own opposition to the teetotal movement in Yeovil before he became a teetotaler, recalled: "Without a particle of evidence, I believed it to be a political movement, supported only by Dissenters, and properly ignored by the respectable portion of the community".⁷⁴ Another Anglican clergyman wrote in 1866,

It has always been a puzzle to me why the agents of a professed Church Temperance Society should, when going about the country, fraternize with Dissenters and slap the parochial clergyman in the face, by coming uninvited into his parish and working for those who are trying to overthrow the church.⁷⁵

The reasons just outlined for the general Anglican aloofness towards the teetotal movement must be qualified. Threats of social ostracism could cause the abstaining cleric some discomfort, but the parishioners' resistance to teetotalism was not always unanimous. There was often countervailing pressure on the clergyman, which increased as time passed, to adopt teetotal principles. There was even some sympathy in Caine's rich Manchester parish for his teetotal work. After a year as curate there, Caine was given a testimonial by some who were sympathetic to the movement, as a mark of their "'gratitude, affection and esteem'".⁷⁶ In parishes where there were more workingmen, as will be shown in the next chapter, many of those clergymen who were to lead the Church teetotal campaign found this pressure irresistible and were converted to total abstinence because of it.

The fear of losing financial support from the liquor interests was effective only in those parishes where the resources of the drink industry were concentrated and where there was some hope of the parish church attracting its share. Furthermore, since the question of the parish clergyman's attitude toward teetotalism was linked in some minds with the wider question of the Church's relationship to the working classes, if he remained aloof from the movement he might provide evidence for those attacking the Anglican Church's claim to public funds on the grounds that it was neglecting its social duties. The anti-teetotal

cleric, then, in order to save the publican's penny might risk the public pound.

Medical prejudices against teetotalism, admittedly, kept some clergymen from adopting total abstinence principles. As will be shown in the next chapter, however, the medical profession was somewhat divided on the question. Teetotalism developed at the same time as medical research into the effects of alcohol on health; and teetotal missionaries were often well-armed with the results of this research. They could usually convince those whom they managed to convert on other grounds that their health would be better without the bottle. As the teetotal movement progressed, special life insurance policies were made available to teetotalers, sometimes at lower rates of premium.⁷⁷

Many Anglican clergymen might understandably avoid a movement which they associated with individual Nonconformists in a period when churchmen were still smarting from the disestablishment of ten Anglican bishoprics in Ireland and when Nonconformist attacks on Anglican prerogatives, concerning tithes, education and marriage and burial rites seemed to threaten an attack on the entire position of the Established Church. The connection of Nonconformists with early teetotalism nonetheless constituted only a partial reason for the initial alienation of Anglican clergymen from the movement. In chapter five, it will be shown that soon after the Church of England Total Abstinence Society was formed in 1862, its promoters argued that Anglican

clergymen could, by co-operating with Nonconformists in anti-drink movements, demonstrate the social utility of the Church and thereby thwart current movements toward disestablishment. Some of the experiences on which this proposition was based can be traced to the early teetotal movement. Soon after he became a teetotaler, W.W. Robinson overcame his dislike for Nonconformists sufficiently to persuade the local Independent, Baptist, Wesleyan and Quaker ministers to quit drinking. Robinson found, as other Anglican clerics did, that a by-product of the ministers' common teetotalism was greater inter-denominational harmony: ". . . it was very refreshing at the monthly tea-table at the Vicarage, to see the union of five denominations, harmoniously combining their efforts against the common foe--strong drink. . . ."78 By 1869, such instances of ecumenical co-operation for the sake of a sober nation had convinced even the highest prelates that greater Anglican involvement in the teetotal movement might in fact help save the Church from those who would disestablish it.79

Although many individual Nonconformists were associated with early teetotalism most Nonconformist official bodies at first refused to sanction the movement for many of the same reasons which troubled the Anglican Establishment. A recent apologist for the Nonconformists has found it "curious how slow, and late, they were in measuring the social evil of which Drink was the main cause. Nor did well

known Free Church ministers and politicians initiate the attack on the Drink Trade".⁸⁰ The historical relationship of official Nonconformity with teetotalism generally supports this observation. Officially, most Nonconformist denominations were even slower than the Anglican Church in giving the teetotal movement their blessings. The Church of England Temperance Society, organized in 1873 as the first officially-approved Anglican anti-drink association, had been preceded by teetotal groups instituted by some of the radical Methodist splinter groups, such as the Primitive Methodists, the Free Methodists, the Bible Christians and the Methodist New Connexion. The majority of the more conservative Nonconformists, however,--the Baptists, the Congregationalists and the Wesleyan Methodists--did not formally sanction teetotal societies until after 1873.⁸¹ In fact, the constitution of the Wesleyan Methodist temperance society, which was founded in 1877, was clearly inspired by the earlier Anglican organization.⁸²

In view of the obstacle which the temperance question has posed to Anglican-Methodist reunion, it is startling to observe that some of the fiercest battles fought among Methodists of the New Connexion before 1869 and among the Wesleyans before 1877 involved teetotalism. As early as 1841, the Wesleyan Conference had forbidden unfermented wine at the Lord's Supper, the use of any Wesleyan chapel to advocate teetotalism and the preaching of total abstinence by any Wesleyan minister without the permission of his Superintendent

Minister.⁸³ This general prohibition of teetotalism did not, however, end the dispute among Wesleyan Methodists who lost, partly over the teetotal question, an estimated 100,000 people in the years 1849 to 1872.⁸⁴ The New Connexion suffered defections, as well. Joseph Barker and William Booth both left the ministry of the New Connexion partly over the teetotal question; Barker went on to preach teetotalism, chartism and skepticism, Booth to wage a wider war on sin with teetotalism as one of his chief weapons.⁸⁵

To recognize the tardiness of official Nonconformity in approving the teetotal movement and the bitterness which this caused in their denominations does not negate the contributions of individual Nonconformists to extending the movement. It will be shown in chapter five that most of the early Anglican clerical teetotalers acknowledged the debt which the Church owed to Nonconformity because of this. It must be stressed, however, that although some Anglican clergymen may have been frightened from teetotalism because of its connection with individual Nonconformists, most, like many similarly disposed Nonconformists, seem to have opposed the movement for theological or social reasons.

V

The connections of teetotalism with secularism and radicalism were probably the greatest obstacles in the 'thirties and 'forties to any great Anglican participation in the movement. Teetotalers throughout the century found

that the objections against their movement which had to be answered most often were related either to religion or class. In the 'thirties and the 'forties the religious objection was considered the most serious. Archdeacon Jeffreys, who has already been identified as an early supporter of teetotalism, wrote in a book designed to answer objections to the movement,

The religious objection against Temperance Societies . . . is one which has spread from mouth to mouth among professors of the gospel, far and wide and all over England, and has caused vast multitudes of serious persons to oppose or (which amounts to the same thing) to hold back from the temperance cause. I myself have encountered the very same objection among religious professors at every turn.⁸⁶

Jeffreys concluded that if the religious objection were not answered it could do incalculable mischief by misleading many "good and pious people" while it served as a "pretext for the hollow-hearted and insincere professor".⁸⁷

The religious objection to teetotalism did not disappear with the unofficial entry of the Church into total abstinence work in 1862 or with the more official establishment of the Church of England Temperance Society in 1873. Although beginning in the 'fifties and 'sixties, more churchmen could be found to argue a religious basis for teetotalism, there were always a significant number to argue the position that at best teetotalism had nothing to do with religion and at worst it was opposed to Christianity.

Among Anglicans, the controversy over the connection between teetotalism and religion was argued most fiercely in

the Evangelical wing of the Church. This was perhaps because those Anglicans who adopted teetotalism as an aid to their pastoral work were usually Evangelicals. Teetotalism was consequently brought to the closer scrutiny of other Evangelicals who were unconvinced by the Evangelical teetotalers' arguments that there was no incompatibility between teetotalism and religion. In order to appreciate the difficulties of conscience which had to be overcome by those Evangelicals who accepted teetotalism, it is necessary to examine some of the most usual Evangelical objections to teetotalism.

Teetotal advocates often seemed to press at the tenderest points of the Evangelical conscience. Evangelicalism, with its emphasis on individual experience and its consequent variety of expression, escapes close definition, but it is possible to isolate some general Evangelical tenets, such as fidelity to Scripture as the only written guide of Christianity; the necessity of prayer in both personal and public expression; the absolute dependence of man in his corrupt state on Christ as his only means of salvation and the Christian's obligation not to let concern for his earthly home blind him to his eternal goal. Evangelical and other Christian opponents of teetotalism feared that the movement might whittle away all of these guide-posts to "real" Christianity.

A Leeds clergyman, in a letter to the Church of England Temperance Magazine, complained that the teetotal movement

was an unscriptural human invention.

The reformed drunkard may still say rightly that Total Abstinence is the best thing for him. But if he joins a society which presses Total Abstinence upon all Christians for the sake of saving drunkards, it appears to me that there are certain passages of scripture of which he must explain away the obvious meaning or even the full force. This is a bad beginning. A man adopts a human institution and proceeds to explain away Scripture to justify it. Surely this is a dangerous use of the 'verifying faculty' or 'inward light' which tends to lead men first to dissent and heresy and ultimately to infidelity.⁸⁸

To condemn teetotalism as unscriptural was an objection not to be taken lightly in an age when no one could realistically propose a scheme for national elementary education without including at least some Bible reading, and when Evangelical clergymen would unite with the odious Anglo-Catholics to save the Scriptures from the impious questioning of Broad churchmen and their higher criticism.

Nor would the absence of prayer at many of the early teetotal meetings have attracted Evangelicals to the movement. Even partisans of the teetotal movement admitted in a controversy in the 1880s, concerning whether or not the early teetotal movement was religious, that there was often no prayer at early teetotal meetings.⁸⁹ Various explanations for the lack of prayer were given by those who tried to prove a religious background for the teetotal movement, but the most frequent reason given was that, like many supporters of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Anti-Slavery Society and the Peace Society, many of the most prominent early teetotalers were Quakers who would not

sanction public prayer lest it became a mere form.⁹⁰ This explanation is only partially valid. There were many prominent Quakers who supported the teetotal movement in its early phase, but there were also Chartists and other rationalists and skeptics of various complexion who participated in the movement and whose opposition to prayer could not be explained by religious scruples.

Teetotalism seemed to some who attacked it on religious grounds to challenge the Evangelical's dependence in his corrupt human condition on Christ as his only hope for salvation. Evangelical and other religious objectors to teetotalism often saw teetotalism as a rival religion which used secular means to accomplish what could be achieved only by faith and grace. To emphasize the pledge as a cure for drunkenness was to attribute to weak and corrupt human nature a power to remove sin which could be exercised only by Christ through his salvation. The danger of such a false emphasis was that unchristianized teetotalers might be led through pride in their own accomplishment to outright infidelity.

The charge that teetotalism often became for its working-class adherents a false religion was even made by James Fraser, the usually liberal Bishop of Manchester. Speaking at the Church Congress at Bath in 1873, Fraser recalled that a jail chaplain friend of his asked a man what religion he was and received the answer that he was a teetotaler.⁹¹ Indeed, there were similarities between

teetotalism and a religious movement. The vivid exhortation of the teetotal reformer often sounded much like the sermons of the preacher; the tales of past abuse told by the reformed drunkard recalled the testimony of a converted sinner's stories of his unregenerate past; the sudden transformation of the drunkard sometimes accompanied by tears and flailing of limbs resembled the religious conversion itself; and the pledge never again to touch alcoholic beverages reminded Evangelicals of the baptismal vows.

Evangelicals, however, often condemned teetotalism as a false religion. The same Leeds clergyman who complained that teetotalism was unscriptural wrote,

Drunkenness is not merely an evil, but a sin.
And sin can only be overcome by the grace of God,
not by any purely human institution such as the
Temperance Pledge.⁹²

Evangelicals and other Christians sometimes saw the teetotal pledge as a symbol of the false secular basis of the movement. The pledge implied both the insufficiency of baptismal vows which already committed the Christian to avoid such carnal abuses as drunkenness and of the Gospel which alone could keep a man steady in this commitment. It was also viewed as an infringement on Christian liberty which approached heresy in its condemnation of drink as essentially evil. Charles Kingsley accused the teetotalers of trying to establish an eleventh commandment and compared teetotalism to Phariseeism and Manicheanism.⁹³ R. Walter,

a Loughborough Vicar who described himself in a letter to F.W. Farrar as an "Old Country Parson", was reminded of the Encratites, an early Christian heretical sect who abstained from meat and sex as well as wine.⁹⁴ Both Walter and Kingsley claimed that teetotalism represented a false asceticism, which resembled celibacy in its complete renunciation of something basically good because of occasional abuses.⁹⁵

The danger of attacking drunkenness, which was essentially a sin, by human means like the pledge or of setting the false goal to avoid drink altogether was that it might encourage the kind of human pride that was damaging to spirituality. Walter claimed to know "several most abstemious men, even total abstainers to all intents [and] purposes utterly worldly men who even despise Christ".⁹⁶ Even after his own conversion to total abstinence, Henry Ellison admitted that often unchristianized teetotalism led to infidelity. Ellison agreed with the assessment of teetotal work among the London cabmen made by the London Scripture Reader's Journal for May, 1857.

A very considerable change . . . for the better has taken place in their moral character. The progress of teetotalism among them has done much good. Temperate men are no longer the objects, as formerly, of contempt and odium. The more common remark which now greets them is an acknowledgement that they are right and the expression of a wish that the speaker could imitate them. With the diminution of drunkenness, all the long list of vices which follow in its train are diminished in the same proportion. It is, however, very remarkable that the adoption of teetotalism is so far from opening the way to the influ-

ence of religion, that it is often found to be a positive impediment. Men rest in the moral change, and, self-satisfied in its results, look no further. External morality is placed in the room of true conversion of heart. In saying this we only record the results of actual experience.⁹⁷

Obviously, this sort of teetotalism could have little appeal to men who were primarily concerned, not with improving the character of this life, but with preparing for the next. Walter objected to teetotalism because of its connection with a melioristic attitude which he, as an Evangelical, found unacceptable.

Suppose that we c[oul]d make all Englishmen total abstainers [and] they remained ungodly men, in what respect w[oul]d they be nearer serving God? The same remark applies to Education, or to any ameliorating process to w[hic]h man in his fallen state can be subjected. He may be improved in some respects [and] yet remains only a more refined enemy of God [and] of all true righteousness. . . .⁹⁸

In objecting to the melioristic tendencies of teetotalism, Walter came close to identifying the essential teleological differences between teetotalism and Evangelical Christianity. His objection was based on his understanding of man as "wholly and entirely corrupt, as our IXth article says".⁹⁹ As such, it contradicted the optimistic teetotaler's assumption that man could be perfected if only drink were eliminated. The struggle between Evangelicals and teetotalers was only part of the conflict between Christians and liberals. The acceptance of teetotalism by a large number of Evangelicals after 1855 indicated a

fairly important victory for the liberals in this conflict.

VI

According to early teetotalers, the second greatest obstacle to the success of the teetotal movement was the failure of the privileged classes to take an interest in the movement, or worse, their outright hostility. W.W. Robinson, before his own conversion to teetotalism, attributed the failure of an earlier attempt to establish a teetotal society at Yeovil to lack of support from the higher classes.¹⁰⁰ The American reformed drunkard, John B. Gough a favourite lecturer for the National Temperance League, recalled in a letter to F.W. Farrar the "slander, scorn and insult" of the early days which resulted from "only a few of the leaders of public opinion taking a very active part in the work. . . ." ¹⁰¹ Julia Wightman, the wife of the Vicar of Shrewsbury, thought that the aloofness of the influential classes from the teetotal movement was so serious that she wrote a book, Haste to the Rescue which described her teetotal work in Shrewsbury, "chiefly for the educated classes" to enlist their aid in the teetotal campaign.¹⁰²

The hostility of the "educated classes" towards the teetotal movement reflected the feelings of some workingmen. Those workingmen who regarded the teetotal movement as an unnecessary, ineffective and unwelcome infringement on their right to drink found support in this view from some of their social superiors. Before he became a teetotaler himself

J.G. Gregory, who served eight years ministering in working-class districts of Lambeth, Islington, Coventry and Birmingham, opposed teetotalism because it would unjustly deprive workingmen of needed beer.

I deemed it a breach of common charity to deny the working man his hard-earned glass of ale. I thought, in all sincerity, he needed it, and would, in the great majority of cases, sink beneath his work without it.¹⁰³

Others connected teetotalism with chartism because of its working-class orientation and its occasional links with the chartist movement. Mrs. Wightman recalled that when she had begun her teetotal work in Shrewsbury, a lady friend had warned her: "But you will make chartists of the lower classes! Are you not laying aside distinctions of rank in your intercourse with them?"¹⁰⁴

Still others resented what they regarded as the extreme intransigence of the working-class teetotalers and their disrespect for their betters. Incidents such as the one already described in which Neal Dow appealed below the head of a nobleman to the support of his working-class audience did little to ingratiate the teetotal movement with those of the privileged classes, who were not only expected to quit drinking in any circumstances but to keep alcoholic beverages from their guests. An anti-teetotal writer in Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine complained:

The besetting sin of these temperance and teetotal societies is their utter deficiency of that greatest of the virtues, 'charity'. It is all devoured by their arrogance. They exclusively

are the 'salt of the earth'. There is neither religion nor morality in any other. As their proselytism is chiefly among the working classes (misnamed by mischievous politicians, the poor), the richer and less accessible are peculiar objects of their aversion. . . . The rich, of course, are they who care not for the poor; and the wine-drinking rich are in modern statistics no part of the people, and must be held up to public odium.¹⁰⁵

The complaint was at least partly justified by the character of working-class teetotal appeals. Even the Rev. Thomas Snow, a native of York who had signed the pledge at the age of seventeen, admitted the "impudence and extravagance" of the language used by some teetotal partisans

Invective has often been mixed with, if not substituted for argument, and unsparing censures have been dealt out, and unworthy motives imputed, to all who have not adopted their side of the question.¹⁰⁶

If the local variety of teetotalism to which a clergyman was exposed was free of any direct connection with chartism or of unusually uncharitable or extreme language, he was still presented with the difficulty of whether or not to accept teetotalism at the suggestion of the workingman and thus risk reversing the accepted Evangelical direction for reforming influences. Most of those Evangelical clerics who described their conversion to total abstinence attributed it to influence from the working class and many of them found teetotalism difficult to accept for that reason. When this difficulty was compounded by fears of social ostracism, financial problems, poor health and Nonconformist gains, as well as the possibility of complete loss of faith, the

reluctance of most Anglican clerics in the early period and of many later in the century to associate themselves with the teetotal movement becomes more understandable.

Rather than representing the imposition of strict moral principles on an unwilling working class the Church teetotal effort implied a difficult acceptance by Anglican clergymen of a solution for social problems which the workmen, themselves, had introduced to them. Because of the important social and religious implications involved in this development, the introduction of teetotalism into English parochial life had a distinctly progressive influence on the evolution of the English parish.

The reluctance of Anglican clergymen, especially before 1855, to give their blessing to the teetotal movement raises two fundamental questions which will be examined in the two following chapters. In view of the serious obstacles which Evangelical clergymen presented to the entry of teetotalism into their parishes, why were there by 1862 a sufficient number of teetotal clerics to justify the establishment of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society? And in resolving the objections which he had previously posed to teetotalism, did the Anglican cleric transform the movement in any significant ways?

NOTES

CHAPTER II

¹After the establishment of the American Temperance Society at Boston in early 1826, word of the new temperance movement was spread to Britain by seamen and commercial travellers. But successful temperance societies were not established there until the summer of 1829 in Scotland and Ireland and in England until June, 1830, when Henry Forbes, a Bradford businessman who had been converted to temperance while on a visit to his native Scotland, instituted the first successful English temperance society at Bradford.

Three works by Brian Harrison are especially helpful for the early period--"Drunkards and Reformers, Early Victorian Temperance Tracts", History To-day XIII (March, 1963), 178; The Temperance Question in England, 1829-1869 (unpublished D. Phil. thesis, Oxford University, 1965), I, 46-50; and Drink and the Victorians, The Temperance Question in England 1815-1872 (London, 1971), pp. 107-126; see also William Logan, The Early Heroes of the Temperance Reformation (Glasgow, 1874), p. 69.

²See P.T. Winskill, The Comprehensive History of the Rise and Progress of the Temperance Reformation. . . . (Warrington, 1881), pp. 42-44. (Hereafter referred to as History.)

³Letter of Bishop Thomas Wilson to his clergy (27 July, 1744), cited by William Caine, in Church of England Temperance Magazine, V, new ser. (1 December, 1868), 74. *Italics were either Caine's or Wilson's.*

⁴P.T. Winskill, History, p. 28. This discussion of the British and Foreign Temperance Society is based, except where indicated on information in ibid., pp. 28-33.

⁵Ibid., p. 32.

⁶Ibid., pp. 28 and 29.

⁷Brian Harrison, The Temperance Question in England, 1829-1869, I, 140.

⁸For Joseph Livesey, see ibid., I, 153.

⁹P.T. Winskill, History, p. 44.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 130-132.

¹¹Reginald Coupland, Wilberforce (London, 1945), p. 99.

¹²M.A. Hopkins, Hannah More and Her Circle (New York, 1947), p. 174.

¹³Patty More, in extract from Mendlip Annals, cited in ibid., p. 160.

¹⁴Letter from William Wilberforce to Samuel Wilberforce (14 October, 1823), in A.M. Wilberforce ed., Private Papers of William Wilberforce (London, 1897), pp. 217-218.

¹⁵Letter from George Rose to William Wilberforce (4 November, 1790), in ibid., p. 86.

¹⁶See William's letter to Sam. (18 Nov. 1820; 23 Oct. 1822 and 14 Oct. 1823), in ibid., pp. 212-220.

¹⁷Letter from William to Sam. Wilberforce (14 Oct. 1823), pp. 216-218.

¹⁸M.A. Hopkins, Hannah More and Her Circle, p. 164.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 177.

²⁰E.M. Forster, Marianne Thornton 1797-1883, A Domestic Biography (London, 1956), p. 101.

²¹Ibid., p. 102.

²²J.J. G[urney], "Additional Memoranda", cited in William Carus, Memoirs of the Life of Rev. Charles Simeon, M.A. (New York, 1847), p. 397.

²³See Charles Kingsley's letter to the editor of the Christian Socialist in Letters and Memoirs of His Life, edited by his wife (London, 1877), I, 270-276; and R. Walter's letter to F.W. Farrar (10 Nov., 1877), in Canterbury Cathedral Library, F.W. Farrar Papers (in bundle marked "Sermons 1860-1902").

²⁴H.P. Liddon, Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey (London, 1894), III, 104.

²⁵Ibid., loc. cit.

²⁶Geoffrey Faber, Oxford Apostles, A Character Study of the Oxford Movement (Hardmondsworth, Middlesex, 1954), pp. 143 and 195; and William Ward, The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman (London, 1913), I, 33.

²⁷See R. Hurrell Froude, Remains (London, 1838), pp. 14, 27, 279.

²⁸H.J. Ellison, "Parochial Temperance Societies, A Paper read at the Church Congress, Oxford, July, 1862", in his The Temperance Reformation Movement in the Church of England (London, 1878), p. 33.

²⁹Neal Dow, The Reminiscences of Neal Dow, Recollections of Eighty Years (Portland, Maine, 1898), p. 594.

³⁰Ibid., pp. 596-597.

³¹This information was given to the author by Brian Harrison in a draft for one of the chapters of his thesis: "Chapter Six Teetotalism Secularised: Henry Vincent and Teetotal Chartism", n. p. The information was taken from the Northern Star for the dates indicated in the text.

³²Brian Harrison, "The Sunday Trading Riots of 1855", The Historical Journal, Vol. 8, no. 2 (1965), 220. For Marx's view see K. Marx, "Anti-Church Movement -- Demonstration in Hyde Park", in K. Marx and F. Engels, On Britain (Moscow, 1953), pp. 414-425.

³³England, 1870-1914 (London, 1936), pp. 20-22.

³⁴See Lord Bramwell, "Drink", Nineteenth Century, XVII (May, 1885), 878-882.

³⁵"Religion and Recreation in 19th Century England", in Papers Presented to the Past and Present Conference on Popular Religion (7 July 1966), p. 12.

³⁶The names in this paragraph of Livesey's assistants in spreading teetotalism are taken from P.T. Winskill, History, pp. 57-154, passim.

³⁷Ibid., p. 149.

³⁸Ibid., loc. cit.

³⁹William Lovett, The Life and Struggles of William Lovett in his Pursuit of Bread, Knowledge, and Freedom (London, 1876), p. 57.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 58.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 92.

⁴²Quoted from "The Objects of the London Working Men's Association", in ibid., p. 92. See also ibid., pp. 92-96.

⁴³Cited in William Dorling, Henry Vincent: A Biographical Sketch (London, 1879), p. 43.

⁴⁴Ibid., loc. cit.

⁴⁵H. Vincent in English Chartist Circular, cited in H.U. Faulkner, Chartism and the Churches: A Study in Democracy (New York, 1916), p. 54.

⁴⁶Faulkner, Chartism and the Churches, p. 55.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 52.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 55.

⁴⁹P.T. Winskill, History, p. 111.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 128.

⁵¹Brian Harrison, "Religion and Recreation in Nineteenth Century England", p. 13.

⁵²Discussion of this controversy is based on Winskill, History, pp. 130-132.

⁵³Robert Maguire, "Parochial Temperance Societies. Their Formation and Management", Paper read at Church Congress Plymouth, 1876, in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, IV (November, 1876), 177.

⁵⁴London Temperance Intelligencer, 1837, pp. 302, 343, 353, 359, 407, 458, 467; and British Temperance Herald, March, 1848, p. 71; as cited in Brian Harrison, Drink and the Victorians The Temperance Question in England 1815-1872, p. 179.

⁵⁵A.P. Stanley, Memories of Edward and Catherine Stanley (London, 1880), pp. 82-83.

⁵⁶Ibid., pp. 20 and 60; and Edward Stanley, Addresses and Charges of Edward Stanley. . . . Edited by A.P. Stanley, (London, 1851), p. 14.

⁵⁷See Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (1 August, 1873), 122.

⁵⁸ P.T. Winskill, History, p. 149.

⁵⁹ Ibid., loc. cit., and P.T. Winskill, Temperance Standard Bearers of the Nineteenth Century. A Biographical and Statistical Dictionary (Manchester, 1897), I, 185.

⁶⁰ P.T. Winskill, The Temperance Movement and its Workers. A Record of Social, Moral, Religious and Political Progress (London, 1892), III, 149 (Hereafter referred to as Temperance Movement); Dawson Burns, Temperance History (London, c.1880), I 179-180.

⁶¹ P.T. Winskill, Temperance Standard Bearers of the Nineteenth Century, II, 99.

⁶² Samuel Couling, History of the Temperance Movement in Great Britain and Ireland; From the Earliest Date to the Present Time (London, 1862), p. 316. (Hereafter referred to as History.) Jeffreys died in 1849.

⁶³ W.W. Robinson, A Clergyman's Reason for Teetotalism (London, 1854), pp. 4 and 6.

⁶⁴ Rev. Henry Moule, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence (London, 1867), no. 17, pp. 90-94.

⁶⁵ For Thomas Spencer, see Sidney Lee ed., Concise Dictionary of National Biography (London, 1920), I, 1229; Jabez Inwards, Memorials of Temperance Workers (London, 1879), p. 238; and P.T. Winskill, Temperance Standard Bearers of the Nineteenth Century, II, 456.

⁶⁶ W.R. Freemantle, Memoir of the Rev. Spencer Thornton (London, 1851), pp. 110, 111, 141, 190-193, 254.

⁶⁷ See Dawson Burns, Temperance History, I, 179, 180 and 213.

⁶⁸ Ibid., I, 108; and W.R. Freemantle, Memoir of the Rev. Spencer Thornton, p. 170.

⁶⁹ This passage on William Caine is based on P.T. Winskill, Temperance Movement, III, 145-147; and William Caine ed., A Biographical Key to the Picture Containing One Hundred and Twenty Portraits of Temperance Reformers (Manchester, 1860), pp. 17-20. (Hereafter referred to as Biographical Key.)

⁷⁰ Samuel Couling, History, p. 316.

⁷¹In Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 17, p. 91.

⁷²Rev. A. Hewlett (Vicar of Ashley near Manchester), in ibid., no. 13, p. 69.

⁷³See Charles R. Drysdale, "Mortality of Total Abstainers in British Insurance Societies", in J.N. Stearns ed., Temperance in All Nations, History of the Cause in all Countries of the Globe, Together with Papers and Essays, Addresses, and Discussions of the World's Temperance Congress Held by the National Temperance Society, Chicago, June, 1893 (New York, 1893), II, 384-387. (Hereafter referred to as Temperance in All Nations.)

⁷⁴In Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 23, p. 122.

⁷⁵H.W. Lett's letter to the editor (9 December, 1865), in Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. III (January, 1866), 26.

⁷⁶William Caine, Biographical Key, p. 20.

⁷⁷Charles R. Drysdale, "Mortality of Total Abstainers in British Insurance Societies", in J.N. Stearns ed., Temperance in All Nations, II, 386-387.

⁷⁸W.W. Robinson, A Clergyman's Reason for Teetotalism, pp. 6-7.

⁷⁹See chapters six, seven and eight.

⁸⁰Henry Townsend, The Claims of the Free Churches (London, 1949), p. 301.

⁸¹Dawson Burns, "Non-Conformist Temperance Societies in England", in J.N. Stearns ed., Temperance in All Nations, I, 222-225.

⁸²Ibid., I, 223.

⁸³Dawson Burns, Temperance in the Victorian Age (London, 1897), p. 87.

⁸⁴St. John Ervine, God's Soldier: General William Booth (London, 1934), I, 190.

⁸⁵See ibid., loc. cit., and P.T. Winskill, Temperance Standard Bearers of the Nineteenth Century, p. 83; and Joseph Barker, The Life of Joseph Barker, edited by J.T. Barker (London, 1880), 210-279, passim.

⁸⁶Henry Jeffreys, The Religious Objection to Te-
totalism [sic] (London, 1840), p.3.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 4.

⁸⁸G.M. Platt's letter to the editor (11 September,
1867), in Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. IV
(October, 1867), 315-316.

⁸⁹George Wilson McCree, Old Friends and New Faces
(London, 1883), p. 20.

⁹⁰Ibid., p. 17.

⁹¹Cited in Church of England Temperance Chronicle,
I (November, 1873), p. 179.

⁹²G.M. Platt's letter to the editor, Church of
England Temperance Magazine, new ser. IV (October, 1867),
315.

⁹³Charles Kingsley's letter to the Christian
Socialist, in his Letters, I, 270-271.

⁹⁴Letter to F.W. Farrar (10 November, 1877), in
Canterbury Cathedral Library, F.W. Farrar Papers (in
bundle marked "Sermons 1860-1902").

⁹⁵Ibid., loc. cit., and Charles Kingsley's letter
to the Christian Socialist, in his Letters, I, 272.

⁹⁶R. Walter, loc. cit. Italics are Walter's.

⁹⁷Cited in H.J. Ellison, "The Distinctive Ground
to be taken by the Clergy of the Church of England" (A
paper read at the Birmingham Conference of abstaining
clergymen, 1864), in his Sermons and Addresses on Church
Temperance Subjects (London, 1894), pp. 71-72.

⁹⁸R. Walter's letter to F.W. Farrar. Italics are
Walter's.

⁹⁹Ibid., loc. cit.

¹⁰⁰W.W. Robinson, A Clergyman's Reason for Total
Abstinence, p. 2.

¹⁰¹Letter from John B. Gough to F.W. Farrar (2
February, 1880), in Canterbury Cathedral Library, F.W.
Farrar Papers (in bundle marked "Temperance").

102 J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue or Work While it is Day (London, 1860), p. xi.

103 In Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 6, p. 55.

104 J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue, p. 4.

105 "Temperance and Teetotal Societies", LXXIII (April, 1853), 390-391.

106 In Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 25, p. 137.

CHAPTER III
THE GROWTH OF EVANGELICAL TEETOTALISM,
1855 - 1862

I

By the eighteen-fifties several general developments had made it easier for the parish clergyman to support the teetotal movement. There is some evidence that progress had already been made by mid-century towards a gradual decline in the social importance of strong drink among educated people, including the clergy. Medical research into the effects of alcohol was also helping to dispel some myths about the supposed psychological and physical benefits of alcoholic beverages. The myths were sometimes replaced by exaggerated notions of drink's supposed harm. In a wider political and social context, the anxiety of the 'forties which had often divided the English people on rigid class lines was replaced in the more comfortable 'fifties by a spirit of greater co-operation. This new theme of social harmony was reflected among organized teetotalers in the 'fifties many of whom, although they retained their full commitment to teetotal principles, lost much of their abrasiveness in trying to convert their social superiors. It was also displayed among churchmen, whether Anglo-Catholic,

Evangelical or Broad, who undertook to expand their social services to meet more fully the needs of the poor.

Although all these general developments made it easier for a clergyman to endorse the teetotal movement, they cannot singly or collectively account for the fairly extensive spread of teetotalism to Anglican parsonages after 1855. The decreased social importance of alcoholic beverages among the influential classes made it somewhat easier for the Anglican cleric to remove the wine bottles from his cellar; but social custom had not yet developed to the point where he could do so without suffering some mocking from his social peers and superiors. Medical research sometimes lessened the clergyman's fear that he would harm his own health by total abstinence and made him more anxious to safe-guard that of his parishioners. Those medical people who supported teetotalism were, however, still in a minority, and often clergymen who were converted to total abstinence still did so with great fears for their health. General developments towards greater social harmony demanded fuller co-operation between the clergyman and his parishioners, but this could be expressed in agencies other than in a parochial teetotal society. The more congenial approach of teetotal organizations towards the educated classes had some influence. But the usual clerical convert to teetotalism was often won, immediately, by the pressure of individual workingmen in his own parish rather than by organizational approach. The

evolution of the Church towards greater social awareness had an indirect effect on the clergyman's acceptance of teetotalism. It brought him into closer contact with the workingmen who were to convert him to teetotalism and also gave him a more pressing sense of obligation to find some formula to relieve parochial distress. It could, however, only bring him part of the way. Teetotalers frequently raised important questions relating to religion and class for which mainstream Evangelicalism had as yet no answers. National teetotal organizations had developed answers to some of these questions, but they were usually ignored by Evangelical clerics who immediately before they became teetotalers often repeated old objections to the movement.

The Evangelical parish clergyman often embraced teetotalism suddenly, in response to real crises which had developed in his parochial work. Either he had failed critically to attract workingmen to his church or a crisis had developed in his relations with working-class parishioners who were trying to attract his support for the teetotal movement. Sometimes the Evangelical clergyman suffered the conjunction of both crises. He supported the teetotal movement because he thought it might stimulate his programmes to attract workingmen to the parish church. Increasingly, by the 'fifties the pressure on him to do so was so strong that if he refused to sanction the teetotal movement he might jeopardize any successful relations he already had with

local workingmen.

There is no way to determine exactly how many teetotal clergymen there were in October, 1862, the month in which the Church of England Total Abstinence Society was founded. Lists of the clerical abstainers were compiled as more heard of the Society or saw the monthly Church of England Temperance Magazine and submitted their names. However, in view of the limited publicity which the Society received and, presumably, the reluctance of some teetotal clerics to have their names published, the lists were probably never complete. The first fairly accurate returns, published in the Society's Annual Report for 1864, gave the names of 426 English and Welsh teetotal clergymen.¹ Statistical analyses of this figure can be found in Appendices A to D and in Chapter five. The greatest number of the teetotal clergy worked in parishes in London and the commercial, industrial, and mining centres of the north and midlands. Fewer lived in the rural regions of the south.

A precise estimate of when most of the 426 became teetotalers is unfortunately impossible owing to a lack of detailed biographical information. There is, however, some general and some particular evidence that in most cases the conversions were recent. In the mid-'fifties, names of abstaining clergymen began to appear more frequently in reports of anti-drink conferences. As already shown, only 4 per cent of those who participated in the 1848 conference of

abstaining ministers were Anglicans, but at a similar meeting held in 1857 to support the United Kingdom Alliance 16 per cent of the ministers who attended were Anglican.²

The five persons most responsible for founding the Church of England Total Abstinence Society and for its early administration were all converted to total abstinence work in the period 1855 to 1862. Rev. Stopford J. Ram, one of the first secretaries of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society and from 1874 to 1877 the full-time organizing secretary of the reconstituted Church of England Temperance Society, first signed the pledge and instituted a parochial teetotal society at his east London parish in November, 1855.³ Mrs. Julia B. Wightman, the wife of the Vicar of St. Alkmond's, Shrewsbury, whose work among Shrewsbury workingmen, as described in her book Haste to the Rescue, helped inspire the formation of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society, became associated with the teetotal movement in mid-January 1858.⁴ Francis Close, the Dean of Carlisle and chairman of the May, 1862, London Coffee House Conference, as well as the Church teetotal society's first president, became an abstainer to escape the gout in 1855, but did not take the pledge or endorse teetotal societies until 1859.⁵ Henry J. Ellison, the Vicar of Windsor, who participated in the founding of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society and who served as Chairman of the Society and its successors until his retirement in 1891, became the abstaining head of a Windsor parochial teetotal society about the end of 1860.⁶

And Rev. Robert Maguire, incumbent at St. James, Clerkenwell, another organizer of the London Coffee House Conference and first editor of the Church teetotal society's publications, became a pledged abstainer in November, 1860, and agreed to head the St. James, Clerkenwell Total Abstinence Society a year later.⁷

II

Changes in drinking customs among the educated classes can help generally to account for the spread of teetotalism to Anglican parsonages after 1855. Statements from a variety of sources indicated the nineteenth-century opinion that the social importance of drinking among the English better classes, including the clergy, declined as the century progressed.

This transformation was already underway in 1835 when a parliamentary committee investigating intemperance found that, although drinking problems had increased at the bottom layers of society, they had decreased at the top.⁸ The change seems to have continued throughout the century. Robert Baxter, a prominent solicitor and first treasurer of the Church of England Temperance Society, recalled in 1873 that when he was a boy at the beginning of the nineteenth century drinking was as serious a problem among the upper classes as it was among the lower classes.

After dinner in those days, few gentlemen went into a drawing-room without being what is popularly called 'screwed'. That has all passed away. If a gentleman goes now into a drawing-room in that state, the ladies will not bear

him. Public opinion is against it; and now in the upper classes the whole system of dinner-table drinking has been reformed and undergone a total change.⁹

What was considered an improvement in better-class drinking habits in the mid-'thirties was by the standards of 1889 considered excessive drinking. Edwin Cherdnud of the Athenaeum Club, a favourite gathering-place for social leaders both lay and clerical, remarked in a letter of 1889 to Archbishop E.W. Benson that in 1838 when he had first joined the Club it had been common for each gentleman to take a pint of sherry during dinner and a pint of port to sip after dinner. In 1889 Cherdnud found that the average amount of wine consumed was not more than a quarter pint and that it was usually of a lighter variety, such as claret. So little port was drunk that the Athenaeum had found it necessary to sell a large quantity which would have spoiled had it been kept.¹⁰

The rejection of alcoholic beverages by an increasing number of Anglican clergymen after 1855 perhaps partly reflected this evolution of higher-class custom away from the excessive use of intoxicating drink. This observation, however, can do more to explain acceptance of the first temperance movement, based on moderation, than to account for the conversion of Anglican clerics to total abstinence. For in 1855 drink was still considered by most, including the clergy, a necessary social lubricant and an indispensable stimulus for those, like clergymen, who engaged in mental work. It may have been easier for a clergyman to become a teetotaler

as his social peers and superiors drank less, but in 1855 it was not yet thought to be a simple matter to give up drinking altogether. The teetotal cleric still risked the withdrawal of financial support from wealthy liquor interests in his congregation and the ridicule of some confrères.

One of the reasons Henry Ellison, the Vicar of Windsor, resisted becoming a teetotaler until the end of 1860 was that he was afraid of "the misconceptions it would expose me to--the jeopardizing of my influence with the sober portion of my people--and the difficulty of running counter to the social customs of my day".¹¹ After he became a teetotaler, Ellison found these fears somewhat justified. On one occasion, Bishop Samuel Wilberforce who had been asked to consecrate a new church at Windsor, took delight in twitting Ellison for sipping lemonade and advised him to follow St. Paul's advice to Timothy and "to take a little wine for his stomach's sake".¹² Francis Close found after his conversion to total abstinence that the most intolerant of anti-teetotalers were practising Christians.

I have incurred no small measure of ridicule and scorn, and some ill-nature, from various classes of moderate drinkers; but from none more virulent than from religious professors who naturally seek to justify themselves in habits which neither they nor their fathers before them discovered to be inexpedient or wrong, and who, fortified by the example often of their clergy and ministers can hardly be expected to listen patiently to what we have to say on the subject of example, influence, and self-denial for the good of others.¹³

The clerical abstainer still often stopped drinking in spite of great fear that he might be damaging his health.

Before he became a teetotaler, Edward Latham, a hard-working Assistant Master at Repton School; "had only just kept my head above water with two or three glasses of port wine a day". He, nonetheless, decided to risk his physical frame in a direct effort to serve Christ and to the astonishment of his dearest friends he suffered no ill effects.¹⁴

Advanced medical opinion supported what Latham had learned through experience. The first important period of clerical conversion to total abstinence coincided with the beginnings of a century-long medical reassessment of alcohol. Excessive reliance on alcohol as food and medicine was being challenged by the medical profession generally and a teetotal medical minority were discountenancing its use under any circumstances.

The importance of these developments in the history of medicine will become more apparent by reviewing the extent to which the Victorian medical profession recommended alcohol for food and treatment. As late as 1870, it was reported that in five of the main London area hospitals the total yearly expenditure for wine, beer and spirits was £ 2,437/7/7 while the total bread account was only £ 904/8/4.

In the University College Hospital, the total expenditure for alcoholic beverages (£618/1/6) exceeded that for both bread and milk (£591/14/7). Alcoholic beverages in the five hospitals amounted to nearly one-fifth of the total house expenses, including all food (£12,489/16/2).¹⁵

Similar figures were sometimes quoted for provincial hospitals

throughout the kingdom.¹⁶ Exaggerated notions of the nutritional benefits associated with alcoholic beverages were supported by English tradition and custom. It was customary in many places to supply workers with alcoholic drinks to keep up their strength, the workingman's meal usually was often judged incomplete without beer and particular alcoholic beverages were considered necessary for specific purposes. Porter, for example, was thought to be indispensable to nursing mothers.

Some physicians who reacted to this over-reliance denied any nutritional or therapeutic benefits to alcohol whatsoever. When in September, 1859, Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury wrote the teetotal doctor John Higginbottom of Nottingham, asking his opinion on the therapeutic qualities of alcohol, he answered that he had not prescribed alcohol as medicine for the last twenty-five years, half of his practice, because,

Alcohol as a medicine 'is a mocker' and those only require a substitute 'who have been deceived thereby'. It possesses no genuine properties as a medicine; if it were not for custom, and the perverted appetites of men, it would be for ever banished as a medicine.¹⁷

Teetotal physicians often had much of the missionary spirit of lay teetotalers. In 1873 after two years of planning, the London Temperance Hospital was established with the expressed purpose of treating disease without the use of alcohol for either medicine or food.¹⁸ Three years later the British Medical Temperance Association was founded by

ten teetotal doctors and agents from the National Temperance League "to advance the practice of total abstinence in and through the medical profession, and to promote investigation as to the action of alcohol in health and disease". The B.M.T.A. issued its own periodical, which until 1892 was called The Medical Temperance Journal. The Membership in the Association in 1876 was 36.¹⁹

Medical research concerning alcohol, which was beginning to advance during the first important period of clerical conversion to teetotalism, made it easier for some clergymen to banish strong drink from the vicarage without being overly anxious for their health. Some accepted total abstinence at least partly because it was consistent with what they regarded as the most progressive medical opinion. John Babington of York abstained partly because of his conviction "that alcohol in all its forms is not necessary to the health of mankind, and is the provocative if not the actual originator of most diseases".²⁰

Developing medical opinion, like the changes in the drinking customs of the educated classes, should not be exaggerated as a cause for clerical conversion to total abstinence. As the high volume of alcoholic consumption in hospitals and the low membership figure for the British Medical Temperance Association indicate, the revolution in professional medicine's attitude towards intoxicating beverages had, as yet, affected only a small minority. Even some physicians who supported teetotalism under ordinary circum-

stances refused to eliminate the use of alcohol in medical treatment. Professor James Miller of Edinburgh, the Surgeon in Ordinary to the Queen, concluded in a paper he read at the National Temperance Congress in August, 1862, that although alcohol had no nutritional benefits its value as medicine could not be denied. He warned teetotal enthusiasts,

We have to guard between two extremes -
Total Abstinence on the one hand - indiscriminate employment on the other.... Very many cases occur to the memory (of both acute and chronic disease), in which not health only, but life itself would have been perilled--if not lost--without the aid of this special drug.²¹

Sir Henry Thompson, who spoke at Exeter Hall against even moderate drinking, came to a similar conclusion when he advised Archbishop A.C. Tait of Canterbury not to support the London Temperance Hospital because,

I believe alcohol to be useful medicine in some cases [and] I think it unwise to deprive ourselves of the ability to employ any agent whatsoever, which can be useful in controlling disease.²²

Even physicians at the London Temperance Hospital prescribed alcohol fourteen times in nineteen years.²³

Although teetotal clerics found some minority medical support for their position, developing medical opinion, like changes in the drinking habits of the influential classes, could do more to explain Anglican adherence to the British and Foreign Temperance Society than to teetotal organizations. Clerical converts to total abstinence usually considered other factors before the medical question. Before John

Babington was convinced of the medical necessity of total abstinence he was "a teetotaler on principle, in order to help forward the moral and religious reformation which is so seriously impeded by the drinking habits of the community".²⁴

It is indeed possible that the teetotal movement had an influence on changing medical opinion at least equal to the effect of medical research in promoting teetotalism. The British Medical Temperance Association was founded partly because of pressure from the National Temperance League which was typical of the special attention which teetotalers gave to converting medical men.²⁵ Lack of medical training did not prevent teetotalers, lay or clerical, from chastising the medical profession for not taking a sufficiently strong position on the alcohol question. Francis Close, reviewing a book by eminent medical researchers from the Imperial School of Medicine at Paris, praised them for pointing out the lack of nutritional benefit in alcoholic beverages and for particularly warning about the danger of those drinks which were artificially-distilled, but he condemned their position that beer and wine could be drunk safely.

We thankfully accept their true science, but totally reject their false morals. We accept their classification of alcohol; we thank them for putting it along with chloroform among dangerous poisons. We believe them when they say that it is not food -- nor ever was intended for food; we consequently place it on our top shelf, among our 'Materia Medica.' But, we decline their advice to drink a little of that of which, by their own

showing, a very little too much may have deleterious, if not deadly effects.²⁶

III

The general social harmony of the 'fifties and 'sixties contrasted with the social cleavage of the "hungry 'forties'", probably helped provide a better climate for clerical acceptance of teetotalism at the suggestion of their working-class parishioners. Although this is not the place to trace the general history of mid-Victorian social relations, it should be noted that the uncompromising class antagonism which had kept apart the two nations of England was being challenged by the beginnings of a social movement towards mutual understanding. Extreme working-class militancy had more or less died with chartism in the fiasco of Kennington Common and some members of the educated classes consequently looked less fearfully at devices to aid their social inferiors, including teetotalism.²⁷

This general feeling of social harmony expressed itself in clerical conversions to teetotalism partly because of recent developments in the teetotal movement. In the 'fifties, teetotal organizations expanded their programmes to attract professional men, particularly physicians and the clergy. The National Temperance League, the London-based organization which resulted in 1856 from amalgamation of the National Temperance Society and the London Temperance League, became particularly adept at this sort of activity.

Clerical and medical conferences, lectures, sermons and publications were used to draw medical doctors and clergymen to the teetotal ranks.²⁸

One of the most popular and effective lecturers commissioned by the League was John B. Gough, the American reformed drunkard who first came to England in 1853 for a two-year stay sponsored by the London Temperance League. Gough returned to Britain from 1856 to 1860, at the invitation of the National Temperance League, and again from 1878 to 1879. He had a high degree of endurance and a well-developed sense of the histrionic. On his two visits to Britain in the 'fifties, he travelled a total of 63,441 miles and delivered 1,043 lectures.²⁹ One of his critics, who dismissed Gough as "a theatrical mountebank", admitted his ability to shed copious tears at will which often inspired similar reactions among his audience.³⁰ One of the most successful books promoted by the National Temperance League was Mrs. Wightman's Haste to the Rescue. In 1861, the League recognized the possible advantages of distributing this record of parochial teetotal work, and 10,300 copies were sent to Anglican clergymen.³¹

Probably more significant than the increased proselytizing activity of national teetotal organizations among the clergy was their more congenial approach to potential clerical converts. Samuel Bowly, a wealthy Quaker businessman and president of the National Temperance League from its establishment in 1856 until his death in 1884, epitom-

ized and contributed to the more moderate stance which organized teetotalers began in the late 'forties to assume toward the educated classes.

Bowly, a cheese manufacturer with banking, railway and gas interests, supported most liberal goals such as repeal of the Corn laws, the national extension of elementary education, abolition of slavery and disestablishment of the Church. His special cause, however, was the promotion of teetotalism.³² He personally organized and contributed to many of the conferences and drawing-room meetings designed to attract more influential supporters to the teetotal cause. More importantly, Bowly, as a man of wealth and a devout Christian, was partly responsible for setting a new tone for National Temperance League promotional endeavours.

Although Bowly made no sacrifice of teetotal principles, under his leadership much of the crudity which had strained social relations and provoked theological fears disappeared from the League's approach. For example, although Bowly still promoted teetotalism as the only answer to England's drink problem, he avoided the older teetotal argument which had raised cries of Manicheanism that it was a sin to drink, in favour of the more theologically respectable proposition that one became an abstainer by exercising Christian liberty. Bowly's approach antagonized some of the more militant teetotalers who tended to think that any connection with the demon drink was sinful,³³ but it made the movement more

attractive to some Anglican clergymen who had been frightened by what they regarded as the theological licence of the movement. After the formation of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society, extracts of Bowly's Total Abstinence in Its Proper Place, which attempted to synthesize teetotalism with accepted Christian theology, were given prominent attention in the Society's magazine.³⁴

Several Anglican clergymen were converted to personal total abstinence directly because of National Temperance League propaganda. Stopford Ram became a teetotaler in November, 1855, as the result of hearing one of John Gough's lectures. At the time Ram had recently been appointed minister to the population of a parish in an east London suburb which he wrote, "consisted of some three or four thousand of the lowest of the people -- navvies, dock-labourers, costermongers, cadgers and such like".³⁵ Ram had found that few of his potential parishioners chose to use the new church which had been built for them, but spent their free time at the numerous "gin palaces". Although he recognized intemperance as a serious problem, he had never considered preaching teetotalism because he "thought that beer was as much a necessary as beef and bread".³⁶ At the urging of a friend, Ram went to hear Gough at Exeter Hall and was convinced by him "that the main source of existing evil lies hid beneath the universally-popular drinking habits and customs of society. . . ." His conversion to teetotalism was instantaneous: "I left Exeter Hall a thorough convert

to Gough and his doctrines."³⁷

Rev. Edward Latham became a teetotaler after reading Mrs. Wightman's Haste to the Rescue. Before reading the book, Latham had only heard the theory of teetotalism, but in his words had found it "so mixed up with petty pride and self-laudation among its professors that I had regarded it as a rival rather than a handmaid to the Gospel".³⁸ Haste to the Rescue showed Latham that teetotalism could be compatible with Anglican practice. "What was best of all" about Mrs. Wightman's book according to Latham was that "it rested not on theory but on practice -- sound Christian and Church of England experience".³⁹

James Fleming became a total abstainer, in about 1861, as the direct result of a visit by Samuel Bowly to Bath where Fleming was a curate among the working classes. Fleming later remembered that

[Bowly] put the matter before me in a way in which I never before had seen it. He showed me not only the importance of our influence, but the gentle power of our influence as Christian ministers and Christian men in our generation. . . .⁴⁰

The direct effect of national teetotal organizations in converting clergymen to their cause should not be exaggerated. Anglican clerics who became teetotalers often did so, immediately, not as the result of organizational pressure but because of the influence of workingmen in their own parishes. Furthermore, the less abrasive approach extended the educated classes by such teetotal groups as the

National Temperance League was not universally approved or followed in teetotal circles. P.T. Winskill agreed with the judgment of Dawson Burns, like himself a militant teetotal agitator-historian, in praising Bowly's "affectionate and Christian tone", but condemned him for often taking the "low ground" on temperance questions and for making "gratuitous concessions".⁴¹ Concerning Bowly's attempt to make teetotalism acceptable to adherents of conservative theology, Winskill shared Burns' judgment that to propose

. . . that 'there is no sin in drinking a glass of wine' is language out of place when the object of address is to convince men of the duty of abstinence, and when, should conviction be produced, the continued use of wine would be sin to the user, on the Apostolic principle that to know to do good and not to do it is sin.⁴²

Enough of the social and theological crudity of early teetotalism survived in the teetotal movement after 1855 to still provoke the fears of Anglican clerics who were being sought for the movement.

As well as changes in social custom, medical opinion and the approach of teetotal organizations, general developments in the social commitment of the Church helped to bring the Anglican clergy into closer contact with the teetotal movement. The early 'fifties, the period immediately prior to the first important phase of clerical conversion to teetotalism, was a time when some churchmen were more clearly recognizing their social obligations and when the three greatest Anglican theological traditions of the day, Evangelical, Anglo-Catholic and liberal or Broad-church were yielding theological justification for social concern. This

was the period when the social implications of the Oxford Anglican's stress on the corporate character of Christian society and the potentiality of using ritualism as an attractive antidote to the drabness of industrial England were drawing ritualist priests to the slums; when the Evangelical's emphasis on spiritual equality and practical Christianity was being shifted from an encounter with heathenism and slavery overseas to the problems of heathen masses at home, enslaved by the difficulties of a run-away industrial society; and when Maurice, Ludlow and Kingsley were finding an affinity between the collectivism of political socialism and the corporate emphasis of catholic Christianity.

Many manifestations of heightened social concern among Anglo-Catholics, Broad churchmen and Evangelicals had appeared immediately prior to the period 1855-1862 when the leaders of the Church teetotal movement had first been converted to total abstinence. In the decade before 1855, Priscilla Lydia Sellon had reintroduced convent life to the Church of England partly to help the Devonport poor; and ritualist priests, such as Walter F. Hook in Pusey's foster-parish at Leeds, George Rundle in Plymouth, George Wilkinson and Bryan King in London had begun their slum work; Evangelicals had introduced into parochial life a host of social agencies such as Mechanics' Institutes and thrift and benefit societies, as well as devotional and educational associations of a more purely spiritual character; The Christian Socialists had issued the first numbers of the Tracts on Christian

Socialism and The Christian Socialist; Kingsley had written Alton Locke and Maurice had begun to organize the Working Men's Associations. In short, concern for the social condition of England was, immediately prior to 1855, intense in many English drawing-rooms, both lay and clerical, as well as in the hovels of the underprivileged. The growth of teetotalism partly reflected this growing social concern, particularly among Evangelicals.

Teetotalism's rising fortune in the Church after 1855 reflected more the increasing social concern of Evangelicals than that of Anglo-Catholics or Christian Socialists. With the exception of the Dean of Chichester, Walter F. Hook who was converted to teetotalism by a Leeds workingman, Anglo-Catholics seem to have ignored the teetotal question.⁴³ Hook supported the teetotal movement locally; spoke on its behalf during the 1866 Church Congress at York; applauded from a distance efforts during the first Gladstone ministry for more restrictive licensing laws; and he was a member, although probably inactive, of an 1868-1869 Convocation of Canterbury committee on intemperance.⁴⁴ Much to the dismay of clerical abstainers, however, he did little to favour the Church teetotal society. The clerical abstainers claimed that Hook withheld his support because he distrusted the pledge, but an alternative explanation would be that he felt uneasy about a Society so dominated by Evangelicals.⁴⁵

Christian Socialists were divided on the drink issue. Although Charles Kingsley showed some support for legislative

restriction of the liquor traffic, he vigorously opposed teetotalism. F.D. Maurice seems to have been indifferent to the question, as examination of a good number of writings by and about him reveal no references to teetotalism. Thomas Hughes was the only well-known Christian Socialist who publicly embraced anti-drink causes. His support, however, seems to have been occasional and lacked the unbending commitment of the real teetotal enthusiast.

Hughes' involvement with the temperance question spanned his whole public career. In 1857, the year he wrote Tom Brown's School Days, he shared a platform with Neal Dow during the latter's last public teetotal meeting that year.⁴⁶ In 1893, three years before his death, Hughes endorsed a scheme, proposed by Bishop Francis J. Jayne of Chester, for a system of state-supervised drinking establishments patterned after a similar experiment in Gothenburg, Sweden.⁴⁷ In the intervening period, he occasionally supported the temperance cause, by working with non-prohibitionist reformers in parliament, by sitting for a short time on the Church of England Temperance Society Council and by speaking on temperance at public meetings.⁴⁸ Yet Hughes was considered to be somewhat of a pariah in teetotal circles because of his moderation. After the 1857 teetotal meeting with Neal Dow, he let Dow know that he had been displeased with his sharp manner.⁴⁹ The work for legislative temperance reform, which he and three other Liberal M.P.s undertook during the first Gladstone ministry, in conjunction

with some teetotal clergymen, was shortlived and unsuccessful.⁵⁰ And, although Hughes could say in 1875 that the temperance movement was the most important any man could touch at that time, he was not himself a teetotaler. In short, he failed to display the degree of impatience with the drink trade expected of both the teetotaler and the prohibitionist. He described his own attitude in a folksy verse borrowed from one Mr. Biglow.

Not that I'm one that much expex
Millenium by express tomorrer --
They will miscarry -- I rec' lec's,
Tu many on 'em -- to my sorer.⁵¹

Bishop Stanley's son Arthur P., the Broad-church Dean of Westminster showed some kindnesses to the clerical abstainers; by arranging in 1867 through the National Temperance League for Robert Maguire to preach at Westminster Abbey and, like Hook, by supporting restrictive licensing legislation and by serving as an inactive member of the Convocation of Canterbury's Committee on Intemperance.⁵² He did not, however, become a teetotaler and was therefore ineligible for membership in the Church teetotal society.⁵³

Those Anglicans most responsible for introducing teetotalism to the Church in the late 'fifties and early 'sixties were usually Evangelicals. The 1862 Conference which laid the groundwork for the Church of England Total Abstinence Society was purposely held at London in May when English Evangelicals were present in large numbers to attend their traditional Exeter Hall meetings; the Conference took place

in the London Coffee House, Ludgate Hill, a favourite gathering-place for Evangelicals.⁵⁴ The development of Evangelical attitudes to social reform should therefore be outlined in some detail.

IV

The development of Evangelical attitudes to social reform followed a pattern not unusual in the history of religious movements with mass followings. Evangelicals of the first generation such as John Thornton, Henry Venn and Joseph Milner, sought to save souls with little apparent concern for the bodies which held them. Evangelicals of the second generation, led by William Wilberforce in their crusade to abolish slavery, seem to have been more concerned with man's material well-being. But usually their preoccupation with freeing distant blacks and converting foreign heathens somewhat prevented them from confronting great social questions at home. When they did face domestic social problems they often did so in a negative way, attempting to preserve the existing social fabric by effecting minor repairs so that radicalism might not tear it apart completely. The third generation of Evangelicals, many of whom became teetotalers, displayed comparatively less interest in overseas problems and more concern for the bodies which held the souls they were trying to reach. There was perhaps some continuity in this development.

The tendency of first generation Evangelicals, goaded

by what they regarded as the godlessness of the Enlightenment and commercial greed, to take refuge in the life of the spirit is well illustrated in the statement Joseph Milner made after his conversion in 1770.

Can riches feed the immortal spirit? Do we not see the more men have of them, the more greedy they are after filthy lucre? The health of the soul is holiness, conformity to God -- this your wealth would be so far from promoting, that it would hinder it exceedingly.⁵⁵

Partly because the first generation of Evangelicals were reluctant to concern themselves with worldly contacts, they generally failed both to establish social connections with the rich and to do much to relieve the problems of the poor. They spent much time travelling the country preaching countless sermons, trying to have Evangelical clergymen installed in as many parishes as possible and distributing Bibles at home and abroad.⁵⁶ There is nonetheless some indication that the greater social concern of the Clapham Sect, the next generation of Evangelicals, was rooted in the activities of the first generation. Early in the Evangelical movement, it was apparently realized that extreme poverty often distracted its sufferers from accepting the Christian message and that it was useless to give a Bible to an illiterate man. So the early Evangelicals became involved in some charitable poor relief and initiated some Sunday-schools.⁵⁷

From these modest beginnings, second generation Evangelicals expanded their social work to supporting a

wide range of activities from "The Humane Society for the Recovery of Drowned and Suffocated Persons" to more socially significant campaigns to reform the Factory laws and to abolish slavery.⁵⁸ Hannah More and others did considerable work at the local level with Sunday-schools and other social programmes.⁵⁹ However, because the ultimate goals of the Clapham Sect were spiritual their beginnings at domestic aid and social reform were never allowed to degenerate into secularistic radicalism and were in fact thought to be of secondary importance to such agencies for world conversion as the Church Missionary Society and the British and Foreign Bible Society.⁶⁰

The attitudes of the Clapham Sect towards domestic social aid and reform nonetheless showed two significant differences from those of their Evangelical predecessors. The cumulative experiences of using social reform as an aid to evangelization had produced in the Clapham Sect more varied approaches to social problems and greater willingness to use them. The Clapham Sect also showed little of the first generation's reluctance to co-operate with leading social and political figures to achieve their goals, even though these men might be in Evangelical eyes nominal Christians or avowed secularists.

The attitudes displayed to social reform by such third-generation Evangelicals as Ram, Close, Mrs. Wightman, Ellison and Maguire even before they became teetotalers represented an appropriate application of Clapham Sect

principles to contemporary needs. Their concern was still with spreading salvation, but their methods had changed because of new circumstances. Their initial emphasis was now no longer so much on reaching leading social figures to effect a moral reformation beginning at the top, but on influencing the masses at the parish level. This shift in orientation can be explained from two approaches. The attention paid by the first two generations of Evangelicals to installing Evangelical clergymen in the parishes was beginning to show dividends in a greater Evangelical presence at the parochial level; and the shift in Evangelical concentration from the rarified air of Cambridge and Clapham Common to the heady atmosphere of the local parish produced changes in their pastoral objectives. Third generation Evangelicals were furthermore, like many of their contemporaries, concerned about popular alienation from the parish church and so it was appropriate that social devices which they used should be directed primarily at remedying that problem.

Before they became teetotalers themselves, all five future leaders of the Church teetotal effort had been closely involved with other attempts to attract workingmen to the parish. Ram's assignment to the east London suburban parish where he finally became a teetotaler had as its main obligation to draw workingmen to a church which had been built especially for them, but which they generally avoided. Ram later remembered that he had begun his work

there

. . . with an earnest desire to do good, and, after the manner of zealous young clergymen, with a conviction that my efforts must speedily work an amazing reformation in the parish. The reformation was slow to commence. I went into the streets and preached. . . .⁶¹

Of Close it was said that he had "tried every means in his power to improve the condition of the poor in Carlisle".⁶² Mrs. Wightman had also attempted other means of attracting workingmen to the parish of St. Alkmond's before in 1858 she reluctantly became a teetotaler. In 1845, shortly after she had arrived in Shrewsbury with her husband who was to be Vicar, she took a special interest in Butcher's Row, once an elegant residential district which had deteriorated into a collection of hovels, housing the most degraded of the working class. She began visiting the homes in an attempt to spread the Gospel. The visits by Mrs. Wightman or her parish assistants went on from time-to-time for thirteen years and by 1856 were supplemented by the experiments of her husband and his curate with open-air preaching, a reading room and a night school.⁶³ Henry Ellison, referring to the days before he became a teetotaler claimed,

I entered zealously into every movement which could, either directly or indirectly, raise the whole character of the people, such as night schools, libraries, working-men's rooms, savings banks, and, above all, the Christian training of the young in schools.⁶⁴

Robert Maguire also engaged in a number of social pro-

grammes to attract workingmen to his parish of St. James, Clerkenwell, the single church for a particularly dismal industrial area of metropolitan London with 28,000 inhabitants. One of his special projects was to provide workingmen with improving literature. In 1859, he reported to his parishioners that in the preceding nine months nearly 11,000 periodicals and 600 bound books had been sold and about 3,000 publications had been distributed gratuitously. Maguire also had made advances in the free pew movement: the upper galleries of the church were free at all services and at the special Tuesday night working-class service all seats were open.⁶⁵ He additionally supervised Sunday-school work, tract distribution, district visitation and home missions.⁶⁶

It may be safely concluded that among Evangelicals attracted to teetotalism, their Evangelicalism had advanced to the point where they were sufficiently concerned about the well-being of their working-class parishioners to experiment with new devices for their relief, such as teetotalism, and that their close contact with working-class parishioners would expose them to teetotal propaganda.

v

Teetotalism did not, however, develop naturally from Evangelicalism. Teetotalism raised problems which either contradicted principles accepted in the Evangelical trad-

ition or for which Evangelicalism had as yet no answers. Of the five who were to lead the Church teetotal effort, Ram was exceptional in the speed of his conversion and his easy escape from the usual Evangelical objections to teetotalism. The four others co-operated with the teetotal movement only after often difficult crises of conscience concerning the possible effects of so doing. Discussion of these difficulties can show that general developments in drinking customs, medical opinion, social harmony, the public relations of teetotalism and Anglican social attitudes, particularly among Evangelicals, were not sufficiently advanced to allow the easy entry of teetotalism into many English parsonages.

Francis Close became a pledged teetotaler in 1859 only after he had overcome religious, social and medical objections to the movement. He refused to take the pledge until 1859, even though he had abstained for four years, mainly because he feared that teetotalism represented a false secular substitute for what should be accomplished by religion. He regarded the pledge and other teetotal practices as "carnal and superogatory methods of doing that which ought to be done by the gospel alone"⁶⁷ At the London Coffee House Conference of May, 1862, Close mentioned the further problem of offending elders and deacons many of whom manufactured or sold intoxicating beverages.⁶⁸ Before 1855 when he was ordered by his physicians to treat his gout by abstinence from drink, Close

had also feared the medical effects of eliminating his "night-cap".⁶⁹

Mrs. Wightman had to overcome a severe distaste for teetotalism which had medical, religious and social bases. Shortly before she decided to engage in total abstinence work in 1858, Mrs. Wightman wrote: "Teetotalism is a thing I have always hated."⁷⁰ She had been exposed to teetotalism for at least fifteen years. She had even abstained for a month in 1843 and signed the pledge in 1846.⁷¹ Her persistence in the cause, however, had always been shortlived, partly owing to the demands on both her health and her hospitality. Less than a week after she had decided to become a teetotaler in February, 1846, she told her diary that she "was so tired that I took one glass of wine at night. . . ."⁷² Six months after she took the pledge in March, 1846, she admitted to having given her school children a noon-time treat of cake and wine.⁷³ After she had signed the pledge permanently in 1858, the reason Mrs. Wightman gave for delaying so long was that she had "been for the last fourteen years so nervous and debilitated that stimulants were considered necessary for me".⁷⁴ The medical objection to teetotalism, however, could not have been the most serious, as she signed the pledge even though she still feared that her health would be ruined. It was only after a little experience with teetotalism that she was convinced that she would have been healthier in the past without drinking.⁷⁵

Mrs. Wightman's objection to teetotalism seems to have been more seriously on religious and social grounds. Like Close, she particularly distrusted the pledge. When the first of her Butcher Row Bible Class took the pledge in January, 1858, she wrote "I thought the pledge an absurdity and total abstinence utterly unnecessary, if not fanatical."⁷⁶ Mrs. Wightman described her fears of the pledge in a letter to Catherine Marsh whose book English Hearts and English Hands, about her work among the navvies who built Crystal Palace, impressed her. In the letter, she asked Miss Marsh if she herself had approached men to sign the pledge.

As no mention is made of it, I gather that you only led them by principle to refrain from drinking -- by 'praying hard' when they passed a 'public'.⁷⁷

She went on to express her apprehension that by administering the pledge to workingmen she would be putting in their way "a stumbling-block, -- that is, a thing to be depended upon instead of Christ as their salvation and strength". Catherine's father, Dr. Marsh, urged her to try the pledge and said that he and Catherine had successfully used it in their work among the navvies.⁷⁸

There was probably more than religious fears involved in Julia Wightman's letter to Catherine Marsh. When she wrote the letter, she was already the virtual leader of a growing teetotal group which had been spontaneously formed by parish workingmen who had voluntarily taken the pledge.

It was already evident to her that there existed some need for total abstinence among workingmen and a strong desire on their part to adopt this method of relieving their drinking problems.

Apart from seeking reassurance that there were no religious obstacles to administering the pledge, Mrs. Wightman seems to have felt obliged to receive from some one of her own class an imprimatur for a movement which had been introduced to her by workingmen. Since Haste to the Rescue was designed to present the working classes in a favourable light, Mrs. Wightman did not directly question their capability to devise solutions for their own problems. Her references to workingmen, however, hint that her trust in them had developed and that she had not always been convinced of their reliability. On occasion, she seemed surprised when workingmen behaved properly. Following a dinner which she had given for her working-class teetotalers in March, 1858, she wrote to her sister: "After the table was cleared, we were amazed to find the cloth unsullied by a single spot."⁷⁹ Since the image of workingmen which she presented in Haste to the Rescue was calculated to attract her social equals and superiors, she must have herself found the image appealing. The workingmen who emerged from Haste to the Rescue were not the sorts of persons to whom one would look for final answers.

There was little in Mrs. Wightman's image of them

to distinguish one workingman from another. All were deferential almost to the point of servility. Conforming to the demands of Victorian literary sentiment, Mrs. Wightman's workingmen frequently had tears in their eyes as they uttered "O Ma'am" in appreciation of her work. The intensity of their appreciation at times verged on idolatry. One of them, surprised that he and his fellows had been allowed to sit at the same dinner table as Mrs. Wightman and her peers, compared the situation to Christ sitting with the publicans and sinners.⁸⁰ Mrs. Wightman's workingmen did not question the hierarchical character of society. She was proud to tell her readers the opinion expressed by one of them when asked if he thought that the game-laws were too severe.

You see, ma'am it's right and fit that there should be different classes. There must be them who serve and them who rule; and the working-man [sic] ought to be the last to wish it otherwise, for it is for his good; and it's a cheering thought that in this country a poor man can better his condition if he will, and provide for his children being higher than he was. Them game-laws are severe, but not a bit too much so; for if a rich man have got property, he have as much right to have it kept safe as the poor man have to his little.⁸¹

Mrs. Wightman's hearty endorsement of such sentiments indicates that it was not easy for her to receive teetotalism from its working-class advocates and that she needed reassurance from one of her own class.

Henry Ellison's conversion to personal total abstinence and to parochial teetotal work in January 1861 follow-

ed about twenty-one years of exposure to the movement which he had resisted apparently on ecclesiastical, medical, religious and social grounds. After he finally became a teetotaler, Ellison recalled that drunkenness had been a problem in the three clerical charges which he had held before becoming Vicar of Windsor in 1855. His first curacy, from 1838 to 1839, was in the agrarian and seafaring town of Cheldmondiston, Suffolk; after which, from 1840 to 1843, he became the only curate for the 60,000 people of All Soul's parish, Brighton; and following about a three years rest because of illness, Ellison from 1846 to 1855 was Vicar of the country parish of Endensor, Derbyshire where he was responsible for several hundred people. In those three posts, he recalled, he was exposed to "every form of sin and every degree of misery" all of which he realized in retrospect were "the result of strong drink".⁸² There were some teetotalers in the latter two places but they were mostly Nonconformists and Ellison who was a staunch defender of the Church, identified them "with sundry extravagances".⁸³

In about 1853, Ellison was nonetheless persuaded to try personal total abstinence, an experiment which lasted about two years, and as rural dean of Bakewell he even introduced the subject to the rural-decanal clergy conference. He abandoned his teetotalism, probably in 1855, when he succeeded in "persuading myself that I was enfeebling my con-

stitution and must return to two or three glasses of wine daily".⁸⁴ He arrived in Windsor as Vicar in 1855 shortly after he had resumed drinking again, and for the next four years, despite almost daily indications of his new parishioners' drinking problems and regular exposure to parochial teetotalers, he resisted taking an active part in the teetotal movement.

Ellison revealed other objections which kept him from the movement. His wariness of "running counter to the social customs of the day" and thus endangering his influence with non-teetotalers has already been noted. Like Close and Mrs. Wightman, Ellison also feared the religious implications of the pledge. Ellison later remembered that when in 1856 he had discovered that one of his drunken parishioners, a carpenter George Thomas Annett, had taken the pledge in a neighbouring village.

I had already seen enough of the Temperance Pledge to welcome it thankfully as a first step, but to distrust it as a very broken reed to lean upon for effecting a permanent change.

He consequently urged the man's wife to send him at once to the vicarage for religious instruction.⁸⁵ Ellison's fears of unchristianized teetotalism were reflected in the agreement which he negotiated with the working-class teetotalers in his parish when, at the end of 1859, he finally submitted to their requests for some sort of parochial teetotal organization. There were to be weekly meetings for religious instruction and prayer, conducted by himself or in his absence

by one of his curates. The agreement also indicated Ellison's fears of endorsing working-class teetotalism without ensuring adequate clerical supervision. As well as leading the weekly religious exercises, Ellison as Vicar was to be president of the association and since he refused to become a total abstainer until the end of 1860, his presidency was established "irrespective of any question of Total Abstinence".⁸⁶

Robert Maguire also resisted pressure from middle and working-class inhabitants in his poor and crowded London parish of St. James, Clerkenwell, that he take the pledge and lead them in a teetotal effort. In a revealing speech during the 1876 Church Congress at Plymouth, Maguire looked back

. . . with astonishment and almost with reproach upon the difficult and reluctant steps of the process through which I was myself led to take up the Temperance cause and to embody it in my ordinary parochial labours.⁸⁷

The steps of this process which Maguire described in several other speeches and writings indicate the strong pressure on the Anglican clergyman to adopt total abstinence and how much resistance to it he could muster. Prior to his own pledge-taking at the end of 1860, Robert Maguire had considered himself tolerant to working-class teetotalism: "I used ever to regard the teetotalism of a working man as a good part of a good character."⁸⁸ He could, however, not convince himself to become a total abstainer or to associate with the movement. Maguire did not explicitly

state all the reasons for his reluctance. He was actively engaged in other social aids to workingmen so that his aloofness from teetotalism did not result from fear of associating with them. As he said: "I generally led the way but seldom followed in the rear."⁸⁹ He was not himself a heavy drinker: "My only beverage in the way of strong drink was -- 'a little wine.'"

The only suggestions which Maguire gave to understand his hesitancy were his belief in the common notion that alcohol was necessary to keep one going and his feeling of discomfort with teetotal principles. He had in fact privately experimented with total abstinence twice before his eventual conversion in 1860. The first time, about 1856, he lasted six weeks drinking water instead of wine, but felt he had to return to wine as: "A hard Sunday's work would make me feel a need of a stimulant. . . ."⁹⁰ The same result occurred some time later after two months of experimenting with total abstinence.⁹¹ Maguire did not specifically reveal his objections to the principles of the movement. In November, 1860, a group of parish workingmen invited him to a teetotal meeting. He reluctantly agreed to go and although he was welcomed warmly to the platform by his working-class parishioners he admitted,

I must candidly say I did not feel comfortable. I was now engaged with men whose principle of action must be either very much higher or very much lower than my own; anyway, we were not equally yoked that night.⁹²

There is reason for suspecting that, like Close and Mrs. Wightman, Maguire feared pledge-taking implied the insufficiency of more purely spiritual means in effecting moral reform. After he became a teetotaler, Maguire attacked this old religious objection so strongly that it may have been one of the impediments to his own conversion.⁹³ In answering the most serious objections to teetotalism, he perhaps began with the objections he knew best because he had once entertained them. Maguire may also have held back from teetotalism because he saw in it the same kind of asceticism that he condemned in his most famous role as anti-Roman Catholic propagandist. After he became a total abstainer, he was careful to emphasize that the teetotalers'

"abstinence is not intended as a piece of asceticism, nor yet as an absolute or essential rule of life, but simply as a means for doing good, a personal contribution toward social advancement, and a contingent to the philanthropic efforts of the day."⁹⁴

The objections which Close, Mrs. Wightman, Ellison and Maguire expressed to the teetotal movement, in many cases shortly before they embraced it, show that their conversions cannot be entirely attributed to the general developments which helped provide a more congenial climate for such conversions. The four and Stopford Ram reversed their opposition to teetotalism only after experiencing often critical difficulties in their pastoral efforts among workingmen or in keeping the allegiance of teetotal parishioners; or a conjunction of both problems.

Stopford Ram's crisis came primarily out of a feeling that his pastoral work was failing. Francis Close and Robert Maguire felt their relations with parochial teetotalers had reached a critical stage. And Julia Wightman and Henry Ellison became teetotalers as the effect of difficulties both in the results of their parochial labours and in their relations with local teetotalers. Additionally, Mrs. Wightman and Ellison took the pledge after having experienced highly-charged emotional encounters with parish drunkards. All but Ram accepted teetotalism, not from organized teetotal associations, but from individual teetotalers in their own parishes.

The critical feeling which led Stopford Ram to teetotalism was brought on by his failure to attract the workmen of his east London parish by bringing them the Gospel in the streets. He described his own frustration immediately prior to his encounter with Gough in tones almost of despair.

My ideas of reformation grew hazy, and then vanished away. My district, which so soon was to have become a model parish, waxed worse and worse as the population increased.⁹⁵

Practically desperate, Ram was prepared for the kind of root answer which promised the success for which he had hoped. He was attracted to Gough's teetotalism because it comprehensively explained all the problems which kept his potential parishioners from church and because the answer was simple, practical and sure.

The simplicity of the remedy; the character of common sense which was attached to it; the remarkable fact that there could be no uncertainty about the cure if only the remedy were universally applied -- convinced me.⁹⁶

Francis Close and Robert Maguire seem to have enjoyed greater success with their pastoral labours. At least neither of them expressed the kind of frustration which Ram suffered. Both nonetheless became teetotalers after suffering from apparently critical relations with working-class teetotalers in their respective parishes. Close may have had in mind his own experiences when at the London Coffee House Conference in May, 1862, he spoke of a dilemma which he felt was suffered by all Christian ministers exposed to strong teetotalism in their congregations: "If they refused to join in the movement, they would offend the most conscientious of the people."⁹⁷ This sort of dilemma was well illustrated by Robert Maguire's experiences at Clerkenwell.

Maguire's conversion to personal total abstinence in November, 1860, and his agreement a year later to head a parochial teetotal society resulted from strong pressure from Clerkenwell teetotalers which threatened to damage his successful relations with local workingmen and to lessen the possibility of winning new church members from the increasing number of teetotalers. The strength of teetotalism at Clerkenwell owed much to the heavy concentration of workingmen there and the accessibility of the

area to teetotal influences from the Metropolis. Maguire could closely observe this strength partly because of his relatively successful programmes for attracting workingmen.

The year before he became an abstainer, Maguire found that in his project for the sale of literature,

The largest sale has been of periodicals that are on the Temperance interest, although no special effort has been made to promote their sale, more than that of the other publications.⁹⁸

One parishioner had even tried to influence Maguire from the grave. In his will, he left Maguire ~~£~~100 "in the event of his living on strict abstinence principles".⁹⁹

Maguire had been subject to the influence of teetotal oratory from both outside and within his parish. He heard John Gough several times during the latter's first visit to England from 1853 to 1855.¹⁰⁰ On at least one occasion, having wandered into one of the temperance halls in his own parish, he also heard one of his own parishioners Thomas Bouffler, a shoe-maker and reformed drunkard who sometimes lectured for the National Temperance League.¹⁰¹ For reasons which have already been discussed, Maguire attended these meetings "just as any outsider would".¹⁰² Apart from two brief attempts at total abstinence, he generally held back from the movement.

Maguire's aloofness was overcome only when the teetotal pressure in his parish became so aggressive that his tee-

totalers determined to establish a parochial teetotal society, with or without him, and thus jeopardize his successful relations with working-class parishioners. When in November, 1860 a parish teetotaler sent Maguire an invitation to the founding meeting of the St. James, Clerk-enwell teetotal society, he at first refused to go on the grounds that he had never before attended a temperance meeting in a public capacity and would therefore "appear to be sailing under false colours".¹⁰³ His correspondent persisted; and Maguire finally agreed to attend the meeting, but only as an "outsider".¹⁰⁴ During the meeting, Maguire felt his conscience troubled on two points. He felt embarrassed that, although ordinarily he led the way in parochial programmes, in this particular situation, he was the object of pressure from the parish workingmen who sat with him on the platform; he also found that his position as an outsider had an air about it of self-righteousness. When it was Maguire's turn to speak, he told the audience of the effect which the meeting had had on him and promised that he would consider the matter.¹⁰⁵ Four days later, he had decided to take the pledge.¹⁰⁶ Finally, after a year's experience as an abstainer, Maguire in December, 1861, addressed a National Temperance League meeting at Exeter Hall and gave the reasons for his teetotalism.¹⁰⁷ After Maguire's speech, Thomas Bouffler, seizing the opportunity to fulfill a long-held ambition, asked him to head the St. James,

Clerkenwell teetotal society. Maguire consented and the first clerically-supported teetotal organization was initiated at Clerkenwell on 6 February, 1862.¹⁰⁸

Julia Wightman became an abstainer and agreed to head a parochial teetotal society at St. Alkmond's only after suffering frustration like Ram's in her attempt to attract workingmen to the parish church and, like Maguire, after she became the object of increasing pressure to embrace the movement from working-class teetotalers in her parish.

Her frustration was due to the almost complete failure of the programmes which she and her husband had undertaken to reach Shrewsbury workingmen. The extent of this failure was revealed in letters which she wrote in January, 1858 to Catherine Marsh, immediately before she began her teetotal campaign. Mrs. Wightman had found after a Sunday's survey of the Butcher Row District, which she and her assistants had visited on-and-off for about thirteen years, that only six individuals from the forty-three families who lived there went to any place of worship.¹⁰⁹ The experiment with open-air preaching, which Rev. Wightman and his curate had conducted for the past two summers, had ended in failure. For the first few Sundays, novelty had attracted some non-church goers. Gradually as the novelty wore off, they disappeared and the two ministers were left preaching to the already converted. The night classes and reading rooms had suffered a similar fate. In the beginning, about twenty-

five or thirty men had enrolled, but only two or three actually attended. Mrs. Wightman supposed that those who had enrolled but had not participated in the programme were youths from other town parishes looking for diversion rather than instruction.¹¹⁰

In spite of the powerless feeling to which she confessed in her relations with local workingmen, Mrs. Wightman for reasons already discussed was hesitant to endorse teetotalism. Even after fourteen years exposure to the movement and two personal experiments with total abstinence when, on 18 January, 1858, she heard that one of her parishioners had signed the pledge she criticized him for his absurdity and fanaticism.¹¹¹ Her opposition was shaken by an encounter the following day with a drunken parishioner after which the man took the pledge and several of his companions also became teetotalers. On Tuesday, 19 January, 1858, at his dying wife's request, Richard Stedman visited Mrs. Wightman at the vicarage. Stedman was ostensibly a good Christian, a regular church attendant and choir member, but according to his wife's account, he passed four nights a week lying drunk on the kitchen floor. Mrs. Wightman spent an hour with Stedman in the vicarage dining-room which she later regarded as "the most solemn that I ever spent".

I felt that eternal issues were at stake. It was the turning point in his life. I saw the hard struggle to give up all, for I knew

not till then, that, with the working man [sic], signing the pledge involves nearly everything included in the world, the flesh, the devil. At last he sobbed as if his heart would break; and then humble and gentle as a little child, he rose up and said, 'I'll come tomorrow night at eight o'clock and I'll keep it too.'¹¹²

The next day, Stedman returned to sign the pledge and later one by one brought his drinking companions to become teetotalers. They, in turn, brought their friends and Mrs. Wightman quickly found herself in effect head of a parochial teetotal society.¹¹³ She soon began to suspect some connection between her opposition to teetotalism and the failure of her attempts to attract workingmen to church. She was still troubled, however, about the potential danger of adherence to the pledge replacing reliance on Christ. She wrote to Catherine Marsh on Saturday 23 January, 1858, seeking her guidance. Mrs. Wightman evidently regarded the situation as too pressing to wait for a reply. The next day, she held the first of her Sunday cottage meetings at the house of a Butcher Row bricklayer.¹¹⁴ On following Sundays, she held further meetings at other Butcher Row homes.¹¹⁵ She was encouraged to expand her efforts when she heard from Catherine Marsh's father soon after her first meeting that he and his daughter had successfully used the pledge in their pastoral work.¹¹⁶ Mrs. Wightman's teetotal group soon had to look for larger meeting places. By June, 1858 they were meeting at the vicarage;¹¹⁷ by mid-August because of an increased number of teetotalers

the meetings had to be moved to the parish school rooms.¹¹⁸ By mid-October, the meetings had been supplemented by a night school for teetotalers.¹¹⁹ Mrs. Wightman found her parish teetotalers often became regular church attendants. A year after she had begun her teetotal work, she had a regular attendance of 150 at her weekly meetings, of whom at least seventy attended church twice a Sunday.¹²⁰ She also heard that their performance at work had improved as a result of their sober week-ends. Mrs. Wightman wrote to Catherine Marsh in January: "The total abstinence pledge has thus rescued the Sabbath for God, and the Monday for their earthly master."¹²¹

Henry Ellison does not appear to have been as severely frustrated in his parochial work as was Mrs. Wightman, nor was the direct pressure on him to become a teetotaler as great at Windsor as it had been on Mrs. Wightman at Shrewsbury. Ellison found that such parish social agencies as night schools, libraries, workingmen's rooms, savings banks and schools for the young had somewhat improved the character of his parishioners.¹²² The number of pledged abstainers at Windsor at the time when he entered teetotal work was only one or two.¹²³

Ellison nonetheless found the immediate problem of drunkenness too pressing to be coped with by ordinary parochial endeavours.

But whatever the success which may attend the

working of agencies such as these, it is necessarily slow and practical in its operations. And in the meanwhile the conflagration is raging all around. . . .¹²⁴

We preach, and toil, and educate; but we are doomed to see those on whom our best labours have been expended, one by one, sucked into the great maelstrom of drink around them.¹²⁵

There were two stages of development in Ellison's teetotal work. In the first period probably at the end of 1859, he agreed to deliver a series of lectures on intemperance at the Windsor workingmen's hall. He also gave his parishioners two rather weak choices for a temperance association: he was willing to preside over a temperance society to include moderate drinkers as well as total abstainers and he would conduct night classes exclusively for teetotalers. At that time, however, he refused to endorse a regular teetotal association.¹²⁶

The first suggestion was never put into effect because, as Ellison said, none of the moderate drinkers would agree to participate and presumably because those with drinking problems knew enough about teetotal claims to distrust the old form of temperance association.¹²⁷ The second alternative, the formation of an instructional association for teetotalers, was accepted and night classes were begun, probably in early 1860.¹²⁸ For almost a year, Ellison, still a non-abstainer, confined his teetotal work to providing night classes for abstaining workingmen.¹²⁹ The immediate reason for his taking a fuller part in the teetotal movement was his reaction to the pathetic murder of a child by

her drunken father.

Shortly before Christmas, 1860, a child of six or seven was killed by her father. On visiting the man in his cell, Ellison learned from him that he had committed the murder after too much holiday drinking. In Ellison's words,

There and then my connection with the 'drink' came to an end. And so the knot of all my difficulties was severed at a blow. For the risk to health, it was hard indeed if I could not place this in His hands for whom the venture was made.¹³⁰

Although Ellison was fully converted to total abstinence by this incident, he admitted that similar events had occurred in the past, but that this time he had responded differently because of the presence in Windsor of "one or two teetotalers" who were confident that they could eliminate the drunkenness which he found so detrimental to his parochial work. If in 1860 there were two parish teetotalers Ellison unfortunately left for the record only the name of George Thomas Annett, the local carpenter who in 1856 had ended about twenty years of excessive drinking by taking the pledge in a neighbouring village. Ellison admitted that it was Annett's suggestion which first led him to teetotal work on a limited basis in the beginning of 1860 and to become more fully involved with the movement about a year later.¹³¹ The knowledge of teetotal claims among Windsor workingmen and the potentiality of attracting them to the movement was shown both by their rejection of

a moderate temperance association and their rapid enrollment in the parish teetotal society which by mid-1862 had reached about 120 members.¹³²

NOTES

CHAPTER III

¹The first tentative list compiled in November, 1862, and admittedly incomplete had given the names of 272 clerical abstainers. Church of England Temperance Magazine, I (November, 1862), 63.

²Brian Harrison, "Religion and Recreation in Nineteenth-Century England", in Papers Presented to the Past and Present Conference on Popular Religion (7 July, 1966), London, 1966, p. 7.

³S.J. Ram, in Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (October, 1863), 206.

⁴See J.M.J. Fletcher, Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury, The Story of a Pioneer in Temperance Work (London, 1906), p. 93. (Hereafter referred to as Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury.)

⁵Francis Close, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence (London, 1867), no. 1, pp. 1-2.

⁶Henry Ellison, in ibid., no. 3, pp. 16-17.

⁷Robert Maguire, in ibid., no. 16, pp. 84 and 89.

⁸Brian Harrison, The Temperance Question in England, 1829-1869, (unpublished D. Phil. thesis, Oxford University, 1965), I, 85.

⁹Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (18 February, 1873), 40.

¹⁰Letter (29 November, 1889), in Lambeth Palace Library, E.W. Benson Papers, 1889, A23.

¹¹H.J. Ellison, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 3, p. 16.

¹²Frederick Sherlock, Henry John Ellison, Founder of the Church of England Temperance Society (London, 1910), p. 16.

¹³ Francis Close, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 1, p. 3.

¹⁴ Edward Latham, in ibid., no. 15, p. 78.

¹⁵ London Temperance Hospital, London Temperance Hospital (London, 1875), p. 3.

¹⁶ See Church of England Temperance Magazine, I (December, 1862), 79.

¹⁷ Letter from John Higginbottom to J.B. Wightman (12 September, 1859), in J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue, Or Work While it is Day (London, 1860), p. 250. Italics are either Higginbottom's or Mrs. Wightman's.

¹⁸ Dawson Burns, "The London Temperance Hospital", in J.N. Stearns ed., Temperance in all Nations, I, 260-263.

¹⁹ J.J. Ridge, "British Medical Temperance Association", in ibid., I, 220-221.

²⁰ Canon Babington, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 2, p. 5.

²¹ In Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (September, 1863), 169.

²² His private letter to A.C. Tait (8 May, 1875), in Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of A.C. Tait, Box 50, no. 165.

²³ Dawson Burns, "The London Temperance Hospital", in J.N. Stearns ed., Temperance in all Nations, I, 262.

²⁴ Canon Babington, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 2, p. 5.

²⁵ J.J. Ridge, "British Medical Temperance Association", in J.N. Stearns ed., Temperance in all Nations, I, 200-221.

²⁶ Francis Close's review of Lallemand, Ludger and Pérrin, Du Rôle de l'alcool et des anesthetiques (Paris, 1860), in Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (January, 1863), 113.

²⁷For a fuller discussion of the general social temper of the 'fifties, as contrasted with the 'forties, see Asa Briggs, The Age of Improvement, 1783-1867 (London, 1960), pp. 402-412, and W.L. Burn, The Age of Equipoise (New York, 1965).

²⁸See P.T. Winskill, The Comprehensive History of the Temperance Reformation (Warrington, 1881), pp. 135-141. (Hereafter referred to as History.)

²⁹John B. Gough, Autobiography and Personal Recollections of John B. Gough (Springfield, Mass.), pp. 280, 454. For this, Gough was well-paid. The agreement by which he was persuaded to come to England provided him with completely-paid expenses, a one-week trip to Paris, one week at his native town in Kent and 10 guineas per lecture. This meant that his income in England for six years in the 'fifties was at least £10,951/10/0, excluding his generous fringe benefits and the many gifts he received. Loc. cit.

³⁰William Wells Brown, cited in ibid., pp. 300-301.

³¹Robert Maguire gave the number of copies distributed by the National Temperance League as 10,000. In Temperance Landmarks, A Narrative of the Work and Workers, 1829-1879 (London, 1879), 48. (Hereafter referred to as Temperance Landmarks.) But in the front of Mrs. Wightman's Bible which is in the archives of the Church of England Temperance Society, the more specific number of 10,300 is given.

³²G.C. Boase, "Samuel Bowly", Dictionary of National Biography (London, 1959), 4, 979.

³³See P.T. Winskill, History, p. 138.

³⁴Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (November and December, 1863), 235-238, 266-270.

³⁵Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no 21, p. 112.

³⁶Ibid., no. 21, p. 113.

³⁷Ibid., no. 21, p. 114.

³⁸Edward Latham in ibid., no. 15, p. 78.

³⁹Ibid., no. 15, p. 77.

⁴⁰Church of England Temperance Chronicle, IV (1 June, 1876), 110.

⁴¹Dawson Burns, Temperance Dictionary, p. 359, cited in P.T. Winskill, History, p. 138.

⁴²Ibid., loc. cit.

⁴³Robert Maguire, Temperance Landmarks, p. 66.

⁴⁴Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. III (November, 1866), 352; Convocation of Canterbury, Chronicle of Convocation (21 February, 1868), Vol. 4, pt. 3, p. 1302.

⁴⁵Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (February, 1873), 17-18.

⁴⁶Neal Dow, The Reminiscences of Neal Dow, Recollections of Eighty Years (Portland, Maine, 1898), p. 595. (Hereafter referred to as Reminiscences.)

⁴⁷See Thomas Hughes' open letter to the Bishop of Chester (22 November, 1893), in Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of E.W. Benson, 1893, c. 8.

⁴⁸See ibid., and Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (1 July and 1 September, 1873), 17 and 144.

⁴⁹Neal Dow, Reminiscences, p. 595.

⁵⁰See chapter VIII.

⁵¹Thomas Hughes' open letter to the Bishop of Chester (22 November, 1893), in Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of E.W. Benson, 1893), c. 8.

⁵²Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. IV (August, 1867), 246-7; and Convocation of Canterbury, Chronicle of Convocation (15 June, 1869), Vol. 5, pp. 249-250.

⁵³In 1873, Stanley joined the Church of England Temperance Society as a vice-president and spoke at its inaugural meeting. Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (March, 1873), 41-42.

⁵⁴The tradition of the May meetings went back to the formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1804. See E.M. Forster, Marianne Thornton, 1797-1887, A Domestic Biography (London, 1956), pp. 125-126.

⁵⁵F.K. Brown, Fathers of the Victorians; The Age of Wilberforce (Cambridge, 1961), p. 51.

⁵⁶Standish Meacham, Henry Thornton of Clapham (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), pp. 4, 5 and 8.

⁵⁷See L.E. Elliott-Binns, The Early Evangelicals: A Religious and Social Study (London, 1953), pp. 378-381 and p. 420.

⁵⁸See F.K. Brown, Fathers of the Victorians, pp. 329-340, for a list of the social agencies supported by Evangelicals.

⁵⁹See M.A. Hopkins, Hannah More and Her Circle (New York, 1947), pp. 172-184.

⁶⁰F.K. Brown, Fathers of the Victorians, p. 125.

⁶¹In Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 21, pp. 112-113.

⁶²G.C. Boase, "Francis Close", Dictionary of National Biography (London, 1960), IV, 579.

⁶³See J.M.J. Fletcher, Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury, pp. 51-57.

⁶⁴In Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 3, p. 13.

⁶⁵Robert Maguire, Pastoral Letter, Addressed to the Congregation of St. James, Clerkenwell, London, 3 May, 1859 (in British Museum).

⁶⁶Robert Maguire, in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, IV (1 November, 1876), 177.

⁶⁷Francis Close, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 1, p. 3.

⁶⁸p.T. Winskill, The Temperance Movement and its Workers. A Record of Social, Moral, Religious and Political Progress (London, 1892), III, 150.

⁶⁹Francis Close, cited in "Church of England Conference on Temperance", Weekly Record of the Temperance Movement, No. 319 (10 May, 1862), p. 163.

⁷⁰In her letter to Catherine Marsh (23 January, 1858), in J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue, p. 25.

⁷¹Extracts from Julia Wightman's diary (10, 11, July 1843 and 13 March, 1846), cited in J.M.J. Fletcher, Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury, pp. 32-33.

⁷²Extract from her diary (13 February, 1846), cited in ibid., p. 33.

⁷³Extract from her diary (21 September, 1846), cited in ibid., p. 33.

⁷⁴Letter of Julia Wightman to her sister Caroline (16 April, 1858), in J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue, p. 54.

⁷⁵Ibid., loc. cit.

⁷⁶Cited in J.M.J. Fletcher, Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury, p. 66.

⁷⁷Letter of Julia Wightman to Catherine Marsh (23 January, 1858), in J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue, p. 21. Catherine Marsh had quoted one of her navvies as saying he had kept sober for five weeks "only by praying hard whenever I see a public". Catherine Marsh, English Hearts and English Hands or the Railway and the Trenches (New York, 1858), p. 52.

⁷⁸J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue, p. 26n.

⁷⁹Letter of Julia Wightman to her sister Caroline (13 March, 1858), ibid., p. 44.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 45. (same letter).

⁸¹Ibid., p. 5.

⁸²Henry Ellison, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 3, p. 12.

⁸³Ibid., no. 3, pp. 13-14.

⁸⁴Ibid., no. 3, p. 14.

⁸⁵In Church of England Temperance Chronicle, II (2 March, 1874), 46.

⁸⁶Ibid., loc. cit.

⁸⁷Robert Maguire, cited in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, IV (1 November, 1876), 177.

⁸⁸Robert Maguire, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 16, p. 83.

⁸⁹Ibid., no. 16, p. 85.

⁹⁰Ibid., no. 16, p. 83.

⁹¹Ibid., no. 16, p. 84.

⁹²Ibid., no. 16, p. 85.

⁹³See Robert Maguire, cited in "The Rev. R. Maguire", Blue Ribbon Official Gazette and Gospel Temperance Herald, IV (27 May, 1885), 161.

⁹⁴Robert Maguire, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 16, p. 81.

⁹⁵In ibid., no. 21, p. 113.

⁹⁶Ibid., no. 21, p. 114.

⁹⁷Francis Close, cited in P.T. Winskill, The Temperance Movement and its Workers. A Record of Social, Moral, Religious and Political Progress (London, 1892), III, 150.

⁹⁸Robert Maguire, Pastoral Letter, Addressed to the Congregation of St. James, Clerkenwell, London, 3 May, 1859.

⁹⁹His name was James Derrington. Samuel Couling, History of the Temperance Movement in Great Britain and Ireland (London, 1862), pp. 287-288. Italics were either Couling's or Derrington's.

¹⁰⁰Robert Maguire, Temperance Landmarks, p. 35.

¹⁰¹"Thomas Bouffler", Blue Ribbon Official Gazette and Gospel Temperance Herald, IV (20 May, 1885), 154.

¹⁰²Robert Maguire, Temperance Landmarks, p. 35.

¹⁰³Robert Maguire, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 16, p. 84.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., no. 16, p. 85.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., no. 16, p. 89.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., loc. cit.

¹⁰⁷See Robert Maguire, First Words on Temperance (London, 1861).

108"Thomas Bouffler", Blue Ribbon Official Gazette and Gospel Temperance Herald, IV (20 May, 1885), 154.

109Julia Wightman's letter to Catherine Marsh (23 January, 1858), in J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue, p. 20.

110Ibid., p. 24 (same letter).

111Julia Wightman, cited in J.M.J. Fletcher, Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury, p. 66.

112Ibid., loc. cit.

113Ibid., loc. cit.

114Ibid., loc. cit.

115Ibid., p. 67.

116J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue, p. 26n.

117Julia Wightman's letter to her sister Caroline (n.d., but almost certainly, June, 1858), ibid., p. 69.

118Julia Wightman's letter to her sister Caroline (11 August, 1858), in ibid., p. 85.

119Julia Wightman's letter to her sister Caroline (31 October, 1858), in ibid., pp. 97-98.

120Julia Wightman's letter to Catherine Marsh (n.d., but almost certainly, January, 1859), in ibid., p. 120.

121Ibid., loc. cit.

122Henry Ellison, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 3, p. 13.

123Ibid., p. 14.

124Ibid., p. 13.

125Henry Ellison, "Parochial Temperance Societies, A Paper read at the Church Congress, Oxford, July, 1862", in his Sermons and Addresses on Church Temperance Subjects (London, 1894), p. 18.

126Henry Ellison, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 3, p. 15.

127 Ibid., loc. cit.

128 Ibid., loc. cit.

129 Henry Ellison, in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, II (2 March, 1874), 46.

130 In Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 3, p. 17.

131 Henry Ellison, in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, II (2 March, 1874), 46.

132 Henry Ellison, "Parochial Temperance Societies", in his Sermons and Addresses, p. 120.

CHAPTER IV

THE THEORY OF EVANGELICAL TEETOTALISM,

1855-1873

I

Because the Evangelical clergyman often reversed his opposition to total abstinence rather suddenly he had to reconcile quickly his new teetotalism with traditional Evangelicalism. He had to answer the objections to teetotalism which he himself had recently entertained and which were still detaining most of his colleagues from embracing the movement. In this effort, he was aided by arguments already developed by theorists of the national teetotal organizations and the accumulated experiences of pioneer Evangelical teetotalers. By in effect theologizing the teetotal movement, Evangelical teetotalers attempted to remove the religious objections that the movement was unscriptural, that prayer was not sufficiently stressed in teetotal meetings and that teetotalism represented a secular substitute for religion. They argued a scriptural basis for the movement, stressed prayer and other religious exercises; and tried to present teetotalism as an appropriate undertaking for Christians since it involved an

attack on the sin of drunkenness, using spiritual means for a spiritual end, the rescue and salvation of former drunkards. The charge that, socially, teetotalism represented a threat to the traditional downward direction of reforming influences was answered by Evangelical clerics who, in traditional fashion, proclaimed that they became teetotalers not out of any concern for themselves but in order to set a good example to those under their influence. It would seem then, at first glance, that Evangelical teetotalers transformed the movement into an agency subsidiary to Evangelicalism and that in this transformation the secular radicalism of teetotalism was replaced by a religiously-oriented conservatism.

Such a conclusion, however, ignores the strong legacy from secular teetotalism which was carried into Evangelical teetotalism. Once the religious character of Evangelical teetotalism, in the object of its attention, its method of operation and its aims had been established, the secular elements of the older teetotalism became respectable by association. And often the religious justifications for the movement were so sufficiently in the background that the Evangelical teetotaler could sound much like the secular teetotaler. Enough of the secularist dimension of early teetotalism showed through the religious overlay which was applied to it even to allow the Evangelical teetotaler to accept explicitly the teetotal root-branch explanation of social distress and implicitly the melioristic teleology on

which it rested. Although Evangelical teetotalers did not usually directly endorse the liberal basis of teetotalism, that Society was capable of virtual perfection if only drink were removed, they accepted it indirectly by attributing to drunkenness the blame for most of society's ills and thus implying that they could be removed.

Furthermore, although officially Evangelical teetotalers restored to some extent what they considered the proper direction of reforming influences by emphasizing the necessity of their own good example and by insisting on clerical control of parochial teetotal societies, working-class teetotalers, who in many cases had converted them to total abstinence in the first place, were given considerable responsibility in the operation of those societies and they continued to exert influence on the parsonage. Evangelical teetotalers restored the principle previously employed by the Clapham Sect that a national moral reformation should begin by transforming the people at the top of society. In attempting to put this principle into operation, however, the example of the workingmen who had converted them to teetotalism was more appropriate than that of the Clapham Sect. Although members of the Clapham Sect because of their own high social positions had attempted to reach the leaders of society by extending their influence across parallel social lines, Evangelical teetotalers, like the workingmen who had influenced them to become abstainers, had to exercise a strenuous upward stretch in their attempt to reach their

own ecclesiastical and social superiors.

II

Some objections to the pledge which had detained Evangelicals from embracing teetotalism could be overcome without challenging the Evangelical tradition.

When Evangelical teetotalers were ridiculed by their social peers and superiors for refusing to serve alcoholic drinks they reassured themselves that in so doing they were advancing their parochial effectiveness and that it was better to change harmful social customs than to accept them. Francis Close endured the "ridicule and scorn" which he felt he received, especially from his fellow Christians, with the thought that he ought

. . . to 'take it patiently', rejoicing and blessing God that the eyes of one and of another are being opened to see the lawfulness of using a mere human instrumentality to further the introduction of the gospel.¹

Similarly, Henry Ellison's fears of "running counter to the social customs of the day", which were somewhat justified when Bishop Wilberforce teased him for drinking lemonade, were more than balanced by his feeling that by supporting total abstinence he was successfully throwing the weight of his influence towards changing those customs.² Mrs. Wightman did not prohibit the strong teetotal emphasis which workingmen gave her parish total abstinence society in spite of the "prejudice", "coldness and suspicion" which Christians displayed towards it. For, as she wrote to Catherine Marsh:

"I am quite certain that, without TOTAL abstinence, no permanent good will be done to the working classes, surrounded as they are by temptations to drunkenness".³

In resolving their medical objections to the pledge, Anglican converts to teetotalism usually relied less on the Evangelical tradition than on their own experiences, heavily influenced by the claims of teetotal physicians. Statements by Evangelical abstainers concerning the medical effects of alcohol usually sounded too much like the tracts of teetotal physicians to be pure uninfluenced expressions of experience. Shortly after he took the pledge in 1855, Stopford Ram became ill and was persuaded by his physician and his wife that his teetotalism was the cause of his poor health. He resumed drinking bitter beer and sherry for a month or six weeks until, because of pangs of conscience, he took the pledge again. Eight years later, he was still a pledged abstainer.⁴ Francis Close's fears of the medical effect of eliminating his "night-cap" were overcome when he was persuaded that by fermentation and distillation "nature's sweetest food was turned into a deadly poison".⁵ Julia Wightman, who had found it necessary for fourteen years before she became a teetotaler to take stimulants for nervousness and debilitation, found after three months' experience with total abstinence that she enjoyed "a degree of health and vigour quite unprecedented in my life", and concluded that alcoholic beverages had been more of a hinderance than a help in the past.⁶ Henry Ellison, who

became a total abstainer in spite of fears for his health, after about six months of uncomfortable adjustment found "I am better, stronger, more equal to my work, in every way, than I was when I was irritating my nervous system with alcohol".⁷ And Robert Maguire, who had failed in two previous attempts at teetotalism partly for medical reasons, claimed four years after he became a teetotaler: "I have enjoyed more steady uniformity of health, and more equable working power; and have suffered less real exhaustion after work than before I became an abstainer".⁸

III

The religious and social objections to the pledge which Anglican teetotalers had to resolve were, of course, more directly related to the Evangelical tradition. The attempts of Evangelical teetotalers to answer the argument that teetotalism was unscriptural show how far they were willing to go in distorting the traditional Evangelical attitude towards Scripture in order to justify a movement to which they obviously had not been introduced by reading the Bible. The kind of Biblical criticism which they employed for this purpose often clearly strayed from their fundamentalist tradition.

Evangelical teetotalers and others who tried to find a scriptural basis for the movement usually tried to prove any combination of the following three possibilities--that teetotalism was not incompatible with the Bible; that it was

supported by Biblical examples; or that it did not really matter whether teetotalism had a scriptural basis, as many other worthwhile undertakings which had not been mentioned in the Bible were judged appropriate to Christians.

The criteria for scriptural analysis adopted by Evangelicals to prove these possibilities frequently had more in common with the higher criticism of the Broad Church than with the fundamentalism of Evangelical "bibliolatry". Attempts to prove that teetotalism was not incompatible with the Bible often rested on linguistic and social bases rather than on literal interpretations of accepted texts. In trying to establish biblical support for teetotalism, Evangelical teetotalers followed the more conventional practice of isolating particular scriptural texts to validate their point of view. The third sort of argument, that biblical justification for teetotalism was unnecessary, was obviously from the fundamentalist point of view the most dangerous.

Arguments that teetotalism was not incompatible with the Bible often rested on clever linguistic explanations for many references to wine-drinking in the Old Testament and such New Testament events as the marriage feast of Cana and the Last Supper. William Caine, who was himself somewhat of a linguistic scholar, used his skills to distinguish between the Hebrew words tirosh, which he translated as the generic term for wines both fermented and unfermented, and yayin, supposed to imply only new, unfermented wine. In the Old

Testament passages where drunkenness is condemned, the wine referred to is presumably the fermented variety of tirosh. Where wine is praised, it is described as yayin.⁹ A similar linguistic approach was taken by some Evangelical teetotalers to explain away Christ's connection with wine-drinking. Their argument was that the New Testament expression "the fruit of the vine" had been improperly taken to mean fermented wine, and actually referred to pure grape juice.¹⁰

William Caine's treatment of wine in the New Testament tended to lean more heavily a priori on social rather than on linguistic grounds. Caine wrote

I must frankly admit that if our Lord encouraged the use of such poisoning drinks as those which spread misery and death in time and eternity in every country to which English so-called Christians go, I should find it very difficult to reply to such men as Winwood Reade and Burton, who exalt Mohammedanism and depreciate Christianity.¹¹

The second alternative to show that teetotalism was supported by Biblical examples simply demanded a careful scrutiny of the Scriptures in search of biblical teetotalers. The Rechabites and the Nazarites were often used for this purpose and, in fact, the former group inspired the name of a teetotal mutual benefit society and the latter the title of one of the most famous sermons by the teetotal Canon of Westminster, F.W. Farrar.¹²

The third alternative, that it did not matter whether or not teetotalism was supported by the Bible, was sometimes used in combination with the other two. For example, Francis Close, before trying to prove in the Church of England

Temperance Magazine both that biblical stories of drinking implied no approval of alcoholic beverages but that descriptions in the Bible of teetotalism did indicate scriptural commendation maintained that even if these two attempts were unsuccessful it would not matter as

To lay down the dogma that we are to have Scriptural authority for every conventional arrangement for the good of Churches or Nations would be to reduce us to the position of mere automations who could draw no inference, who could originate no beneficent scheme, but must travel only in the narrow and deep ruts in which men of bygone ages travelled before us.¹³

There is some significance in Close's approach to the scriptural question. Although he believed that there was scriptural justification for teetotalism, the most important reason for promoting teetotalism was not biblical, but came out of concern for "the reformation of the masses".¹⁴

Close's argument that it was unnecessary to find direct scriptural proof for total abstinence was fairly common. A correspondent to the Church of England Temperance Magazine confessed that he was not convinced that the wines of the New Testament consisted of unfermented grape juice

I do not think it can be proved that our Divine Master used only unintoxicating wine; there may be a strong presumption, perhaps, but I think that is all My total abstinence is entirely independent of anything that can be proved or disproved concerning the Wine of Scripture. 'In the present distress' I cannot but feel it is a great privilege to be permitted to join the ranks of those who, by personal self-denial for their weak brethren's sake, are throwing any influence they possess into the scale against the prevailing vice of the country.¹⁵

Even when an attempt was made to find a direct scriptural

basis for total abstinence, recourse was often made to techniques unusual in the fundamentalist approach to Scripture.

The second religious objection to teetotalism that teetotal meetings were often conducted without prayer was superficially the easiest to remedy. Meetings of parochial teetotal societies naturally emphasized prayer, as well as religious instruction and hymn singing.¹⁶

Yet the history of Church teetotal work was marked by continuing concern that the religious element, especially the place of prayer, was being dwarfed by the secular concerns of the movement. In 1864, Henry Ellison, no doubt feeling such concern, organized the Temperance Prayer Union. One could become a member, on annual payment of a penny to the local secretary, usually the incumbent, if he agreed to pray for the objectives of the temperance reformation movement, using either the collects which Ellison had composed for the membership card or some prayers of his own.¹⁷ The Prayer Union was far from being the most successful operation of the Church teetotalers. By 1871, it had practically died and an elaborate scheme of re-organization had to be devised to revive it.¹⁸ Similar operations had to be performed on the Prayer Union at regular intervals until the end of the nineteenth century.¹⁹

The third religious obstacle which Evangelical teetotalers had to overcome was the accusation that teetotalism represented a rival religion which used secular means to

attempt what could only be achieved by faith and grace. The pledge was being used in effect as a substitute for baptismal vows and might lead unchristianized teetotalers through pride with their own accomplishments to outright infidelity. At times, Evangelical teetotalers seemed to present a case for their position which was entirely consistent with traditional Evangelical views. Christian teetotalers could rightly attack drunkenness as it was essentially a sin. Because of this they must rely for the brunt of their attack on Christian methods of combatting sin. Teetotalism was not an end in itself, but a method of removing physical disabilities to spiritual conversion. To take the pledge did not imply either the Manichean heresy that drink was an evil in itself or the secularist error that such action indicated the insufficiency of the Gospel. Pledge-taking was justified for three reasons: the habitual drunkard could stop drinking in order to remove his cause of sin; someone who was not a drunkard could pledge total abstinence in order to remove from himself the temptation to sin; and others such as Anglican clergymen could take the pledge so that they might provide an example to drunkards or potential drunkards. The ultimate aim of the movement was spiritual conversion. All of these arguments were stressed by the Evangelical teetotalers trying to prove that teetotalism was an appropriate ally to religion.

Examples of each of them can be found in the speeches and writings of a single Evangelical teetotaler, Henry

Ellison who made a special point to remove Church opposition to teetotalism by stressing its spiritual character. At the Lambeth Palace meeting held in February, 1873, to inaugurate the C.E.T.S., Ellison emphasized that it was appropriate for Christians to attack drunkenness because it was a serious sin "at the present time the masterpiece of direct Satanic possession with the phenomena clearly marked as they were in apostolic times".²⁰ Because drunkenness was a sin, "there is but one power that can dislodge the enemy and restore the man, and that is the power of Him who was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil".²¹ This power was best delivered to those who needed it to overcome drunkenness, as Ellison was to repeat frequently, by giving them such spiritual weapons as prayer, weekly Scriptural instruction and communicants' classes.²² Therefore, "in forming Associations, the general and non-religious element must be subordinated to the religious".²³ Not only the method of conversion was religious, but the aim. Ellison claimed in 1893 that the work of the early Evangelical teetotalers had differed from that of secular teetotalers because to them "total abstinence was not an end in itself, but only the means to an end--the conversion and restoration of the drunkard".²⁴ Christian teetotalers, Ellison argued in the preface to the second edition of his collected writings, rejected the Manichean notion that drink was essentially evil, but were teetotalers out of an exercise of Christian liberty for practical reasons.

Ellison distinguished between wine which he "admitted to be a 'creature of God'" and artificially distilled beverages "those counterfeits and 'inventions' which 'man has sought out' for himself and by which the intoxicating principle is largely increased".²⁵ The right to drink spirits did not have to be defended, but Christian teetotalers held the principle concerning wine

That Manichean denunciations of God's creature, as in itself evil, or proceeding from an evil source and renunciation of the creature as an act intrinsically good, or even justifiable except for purposes of Christian love, are alike condemned.²⁶

Teetotalism did not represent a denial of Christian liberty but was recommended on grounds of expediency--

1. To the drunkard, as the essential preliminary to all other efforts for his restoration.
2. To those who, through the inordinate temptations to which the customs of their age and country expose them, are in danger of becoming drunkards.
3. To Christian men and women, as a marked opportunity of usefulness in their Lord's service.²⁷

Nor did pledge-taking imply the insufficiency of the gospel. To the contrary, as Ellison told a conference of abstaining clergymen in 1864, since drunkenness was in the first instance not a physical disease, but the product of fleshly lust it could only be removed by the salvation of Christ.

So far . . . from substituting total abstinence for the Gospel, we, of all others, I apprehend, shall be ready to maintain that it is nothing without it.²⁸

The pledge, then, could not be considered a substitute for the baptismal vow as the pledge in itself could never achieve

permanent sobriety.

Ellison admitted that the secular teetotal movement did not necessarily predispose its converts to religion and that, in fact, the reverse was often true. Evangelical teetotalism, however, by its emphasis on Christian methods as the only sure way to sobriety, would lead men to Christianity.²⁹

It might seem that the objection that teetotalism belonged to the material rather than the spiritual world had been completely answered. Evangelical teetotalism, by aiming essentially spiritual weapons at drunkenness, a spiritual enemy, to achieve the spiritual victory of its converts was presented as an entirely appropriate Christian crusade. Yet, the continuing religious objections of such men as the Rev. R. Walter and Bishop Fraser indicate that teetotalism was still feared as a rival religion. And the difficulties which clerical abstainers had in keeping even prayer paramount in their parish teetotal societies indicated some justification for these fears.

IV

The secular character of teetotalism had in fact not been so completely covered by a religious overlay as might have been suggested by Evangelical teetotalers when they were trying to answer the religious objections to the movement. Although Evangelical abstainers were careful when the occasion demanded to emphasize the religious character of teetotalism, in other contexts when they were not

addressing themselves to the religious objections, it was apparent that a good part of the older secular dimension to the movement had survived. Once the ultimately spiritual character of various elements of Evangelical teetotalism had been established, their corresponding secular opposites became respectable by association. Once the Evangelical teetotaler had affirmed the validity of his mission by stressing that drunkenness was primarily a sin, he could then add that there were specific physical qualities to the state of drunkenness which were best explained not theologically, but scientifically.

Because of this, although the primary means of attacking drunkenness had to be spiritual, certain secular devices such as the pledge were also advisable. Drink was not evil in itself, but the evil results far outweighed the good results. Once it was asserted that the pledge did not imply the insufficiency of the Gospel, it could be said that an approach to the Gospel which ignored social problems was irrelevant to those who suffered from these problems. Once teetotalism was defended as consistent either with expediency for the habitual drunkard or with the propriety of good example for the moderate-drinking Christian, it could be at least hinted that both had a duty to abstain. Finally, once it was clarified that the ultimate aim of teetotalism was to prepare the reformed drunkard for Christianity, the appropriateness of intermediate materialistic benefits which accrued to newly-found sobriety could be accepted. The secular

elements of teetotalism were justified, then, by a theologizing process which theoretically subordinated them to their spiritual opposites.

Evangelical teetotalers, however, did not always discuss these secular elements in conjunction with their spiritual opposites. The Christian basis of Evangelical teetotalism was often enough in the background that its exponents could sound much like the secular teetotaler. Drunkenness was occasionally described as a physical disease. The pledge was so much emphasized that it could appear to be in itself a means to sobriety. Drink was sometimes described as evil in itself. Sermons which ignored the problem of drunkenness could be condemned as useless. Total abstinence was occasionally said to be an absolute necessity for the drunkard and in the further evolution of Christianity would become so for the moderate-drinking Christian. And the intermediate materialistic benefits of teetotalism were at times discussed as if they were ends in themselves.

Concerning some issues, all three approaches--the predominantly spiritual, the primarily spiritual mixed with the secular and the predominantly secular--were presented by the same person in different contexts. Even concerning those issues on which an individual Evangelical teetotaler might stay quite closely to the orthodox line, others of his colleagues frequently drifted over to the secularist side.

Henry Ellison could tell the assembled dignitaries at Lambeth Palace in 1873 that drunkenness was attacked not as

a physical disease, but as a sin which produced all of the characteristics of Satanic possession and that because of this the main weapons used had to be spiritual. On the same occasion, however, he added that the root of drunkenness was a physical one "an abnormal and insatiable craving for the drink which had been the cause of the mischief".³⁰ This meant that although the ultimate means of attacking drunkenness had to be spiritual, this physical craving for drink which "enfeebled" the victim's "power of resistance", "dethroned" his "will" and "clouded" his "reason", had to be attacked in the first instance by the teetotal pledge, the physical means which had first been devised by the sufferers from drink themselves.³¹ Other teetotal Evangelicals, such as Henry Gale, went further in stressing the physical character of drunkenness and the necessity of using physical means to attack it.

Henry Gale, who had been a teetotaler before he became a clergyman, was from 1856 to 1869 rector of Treborough near Taunton, Somerset a post to which he had been appointed by Walter Trevelyan, first president of the prohibitionist United Kingdom Alliance.³² Having become a teetotaler about 1844 while he was still a solicitor, Gale retained his teetotal principles after his ordination six years later and was one of the first Anglican clerics to join the United Kingdom Alliance. His unapologetic defence of teetotalism caused considerable resentment in some Church circles.

Gale caused a riot when he suggested that all Church missionaries should be abstainers which was ended by his ejection from the meeting by the police. Gale was not discouraged and carried on his crusade literally until death. In 1877, he dictated from his death-bed a passionate appeal to the Church to use its influence to put down the drink trade on the grounds that, "The Church is bound by the Laws of Evidence not less than the scientific world".³³

Characteristically, since Gale saw drunkenness as primarily a physical disease, he regarded as erroneous the notion that it could be cured by spiritual means. In a sermon which he delivered in London at St. Botolph's Church, Aldersgate St. prior to the 1862 International Temperance and Prohibition Convention, Gale rejected the proposition that the Gospel was the only remedy for drunkenness

We view the Gospel as a remedy for what man is without it; and millions of sober heathen attest to the fact that they can be sober in the absence of the Gospel, by simply abstaining from the drunkard-making drink. Those who misinterpret the Gospel are wanting in the knowledge of both natural and revealed laws. So far as the Gospel message has shown itself in connection with the cure of drunkenness, it has been aided by teaching the laws of man's nature and the nature of drink; and only so far as it has done this has it been instrumental in the cure; it is no more a cure for the broken laws of drinking than the broken laws of the process of digestion.³⁴

According to Gale, the appropriate means of attacking drunkenness, which essentially resulted from violations of natural law, were those natural means calculated to redress such violations. This should be done immediately, "by a

course of prudent living in steady conformity with the laws of natural life" and, ultimately, by enacting prohibitive legislation to rescind "that law that licenses the sale, that facilitates the drinking, that produces the crime, disease and pauperism, which fills the land with mourning, and peoples the regions of darkness".³⁵

Although Evangelical teetotalers were usually careful to avoid the Manichean position that total abstinence was necessitated by the essentially evil character of drink in itself, one searches in vain their speeches and writings for references to any good characteristics of alcoholic beverages. Extensive cataloguing of drink's evil results are more easily found. In a New Year's Day sermon which he preached in 1864 at St. Aldgate's, Oxford, Henry Ellison described drink as "the Englishman's curse" and intemperance as "the Englishman's sin".³⁶ Intemperance was not only destroying the homes of England and filling the nation's lunatic asylums, penitentiaries and hospitals, but was being carried by the Englishman abroad to the destruction of the African Negro, the North American Indian and the native New Zealander.³⁷ In a theologically unguarded moment, during a sermon at his Windsor parish church on 5 January, 1862, Ellison even repeated without qualification the diagnosis of the victims of intemperance. "'IT WAS THE DRINK THAT DID IT!'"³⁸ Francis Close, in an article in the Church of England Temperance Magazine, more clearly opened himself to charges of Manicheanism. In attempting to define

the character of intoxicating beverages, Close concluded that a wise man would recognize that

. . . those stimulants which were so subtle, so perilous even on the most trivial excess and so frightful in their consequences if further persisted in, must be evil, injurious, noxious in themselves.³⁹

Ellison had denied the charge that teetotalism implied the insufficiency of the Gospel by asserting that teetotalism was insufficient without the Gospel. Although this was the usual official position, the approach taken by more outspoken Evangelical teetotalers, such as Gale, made the Gospel unnecessary for the attainment of sobriety. Other Evangelical teetotalers at least implied that, in view of the widespread drink problem from which England suffered, approaches to the Gospel which did not incorporate teetotalism were useless. In an editorial for the April, 1866 Church of England Temperance Magazine, probably written by Robert Maguire, it was observed that although an estimated 4,000,000 sermons were delivered every year in Great Britain

We must confess to having felt a sensation of disappointment when we measured this vast array of sermons with the sin and sorrow, the woe and misery, the vice and crime, the degradation and drunkenness that so mightily prevail in this 'land of sermons'.⁴⁰

Attitudes which seemed to imply the essentially evil character of drink itself and the uselessness of pastoral approaches which ignored teetotalism led easily to at least implicit denials of the official position that Christians chose teetotalism by exercising Christian liberty. William

Caine, writing in 1860, claimed that Henry Gale

. . . firmly believes that the day is near when all who 'love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity; will as much scorn to be associated with it, either as makers, sellers, or consumers, of the drunkard's drink, as they would shudder to be the actual perpetrators of the crimes and blasphemies, cruelties and oppressions, to which it gives rise.⁴¹

Even the theologically-conservative Julia Wightman wrote shortly after her conversion to personal teetotalism: "I could no more now be a Christian and not a total abstainer, than I could be a Christian and a drunkard".⁴²

In summary, the fusion between teetotalism and Evangelicalism as developed by Evangelical teetotalers represented a compromise. Concerning the difficult scriptural question, although Evangelical teetotalers tried both to find biblical support for total abstinence and to explain away embarrassing scriptural references to drinking, they also had recourse to the position, dangerous for Evangelicals, that it did not matter whether or not teetotalism had biblical support. Prayer and other spiritual exercises were stressed at Evangelical teetotal meetings, but the continuing preoccupation of clerical abstainers with the fear that the religious elements of parochial teetotalism were being subordinated to the secular indicates the limited place of such exercises. Finally, although teetotalism was officially defended as appropriate to Christians because it involved an attack on a spiritual enemy using spiritual weapons for spiritual goals, even in the official approach it was admitted that

because of the physical characteristics of drunkenness, physical devices, such as the pledge, were permitted to achieve the physical end of sobriety. In Henry Gale's approach, the physical character of drunkenness and the consequent necessity of using physical means to suppress it in order to produce physical benefits gave no directly spiritual character to the teetotaler's mission.

The compromise which Evangelical teetotalers reached in trying to answer the religious objections to teetotalism implied a significant shift in their teleological attitudes and the acceptance of a good part of the metaphysical assumptions of liberalism. The appeals of teetotalism were based on two assumptions. Immediately, it was asserted that most of society's ills were caused by drunkenness and that if drunkenness were removed near social perfection would follow. This assumption, however, relied on the more basic premises that society could be perfected and that human nature was such as to allow the elimination of social evil. It has already been shown that such views ran counter to the pessimistic Evangelical attitudes toward human nature. Indications therefore that Evangelical teetotalers accepted the root-branch theory of teetotalism--that drunkenness caused most ramifications of social evil--would point to the conclusion that in becoming teetotalers they were displaying teleological attitudes new in the development of Evangelicalism.

There were enough examples that Evangelical teetotalers accepted the root-branch theory of secular teetotalism to

suggest that it became fundamental to theologized teetotalism. An editorial in the Church of England Temperance Magazine for December, 1862, asserted that most evils could be attributed to drunkenness

Read the newspapers--the reports of crime; visit the gaols; examine the statistics of lunacy in the land; take a stroll through Lambeth or St. Giles's; walk the hospitals; look in your union workhouses; seek out the primary cause of ragged schools, refuges, and reformatories; ask your Clergymen, and Scripture Readers, and City Missionaries, whence arise the innumerable claims upon charity and alms; philosophize awhile on the ragged homes of London, the wasted means, the bruised and battered wives, the naked, outcast children; the pawnshops, glutted with the chattels of the poor, the tears and sighs; the pining sick, the neglected dying, the unburied dead; the casualties, the accidents, the woe-begone sorrows and sufferings of the million-peopled city--inquire into all these, and a thousand more, of the crying evils of the day, and greatly more than one-half of all may, directly or indirectly, set down to the account of Strong Drink.⁴³

Even Henry Ellison who, as has been shown, was usually careful to deliver his teetotal addresses in an orthodox manner often at least implicitly accepted the teetotal root-branch formula. He told those assembled at the Church Congress at Oxford in July, 1862, that "the parochial clergyman who has laboured much among the working classes, can go far to say "

if it were not for this drink, poverty and rags would come to an end; poor-rates would scarcely exist; union workhouses and pauper lunatic asylums would lose two-thirds of their inmates; the education question and many others, would settle themselves.⁴⁴

Henry Gale came closest to acknowledging the secularist underpinnings of the root-branch theory and its connection with secularist teleology when, in the philosophical manner

common to both the Enlightenment and Positivism, he saw teetotalism as the result of an insight into the beneficent operation of natural law. For, according to Gale

He who knows the law of mechanics, and he alone can frame a successful machine; so he who knows the laws operating to the production of social phenomena, and he alone, can adapt his instrumentality of word, law and organisation to the removal of bad effects, and the introduction of good ones.⁴⁵

Gale was not concerned that his view, by accepting both the self-directing, beneficent and immutable character of material laws and the possibility that man by exercising his reason in conformity with natural law could reach perfection, seemed to deny both the corrupt character of human nature and the necessity of divine grace. To the contrary, the infallibility of natural law was supported by its divine authorship

There is, and can be, no failure in God's law. All events are caused, and nothing happens by chance. Hence, unless we believe in a blind and irresistible fate governing society we must believe that the causes of human misery exist; and further, that these causes are discoverable, and also that they are certainly removable as they are originable.⁴⁶

Most Evangelical teetotalers stopped short of Henry Gale in explicitly accepting the liberal metaphysical assumptions on which teetotalism rested. Their general silence on the teleological implications of the teetotal root-branch theory may have come from a conscious reluctance to go as far as Henry Gale in undermining accepted Evangelical teleology; or it may have resulted from a failure on

their part to understand these implications, preoccupied as they were with the demands of practical Christianity; or, in some cases, Evangelical teetotalers may have lacked the intellectual depth to recognize them. No doubt, Ellison and his like-minded colleagues, convinced as they were of the corruption of human nature and the continuing necessity of an intervening divine grace, would have denied any connection with a metaphysical system which relegated God to a position as First Cause and then trusted human reason to carry His plan forward.

Despite their failure to recognize explicitly the ultimate philosophical implications in their move, when Evangelical teetotalers adopted the teetotal root-branch theory they accepted with it the ambition of the liberal philosophy in which it was rooted. The teetotaler promised to eliminate virtually all of society's ills by removing drink and the Evangelical teetotaler accepted this goal.

V

In answering the social objection that teetotalism threatened to reverse the proper direction of reforming influences, Evangelical teetotalers invoked the religious principle by which they had theoretically justified their own total abstinence. As a result, theoretically and officially, they assumed control of a movement which had been introduced to them by workingmen in their parishes.

Clerical abstainers justified their own teetotalism by claiming neither that drink was evil in itself, nor that

it would solve their own drinking problems, but that it would provide the example needed to promote good among their parishioners. Robert Maguire expressed this principle in a letter which he addressed to his parishioners in February, 1862, to explain his personal teetotalism: "I have joined, not for any necessity to myself, but for the good I may do to others".⁴⁷ The good example to be exercised by clerical teetotalers was an obligation derived from biblical command. Henry Ellison told those gathered at the Church Congress at Oxford in 1862 that he was an abstainer because

. . . it is 'good' for me to take away the stumbling stone from my brother's path; for I have my express directions--'It is good neither to eat meat, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby a brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak'. . . .⁴⁸

The immediate benefit of clerical abstinence was to provide good example to parishioners who suffered themselves from personal drinking problems, but it could also have the more general effects of enhancing the teetotal movement on the whole and of removing popular misinformation concerning the supposed benefits of drinking. Close became a teetotaler partly to "cast myself and any weight of influence I possess into the scale of the despised, ridiculed and outcast teetotalers".⁴⁹ And Mrs. Wightman, at the conclusion of Haste to the Rescue after she had chronicled the good results of her own personal abstinence asked her readers: "Will you become total abstainers, and discountenance the fatal lie, banish the popular prejudice that alcoholic

drinks are wholesome as a daily beverage?"⁵⁰

The biblical principle by which Evangelical teetotalers justified their personal abstinence by appealing to the necessity of setting a good example to those under their influence was in direct line with traditional social attitudes which Evangelicals had expressed in much of their social work, including their participation in the British and Foreign Temperance Society. In their social relations with parochial teetotalers, officially and theoretically, clerical abstainers assumed control of a movement which had been introduced to them from below. Like their participation in the British and Foreign Temperance Society, the teetotal activities of clerical abstainers were theoretically justified by a principle which because it stood on the necessity of their good example implied their own moral superiority and ensured the continuance of their social superiority. As such, it appeared to restore the socially hierarchical structure of Evangelical philanthropy which teetotalism, with its emphasis on working-class self-help and influence from below, had seemed to threaten.

Officially, parochial teetotal societies were under the firm control of the parsonage. Robert Maguire's role as president of the St. James parochial teetotal organization at Clerkenwell was understandable since one of the troubling considerations which had led him to embrace the movement in the first place was that he had refused to exert the kind of leadership in the teetotal movement which he had given to

other operations in his parish. Ellison and Mrs. Wightman wanted firm control of teetotal activities in their parishes to soften their fears of the religious and social implications of the movement. Even when Henry Ellison became a teetotaler himself at the end of 1860 after a year as the non-abstaining president of the Windsor parish teetotal society, he still insisted that to ensure the Society's religious orientation the vice-presidency be retained by Thomas Rooke, his non-teetotal curate.⁵¹ Mrs. Wightman also used the presidency of the St. Alkmond's Shrewsbury Total Abstinence Association to watch that the religious character of the society was not submerged by its secular activities. Even after she had disposed of her objections to the pledge in 1858, Mrs. Wightman was still determined not to press the pledge on her potential charges, but rather to approach them by purely religious means. After four years of working with teetotalers, she could write: "We have never had a temperance meeting; we have never spoken a word about drunkenness only about Christ, our meetings are all religious meetings".⁵² Mrs. Wightman claimed that in the period 1858 to 1862 she, herself, had asked only about six people to take the pledge.⁵³

Even though the theory of Evangelical teetotalism demanded that the clerical abstainer exercise leadership in the parochial teetotal society and he was given constitutional power to do so, in practice, the influence of working-class teetotalers on the parsonage, which had created parochial

teetotalism, continued after the parochial teetotal societies were formed. Working-class teetotalers often took a prominent part in the administration and operation of parochial teetotal societies, particularly in their specifically teetotal, as distinguished from their religious functions. They continued to exercise influence on the clerical abstainer even after his initial conversion to the movement.

Robert Maguire employed a number of working-class teetotalers in operating the St. James' Clerkenwell Total Abstinence Society. The most prominent of these was Thomas Bouffler, the shoemaker who had asked Maguire to head the society. Bouffler became the first registrar of the Society and became known as Maguire's "lay lieutenant". Maguire, himself, described Bouffler as the "Boanerges of Temperance".⁵⁴

Henry Ellison had fifteen lay parishioners on the administrative committee of the Windsor parochial teetotal society and relied on eighteen men and women as district visitors.⁵⁵ Like Maguire, Ellison particularly used the services of the workingman who had persuaded him to lead the parochial teetotal effort. George Thomas Annett, the carpenter, was given the task of recruiting his working-class colleagues, some his former drinking cronies, to attend the religious and teetotal exercises at the church. In 1864, when a new church was consecrated in the parish of Windsor, Ellison recommended Annett as sacristan. Annett

performed his triple duties as parish teetotal missionary, sacristan and carpenter until his death in 1868.⁵⁶

Mrs. Wightman also enjoyed the help of a considerable number of working people in her missionary, teetotal and organizational undertakings. The reason Mrs. Wightman found it virtually unnecessary to ask anyone to take the pledge was that workingmen voluntarily did so and urged their fellows to do the same. Her working-class teetotalers distributed tracts at the race course, organized and contributed to a fund for the Working-Men's Hall which was built in Shrewsbury in 1863; and, after work, served as district visitors.⁵⁷ Business girls graduated from her Bible class to become religious and social workers.⁵⁸ The task of judging pledge violations was given entirely to a committee of the three eldest members of the parochial teetotal society.⁵⁹

The experiences of Ellison, Maguire and Mrs. Wightman with working-class teetotalers in their parishes seem to have strengthened them in their commitment to the teetotal cause. There were, however, some variations in the character of this commitment. Henry Ellison's advance in one year from his position as the non-abstaining president of an instructional association for abstaining parishioners to a role as teetotal president of a full-fledged parochial teetotal society has already been discussed. The success of the Windsor teetotal operation no doubt encouraged him to dedicate the greater part of his remaining life to the fight

against intemperance. Ellison felt encouraged to discover that many of the 120 who had become members of the Windsor parochial teetotal society by July, 1862, were workingmen who became church attendants for the first time.⁶⁰ By February, 1864, a total of 557 persons had joined the society since its first year of operation. Of these, 294 had been steady members.⁶¹ Ellison began his national teetotal work in 1862 when he co-operated with other clerical abstainers to form the Church of England Total Abstinence Society and became the chairman of the new Society's council. His influence more than that of anyone else was responsible for transforming the Society in 1873 from a militant teetotal sect within the Church to the highly influential Church of England Temperance Society. Ellison continued as chairman of the Society until his retirement in 1891. After 1875, when he resigned his post as Vicar of Windsor for a less demanding position as Rector of Great Haseley, Ellison devoted most of his time to the chairmanship of the Church of England Temperance Society.⁶²

Although this life-time involvement in temperance work must have been inspired in great part by his successful teetotal operation at Windsor, Ellison's association with working-class teetotalers does not seem to have had the same effect on him as similar experiences had on such colleagues as Maguire and Mrs. Wightman. Despite his experiences at Windsor that a temperance society which included both moderate drinkers and teetotalers had been unacceptable to

both teetotalers and drunkards and that a non-abstaining clergyman had limited effectiveness in a parochial teetotal society, little more than two years after he became a teetotaler at the London Coffee House Conference, Ellison pleaded a case for moderate-drinking clergymen to lead parochial teetotal societies. He was also main architect of the compromise which, in 1873, made possible the Church of England Temperance Society, by providing a place for moderate drinkers as well as teetotalers.⁶³

Robert Maguire's association with working-class teetotalism, which had influenced him both to take the pledge in November, 1860, and to accept the presidency of the St. James, Clerkenwell, Total Abstinence Society at the end of the following year, seems to have forced a stricter adherence to teetotal principles. Although Maguire himself was closely involved with the administration of Anglican temperance work, after the formation of the Church of England Temperance Society in February, 1873, he refused to link with it his Clerkenwell teetotal society.⁶⁴ In view of his own continuing association with the C.E.T.S., this aloofness can only be explained by the refusal of the St. James parochial teetotalers, who as early as May, 1862, had grown to 500, to sanction a temperance association which had a section for non-abstainers.⁶⁵

Mrs. Wightman's association with working-class teetotalers at Shrewsbury both increased her commitment to the teetotal movement and her awareness of working-class needs

which she tried to meet with the auxiliary social services which became connected with her parochial teetotal society.

Since, even after she had taken the pledge Mrs. Wightman had determined to confine her contributions to the St. Alkmond's Total Abstinence Society to its purely spiritual aspects, the development of a strong teetotal orientation in the organization must be attributed to its working-class members. A year after she agreed to head the Society, it had taken on so distinct a teetotal character that she feared that her work might be inhibited because of the great "prejudice" of Christians against total abstinence.⁶⁶ Even though she herself rarely asked anyone to take the pledge, by 1863 the number of Mrs. Wightman's teetotalers had increased to nearly 700 adults.⁶⁷ And in 1872, nine years after the Shrewsbury's Working-Men's Hall was built, Mrs. Wightman found that her work was so closely associated with teetotalism that most of the men who used its services were from among her total abstainers who by then numbered 4,500.⁶⁸

As well as contributing a more definitely teetotal focus to her work than she had anticipated, Mrs. Wightman's teetotalers had the effect on her of strengthening her own belief in the movement. The disdain which she developed even for moderate drinking was illustrated in an 1879 letter to a friend, in which she described a sermon which she had recently heard in the Bath Abbey. According to Mrs. Wightman's account, the curate turned to the congregation consisting

largely of British army men, and urged them to drink moderately

. . . 'I am not for total abstinence or teetotalism', and then for the edification of us all he defined moderation to be this, 'Two glasses of sherry, or one glass of champagne, or two glasses of beer, or two tumblers of porter, or one glass of brandy, or one glass of whisky or any other spirits'.⁶⁹

Mrs. Wightman wrote that she "felt so disgusted that I do not mean to enter the Abbey again".⁷⁰ Although unlike Maguire, Mrs. Wightman associated her parish teetotal society with the Church of England Temperance Society, she left supervision of the moderate section to her husband and retained for herself the presidency of the total abstinence section.⁷¹

A more positive result of Mrs. Wightman's teetotal work was that closer contact with the parish workingmen led her to expand the services which the parish offered to meet the needs which she now realized they had. The varied social services offered after the opening of the Shrewsbury's Working-Men's Hall in 1862 were directly related to the teetotal basis which her work had assumed. As early as 1858, she had felt the need

. . . to devise some plan for amusing the men in the long winter evenings. There must be some counter-attraction found for them to make up to them for the loss of the public-houses.⁷²

By 1860, encouraged by the workingmen's suggestions, she began plans for the Working-Men's Hall which was opened three years later.⁷³ The Hall was financed by donations

given by Mrs. Wightman from the profits of Haste to the Rescue; by influential people; and in great part by the workingmen, themselves.⁷⁴ The Shrewsbury Working-Men's Hall became the centre for a wide range of spiritual and social activities. Religious services and Bible classes, a benefit society, a ragged school, a library, a brass band and lectures were all centred there. A dining-room, offering a wide variety of foods, was well-used by the workingmen and bathrooms; and common rooms, in which coffee and tea were served, were open to anyone without charge.⁷⁵ Since almost all the workingmen who used the Hall after its erection were from Mrs. Wightman's group of total abstainers the function of the Hall was closely related to her teetotal work. It provided counterattractions to drinking and afforded her sober workingmen improving programmes for their further spiritual and material advancement.⁷⁶

Even though in their relations with parochial teetotalers abstaining clerics exercised the sort of authority which the Evangelical tradition held to be proper, in their relations with their own social and ecclesiastical superiors they often adopted attitudes similar to those which had been directed at them by the working-class teetotalers who had converted them to total abstinence. This observation will be treated more fully in following chapters, but it is necessary at this point to place it in the context of developing Evangelical attitudes to social relations. As has already been stated, Mrs. Wightman wrote Haste to the Rescue

to convert the influential classes to the teetotal cause. This publication and her later writings are credited to a considerable degree with accomplishing their purpose.⁷⁷

Henry Ellison successfully converted several of his clerical colleagues, including Lord John Russell's brother Wriothsesley who was a chaplain to the royal family and canon of St. George's, Windsor.⁷⁸ Of greater importance, Ellison more than anyone transformed the Church teetotal effort into an instrument for winning the entire Church, including its highest officials to the temperance cause. Robert Maguire participated in efforts to influence the highest officials of Church and State by his administrative and editorial contributions to the Church teetotal society and the National Temperance League.

As early as 1862, Maguire, co-operating with the National Temperance League, had tried to gain for the anti-drink cause Frederick Temple who was to become the late nineteenth century's most famous Anglican teetotal bishop.⁷⁹ In May, 1862, Maguire engaged Temple, then head-master of Rugby, in a debate which faintly resembled the more famous confrontation between Bishop Wilberforce and Thomas Huxley. During a teetotal meeting at the Rugby Town Hall, Temple argued that the kind of example which the teetotaler provided the drunkard might be merely external. He compared the process to a monkey learning to dance by imitating his master. Maguire responded that a drunkard had no more sense than a monkey since any inner principles he once possessed

had been destroyed by over-indulgence. He could therefore be reached only by external example. Temple was not immediately convinced. His conversion to the temperance movement did not occur until after his appointment in 1869 as Bishop of Exeter. Temperance reformers, however, gave Maguire credit for helping introduce Temple to the movement.⁸⁰

The Janus-like stance which clerical teetotalers assumed in their relations with their social and ecclesiastical inferiors and superiors had familiar and novel traits in the context of Evangelical tradition. The importance they attributed to providing parish workingmen good example by becoming teetotalers themselves reflected the older Evangelical tradition of reform from top to bottom. This was true even though the abstaining clerics were themselves the objects of continuing pressure from working-class teetotalers in their parishes. The systematic and unembarrassed attempts of clerical abstainers to convert their own social and ecclesiastical superiors, however, were at least partly new in the Evangelical tradition. Evangelicals of the Clapham Sect had already employed the method of seeking a national moral regeneration by influencing those at the top of society, but in attempting to reach leading figures they had done so on a more or less equal social level. Evangelical teetotalers, however, were often much lower on the social scale than those whom they were trying to attract to the teetotal movement. In this sense,

then, the proselytising efforts of Evangelical teetotalers had more in common with the successful attempts of working-men to convert them than with the activities of the Clapham Sect.

NOTES

CHAPTER IV

¹Francis Close, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence (London, 1867), no. I, p. 3.

²Henry Ellison, in ibid., no. 3, pp. 16 and 18.

³Julia Wightman's letter to Catherine Marsh (n.d., probably mid-January, 1858), in J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue or Work While it is Day (London, 1860), p. 119.

⁴S.J. Ram, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 20, p. 115.

⁵Francis Close, cited in "Church of England Conference on Temperance", Weekly Record of the Temperance Movement, No. 319 (10 May, 1862), p. 163.

⁶Julia Wightman's letter to her sister Caroline (16 April, 1858), in J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue, p. 54.

⁷Henry Ellison, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 3, p. 139.

⁸In ibid., no. 16, p. 89.

⁹William Caine, Thoughts for Christians on Bible Wines and Temperance (Manchester, 1875), pp. 14-27.

¹⁰See Rev. Thomas Snow's letter to the editor (18 February, 1868), in Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. V (May, 1868), 155-156.

¹¹In his Thoughts for Christians on Bible Wines and Temperance, p. 128.

¹²See Richardson Campbell, Rechabite History, (Manchester, 1911); and F.W. Farrar, The Vow of the Nazarite. Preached before the University of Cambridge, at the Church of St. Mary the Great, 11 March, 1877 (London, 1877).

¹³In Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (February, 1863), 139.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 138.

¹⁵"v.x." 's letter to the editor (n.d., 1868), in ibid., new ser. V (1 April, 1868), 114.

¹⁶See Thomas Rooke, Parochial Temperance Associations: Hints on their Formation. A Paper read before the Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, May 4th, 1866 (London, 1866), pp. 5-6.

¹⁷Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. I (November, 1864), 340-341.

¹⁸Ibid., 3d ser. III (August, 1871), 142.

¹⁹See Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-sixth Annual Report, 1887, p. 18; Twenty-ninth Annual Report, 1890, p. 56; Thirtieth Annual Report, 1891, p. 11; and Thirty-ninth Annual Report, 1900, p. 5.

²⁰Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (18 February, 1873), 39.

²¹Ibid., loc. cit.

²²Henry Ellison, "The Saving of the Lost, A Sermon preached before the Church of England Total Abstinence Society, in the parish church of St. Clement Danes, London, May 5th, 1863", in his The Temperance Reformation Movement in the Church of England (London, 1878), p. 56. (Hereafter referred to as Temperance Reformation.)

²³Henry Ellison, "The Distinctive Ground to be Taken by the Clergy of the Church of England in Connexion with the Temperance Reformation and in the Formation of Societies, a Paper read at the Birmingham Conference of Abstaining Clergy, 1864", in ibid., p. 68.

²⁴Henry Ellison, "Church of England Temperance Society", in J.N. Stearns ed., Temperance in All Nations (New York, 1893), I, 207.

²⁵Henry Ellison, in his Temperance Reformation, p. vi.

²⁶Ibid., loc. cit.

²⁷Ibid., p. vii.

²⁸Henry Ellison, "The Distinctive Ground to be Taken by the Clergy of the Church of England in Connexion with the Temperance Reformation", in ibid., pp. 64-65.

²⁹Ibid., p. 64 (same address).

³⁰Henry Ellison, cited in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (18 February, 1873), 39.

³¹Ibid., loc. cit.

³²The biographical sketch of Henry Gale in this paragraph is based on the following sources: P.T. Winskill, A Biographical and Statistical Temperance Dictionary (Manchester, 1897), I, 396; P.T. Winskill, The Temperance Movement and its Workers (London, 1892), p. 147; and William Caine ed., A Biographical Key to the Picture Containing One Hundred and Twenty Portraits of Temperance Reformers (Manchester, 1860), pp. 54-55. (Hereafter referred to as Biographical Key.)

³³Henry Gale, How the Church Alone Can Save the Nation from the Curse and Consequences of the Drinking System (London, 1877), p. 17. Italics were Gale's.

³⁴Henry Gale, The Good Samaritan (London, 1862), p. 15.

³⁵Ibid., loc. cit.

³⁶Henry Ellison, "The Destroyer of the Works of the Devil", in his Sermons and Addresses on Church Temperance Subjects (London, 1894), p. 53. (Hereafter referred to as Sermons and Addresses.)

³⁷Ibid., pp. 52-53 (same sermon).

³⁸"The Recovery of the Captives", in ibid., p. 3.

³⁹I (November, 1862), 39. Capitals were his.

⁴⁰New ser. III (2 April, 1866), 97.

⁴¹In Biographical Key, p. 55.

⁴²Julia Wightman's letter to her sister Caroline (n.d., probably July, 1858), in J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue, p. 76.

⁴³I (December, 1862), 66-67.

⁴⁴Henry Ellison, "Parochial Temperance Societies", in his Sermons and Addresses, p. 17.

⁴⁵How the Church Alone Can Save the Nation from the Curse and Consequences of the Drinking System, p. 5. *Italics were his.*

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 6.

⁴⁷Robert Maguire, cited in "Rev. R. Maguire", Blue Ribbon Official Gazette and Gospel Temperance Herald, IV (27 May, 1885), 161.

⁴⁸Henry Ellison, "Parochial Temperance Societies", in his Sermons and Addresses, p. 27.

⁴⁹Francis Close, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 1, p. 2.

⁵⁰J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue, p. 258. *Italics were hers.*

⁵¹See Thomas Rooke, in his Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 24, pp. 129-131.

⁵²J.B. Wightman's "Address", read in her absence by her husband at the opening of the Shrewsbury Working-Men's Hall (8 April, 1862) cited in J.M.J. Fletcher, Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury, The Story of a Pioneer in Temperance Work (London, 1906), p. 136.

⁵³Ibid., loc. cit.

⁵⁴"Thomas Bouffler", Blue Ribbon Official Gazette and Gospel Temperance Herald, IV (20 May, 1885), 145.

⁵⁵Henry Ellison, "Parochial Temperance Societies", in his Temperance Reformation, p. 33.

⁵⁶Henry Ellison, in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, II (2 March, 1874), 46.

⁵⁷See Julia Wightman's letters to c____,____, (15 November, 1858), and to her sister Caroline (-August, 1859) in J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue, pp. 103 and 131; and J.M.J. Fletcher, Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury, p. 139.

⁵⁸See Julia Wightman's letter to Rev. & Mrs. W.G.D. Fletcher (30 April, 1890), in J.M.J. Fletcher, Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury, p. 185.

⁵⁹"Rules of the St. Alkmond's Total Abstinence Society", in J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue, p. 248.

⁶⁰Henry Ellison, "Parochial Temperance Societies", in his Sermons and Addresses, p. 20.

⁶¹Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. I (April, 1864), 124.

⁶²For a short biographical notice of Ellison, see "Ellison, Henry John", Frederick Boase ed., Modern Biographical Dictionary (London, 1965, [1912]), V, 224. Also see, Frederick Sherlock, Henry John Ellison Founder of the Church of England Temperance Society (London, 1910).

⁶³Henry Ellison, cited in "Church of England Conference on Temperance", Weekly Record of the Temperance Movement, No. 319 (10 May, 1862), p. 165. Formation of the C.E.T.S. is discussed in Chapter VIII.

⁶⁴Robert Maguire, cited in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, IV (1 November, 1876), 178.

⁶⁵Number contained in Robert Maguire's statement, cited in "Church of England Conference on Temperance", Weekly Record of the Temperance Movement, No. 319 (10 May, 1862), p. 165.

⁶⁶Julia Wightman's letter to Catherine Marsh (n.d., probably January, 1859), in J.B. Wightman, Haste to the Rescue, p. 119.

⁶⁷Julia Wightman, cited in J.M.J. Fletcher, Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury, p. 128.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 278.

⁶⁹Julia Wightman's letter to Mr. Jones (16 June, 1879), in ibid., p. 215.

⁷⁰Ibid., loc. cit.

⁷¹Julia Wightman, cited in ibid., p. 193.

⁷²Julia Wightman's letter to her sister Caroline (15 October, 1858), in ibid., p. 127.

⁷³Ibid., pp. 128-129; 139-140.

⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 129, 138-139.

⁷⁵Ibid., pp. 139-140; and Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. I (February, 1864), 40.

⁷⁶See Mrs. Wightman's form letter requesting funds for the Working-Men's Hall (18 June, 1861), in J.M.J. Fletcher, Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury, pp. 129-130.

⁷⁷For example, see Henry Gale, The Good Samaritan, p. 10.

⁷⁸See Church of England Temperance Chronicle, II (1 July, 1874), 109-110.

⁷⁹The incident is described in, "Rev. R. Maguire", Blue Ribbon Official Gazette and Gospel Temperance Herald, IV (27 May, 1885), 162.

⁸⁰Ibid.

CHAPTER V
THE CHURCH TEETOTAL SOCIETY AND
THE NONCONFORMISTS, 1857-1869

I

Clerical teetotalism was transformed in the short period between 1859 to 1862 from a movement representing the often unconnected efforts of local clergymen into an organized attempt to use the resources of the entire Church to create a sober nation. The establishment of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society, in October 1862, grew naturally out of attempts, beginning in 1858, to provide contact among parochial teetotalers all over the kingdom. Soon after the Society was organized its promoters began to think of it as the organ of the Church on temperance matters and to urge all Anglican clerics, from the archbishops to the lowest curates, to qualify for membership by becoming teetotalers.

In return for making the nation sober, the Church was promised no less than the preservation of its established position. Teetotal clerics argued that Nonconformists were less interested in disestablishment than in seeing the resources of the Church put to good use. They proposed, after

years of co-operation with Nonconformists in anti-drink movements, that the parochial system and the political power of the bishops could be saved if they were used to promote teetotalism and prohibition. And in spite of suggestions made particularly by Henry Ellison that they moderate their views, before 1869, the promoters of the Church teetotal society generally adhered to the strict teetotal and prohibitionist principles which they shared with many Nonconformists.

The purposes of this chapter will be to examine the development of organized clerical teetotalism from 1858 to 1862; and to discuss how, in the period 1862 to 1869, clerical teetotalism developed into a conscious movement to save the Church from the attacks of Nonconformists. At the same time teetotal clerics continued co-operating with Nonconformists to overcome working-class estrangement from religious adherence of any kind.

II

Before 1862 the abstaining clergyman, who in many cases had embraced teetotalism in response to critical local pressures in his own parish, often worked in virtual isolation from clerical abstainers in other parts of the kingdom. Robert Maguire, recalling the London Coffee House meeting of May, 1862, which by the following October had resulted in the establishment of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society, claimed that the organizers of the meeting had

been personally unacquainted with one another.¹

This is not to say that no communications had developed between clerical abstainers before 1862. Teetotal clerics had the regular ecclesiastical, social and family relationships of other Anglican clergymen. A common commitment to teetotalism must have brought clergymen closer together when they met at an Evangelical conference or a drawing-room gathering. The brothers Thomas and William Caine and James Bardsley, his brother Joseph and James' son, John W., were further related by blood as well as by their teetotalism and their ministry.² Clerical abstainers also developed an informal network of connections among themselves.

It would be tedious if not impossible to trace the extent of these connections before 1862, but if Julia Wightman's experience after she became a teetotaler was representative, they were considerable. In November, 1858, less than a year after she had begun her teetotal work, Julia Wightman received a note from the pioneer Evangelical abstainer, W.W. Robinson, congratulating her on her work and advertising the annual soiree of his Christ Church, Chelsea Total Abstinence Society. Mrs. Wightman was surprised that Robinson, "a perfect stranger to me even by name", had heard of her work. In fact even after having received his letter, she mistakenly referred to him in a letter to her sister Caroline as the Rev. J.W. Robinson.³ In 1857, she also co-operated with Stopford Ram in an attempt to obtain a list of abstaining clerics.⁴ After the public-

action of Haste to the Rescue, the next year, Mrs. Wightman's activities became well-known in Evangelical circles, particularly among the increasing number of teetotalers. By March 1860, Mrs. Wightman and Francis Close had become good friends. They exchanged notes about their teetotal publications and shared the problems which they had encountered in their parochial teetotal work.⁵ Henry Ellison praised Mrs. Wightman in his sermon early in 1862 marking initiation of the Windsor parochial teetotal society and, in the following year, he was present for the opening of her Shrewsbury Workingmen's Hall.⁶ Robert Maguire became a "staunch friend" of Mrs. Wightman as well as a partner for her tea and teetotal talk.⁷

Before 1862 teetotal clerics were most likely to meet one another at meetings of one of the secular, Non-conformist dominated anti-drink associations. The Manchester-based prohibitionist United Kingdom Alliance was particularly well supported by many of the Anglican clergy who were to become associated with the Church teetotal society. In October 1862, the month in which the Church teetotal society was founded, seven of the eleven ministerial vice-presidencies of the Alliance were held by Anglican clergymen.⁸ The list of Alliance vice-presidents was headed by Francis Close, who was to become the president of the Church teetotal society. Five of the other six Anglican ministerial vice-presidents of the Alliance were also clerical abstainers who later supported the Church teetotal

society:⁹ they were James Bardsley, Rector of St. James, Manchester, George T. Fox, incumbent of St. Nicholas, Durham, the Hon. Leland Noel, Vicar of Exton, Oakham in Rutland, Canon Evan Jenkins, Rector of Llangyniev near Welshpool, Wales, and Prebendary John Venn, Vicar of St. Peter's with St. Owen's in Hereford. The other Anglican clerical vice-president of the Alliance in 1862, Canon Hugh Stowell, incumbent of Christ Church, Salford, was not connected with the Church teetotal society.

Bardsley, Fox, Noel and Jenkins, all of whom had attended the Alliance's ministerial conference in Manchester in 1857, had been early supporters of the Alliance.¹⁰ Bardsley, one of its founders in 1853, claimed that it was through his influence that the organization had been called Alliance rather than League, as had been suggested.¹¹ Jenkins, Fox and Noel joined the Alliance soon after its formation.¹² Unlike the others, George Fox, brother of William Fox premier of New Zealand, was not a teetotaler before he joined the Alliance. Fox overcame what he described as "popular prejudices" to the teetotal pledge while serving as chairman the first day of the Alliance's 1857 ministerial conference in Manchester. He was particularly impressed with an address by Neal Dow and on returning to Durham after the Conference Fox took the pledge.¹³

Members of the Church teetotal society contributed to Alliance funds: thirty-four of the eighty-nine ministers

who donated money to the Alliance from October, 1861 to October, 1862 could be identified as Anglican.¹⁴ They also took a prominent part in deliberations of the Alliance-sponsored International Temperance and Prohibition Convention, held in London in early September, 1862. Delegates and members of the Convention included nineteen of the abstaining clergy who held nine of the Convention's official positions and delivered five of its speeches.¹⁵ Henry Gale preached the Convention's sermon at St. Botolph's Church, Aldersgate St.¹⁶

Teetotal clerics supported other temperance organizations, including the London-based National Temperance League, which played a strong role in the steps leading to establishment of the Church society. In 1859 two League members, Stopford Ram and Joseph Tucker, the teetotal squire of Pavenham, attempted to determine the strength of clerical teetotalism when they placed advertisements in Church papers asking abstaining clerics to identify themselves. They thereby extended the effort made two years before by Ram and Mrs. Wightman.

Joseph Tucker, who at an early age had entered the silk business in partnership with his brother, had retired with a comfortable fortune in his early 'fifties to take up residence at Pavenham, Beds., as the village's chief landowner, justice of the peace and church patron.¹⁷ He later recalled that when he had arrived in Pavenham in 1853 he had found himself surrounded with much "poverty, ignorance

and sin".¹⁸ The people, many of whom were employed as agricultural labourers, mat-makers and small traders, had few comforts and many of their children were never sent to school. Tucker felt that their difficulties were not due to poverty: he claimed that the men received good wages. Nor could they be attributed to lack of religious influence: there were Wesleyan and Primitive Methodist chapels and the Baptists shared facilities with the Anglicans at the parish church. He was soon led to believe that the poverty and immorality from which his villagers suffered were due to drink.

Pavenham was well supplied with both pubs and teetotal missionaries. The four village pubs were frequented by the population of about 500, particularly at times of church, social and harvest festivals. The local barns were well-used for meetings called by professional teetotal missionaries, such as Thomas Whittaker, the former Birmingham blacksmith, and Jabez Inwards, a Baptist from near Dunstable. It was during one of these barn teetotal meetings, about a year after he arrived in Pavenham, that Joseph Tucker took the pledge and determined to relieve the village of its drinking problems. His example was soon followed by his family and several of his servants. By 1865 two of the pubs had been closed and the village had 100 adult teetotalers and 80 children enrolled in the local Band of Hope. Tucker co-operated with the teetotal movement, locally and nationally, in various ways. In addition to super-

vising the Pavenham teetotal activities, he made sure that the most important social event of the year, the Harvest festival, was spirited in an entirely non-intoxicating way. He took part in events leading to the founding of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society. In October 1863, he became the Society's second treasurer, serving also as one of the vice-presidents of the National Temperance League. Tucker's commitment to teetotalism was so unbending that he refused to join the Church of England Temperance Society because the Society, formed in February 1873, permitted membership to moderate drinkers.¹⁹

Ram had been associated with the National Temperance League since 1855, when he became an abstainer by signing the pledge in the offices of what was then called the London Temperance League.²⁰ He may have met Tucker in League circles. In 1859 Ram was still perpetual curate at Christ Church, Stratford. In the following year Tucker as Patron of the Pavenham parish Church invited Ram to become perpetual curate there, a post which Ram was to hold until he resigned in 1874 to become full-time organizing secretary of the new Church of England Temperance Society.²¹

In 1859 advertisements, financed by Tucker and signed by Ram, were carried in the Guardian and the Record.²² They requested abstaining clergymen to send Ram their names and addresses. Answers were received from 158 teetotal clerics and another advertisement was prepared, appealing to the remainder of the Anglican clergy to support the teetotal

movement. The names of the 158 respondents to the original appeal were appended to the second advertisement, including those of Ram, Close and James Bardsley. The number of papers in which the second advertisement ran was expanded to include The Times and some other secular newspapers. The teetotal clerics pointed out to their non-abstaining brethren that although many efforts were being made "for the religious and social improvement of the people in this land", intemperance "well nigh nullifies them all".²³ They invited all clergymen to take part in the war of the parish against the pub by asking them to compare "our Sunday evening congregations with the hideous assemblages to be found in our gin-palaces, public-houses, and beershops".²⁴ As a result of the advertisement, a few more names were received of abstaining clergymen. Contacts by correspondence were then established between them.

The next move of the National Temperance League was to distribute, in 1861, 10,300 copies of Mrs. Wightman's Haste to the Rescue. The effect of this distribution has been exaggerated in Church temperance circles. When, in 1914, Mrs. Wightman's Bible was donated to the archives of the Church of England Temperance Society, a note was attached to it claiming that "One Result [of the 1861 distribution of Haste to the Rescue] Was the Founding in 1862 of the C.E.T.S."²⁵ This rather extravagant claim was generally consistent with Robert Maguire's judgment in his 1879 history that the distribution of Mrs. Wightman's

book "was the real beginning of the Movement within the Church of England."²⁶ Maguire gave the book credit for illustrating that teetotalism could be practised "under directly religious influences" and for provoking among clerical abstainers interest in establishing a Church teetotal society.²⁷ Maguire's judgment may have been true in a superficial sense. The London Coffee House meeting in May, 1862, was called in the wake of interest stirred by the 1861 distribution of Haste to the Rescue; and although Mrs. Wightman did not attend the all-male gathering, one of the highlights of the meeting was the reading of a letter which she had written on parochial teetotalism to Bishop John Lonsdale of Lichfield.²⁸ Those who attended the May Conference seemed, however, to have had no intention of founding a Church teetotal society.²⁹ They had generally become teetotalers not as a result of reading Haste to the Rescue, but in response to local and often non-Anglican influences. As will be shown later in this chapter, the formation in October, 1862, of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society did not cause a sharp break with non-Anglican precedents in the anti-drink movements.³⁰

The National Temperance League claimed credit for organizing the London Coffee House Conference; and one teetotal cleric remembered in 1893 that a League member, T.B. Smithies, editor of the British Workman and later a benefactor of the Church teetotal society, had paid the

expenses of the Conference.³¹

The three teetotal clerics who took the most active part in organizing and conducting the Conference, Francis Close, Stopford Ram and Robert Maguire, were members of the National Temperance League. Francis Close was also a vice-president of the United Kingdom Alliance.

Francis Close's name had headed the circular inviting Anglican clergymen to attend the meeting,³² and he served as president of the Conference. He was also appointed president of a Committee established by the Conference to carry on its work. After October, 1862, he became the president of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society.³³ Close's predominance however, was probably more honourary than active. As Dean of Carlisle he gave the activities of the clerical teetotalers a greater prestige than they might have had otherwise. There is no evidence that Close had taken a primary role in organizing the Conference. As the next chapter will show, his practical service as president of the Church teetotal society was limited.

Stopford Ram and Robert Maguire were more actively involved in the steps leading to formation of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society. They served as pro tem secretaries before the May, 1862, Clerical Conference, and were appointed honourary secretaries both of the Committee established at the Conference and of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society.³⁴ P.T. Winskill gave Ram credit

for actually organizing the Conference.³⁵ Robert Maguire maintained, however, that the Conference resulted from correspondence between several clerical abstainers, including himself. He claimed not to remember who had originated the idea for the meeting.³⁶ Ram and Maguire were, apparently, both responsible for receiving answers to the circulars inviting the Anglican clergy to the Conference. Ram read letters at the Conference from those who could not attend and Maguire announced that of the 1400 letters received not one had been antagonistic.³⁷

The tradition which later developed in Church temperance circles of referring to the London Coffee House Conference as the founding meeting of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society is technically incorrect. No mention was made of a Church teetotal society either in the letter inviting the clergy to the Conference or at the meeting itself. The letter, signed by Close and 48 other teetotal clerics, described drunkenness as "at the root of many of the evils of the present day--an obstacle and hindrance to our ministerial labour and success . . ."; and invited clergymen both to become abstainers and to participate in the Conference.³⁸

At this meeting, which was attended by over fifty teetotal clerics, discussion was mainly confined to the evils of drink and the necessity of parochial teetotalism. On the motion of the Rev. Talbot Greaves of St. Mary's Weymouth, the assembly resolved,

Seeing that the evils arising from the drinking habits of the people are so widely extended and exercise such a pernicious influence over every effort for the advancement of the Gospel at home and abroad, they appear to call upon this meeting of clergymen for special and extraordinary efforts to counteract them for the good of the Church, and for the glory of God.³⁹

The immediate means to be used by parochial clergymen in exercising this extraordinary effort was their own personal abstinence. Moderation was not enough. Robert Maguire told his teetotal colleagues that the three or four glasses of alcoholic drink which a clergyman might take daily might not harm his health because he ate well, but that "some of their poorer brethren might be put under the table" by the same amount.⁴⁰ The meeting resolved that clergymen should publicly become teetotalers and thus adopt "one of the most effectual means of checking the deplorable evils resulting from the drinking customs of the day".⁴¹ Ministers were advised to found parochial teetotal associations "as a means to the moral, social and spiritual good of their people".⁴²

Although the abstaining clerics at the London Coffee House did not mention the possibility of establishing a Church teetotal society, they appointed the Committee which, by the following October, would announce formation of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society. The May Conference resolved that a committee should be formed to keep "the subject of Total Abstinence and the suppression of the present liquor traffic before the mind of the Clergy of the Church of England".⁴³ The committee was to convene

occasional meetings in London and elsewhere for "mutual counsel" and to assist in the formation of parochial teetotal associations. They were to publish special papers to promote the teetotal cause among the clergy; to compile a list of abstaining Anglican clergymen; to organize another conference in the following year and to receive subscriptions and donations towards defraying the expenses of the May Conference and of subsequent operations.⁴⁴

In addition to Francis Close as president and Robert Maguire and Stopford Ram as honorary secretaries, the executive of the original Committee included a layman, Major Hon. H.L. Powys-Keck, as treasurer. Powys-Keck was the fifth son of Lord Lilford and heir to a wealthy uncle, Col. Keck from whom in 1860 he had adopted the latter part of his name.⁴⁵ Within the next few weeks, two of the quieter participants at the May Conference, Henry Ellison and Thomas Richardson, were appointed to the Executive: Ellison became Chairman, and Richardson a third honorary secretary.⁴⁶ Richardson, who in 1862 was incumbent of St. Matthew's Pell Street and lecturer of St. George's in the East, was like Ram and Maguire associated with the National Temperance League. He had taken the pledge in 1852 at the first Exeter Hall meeting of the original London Temperance League.⁴⁷ These six men became the executive of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society when its formation was announced in October, 1862.

The preparations of the Committee to establish a Church

teetotal society were rather informal. In fact, before October 1862, the Committee met as a body only twice.⁴⁸ Their activities personally and by correspondence were more extensive. In the period between May and October, 1862, the members of the Committee and others who had participated at the Conference tried to promote the extension of parochial teetotal societies. They developed on a wider basis the organizational framework with the Committee at its nucleus, which was to support the Church of England Total Abstinence Society. In July Henry Ellison delivered a paper at the Church Congress at Oxford in which he outlined his and others experiences with parochial teetotal societies; answered some of the religious objections to the movement; and urged Anglican clergymen to lead the teetotal movement in their own parishes.⁴⁹ Members of the Committee also participated in the two rival temperance conventions which were held in London in the summer of 1862 to coincide with the Great Exhibition of that year.

Robert Maguire spoke on parochial teetotal associations at the National Temperance Convention, organized at the beginning of August by the National Temperance League.⁵⁰ In his paper, Maguire argued that the nationally extended parochial system of the Church should be used as the basis for a national attack on intemperance.⁵¹ Francis Close, supported by a contingent of clerical teetotalers, read a paper at the International Temperance and Prohibition Convention which was convened at the beginning of the next

month, by the United Kingdom Alliance. Because of their prohibitionist views, the Alliance had been excluded from participation in the earlier Congress. Close fully supported the bias of the Convention when at the conclusion of his paper he stated that a "Christian government" could do no less than "abolish the open traffic" in alcoholic beverages.⁵²

The members of the Committee were also preparing to constitute formally a Church teetotal society which they considered "authorized to do by virtue of the power delegated to them" by the May Conference.⁵³ In addition to assessing the number of clerical abstainers, they appointed diocesan corresponding secretaries to organize their society on a national basis and prepared to issue a monthly periodical.

By October, 1862, the first issue of the periodical had appeared, called the Church of England Temperance Magazine. The issue was fairly typical of the sort of thing published in the Magazine until 1873 when it was replaced by the more ambitious Church of England Temperance Chronicle. It included reports on the May clerical conference, developments since then and the number of clerical abstainers ascertained to date. Mrs. Wightman and her counterpart in Notting Hill, Mrs. Mary Bayly, the author of Ragged Homes and How to Mend them, described their own teetotal work.⁵⁴ Also published in the October Magazine were a reprint of Francis Close's paper to the International Temperance and Prohibition Convention, a plea for total abstinence by Talbot Greaves; and the first part of a serialized fictional

tale by Mrs. Clara Lucas Balfour, a teetotaler since 1837 and one of the most popular of the growing number of teetotal "literati".⁵⁵ There were also two verses, "The Outcast Children's Cry", composed by one Mary Howitt, in which waifs pleaded for temperance and other virtues, and "The Vision of Mirza", a Bunyan-like allegory extracted from an Eastern tale which had been originally printed in the Spectator.⁵⁶

In the first issue of the Magazine, the Committee announced that they had compiled a list of 250 Anglican teetotal clerics of whom twenty-five had agreed to serve as corresponding secretaries for their dioceses.⁵⁷ Enclosed with the first issue was a prospectus outlining the constitution of the Society and naming its officers.⁵⁸ The next issue of the Magazine in November reported the names of twenty-two additional clerical abstainers and three more diocesan corresponding secretaries. This meant that the organizational structure of the new Society had now been extended to include all twenty-eight dioceses of England and Wales.⁵⁹ The promoters of the Society lyrically and ambitiously looked forward to the

...day when the influence of this organization [sic] will rise and spread throughout the Dignitaries and the Bench of the Church of England, and disperse itself, like the refreshing dew, upon the metropolitan and provincial parishes, to the advancement of the moral, social, domestic, and religious welfare of our country and population.⁶⁰

III

Henry Ellison knew in the early years of the Church teetotal society that if the clerical abstainers realistically wanted to influence the whole Church they would have to recast the anti-drink movement, which they had derived from mainly liberal and Nonconformist sources, into a mould more acceptable to Anglicans. Churchmen had shown themselves in the past receptive to moderate approaches like that of the British and Foreign Temperance Society and rather hostile to extreme expressions of both the teetotal and prohibitionist movements. Ellison consistently warned his fellow teetotal clerics to remember their mission was to the whole Church and not to offend potential Anglican converts by insisting too vigorously that they become teetotalers. In a sermon he preached at St. Clement Dane's in May, 1863, to commemorate the Society's first anniversary, Ellison advised teetotal clerics:

We seek to leaven the whole Church; we must not shrivel ourselves into the dimensions of a sect within it, as we should do by intolerance in thought and speech. We are ministering to others as well as the intemperate; then we must beware lest in any way we put the temperate in the wrong; and this we shall do if we press strongly as a duty on all, that which I have rather upheld as a special opportunity to some.⁶¹

Three principles, anticipating the spirit of compromise which by 1873 would enable the establishment of the Church-wide Church of England Temperance Society, can be extracted from Ellison's speeches and activities, as early as the

period 1862 to 1866. The first was that teetotal clerics should make their appeal in a manner consistent both with traditional Anglican doctrine and with the organizational structure of the Church. Ellison told the teetotal clerics at a special conference held in Birmingham, in December, 1864, that they should co-operate with Nonconformists in the teetotal movement, while not forgetting that they were Anglican clergymen. In the paper which he called "The Distinctive Ground To Be Taken by the Clergy of the Church of England", Ellison urged the clergy to stress the religious element of parochial teetotal meetings as the only sure way to permanent sobriety and to preach teetotalism in Anglican parishes only with the incumbent's permission.⁶²

Ellison's second principle was that non-abstaining clergymen should be encouraged to work with the Anglican teetotal movement. He had first made this suggestion, which reflected his own experience at Windsor, in a brief speech he gave at the London Coffee House Conference in May, 1862, and he repeated it more vigorously at the Birmingham Conference in December, 1864.⁶³

His third principle was that Anglicans should develop a political stance on the drink question separate from that of the Nonconformist-dominated and prohibitionist United Kingdom Alliance. Unlike many of his clerical colleagues, Ellison rejected the main proposition which lay behind the Alliance's legislative proposals that the sale of drink should necessarily be prohibited; he did agree, however, with

Alliance supporters that the licensing authority of the magistrates should be replaced with popularly elected boards. Beginning in 1866, he organized around himself a movement to reform the existing licensing laws, particularly by eliminating the great number of beer shops which had resulted from the Duke of Wellington's permissive legislation in 1830.⁶⁴ By December, 1868, Ellison's movement for restrictive legislation had resulted in the formation of the National Association for the Amendment of the Liquor Laws which paralleled the Church teetotal society as its unofficial political organ.⁶⁵

After 1865, Ellison had greater opportunities than the other clerical abstainers to press his opinions on the Church teetotal society. The Society's first full-time and salaried official, Thomas Rooke who served as organizing secretary from 1865 to 1870, had formerly been one of his curates at Windsor.⁶⁶ Rooke, who had been converted to teetotalism by Ellison only after a three or four year period as a non-abstaining participant in the Windsor parochial teetotal society, shared not only Ellison's views on clerical teetotalism, but many of his experiences.⁶⁷ Others in the Church teetotal society generally considered Rooke to be a spokesman for Ellison's moderate principles and they were willing to give them at least nominal adherence.⁶⁸ A speech which Rooke delivered at the Society's anniversary meeting in May, 1866, was published as the official guide for the formation of parochial teetotal

societies.⁶⁹ The speech had the marks of Ellison's influence in its emphasis on softly advocating teetotalism so as not to offend non-abstaining churchmen; the importance of stressing the religious element of parochial teetotalism and of not entering a parish in spite of the incumbent's opposition; and the advisability of making a place in the Anglican teetotal movement for non-abstaining clergymen.⁷⁰

Although there is limited evidence that other Church teetotalers directly challenged Ellison and Rooke on these points, they often did so indirectly in word or in deed. At times, in spite of Ellison's warnings to the contrary, they behaved with all the intransigence of sectarians trying to reform the Church according to their own pattern. No one was free from their sharp tongues or pens, least of all their own bishops.⁷¹ In 1867 alone, the bishops were accused in the Church of England Temperance Magazine of being less socially conscious than even the English Roman Catholic hierarchy, of being tied financially to the liquor interests and of virtual idolatry. In April, 1867, Robert Maguire, on returning from a temperance meeting at the London City Guildhall at which Archbishop Manning had been the only prelate present, complained in the Magazine of

...men of alien notions and foreign sympathies taking, or appearing to take a deeper and more practical interest in the social and physical condition of England and Englishmen, than is manifested by our own chief pastors and fathers of the Church.⁷²

In an editorial in June of the same year the bishops were

said to be "hedged in by circumstances".⁷³ The reason they did not become teetotalers was that they were afraid to lose the financial support of the brewers in their dioceses.⁷⁴ "Do not," the editorial asked, "'Our Bishops' and 'Our Clergy', thus serve the great god that is made of beer-barrels and hopheads!"⁷⁵

Ellison's advice that the religious elements of parochial teetotalism should be given a primary place seems to have been more closely followed, at least in a literal sense. Clerical abstainers claimed that religious exercises were employed to an unprecedented extent at Anglican teetotal meetings.⁷⁶ Reports of parochial meetings, which emphasized Christian instruction, prayer and hymn-singing, justified that claim to some extent.⁷⁷ However, as was indicated in chapter three, the Society's Prayer Union gained weak and uneven support; and the secular objectives of the teetotal movement sometimes received primary attention. Moreover, teetotal clerics were accused of entering at least one Anglican parish without the consent of the incumbent. In December, 1865, the parish priest of Meigh, Newry, Ireland complained in a letter to the Church of England Temperance Magazine that within the last eighteen months two clergymen, whose names had appeared on the Society's lists of clerical abstainers, had, despite his opposition, proselytized in his parish on behalf of Nonconformist teetotal organizations.⁷⁸

Ellison's policy of permitting non-abstaining clergymen to work with the Church teetotal movement gained slow

and incomplete acceptance. At the convention of the National Temperance League in August, 1862, Robert Maguire, without mentioning his name, ridiculed the position which Ellison had taken at the London Coffee House Conference in May, that non-abstaining clergymen should be permitted to participate in parochial teetotal societies.

It seems an incongruity, to say the best of it. It also looks so very patronizing, as though the person were not of the same flesh and blood; as though he were removed from beyond the reach of the common temptations of men...; and thus the link of sympathy is lost.⁷⁹

Maguire's feelings against admitting non-abstainers to Church teetotal work had not changed as late as 1873 when he refused to link his Clerkenwell parochial teetotal society with the re-organized Church of England Temperance Society. His views were shared by other clerical teetotalers. Although several concessions were made in the Society's constitution to Ellison's stand, they had little practical effect before 1870. Even though after 1865 it became officially possible for non-abstaining clergymen to head parochial teetotal societies, few did so before 1870. The parish teetotal societies at Holy Trinity in Dover and St. Margaret's Westminster were both officially headed in 1866 by incumbents who felt unable to take the pledge for medical reasons.⁸⁰ In both cases the actual conduct of parish teetotal activities was entrusted to abstaining clerics: in Holy Trinity, Dover, the parish curate was a teetotaler, but at St. Margaret's, Westminster, teetotal

meetings were supervised by Lord Wriothsesley Russell who travelled fortnightly from Windsor where he held a number of ecclesiastical posts.⁸¹ Even though, after 1865, non-abstaining clerics were warmly invited to help the Church teetotal movement financially and in other ways, teetotalism continued to be a requirement for full membership in the Society.⁸² In 1870 the status of associate membership was created to permit sympathetic non-teetotal bishops to become patrons of the Society;⁸³ but this was done only because the clerical teetotalers had failed to convert domestic bishops to total abstinence and they needed the prestige of their support.⁸⁴

Before 1869, Ellison's legislative policy received some formal support from the Executive of the Church teetotal society. They authorized deputations to Archbishop Charles Longley of Canterbury in 1866 and to Gathorne Hardy, Disraeli's Home Secretary, in 1868 pressing for a reduction in the number of beer shops.⁸⁵ Ellison's movement for more restrictive liquor licensing was, however, only one of a number of political proposals which various members of the Society favoured. Before 1869, appeals for the Sunday closing of liquor outlets and for permissive prohibition received more attention in the Society's Magazine than did Ellison's movement. The many supporters of the United Kingdom Alliance in the Church teetotal society often ignored the existence of Ellison's political programme which, in their view, did not go far enough. From May to

September, 1866, a series of six articles called "Pleas for Prohibition" appeared in the Church of England Temperance Magazine.⁸⁶ The articles, which openly supported the policies of the United Kingdom Alliance, did not specifically mention Ellison's efforts to secure legislative restrictions of the liquor trade. This was despite a report in the Magazine for May, 1866, of the deputation seeking restrictive temperance legislation which Ellison had led the month before to Archbishop Longley.⁸⁷ The articles, nonetheless condemned any attempt to improve the existing licensing system.

Being essentially evil, immoral, and corrupt, it is not possible to make it good by any kind of legislative tinkering... There is no remedy, and can be none, short of PROHIBITION.⁸⁸

This anonymous judgment which indirectly dismissed Ellison's political activity as useless tinkering could have been written by any of several officers or members of the Church teetotal society. Ellison's policy of legislative restriction gained more support in the Church teetotal society only after 1869 when it was found to be more effective than appeals to either teetotalism or prohibition in attracting the interest of bishops and other Anglican dignitaries.⁸⁹ Until then, the exponents of strict teetotalism and prohibition seem to have had the upper hand. At the same Birmingham Conference where, in 1864, Ellison had pleaded for a distinctive Anglican movement, Canon Evan Jenkins had called for adhesion to teetotal and prohibitionist principles to a degree which would have pleased the

strictest Nonconformist temperance enthusiasts.

The two movements have in my opinion, precisely the same grand object in view--they differ only in their mode of operation. The one movement seeks to keep the people from drink--that is total abstinence; and the other movement to keep the drink from the people--that is the Permissive Bill of the United Kingdom Alliance. I am attached to both.⁹⁰

In fact, close co-operation between members of the Church teetotal society and the Nonconformist-dominated National Temperance League and United Kingdom Alliance corresponded to the policy announced when the separate Anglican organization was formed in October, 1862. In the first issue of the Church of England Temperance Magazine, the attitude of the new Anglican teetotal society towards the older groups was described as one "of cordial sympathy". The officers of the Society claimed to enjoy "the most friendly relations" with the League and the Alliance and promised "to influence new centres, to raise up fresh allies and to contribute another contingent to the common battlefield".⁹¹ At times, some teetotal ministers seem to have placed a higher priority on their allegiance to the League or the Alliance than to their own Anglican organization. The Church of England Temperance Magazine, as late as 1869, reported that slight attendance at the Society's annual May Conference for that year may have been due to large meetings of the United Kingdom Alliance and the National Temperance League held earlier in the week.⁹²

Relations, especially with the National Temperance

League, were generally considered beneficial to the Church teetotal society. Robert Maguire recalled that, in the early days of the Church teetotal society, "the National Temperance League, as old hands, 'coached' us over the waters that at that time were rather new to us".⁹³ Henry Ellison, not an indiscriminate friend of Nonconformists, told teetotal clerics at the 1864 Birmingham Conference that one of the results of his teetotal work for which he was most "grateful" was the "introduction it has given me to some of the leading members of the Society of Friends, and foremost among them the noble-hearted President of the National Temperance League", Samuel Bowly.⁹⁴ Bowly, although an exponent of disestablishment, was generally considered by Church teetotalers to express a brand of teetotalism which was consistent with Anglican doctrine.⁹⁵

The members of the National Temperance League had more experience with teetotal proselytism and, apparently, closer connection with some Anglican dignitaries than many of the abstaining clerics. Consequently, League representatives often appeared in advisory capacities at meetings of the Church teetotal society at both the parish and the national levels.⁹⁶ Executive members of the Church teetotal society attended functions of the League and promoted its activities in the Church of England Temperance Magazine.⁹⁷ The first teetotal sermon preached in any English cathedral was arranged by the National Temperance League. The League's secretary, Robert Rae, negotiated with W.F. Hook, the

teetotal dean of Chichester, for Henry Ellison to preach at Chichester Cathedral on 22 February, 1869.⁹⁸ The first sermons granted the Church teetotal society at Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's Cathedral were also arranged by League officials: on 7 July, 1867, Robert Maguire addressed an "overflow crowd" in the nave of the Abbey; and on 20 February, 1870, Henry Ellison preached to an unusually large Sunday congregation at St. Paul's.⁹⁹ The League further co-operated by publishing Maguire's sermon and by arranging for Ellison to deliver a sermon on 22 February, 1870, in Gloucester Cathedral.¹⁰⁰

The Church teetotal society was especially dependent on the generosity of T.B. Smithies who, like Joseph Tucker, its treasurer from 1863 to 1871, was a Nonconformist member of the National Temperance League. Smithies, a former Quaker who had converted to Wesleyan Methodism, provided the Society with office space from 1862 to 1868 and subsidized the Church of England Temperance Magazine in 1864 and 1865.¹⁰¹

Officially, the Executive of the Church teetotal society sometimes kept at a greater distance in supporting the United Kingdom Alliance. The reason most often given for their reluctance to endorse directly the Alliance was that, as members of a Church organization, they were engaged in a movement of temperance reformation whose object was ultimately religious and that the promoters of the Alliance were involved for secular motives in a purely political movement. According to a columnist in the Church

of England Temperance Magazine, for July, 1864, this was no reason for condemning the prohibitionists.

So long as any good is to be gained by the prohibition of intoxicating drinks--whether social, religious or political good--we cannot deny the use of our great lever to those who would employ it only for the temporal advantage of their fellow-men.¹⁰²

The secular motives of the prohibitionists, however, had to be regarded as "the threshold and the highway to higher and holier ends" which were more immediately in the province of the Church teetotal society.¹⁰³ There was as the Executive admitted in their Annual Report for 1865, a more practical reason for not directly supporting the Alliance. Although some members of the Church teetotal society were ardent prohibitionists, some were moral suasionists who preferred a completely voluntary approach to the drink problem. The official policy expressed in the 1865 Report was "to leave it to each man's own judgment and option as to how he can best promote the movement in his own parish or neighbourhood".¹⁰⁴

Individual supporters of the United Kingdom Alliance seem to have felt no compunction in using the facilities of the Church teetotal society to endorse prohibitionist policy. In 1864, the same year in which Canon Evan Jenkins pleaded with the abstaining clerics at the Birmingham Conference to support teetotalism and prohibition, William Caine, at the annual meeting of the Church teetotal society, campaigned for the Alliance's legislative proposal: "the

great Permissive Bill which has for its object the removing altogether that which is the cause of a great portion of the horrible evils by which we are at present encompassed".¹⁰⁵ The 1866 series in the Church of England Temperance Magazine, called "Pleas for Prohibition", was representative of frequent articles which appeared in the Magazine on behalf of Alliance proposals.

Teetotal clergymen not only continued to support the League and the Alliance, but looked for new contacts with Nonconformists in the teetotal movement. In the winter and spring of 1865, Robert Maguire visited the teetotal societies of north and central London to organize them in some kind of co-ordinated effort.¹⁰⁶ After his tour in the summer of 1865 Maguire invited two members of each society to tea. According to his own account, "many earnest-minded men" responded to the invitation and the meeting resulted in the formation of the North London Temperance Union.¹⁰⁷ Representatives of twenty-two temperance societies elected Maguire to head the organization. One of the purposes of the Union was to organize excursions with the money saved by workingmen from the pubs. On 11 September, 1865, 4,000 people assembled on Waltham Green on one of the Union's outings.

IV

Teetotal clerics realized that many of the Nonconformists with whom they co-operated to advance teetotal or

prohibitionist goals were actively engaged in movements to diminish the power of the Anglican Church. The history of the Church teetotal society, from its foundation in 1862 until its reorganization in 1873, paralleled a period when the force of Nonconformist attacks and the reform policies of the first Gladstone ministry made many churchmen fear complete disestablishment. Teetotal clerics were not immune to this fear. William Caine warned English readers of the Church of England Temperance Magazine in September, 1868, that they too were threatened by current attempts to disestablish the Church in Ireland.

Efforts are now being made in every county, and city, and town, and parish in the kingdom to bring about the separation of Church and State, and so far to destroy the Constitution which has hitherto been the boast of every Englishman.¹⁰⁸

Many clerical abstainers who read Caine's warning knew from experience the inroads which Nonconformists were making in British parishes. Of the 415 declared teetotal clerics in the English and Welsh dioceses in 1864 whose positions could be traced, 381 were parish ministers.¹⁰⁹ Others, including domestic missionaries, teachers and chaplains to social agencies, had at least indirect connections with parish work. The regions of England with the highest number of teetotal clerics were often areas where the Anglican Church had the greatest difficulty in holding its own against the Nonconformists.¹¹⁰ Conversely, in the regions of England with the lowest concentration of teetotal clerics the Church often attracted an unusually high proportion of worshippers.

Anglicans in only one of the four regions of England, which in 1864 had the greatest number of teetotal clerics, could claim, by virtue of the Census of 1851, to have attracted more than an average share of attendants at religious services. In the West-midlands, 56.20% of the attendances counted at all the services of all Christian denominations were credited to the Anglicans. This compared favourably with the national average by which Anglicans accounted for 51.70% of the total attendances. In the other three, the North-west, the North and the North-midlands, Anglicans were only able to report under 44% the total attendances recorded for their regions. The reverse was true in the four regions with the fewest number of clerical teetotalers. Anglicans in three of the four regions, the South-east, the East and the South-midlands, claimed more than 51.70% of the total attendances. In the South-west, 51.12% of the total number of attendances were credited to the Anglicans, which approximated the national average. The Census of 1851 had also revealed that Anglicans in five of the nine counties which in 1864 had the greatest number of teetotal clerics, Lancashire, Yorkshire, Durham, Derbyshire and Staffordshire, had failed to attract 51% of the attendances recorded for their counties. In the other four, London, Gloucestershire, Warwickshire and Cumberland, attendances at Anglican Churches, in proportion to attendances at the services of other denominations, exceeded the national average.

Some Anglican clergymen had entered the teetotal field partly because they feared that the Nonconformist connection with teetotalism had created a source of leakage from the parish church. In April, 1866, the Church of England Temperance Magazine, in an appeal for funds, quoted an unnamed clergyman who considered his temperance operation as a means of competition with Nonconformists for the loyalty of the people in his parish.¹¹¹ The Nonconformists already operated a flourishing temperance society before he arrived in the parish. After the clergyman founded a parochial teetotal society, the two organizations went their own ways with little contact between them. The clergyman felt that the Anglican society was a "secondary thing compared with theirs" and would continue to be so unless the parochial teetotal work received some outside help. He considered that the head-start of Nonconformists in temperance work had attracted many former Anglicans from the Church to the chapel

...whom it would be perhaps impossible to draw back again; and I feel convinced that if there had been a temperance association in connection with our own Church a few years ago, the Church would have retained many members who are now lost to us.

Henry Ellison had expressed a similar view during the 1862 Church Congress at Oxford. He told the Congress delegates that many workingmen who were the "strength and ornaments" of the Nonconformist sects were Nonconformists only because they were reformed drunkards and "the dissenters showed them the way to recover from their terrible

sin".¹¹² Two years later at the Birmingham Conference of abstaining clerics, Ellison even hinted that clerical teetotalism might serve as an agency for Anglican proselytism among Nonconformists. Ellison told the teetotal clerics at the Conference that they could expect that Nonconformists would want to participate in their parochial teetotal organizations. He insisted that their presence was no reason to diminish the doctrinal content of the Anglican teetotal meetings. He did not anticipate that the Nonconformists would leave the parochial organizations because of their Anglican orientation, but if they did so it would probably be in favour of teetotal organizations connected with their own chapels.¹¹³

Clerical teetotalism, then, was at least partly rooted in a crude Anglican-Nonconformist competition to determine which could attract the most local worshippers. Parish ministers were advised to become abstainers in imitation of Nonconformists so that they could challenge their success in attracting parishioners to religious services. Robert Maguire, on returning from his 1865 organizing tour of the mainly Nonconformist teetotal organizations of north and central London, told clerical readers of the Church of England Temperance Magazine that if they wanted to find the workingman who did not attend Anglican services "they could scarcely do better than pay a visit to the Temperance halls in their neighbourhood, and they will find there the very best of the workingmen, ready to be enlisted in any good

work".¹¹⁴ Maguire even admitted in passing that if teetotalism were used "simply as a lever for restoring lost and lapsed attachments to our Church we would not go amiss". However, he was quick to add that "this is not our main object".¹¹⁵

Maguire's reservation represented more than token respect for the Nonconformists who had gained the allegiance of these "lapsed attachments". Abstaining clerics usually admitted the debt which they owed to Nonconformists for introducing teetotalism into parochial life and expressed embarrassment that they had neglected a movement which in their view the Church had a responsibility to promote. Even Henry Ellison saw the initiative which Nonconformists had taken by adopting teetotalism in a light favourable to Nonconformity and critical of the Church. Writing of his earliest contacts with working-class teetotalers, Ellison remembered that,

They were chiefly Dissenters, it is true, they could not well have been anything else, seeing it was in the Dissenting chapels and schools, while we the clergy were standing aloof, that the promoters of the movement had found a welcome.¹¹⁶

Clerical abstainers usually regarded the connection of Nonconformists with the teetotal movement as a challenge to the Church. The lead which Nonconformists had taken in confronting intemperance implied the failure of the National Church to address itself to a problem within its own responsibility. The Church of England Temperance Magazine, for October, 1867, observed that: "If any good movement

becomes a dissenting movement in this country, then it is because the Church has not done its duty in respect to that movement".¹¹⁷

This observation implied both sympathy with Nonconformist complaints against the Church and a comprehensive belief in the Church's responsibilities towards the nation.

Clerical abstainers sometimes went a long way in agreeing with Nonconformist arguments that the Church had not properly fulfilled her social obligations. William Caine's warnings in September, 1868, that total disestablishment might be at hand were issued with a sympathetic list of Nonconformist grievances against the Church. Anglican leaders had neglected their responsibilities in educating the nation; had supported the South in the American Civil War; and had opposed the Reform Bill of 1832 and the Repeal of the Corn Laws.¹¹⁸

Caine repeated without rebuttal the regret recently expressed by a Nonconformist supporter of Irish disestablishment at the "comparative indifference" shown by Anglican bishops and clergy on

...great questions which affected the welfare of the nation, the table of the working man, the food of the people; but when there came a question concerning the ... property of the Church ... they were all there to protest before God and man for the sacred rights of property.¹¹⁹

Clerical abstainers partially agreed with Nonconformists that Anglican institutions had failed to come to terms with the industrial age but they denied that these institutions were no longer useful. They justified the creation of a

separate Church teetotal society, in a field dominated by Nonconformists, by the proposition that the unique resources of the Established Church would enable them to exercise "a special work for which no other Society is so specially qualified".¹²⁰ In the November, 1862, issue of the Church of England Temperance Magazine, the Anglican parochial system was said to offer exceptional possibilities for the spread of teetotalism. It provided a network by which all the inhabitants in the most remote parts of the country could be reached.¹²¹ Although this proposition accurately described the geographical extension of the parochial system, it was based on a wishful assessment of the parish minister's potential influence. The local clergyman was described in the same article as "Minister, not of a congregation only, but of a parish; and over and above his ordinary congregation, all the inhabitants of his district are, at least nominally in his charge".¹²² In a similar vein, Robert Maguire had told the delegates to the Convention of the National Temperance League in August, 1862

Within the charge of a parochial minister is included all that is spiritual, nearly all that is educational, and much of that which is social and philanthropic... His work, in fact, includes everything that tends to promote the peace, the happiness, the temporal and external welfare of the parishioners.¹²³

Those teetotal clergymen who also supported prohibition emphasized the power for moral legislative reform which the bishops could exercise. Henry Gale told supporters of the United Kingdom Alliance in his sermon prior to their

Convention in September, 1862, of the help they should expect from "our Bishops whose duty it is whilst, they defend the interests temporal and spiritual of the 'Church Established' also to promote the morality and happiness of the nation".¹²⁴

Teetotal parish ministers assumed, then, that their own responsibilities and those of the bishops were as great in the present industrial age as they had been in the rural and feudal era in which the parochial system and the political power of the episcopal bench had been created. They hoped that by using the institutions of the Established Church to combat intemperance they would demonstrate to the Nonconformists that disestablishment would deprive the nation of these unique resources for social and moral amelioration.

Apologists for clerical teetotalism and prohibition obviously exaggerated the benefits which the parish minister and the bishop could expect from participation in anti-drink movements. The utopian character of secular teetotalism survived in the clerical movement even when the objectives pursued were ecclesiastical. By accepting the teetotal root-branch explanation of human distress, the clerical abstainer was able to tell the parish clergyman that most of the temporal and spiritual troubles from which his parishioners suffered were due to their drinking habits. Samuel J. Stone, the composer of hymns, wrote in 1865 while he was serving as one of Henry Ellison's curates at Windsor that "three-fourths of all the wickedness and misery,--of all the evil, physical, moral and spiritual . . . could be traced to the use made by

the devil of the power of drink".¹²⁵ Robert Maguire had told delegates to the 1862 National Temperance League Convention that drink caused "nine-tenths" of a parish's "sins and sorrows".¹²⁶ Therefore, if the parish minister helped to eliminate drink from the tables of his parishioners, he was really helping to eliminate most of their problems. According to William Caine, if the clergy and the bishops used their political influence to press for prohibition they would contribute to the "temporal and eternal welfare of millions of their fellow-creatures now being injured and ruined in this world and the next by the poison--alcohol".¹²⁷

As well as magnifying the importance of drink as a cause of social problems at the parochial and national levels, apologists for clerical teetotalism often exaggerated the importance which Nonconformists attributed to anti-drink movements. Because clerical abstainers met Nonconformists primarily in teetotal circles, they sometimes tended to stress the interest which many Nonconformists had in seeing Anglicans take a stronger position on the drink question and to under-estimate their other grievances towards the Church. Robert Maguire was pleased to find during his 1865 tour of the mainly Nonconformist temperance associations of north and central London that

. . . the feeling about 'Church establishments' and 'Church rates' got thrust into the background, and speakers would rise up to propose a vote of thanks, and express their gratification, that 'the old Mother Church of this land; the National Church' had taken up this great subject.¹²⁸

The parish minister and the bishop were both assured by clerical abstainers that they could earn the same sort of gratification from Nonconformists if they, too, co-operated in movements to combat intemperance. Teetotalism would help revive the parochial system by actually extending the influence of parish ministers over all the people in their jurisdictions. The parochial clergyman, according to the November, 1862, Church of England Temperance Magazine, had "but to lead the way in any good work, and in due time the people will follow the good leadership of a pastor and friend".¹²⁹ William Caine further promised in 1868 that

Were all the clergy, with the archbishops and bishops at their head, even now at the eleventh hour to unite and petition the Queen and Parliament for the abolition of the traffic in intoxicating drinks, the enemies of the Church would be silenced to a great extent, and they would begin to think that the bishops and clergy were not the useless, worthless men they thought they were . . .¹³⁰

If the clergy and bishops did not co-operate in the anti-drink campaign, they would demonstrate a lack of responsibility which might lead to the deterioration and destruction of Anglican institutions. Henry Ellison told the abstaining clergy at the 1864 Birmingham Conference that without the aid of movements such as teetotalism the "parochial machinery of our Church becomes a system of mere lifeless formalism in our hands. . ."¹³¹ William Caine predicted in 1868 that

"If all the bishops and clergy do not soon join our Total Abstinence movement there is no doubt whatever but that their indifference to the misery and vice and crime of the people committed to their

charge will be used as . . . a most powerful argument for the entire destruction of our church as the Established Church. . ."132

v

The main reason for Anglican and Nonconformist co-operation in the anti-drink movement went beyond their sectarian differences. The estrangement of the working classes from religious adherence, revealed in the Census of 1851, had shocked Nonconformists only slightly less than Anglicans. The relatively greater success which Nonconformists had often enjoyed over Anglicans in attracting congregations in the main commercial and industrial areas of England was almost overshadowed by the failure of all denominations to establish habits of worship among the working classes. In three of the four regions which in 1864 had the highest number of teetotal clerics, Christians of all denominations had failed in 1851 to attract an average number of attendants at their religious services.¹³³ Returns for the Census of 1851 showed that in the West-midlands, North-west and the North, the attendances at the services of all denominations in proportion to the total populations of those regions was lower than the national average of 58.39%. In the North-midlands, the rate of attendance was 63.07%. Conversely, in the four regions with the fewest number of teetotal clerics, the South-east, the South-west, the East and the South-midlands, the rates of attendance were above the national average. The least important region for clerical abstinence, the

South-midlands where there were only 19 teetotal clerics, had the highest rate of attendance at religious services, over 80%.

All nine counties with the greatest number of teetotal clerics except Gloucester and Derbyshire had shown rates of attendance below the national average. Derbyshire with a 58.47% rate of attendance roughly equalled the national averages and Gloucester with 65.55% comfortably exceeded it. Anglicans in Lancashire, Yorkshire, Durham and Staffordshire were abnormally unsuccessful in attracting working-class adherents, both absolutely and proportionately to Nonconformists. In London, Warwickshire, and Cumberland, the unusual success which the Anglicans had in holding their own against the Nonconformists was little consolation to those churchmen who realized the more significant failure of all Christians to attract an average number of workingmen to their religious services.

The teetotal cleric saw the main rival to his influence not in the Nonconformist minister but in the publican. In industrial England the pub, not the chapel, had assumed the role of community centre once performed by the parish. The pub was the most obvious symbol of the disorientation which drove workingmen to seek convivial refuge from the misery, toil, and anonymity of an unfamiliar industrial society. At the same time it clearly symbolized the failure of the parish to relieve this disorientation by providing workingmen with doctrines and programmes relevant to their urban

situation. Therefore, the teetotal cleric attacked the pub not only to reassert his claim that the parish was the rightful centre of modern community life, but to legitimize that claim by defeating drink as the cause of most moral, social and economic problems which workingmen faced in adjusting to industrial society. The Nonconformist might not agree with the desire of the teetotal cleric to reassert the central importance of the Anglican parish in the modern community; but he could not deny the importance both of attracting workingmen to religious adherence and of helping them adjust to industrial society. Most teetotal Nonconformists shared with most teetotal clergymen a common Evangelicalism which made the spiritual salvation of Britain a necessary goal. Teetotal Christians of all persuasions usually found in the liberal foundations of teetotalism agreement on the best methods of achieving the slightly less necessary goal of a prosperous Britain.

Teetotalism had absorbed from the liberal climate which had spawned it a belief that social distress could be more effectively eliminated by relying on self-help rather than on state intervention or increased wages. Teetotalers also, at least implicitly shared in the liberal optimism that the laws of economics and the strength of human nature were up to such a task. The teetotal cleric who told his parishioners to improve their lot by the discipline of a sober life displayed a belief in self-help which would have been accepted in most Nonconformist chapels; he also exhibited a

distrust of the state which was shared by the secularist, as well as the Nonconformist exponent of disestablishment, and an opposition to increased wages which would have pleased any employer. If he also supported the prohibitionist United Kingdom Alliance, the teetotal cleric, by asserting that the majority of a community should have the right to legislate prohibition, virtually endorsed democratic methods.

Not surprisingly, clerical teetotalism was most popular in centres of concentrated population where the problems of industrial society were the greatest and most obvious. The Anglican clergy who became teetotalers often lived in regions or counties where the industrial revolution had created heavy internal migration which in turn had caused serious problems of adjustment for church and people alike.

Of the 410 declared teetotal clerics on mainland England and Wales in 1864, 124 or more than a quarter lived in cities with a population over 50,000; 233, more than half, lived in communities with more than 10,000 people; and 319, more than three-quarters, lived in centres in which the population was greater than 2,000.¹³⁴ Most of the areas where a majority of the teetotal clerics lived were still facing abnormally high immigration immediately prior to the establishment of the Church teetotal society.¹³⁵ Three of the four regions of England with the greatest concentration of teetotal clerics in 1864, the West-midlands, the North and the North-west, had recorded rates of population increase in the census period 1851-1861 greater than the national

average of 12%. The North-midlands had experienced a population increase in the same period of only 6%. The average rate of population increase for the period 1851 to 1861 had also been exceeded in seven of the nine counties which in 1864 had the highest number of clerical abstainers: London, Lancashire, Yorkshire, Warwickshire, Durham, Derbyshire and Staffordshire. In Gloucestershire and Cumberland the rate of population increase had fallen below the national average.

Clerical teetotalism was least popular in rural areas where problems were fairly familiar and the population relatively stable. Of the 410 recorded clerical abstainers on mainland England and Wales in 1864, only 89 lived in places with fewer than 2,000 people: 36 in localities with 1,000 to 2,000 people; 27 in communities with 500 to 1,000; and 26 in villages and hamlets with fewer than 500 people.¹³⁶ The rate of population increase recorded in areas where there were few clerical abstainers was usually low. In three of the four regions which in 1864 had the fewest number of teetotal clerics, the South-west, the East and the South-midlands, the population increase for the census period 1851 to 1861 was below the national average of 12%. The rate of population increase in the South-east had exceeded the national average by 1%.¹³⁷

When a rural clergyman employed parochial teetotalism he sometimes adapted it to suit the needs and attitudes of the country-side. T.H. Gill, chaplain of St. Mark's on the Isle of Man, found conventional suggestions for the conduct

of parochial teetotal societies were too closely tied to the urban situation. In an article in the August, 1863, Church of England Temperance Magazine, Gill argued that whereas the city clergyman had a number of district visitors, city missionaries, scripture readers, as well as "fairly educated tradesmen and mechanics" on whom he could rely in his teetotal organization, the country cleric had to do most of the organizing himself.¹³⁸ Consequently, the organization which Gill proposed for teetotal work in rural parishes was paternalistic. Gill suggested that workingmen be invited to address the parish teetotal meetings on the grounds that "many of them will come to hear 'one of themselves' speaking, who would not come to hear others". However, he went on to advise "great caution . . . in selecting speakers of this kind: if possible, hear what they have to say beforehand".¹³⁹ Such country versions of parochial teetotalism were relatively rare.

The low concentration of teetotal clerics in rural areas was consistent with the general failure of teetotalers to make great inroads in the country-side. From the beginning of the movement, teetotal missionaries had not ignored the rural communities which lay between the cities in their proselytizing itineraries. Later in the movement, as Harrison and Trinder show in a recent article, Nonconformist-dominated temperance leagues paid agents to keep contact between isolated teetotalers in the country and the main bodies of teetotalers in the towns.¹⁴⁰ Nonetheless, teetotalers

whether Anglican or Nonconformist, gained few converts among the Anglican country clergy.

Of course, in those rural areas where the livelihoods of the inhabitants depended on producing or processing the ingredients for brewing or distilling, teetotalism and prohibition were sometimes looked on with particular suspicion. The Church of England Temperance Magazine regretted to report, in January, 1867, that a clergyman whose name had previously appeared on the Society's list of clerical abstainers had abandoned his teetotalism because he had moved to a cider-producing area.¹⁴¹ The involvement of rural people in the primary stage of liquor production, however, does not go far in explaining the relative success of clerical teetotalism in the city as compared to the country. Urban inhabitants were involved in the production and sale of alcoholic beverages to an extent sufficient to warrant long teetotal arguments that the national economy would be improved rather than damaged by elimination of the drink industry.¹⁴² Such arguments, which apparently were fairly successful in the cities, were also used by teetotal apologists in their attempt to convince rural people that they would be more prosperous without drink.¹⁴³ That they were not as successful in the country was due less to the relatively greater involvement of particular rural regions in the primary stage of liquor production than to their different attitudes towards drinking problems and their solution.

The teetotal and prohibitionist movements did not fail in the country-side because there were no rural drinking problems. Excessive drinking had always been a feature of country life, particularly during times of special celebration such as the Harvest festivals and the so-called Statute or Mopps fairs, annual events designed for the hiring of farm workers and servants. The Rev. Nash Stephenson, Vicar of Bromyard, complained in an address, which he delivered in 1858 at Liverpool to the annual meeting of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, that Statute fairs aroused more than an interest in employment

It would be well were the legitimate and ostensible objects of the Statutes the only inducements that draw persons thither. But, for the sake of the rioting and drunkenness that ensue, to this spot likewise are drawn the idle, the profligate, and the abandoned of the surrounding district.¹⁴⁴

Stephenson cited a number of witnesses to the indecency, crime and immorality which resulted from these drunken episodes.¹⁴⁵

The drunkenness which accompanied observance of rural business rites and festive occasions on the country calendar differed from the habitual insobriety by which many urban workers tried to escape the demands of everyday life. The drunkenness of the rural festival punctuated the regularity of country life to which it usually posed no threat. The insobriety of the urban proletariat was both a symptom and a cause of the workingman's failure to adjust to the demands of industrial life. This does not mean that there were no

habitual drunkards in the country, but that those rural people who were regularly inebriated, unlike their relatives in the cities, could not be considered to represent the social and economic maladjustment of the entire working class.

The leaders of rural society, including the clergy, refused to accept teetotalism and prohibition partly because they had already developed methods of dealing with drunkenness which were more appropriate to the mentality of the country-side. In response to an inquiry by an 1869 committee on intemperance of the Convocation of Canterbury, county constabularies in the Southern Province reported the names of 1,342 parishes, townships and hamlets in central and southern England and 154 in Wales where there was neither a public house nor beer shop.¹⁴⁶ In some cases, the inhabitants themselves seem to have opposed facilities for the sale of beer. One correspondent wrote to the Committee that, on hearing that a beer shop was to be established in their parish, every resident signed a petition to Lord Shaftesbury, the chief landowner, asking him to withhold his consent. Shaftesbury, who was somewhat of a temperance enthusiast, gladly obliged.¹⁴⁷ In most cases, however, the initiative seems to have come either from the local magnate or the parish incumbent who used their positions as landowners or magistrates effectively to prohibit the sale of beer.

It would be mistaken to find in this high incidence of practical local prohibition in the rural areas of England

and Wales natural sympathy for either the prohibitionist or the teetotal movements. Indeed, the United Kingdom Alliance later argued on the basis of the Canterbury Report that in advocating permissive local prohibition they were simply seeking the universal extension of a right already exercised by residents in dry areas of the Province of Canterbury.¹⁴⁸ Actually, the attitudes toward authority implicit in the Alliance's proposal were at direct variance to those which lay behind the practical prohibition in the 1,342 rural communities of England and Wales: the former was based on liberal principles of decentralization and democratic determination; the latter reflected an older tradition, paternalistic regulation of the lives and morals of rural inhabitants by their social superiors.

The lack of connection between the teetotalism of the town clergy and the practical prohibition of their country cousins was shown in the scarcity of declared abstainers among the clerical inhabitants of dry communities. Of the many English and Welsh Anglican clergy who lived in dry areas of the Province of Canterbury, only seven had declared themselves teetotalers in 1864. Three of the seven, including Henry Moule who has already been identified as an early adherent to the teetotal cause, lived in the Dorchester area of Dorset. In addition to Henry Gale who lived in Treborough, Somerset, there were declared teetotal clerics in the dry communities of Greestead, Essex; Galby, Leicestershire; and Halford, Shropshire.¹⁴⁹ In other places, the

urban teetotaler who helped himself to sobriety and then demanded that his social superiors in the country do likewise was usually regarded with considerable suspicion by the traditional leaders of the country-side, including even clergy in dry rural communities.

In view of the relative success which teetotalers and prohibitionists had in converting the urban clergy to their cause, some reservation must be made to Harrison and Trinder's recent statement that teetotalism failed in the country-side because of dominant "Anglicanism and traditionalism".¹⁵⁰ This explanation rightfully identifies resistance to teetotalism with the survival of traditional attitudes in rural areas. It fails to note that not only Nonconformists but Anglican teetotalers had difficulty exporting teetotalism from the city to the country. Anglicans in the country-side resisted teetotalism, not primarily because they were Anglicans, but because as men of the land they preferred to fight drunkenness within the context of traditional authority rather than to accept the democratic assumptions of the prohibitionist or the liberal orientation of the teetotaler. Because the degree of attendance at Anglican services, both absolutely and proportionately to the Nonconformists, stood up better in the country than in the city, the rural clergyman felt less pressure to do otherwise. In the country, the parish had not generally lost its role as community centre to the extent that it had in the city.

NOTES

CHAPTER V

¹In his Temperance Landmarks, A Narrative of the Work and Workers, 1829-1879 (London, 1879), p. 57.

²James Bardsley raised all seven of his sons as abstainers. Four of them later became teetotal ministers. But John W., the future Bishop successively of Sodor and Man, and Carlisle, was the only one ordained before 1862. In 1862, John W. was clerical secretary of the Islington Protestant Institute and his uncle Joseph was a lecturer at St. Marylebone's and a London diocesan home missionary. P.T. Winskill, Temperance Standard Bearers of the Nineteenth Century (Manchester, 1897), II, 82-83; John W. Bardsley, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence (London, 1867), no. 6, pp. 28-32; and Crockford's Clerical Directory (London, 1868), p. 31.

³Julia Wightman's letter to her sister Caroline (12 November, 1858), in her Haste to the Rescue or Work While it is Day.

⁴Brian Harrison, Drink and the Victorians. The Temperance Question in England, 1815-1872 (London, 1971), p. 181.

⁵See Francis Close's letter to Julia Wightman (30 March, 1860), printed in J.M.J. Fletcher, Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury, The Story of a Pioneer in Temperance Work (London, 1906), p. 120.

⁶Ibid., p. 139. Henry Ellison, "The Recovery of the Captives", in his Sermons and Addresses on Church Temperance Subjects (London, 1894), p. 13.

⁷Julia Wightman, cited in J.M.J. Fletcher, Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury, p. 177.

⁸United Kingdom Alliance, Report, 1862. I am grateful to Mr. T. Garth Waite, the General Secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance, for sending me this information in a letter of 24 November, 1969.

⁹The connection of Anglican clerical supporters of the United Kingdom Alliance with the Church teetotal society was determined by consulting the Anglican society's list of clerical abstainers in Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, pp. 3-15.

¹⁰J.C. Street, F.R. Lees and D. Burns eds., Proceedings of the International Temperance and Prohibition Convention, Held in London, September 2nd, 3rd, and 4th, 1862 (London, 1862), p. 125.

¹¹Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (1 August, 1873), 122.

¹²William Caine ed., A Biographical Key to the Picture Containing One Hundred and Twenty Portraits of Temperance Reformers (Manchester, 1860), p. 78 and G.T. Fox, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Testimony in Favour of Total Abstinence (London, 1867), no. 9, p. 47.

¹³G.T. Fox, in ibid., no. 9, p. 48.

¹⁴United Kingdom Alliance, Report, 1862.

¹⁵J.C. Street, F.R. Lees and D. Burns eds., Proceedings of the International Temperance and Prohibition Convention, Held in London, September 2nd, 3rd, and 4th, 1862 (London, 1862), pp. xii-xvi, 97-101, 133-138, 160-161, 286-290, 319-324, 487-490.

¹⁶The sermon was called "A Clergyman's View of Total Abstinence and the Liquor Traffic". See ibid., pp. 104-110.

¹⁷This description of Joseph Tucker is taken mainly from his own account in the Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. II (June, 1865), 179-182; but see also Jabez Inwards, Memorials of Temperance Workers (London, 1879), pp. 268-269; and Robert Maguire Temperance Landmarks, p. 54.

¹⁸Joseph Tucker, in Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. II (June, 1865), 179.

¹⁹Henry Ellison, in Temperance Chronicle, XXI (10 February, 1893), 65.

²⁰Stopford Ram, in Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (October, 1863), p. 206.

²¹Robert Maguire, Temperance Landmarks, p. 4; P.T. Winskill, The Temperance Movement and its Workers. A Record of Social, Moral, Religious and Political Progress. (London, 1892), III, 54 (Hereafter referred to as Temperance Movement); and Church of England Temperance Chronicle II (June, 1874), 102.

²²The information in this paragraph is derived from Robert Maguire, Temperance Landmarks, pp. 54-57.

²³Ibid., p. 55.

²⁴Ibid., loc. cit.

²⁵Attached to the frontispiece of Mrs. Wightman's Bible which is still in the archives of the Church of England Temperance Society, Church House, Westminster.

²⁶Robert Maguire, Temperance Landmarks, p. 48.

²⁷Ibid., pp. 44, 45, 48, 54.

²⁸The letter was read by Rev. Erskine Clark of Derby. Weekly Record of the Temperance Movement, No. 318 (3 May, 1862), p. 164.

²⁹As will be shown below, no mention was made at the May Conference of founding an organization although the Committee which would establish the Church of England Total Abstinence Society in October, 1862 was appointed at the meeting. See pp. 190-191.

³⁰See pp. 199-229.

³¹A Styleman Herring, in Temperance Chronicle XX (20 January, 1893), 28.

³²Weekly Record of the Temperance Movement, No. 318 (3 May, 1862), p. 150.

³³Church of England Temperance Magazine, I (October, 1862), 4.

³⁴Robert Maguire, Temperance Landmarks, p. 61.

³⁵Temperance Movement, III, 149.

³⁶In his Temperance Landmarks, p. 58.

³⁷P.T. Winskill, Temperance Movement, III, 50.

- ³⁸Weekly Record of the Temperance Movement, No. 318 (3 May, 1862), p. 150.
- ³⁹Ibid., No. 319 (10 May, 1862), p. 163.
- ⁴⁰Ibid., No. 319 (10 May, 1862), p. 165.
- ⁴¹Church of England Temperance Magazine, I (October, 1862), 1-4.
- ⁴²Ibid., loc. cit.
- ⁴³Ibid., loc. cit.
- ⁴⁴Ibid., loc. cit.
- ⁴⁵Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (August, 1863), 136.
- ⁴⁶Frederick Sherlock, Henry John Ellison, Founder of the Church of England Temperance Society (London, 1910), p. 27.
- ⁴⁷Thomas Richardson, in Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 24, pp. 118-119.
- ⁴⁸Church of England Temperance Magazine, I (October, 1862), 2.
- ⁴⁹Henry Ellison, "Parochial Temperance Societies", in his Sermons and Addresses, pp. 17-35.
- ⁵⁰Robert Maguire, in Church of England Temperance Magazine, I (December, 1862), 80-86.
- ⁵¹Ibid., I, 80.
- ⁵²Francis Close in ibid., I (October, 1862), II.
- ⁵³Ibid., I (October, 1862), 2.
- ⁵⁴Ibid., I (October, 1862), 3-4, 18-21, 29-32. Ragged Homes and How to Mend Them (London, 1860 [1859]), was mainly a description of Mary Bayly's attempts to propagate domestic economy; but teetotalism formed a part of her programme.
- ⁵⁵Church of England Temperance Magazine, I (October, 1862), 5-11, 12-15, 23-28.

⁵⁶Ibid., I (October, 1862), 16-17, 21-22.

⁵⁷Ibid., I (October, 1862), 2.

⁵⁸Prospectus of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society (London, 1862).

⁵⁹Church of England Temperance Magazine, I (November, 1862), 35 and 63.

⁶⁰Ibid., I (November, 1862), 35.

⁶¹Henry Ellison, "The Distinctive Ground to be Taken by the Clergy of the Church of England", in his Sermons and Addresses, pp. 48-49.

⁶²In ibid., pp. 73, 76, 77.

⁶³Henry Ellison in ibid., p. 77, and cited in Weekly Record of the Temperance Movement, No. 319 (10 May, 1862), p. 165.

⁶⁴Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. III (September, 1866), 288. For a discussion of the 1830 legislation and its effects see S. and B. Webb, The History of Liquor Licensing in England Principally from 1700 to 1830 (London, 1903), pp. 113-126.

⁶⁵Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d ser. I (February, 1869), 38.

⁶⁶Rooke was curate at Windsor from 1859 to 1862. Crockford's Clerical Directory (London, 1868), p. 568.

⁶⁷Thomas Rooke, in the book edited by him, Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 24, p. 129.

⁶⁸See Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Third Annual Report, 1865, p. 23.

⁶⁹Thomas Rooke, Parochial Temperance Associations: Hints on their Formation (London, 1866).

⁷⁰Ibid., pp. 2, 3, 6.

⁷¹The Church teetotal society found no domestic teetotal bishop to serve as its patron.

⁷²Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. IV (April, 1867), 99.

⁷³Ibid., new ser. IV (June, 1867), 164.

⁷⁴Ibid., loc. cit.

⁷⁵Ibid., new ser. IV (June, 1867), 165.

⁷⁶For example, see Robert Maguire, Temperance Landmarks, pp. 44-45.

⁷⁷For example, see the report of the Durham diocesan association of the Church teetotal society, in Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. I (September, 1864), 285.

⁷⁸Henry W. Lett in ibid., new ser. III (January, 1866), 26.

⁷⁹Robert Maguire in ibid., I (December, 1862), 81-82.

⁸⁰Ibid., new ser. III (August, 1866), 256.

⁸¹Ibid., loc. cit.

⁸²See "Rules" in Church of England and Ireland Temperance Society, Fourth Annual Report, 1866, p. 2.

⁸³Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d ser. II (September, 1870), 164.

⁸⁴Ibid., 3d ser. II (June, 1870), 101-102.

⁸⁵See ibid., new ser. III (May, 1866), 133-134; and new ser. V (March, 1868), 85-87.

⁸⁶Ibid., new ser. III (May to September, 1866), 149-150; 177-179; 201-202; 271-272; 301-302; 367-368.

⁸⁷Ibid., new ser. III (May, 1866), 133-134.

⁸⁸Ibid., new ser. III (June, 1866), 179.

⁸⁹See ibid., 3d ser. I (April, 1869), 66.

⁹⁰Cited in ibid., new ser. I (March, 1864), 79.

⁹¹I (October, 1862), 3.

⁹²Third Ser. I (June, 1869), 104.

⁹³In his Temperance Landmarks, p. 67.

⁹⁴In his "The Distinctive Ground to be Taken by the Clergy of the Church of England", in his Sermons and Addresses, p. 74.

⁹⁵Extracts from Bowly's Total Abstinence in its Proper Place, which was "addressed expecially to the religious portion of the community", were printed in the Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (November and December, 1863), 235-238, 266-270.

⁹⁶For example, see ibid., new ser. III (May and June, 1866), 160, 191.

⁹⁷For example, see ibid., new ser. III (August, 1866), 230 and new ser. II (April, 1865), 128.

⁹⁸Frederick Sherlock, Henry Ellison, p. 33.

⁹⁹Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. IV (August, 1867), 246-247; and 3d ser. II (April, 1870), 61.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., loc. cit.

¹⁰¹Ibid., new ser. V (June, 1868), 191; and Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Fourth Annual Report, 1866, p. 9.

¹⁰²Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. I (July, 1864), 223.

¹⁰³Ibid., loc. cit.

¹⁰⁴Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Third Annual Report, 1865.

¹⁰⁵Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. I (June, 1864), 182. Italics were in the original.

¹⁰⁶This paragraph is based on information written by Robert Maguire in ibid., new ser. II (November, 1865), 330-332.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., 332.

¹⁰⁸In ibid., new ser. V (September, 1868), 283.

¹⁰⁹See Appendix B for the positions held in 1864 by teetotal clerics in England and Wales.

¹¹⁰The information in the following paragraph is derived from Appendix C.

111The information and quotations in this paragraph are from Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. III (April, 1866), 128.

112Henry Ellison, in his "Parochial Temperance Societies", in his The Temperance Reformation Movement in the Church of England (London, 1869), pp. 42-43.

113Henry Ellison, in his "The Distinctive Grounds to be Taken by the Clergy of the Church of England in Connexion with the Temperance Reformation and in the Formation of Societies", in ibid., p. 66.

114New ser. II (November, 1865), 331.

115Ibid., loc. cit. Italics were Maguire's.

116In Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 3, pp. 13-14.

117New ser. IV (October, 1867), 294.

118William Caine in ibid., new ser. V (September, 1868), 283-285.

119In ibid., new ser. V (September, 1868), 284. The speech was by Rev. T. Davies and had appeared in the Blackburn Times of 27 June, 1868.

120Church of England Temperance Magazine, I (October, 1862), 3.

121Ibid., I (November, 1862), 34.

122Ibid., loc. cit.

123In ibid., I (December, 1862), 81.

124In his, The Good Samaritan, p. 11.

125In Thomas Rooke ed., Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence, no. 24, p. 141.

126Robert Maguire in Church of England Temperance Magazine, I (December, 1862), 83.

127In ibid., new ser. V (September, 1868), 285.

128In ibid., new ser. II (November, 1865), 331.

129Ibid., I (November, 1862), 34.

130In ibid., new ser. V (September, 1868), 285.

131In his "The Distinctive Ground to be Taken by the Clergy of the Church of England", in his Sermons and Addresses, p. 73.

132In Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. V (September, 1868), 284.

133Information in the following two paragraphs is from Appendix C.

134The names of the places can be found in, Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, pp. 3-15. The populations were determined by consulting the Census of 1861, Great Britain, Parliament, House of Commons, Parliamentary Papers, 1862, L, 1-189.

135See Appendix C.

136See foot-note 134.

137See Appendix C.

138In Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (August, 1863), 152.

139In ibid., II (August, 1863), 153.

140Brian Harrison and Barrie Trinder, "Drink and Sobriety in an Early Victorian Country Town: Banbury 1830-1860", English Historical Review, Supplement 4 (London, 1969), p. 32.

141New ser. IV (January, 1867), 41.

142One of the most popular was--William Hoyle, Intemperance and Crime; their Causes and Remedies (London, 1864).

143For examples of such arguments, see Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (July, 1863), 110-111.

144Cited in Convocation of Canterbury, Lower House, Report of the Committee on Intemperance (London, 1869), p. 37.

145Ibid., pp. 38-39.

146Ibid., pp. 183-191.

147 Ibid., no. 2124, p. 164.

148 Sir Wilfrid Lawson, in Great Britain, Parliament, House of Commons, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3d ser. XXLII (18 June, 1880), 348-349.

149 The dry communities are listed in Convocation of Canterbury, Lower House, Report of the Committee on Intemperance, pp. 183-191; the teetotal clerics are listed in Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, pp. 3-15; and Fourth Annual Report, 1866, pp. 29-40.

150 Brian Harrison and Barrie Trinder, "Drink and Sobriety in an Early Victorian Country Town: Banbury 1830-1860", p. 32.

CHAPTER VI

CLERICAL ABSTAINERS AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1862-1872

I

The argument that the Established Church could be preserved if its resources were used for a co-operative Nonconformist-Anglican attack on intemperance was eventually taken seriously by influential prelates. The unprecedented interest in temperance matters which, beginning in 1869, was displayed in the highest Church circles, partly reflected a common view that there was a link between the two of the most controversial issues raised in the first Gladstone ministry--the future of the Church and the future of drink. Before 1873, delegates to the annual Church Congresses rarely heard intemperance discussed, but at Liverpool in the fall of 1869, they were told that "the Nonconformists were calling to [the Church] for help, and in no way could she better use her influence than in supporting the Temperance Movement".¹

Similar appeals had been made earlier in the year when the Convocation of Canterbury discussed the Report of a committee on intemperance, presided over by John Sandford,

Rector of Alvechurch, Archdeacon of Coventry and a close friend of A.C. Tait. In June, 1869, Sandford told the lower house of Convocation that he had decided the year before to press for a committee on intemperance after he had heard a Nonconformist tell 4,000 workingmen at a teetotal meeting,

Oh! if the Clergy of the national Communion would place themselves at the head of this movement, what golden opinions they would reap, what countless blessings they would impart! We have no jealousy at all of the endowments, the position and character of the Established Clergy; but we want them to use the good advantages which God and society have bestowed in every philanthropic movement in this country.²

During the next four years, Anglican prelates, led by the two Archbishops, frequently took up the theme of Anglican-Nonconformist co-operation in the fight against intemperance. Archbishop William Thomson of York was the most prominent active supporter of the National Association for the Amendment of the Liquor Laws which Henry Ellison and others organized at the end of 1868 to meet licensing legislation expected from the new Gladstone ministry. The National Association, although primarily an Anglican organization, was careful both to include Nonconformists in its activities and to court their favour with fairly radical licensing policies. Thomson also supported other efforts to secure temperance legislation which were more obviously inter-denominational. In April, 1871, at a meeting over which he presided to urge Sunday closing of liquor establishments, Thomson acknowledged the dignitaries present, including H.E. Manning, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of

Westminster, Charles J. Ellicott, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol and Newman Hall, the minister of Surrey Chapel; and he expressed satisfaction that the drink question had "brought together persons who on other occasions might be separated".³ A.C. Tait, while Bishop of London, had helped his friend John Sandford secure permission from the Convocation of Canterbury for his committee on intemperance. As Archbishop of Canterbury, he lent some support to the National Association; and in February, 1873, used the prestige of his office to launch the Church of England Temperance Society. The C.E.T.S., which soon became the most honoured temperance organization in the kingdom, was inaugurated at a special Lambeth Palace conference during which the ecumenical character of the temperance movement was frequently praised.

At the Lambeth Palace meeting, Tait displayed his usual concern to fight the attempts of Nonconformists and others to diminish the power of the Church at the same time as he sought among them bases of co-operation. He described temperance as

exactly one of those points respecting which we are glad to meet persons, of all beliefs, whether they be Roman Catholics, or whether they be Protestant Dissenters or whether they be Jews or whatever they be⁴

Tait was supported in this view by the cheers and speeches of the prominent churchmen present, as he was when he affirmed the unique contribution which the Church could make to the temperance movement because of its established

position. He spoke of the special value of having "an organization which reaches to every parish in England" and an "accredited minister of the National Church, resident in the midst of every community, having great advantages for gathering the people around him".⁵

The prominent support given by Anglican prelates to the temperance movement after 1869 cannot of course be explained entirely by their desire to impress Nonconformists. Like their episcopal colleagues, Thomson and Tait gave the usual religious, social and economic reasons for enlisting in the battle against intemperance. In October, 1870, Thomson had delivered what the Church of England Temperance Magazine called "strong words" in a charge to his clergy at Malton. Thomson praised the teetotal clergy for striking

against an evil which made the working classes of this country poorer by millions yearly--which sent down a heritage of disease and suffering to unborn generations--and which lamentably hindered the work of God amongst them.⁶

Two years later, the Magazine had "rejoice[d]" to quote from Archbishop Tait's first charge to his clergy,

There is one dreadful evil over-spreading the whole land, which makes havoc of thousands of our working men--the evil of Intemperance. It will be the bounden duty of every clergyman to see what efforts can be made in his parish to bring men to an understanding of the misery of Intemperance.⁷

Such comprehensive statements, although no doubt sincere, do not explain the suddenness with which Anglican bishops after 1869 embraced the temperance movement. The new element in 1869 was that the election with heavy

Nonconformist support of the first Gladstone ministry had added a political dimension to the drink questions which, as legislators and churchmen, the bishops could scarcely ignore. If they did so, they would help prove the validity of Nonconformists' claims that the Established Church was a socially useless institution and intensify demands for disestablishment which the recent election had provoked and which to some extent the current parliament was satisfying.

Although Anglican bishops after 1869 supported the temperance movement partly as an aid to Church defence, they were unwilling to stop drinking themselves or to recommend teetotalism as a condition of Church membership. Consequently, most clerical abstainers felt the dilemma of choosing between the strict teetotalism which they had long recommended and the episcopal patronage which they had long desired. To understand the establishment of the Church of England Temperance Society it is necessary to examine what led the clerical abstainers to this choice.

II

The Church of England Temperance Society grew out of the frustrated attempts of a poorly-organized, badly-financed group of relatively unknown teetotal clerics to influence the Church and nation at large. Not surprisingly, before 1873 the abstaining clergy gained little favourable attention in the secular and ecclesiastical press. They also failed to increase significantly their own numbers, let

alone to convert prominent Anglicans to teetotalism.

The Church teetotal society lacked the administrative resources to accomplish its announced intention of converting the entire Church to total abstinence principles. During six of its eleven year existence, all the work of administering the Society, providing speakers for parochial and other meetings, fund-raising, issuing its Magazine and other publications was done gratuitously, usually by clergymen who had other positions to which they had to devote their primary attention. From 1865 to 1870, Thomas Rooke served as the Society's full-time, salaried organizing secretary, as did R.O. West, formerly Vicar of Dalehead in the diocese of Ripon, during the last ten months of the Church teetotal society;⁸ but the magnitude of the Society's ambition far exceeded the possibilities of these two short terms.

The Church teetotal society began its operations in October, 1862, with what on paper might have seemed to have been an adequate administrative body. The Society was controlled by a Committee, of twenty-five lay and clerical teetotalers from various parts of England and Wales, which had been appointed at the May, 1862, London Coffee House Conference. It was administered by the seven-man Executive chosen at the May Conference and shortly after.⁹ However, because of the distances which most of the Committee and some of the Executive had to travel to attend meetings in London and the responsibilities which all had to fulfill in other positions the Society was rather unevenly administered.

The Committee, which by 1864 had grown to twenty clergymen and seven laymen, could only meet when its members happened to be available and in London.¹⁰ Its meetings were so irregular that in 1867, administration was transferred to the seven-man Executive and the rest of the Committee, now called the Council, were left to meet "quarterly or occasionally".¹¹ Francis Close, who had to divide his attention between the Society's presidency and his duties as Incumbent of Christ Church and Dean of Carlisle, does not appear to have regularly made the lengthy trip from the north to the London headquarters. His visits were infrequent enough to be considered newsworthy by the Church of England Temperance Magazine which reported his schedule of speaking engagements when he toured the south in the spring of 1863.¹² In the eleven years between the formation of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society and that of the Church of England Temperance Society, Close presided over the Society's annual meetings only twice, in 1863 and 1867.¹³

Robert Maguire, incumbent of Clerkenwell, Stopford Ram, incumbent of Pavenham and Thomas Richardson, incumbent of St. Matthew's Pell Street and lecturer at St. George's in the East, had to combine their regular pastoral duties with their responsibilities as honorary secretaries of the Church teetotal society. Maguire's special assignment was to edit the Church of England Temperance Magazine; Richardson's was to handle the Society's correspondence; and Ram's was to assist the Treasurer, H.L. Powys Keck, until he died

in July, 1863, and after October, 1863, Joseph Tucker, Ram's patron at Pavenham.¹⁴ Presumably, Ram was also acting treasurer in the interim between Keck's death and Tucker's appointment. The three honorary secretaries were also expected to be available for speaking engagements which the Society might be offered; but because of their other duties they were able to accept only an estimated tenth of these.¹⁵ Ram felt that he was in no position even to exercise his financial responsibilities well. The Society's Annual Report announced his resignation as honorary secretary in May, 1864, with the statement that he had "felt for some time that financial work could not be carried out from so remote a part of the country".¹⁶ Ram continued as a member of the Council of the Society until 1874 when he left his post at Pavenham to become full-time organizing secretary of the new Church of England Temperance Society.¹⁷ Richardson continued as honorary secretary until 1868 when he was retired to the Executive Committee and Maguire remained editor of Church temperance publications until about 1878.¹⁸

Keck's tenure as treasurer in the early months of the new Society was not very active due to his poor health. Even before the establishment of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society, in the summer of 1862 he had been thrown from his carriage on the way to a meeting at the Leicester Infirmary. He suffered a brain concussion which forced him to curtail anything except his ordinary duties for the next

year. On 10 July, 1863, he died as a delayed result of the cerebral injuries suffered the year before.¹⁹ The appointment of Joseph Tucker to succeed Keck as treasurer was not announced until the following October.²⁰

Tucker must have found it no easier to exercise his duties of office from Pavenham than did Ram. Although Tucker was officially treasurer until 1871, after 1865 more of the financial duties seem to have fallen on Thomas Rooke, the organizing secretary.²¹ In July, 1871, Tucker was succeeded as treasurer by Robert Baxter, a teetotaler of twenty-four years and a prominent solicitor with railway connections and law firms in London and Yorkshire.²² By then, however, the Society had no regular full-time official and was in poor financial health.

The role which Henry Ellison played in the first few years of the Church teetotal society has been exaggerated. Because of his over-riding importance in the later history of the Church temperance effort, a legend grew in Anglican teetotal circles that Ellison's predominance had begun as early as the May, 1862, London Coffee House Conference. The writer of his obituary in the 1899 Annual Report of the Church of England Temperance Society saw him on 2nd May, 1862 "presiding over a small meeting of clergy like minded with himself, each having a similar society in his parish. This was the birth of the C.E.T.S."²³ And Robert Maguire in his 1879 history described Ellison as "the stroke-oar" who, in the early days, prepared the Society for the race.²⁴

Ellison had been one of the quieter participants at the London Coffee House Conference; and, although he was one of the original members of the Committee appointed at the Conference, he did not become its chairman until a few weeks later. If Ellison was calling the signals in the first few years of the Church teetotal society, they often fell on deaf ears. His moderate approach to the drink question became influential only in 1869 when the National Association and Ellison's emphasis on making a place for non-abstaining clergymen in the Anglican society proved attractive in gaining support from Church dignitaries.

Like other officers of the Church teetotal society, the time which Ellison could devote to the Society's affairs was limited by the pressure of his other ecclesiastical duties, especially his active service as Vicar of Windsor. In the twenty years from 1855 when he accepted the invitation of Dean G. Wellesley to become Vicar of Windsor until 1875 when he resigned his post in Windsor to become Rector of Great Haseley to find more time for his temperance activities, Ellison accomplished a number of programmes which his predecessor, a paralytic, had been unable to achieve: the parish church was completely restored; a new satellite district church, All Saints, was erected; the old infirmary was replaced with a dispensary and a larger infirmary; new industrial and elementary schools were constructed; the poor-houses were consolidated and rebuilt and a number of parish activities in addition to the successful teetotal

society were organized, including bible classes, Sunday-schools with sixty teachers, a thrift club and a young men's society.²⁵

The irregular administration of the Society before 1865 reflected and partly caused its poor financial condition. The income of the Society actually declined from ~~£~~150 in the period from May, 1862 to May, 1863, to slightly over ~~£~~142 in the next financial year. In reporting the decline, the Executive, not wanting to admit a lagging interest in the Society's activities, actually argued the opposite. The Society's treasury in its first year of operation had been swelled by especially generous individual contributions; in the second year, there was less money, but it had been given by more contributors.²⁶

The appointment of Thomas Rooke as organizing secretary in May, 1865 resulted from a review of the Society's status at the special conference of abstaining clergymen held in Birmingham in December, 1863, and at the regular annual meeting held in London in May, 1864. Attempting to increase their influence in the Church, the teetotal clergy at the two meetings had instituted special funds to finance free circulation of the Society's Magazine and the appointment of a full-time official.²⁷ Rooke's tenure as organizing secretary, which lasted until 1870, afforded the Society improved finances, a more consistent policy and greater contacts between the central administration in London and parochial branches all over England and Wales. At the end

of his first year as organizing secretary, the Society's income had risen to £612, an increase of about £336 over receipts of the previous year.²⁸ By 1868, the Society's income exceeded £745.²⁹ The pamphlet, printed from Rooke's speech to the Society's annual meeting in May, 1866, provided a guide for the formation and conduct of parochial teetotal societies. It incorporated Ellison's tactful suggestions that official representatives of the teetotal society should not enter Anglican parishes without the incumbent's permission and that parochial teetotal societies should be headed by the local clergyman whether or not he himself abstained.³⁰ Rooke and other Society officials, when they were available, travelled all over the country to attend local meetings of parish teetotal societies. In his first year as organizing secretary, Rooke, himself, attended forty-five meetings and delivered twelve sermons.³¹ The Society's improved financial and administrative position was celebrated early in 1868 when the Executive moved from borrowed quarters into their own offices at 6 Adam St., Adelphi.³² The clerical abstainers also appointed a lay secretary to manage the new offices while Rooke was away on one of his frequent organizing tours. This made possible regular though brief business hours, from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m., Mondays through Fridays.³³

There were limits, however, to what Rooke could do to improve the Society's administration. Restricted by the time he had available to him, he usually confined his visits to parishes where total abstinence societies were already

established.³⁴ Although in this way he consolidated support which the Church teetotal society had already gained and avoided antagonizing unsympathetic clergymen, he failed to extend the Society's influence to many new areas.³⁵ Consequently, by 1869, even the increased funds which the Society had derived from closer contact between the central organization and the parochial teetotalers, had begun to decline. The members of the Church teetotal society were told at their annual meeting in May, 1869, that because of decreased income they now faced a deficit.³⁶ When at the end of 1870 Rooke ended his full-time employment with the Church teetotal society to become chaplain at St. George's Hospital Hyde Park, the Society returned to completely voluntary administration.³⁷

The Society's administration and finances were neglected beginning in 1869 partly because Ellison and those who supported his political movement had shifted much of their attention from parochial teetotalism to the National Association for the Amendment of the Liquor Laws which had been formed in December, 1868. The appointment of Henry C. Greenwood, a London barrister, in March, 1871, to the post of organizing secretary which Rooke had resigned three months before signified the increased importance of Ellison's political movement.³⁸ Since the formation of the National Association, Greenwood had, with Thomas Rooke, served as its honorary co-secretary and had drafted the Association's licensing bill.³⁹ He continued to act as legal adviser to

the National Association during the hectic parliamentary deliberations on the drink question which ended in August, 1872, with the passage of the government's second licensing bill.

During Greenwood's tenure as organizing secretary of the Church teetotal society, which lasted until May, 1872, the Society had to ask again for volunteers to perform the speaking engagements which had once been Rooke's responsibility.⁴⁰ In 1872, their annual income declined to a little over ~~£~~656. A special collection had to be taken at the annual May meeting that year to meet the Society's debts.⁴¹ Uncharacteristically, the Society openly admitted this time that its sparse funds indicated its limited base of active support in the Church. A writer in the Church of England Temperance Magazine for January, 1872, confessed that he was "almost tempted to despair as Churchmen do not, as they ought, come forward to help the only general Church Society that is established for the prosecution of this work".⁴² The appointment of R.O. West as organizing secretary in May, 1872, marked the return to full-time administration.⁴³ West, however, was more active in negotiations leading to the formation of the Church of England Temperance Society in February, 1873, than he was in restoring the administration of the old Church teetotal society.

III

The irregular administration and financing of the Church

teetotal society was complicated by the failure of most English and Welsh dioceses to develop subsidiary organizations. In all but six of the 28 English and Welsh dioceses the formal diocesan organization of the Church teetotal society consisted exclusively of a single honorary clerical secretary. There were regularly constituted diocesan branches of the Church teetotal society in Durham and Salisbury, but their failure to increase the number of declared clerical abstainers in those two dioceses raises doubts as to their effectiveness.⁴⁴ In the diocese of Durham, the number of known teetotal clerics steadily declined, from 21 in 1864 to 19 in 1866 and to 16 in 1872.⁴⁵ In the diocese of Salisbury, there were as many declared teetotal clerics in 1872 as there had been in 1864 although their number had declined somewhat in 1866.

In the dioceses of Lichfield, Manchester, Chester and Ripon, there were, in addition to many of the conditions which made clerical abstinence attractive, exceptionally good diocesan teetotal organizations. These four dioceses, which included the important mining and industrial regions of Staffordshire, Derbyshire, Lancashire and the West Riding, provided the sort of socio-economic climate which often caused both excessive drinking and strong teetotal reactions. They were also areas where all denominations had been abnormally unsuccessful in attracting workingmen to religious services and where the Church of England failed to attract at least half of those who did worship. In their

attempt to improve the living conditions of workingmen by encouraging them to redirect the money and energy which they wasted on drink to productive and self-improving pursuits, lay teetotalers had established strong presences in these areas from the beginning of the movement. Nonconformists and Anglicans, who combined these secular aims of the lay movement with their own desire to attract more workingmen to religious adherence, had also concentrated much teetotal effort there.

The Lichfield diocesan branch of the Church teetotal society was well organized with committees of clergy and laymen at the diocesan, district and parish levels, a consistent scheme of finance and a programme for proselytism.⁴⁶ Mrs. Wightman's work at Shrewsbury provided a continuing example to Anglicans of how successful teetotalism could be in solving the problems of workingmen and at the same time of attracting them to the Church. The dioceses of Manchester, Chester and Ripon, which by 1869 had combined their diocesan teetotal societies into one, could claim the most efficient Anglican teetotal organization in the kingdom. In 1867, the abstaining clergy of the dioceses of Manchester and Chester had united to form one diocesan branch of the Church teetotal society;⁴⁷ in 1869 they were joined by the clerical abstainers from the diocese of Ripon.⁴⁸

The tri-diocesan organization had particular advantages. Teetotal clerics from the diocese of Chester, who had already from 1864 to 1866 almost doubled their number from

eighteen to thirty-five, provided an example of what rapid progress could be made in converting the Anglican clergy to teetotalism.⁴⁹ During its first year of operation, the Manchester and Chester association sent deputations to eighteen different centres, held three special meetings in the Manchester Town Hall, collected over £244, distributed 10,000 temperance tracts, enrolled as members 60 teetotal clergymen and organized 30 new parochial teetotal societies, to make a total of 59.⁵⁰ Four months later, the number of parochial teetotal societies had grown to 96, with 30,000 members.⁵¹ With the addition of Ripon in 1869, the human and financial resources available to the Society were further increased. From 1867 to 1870, the northern organization also benefitted from the energetic service of their organizing secretary, James Taylor a lay teetotaler who had previously been employed by the Manchester and Salford Temperance Union. In April, 1871, Taylor would with John Garrett, a maverick clerical vice-president of the tri-diocesan branch of the Church teetotal society, cause teetotal clergymen great anxiety by forming their own rival Anglican temperance organization. As late as May, 1870, however, the Church of England Temperance Magazine gave Taylor much of the credit for the extra-ordinary success of clerical teetotalism in the north.⁵²

The tri-diocesan organization was so successful that in 1873 the reorganized Church of England Temperance Society was described as a merger of the Church of England and Ireland

Temperance Reformation Society and the Manchester, Chester and Ripon Diocesan Association, even though strictly speaking the latter was merely a branch of the former.⁵³ Head offices for the C.E.T.S. were established in Manchester as well as in London and the administrative machinery of the tri-diocesan organization was extended to the Province of York.⁵⁴ The effectiveness of the tri-diocesan organization and that of Lichfield was shown by their success in attracting new converts to clerical teetotalism.⁵⁵ In 1864, there had been 36 declared clerical abstainers in the diocese of Lichfield; in 1872, there were 47. The number of declared teetotal clergymen in the dioceses of Chester, Manchester and Ripon, together increased by 148.3%, from 60 in 1864 to 149 in 1872.

These successes were not matched in the other 24 English and Welsh dioceses. In seven of the twenty other English dioceses, Durham, Sodor and Man, Winchester, Norwich, Peterborough and Chichester, the number of teetotal clergymen actually declined. Of the four Welsh dioceses, there were as many teetotal clerics in 1872 as there had been in 1864 only in St. David's: in the other three there were fewer. None of the remaining English dioceses recorded the names of more than nine additional teetotal clerics. The number of clerical abstainers in the diocese of London increased by only five, from 37 in 1864 to 42 in 1873. The diocese of London which in 1864 had the greatest number of teetotal clerics had in 1872 been surpassed by the dioceses

of Manchester, Chester and Lichfield. The total number of declared clerical abstainers in the ecclesiastical provinces of Canterbury and York grew slightly from 426 in 1864, the first year when the Society's lists of abstaining clergy were considered fairly complete, to 528 in 1872, the last year before reorganization. The increase in the number of teetotal clerics in proportion to the total number of Anglican clergy in England and Wales was also modest, from 2.2% in 1864 to 2.5% in 1872.⁵⁶

Although the historian has no other definite guide on which to rely, the lists of clerical abstainers, in some ways, unfairly minimized the strength which the Anglican teetotal society had gained in the Church. The number of teetotal clerics in proportion to the total number of domestic clergy was dwarfed by the continued concentration of the Church in rural areas where teetotalism and prohibition were most unpopular. Nor did the published lists of clerical abstainers represent the full moral support which the Church teetotal society claimed from the clergy of England and Wales. The Society's promoters maintained that there were many teetotal clerics whose names for one reason or another did not appear on their lists.⁵⁷ Some probably did not take the trouble to submit their names for publication and others may have been reluctant to part with a five shilling membership fee.

The cumulative lists also do not show as gains a considerable number of teetotal clerics who had to ask that

their names be removed because they had resumed drinking. The Society claimed to have added about 100 new names of clerical abstainers to its list each year, but their net total failed to rise appreciably because of frequent back-sliding.⁵⁸ The reasons why so many clergymen abandoned teetotalism were varied; but the promoters of the Church teetotal society blamed most defections on misplaced medical advice.⁵⁹ The abstaining cleric who resumed drinking on his doctor's orders had his name struck from the Society's lists even though he was still considered an unofficial supporter of its principles.⁶⁰ This kind of silent support, however, was little consolation to a Society which desired full Church recognition of its teetotal principles.

IV

As good Victorians, the clerical abstainers blamed their limited success in converting the Church to teetotalism on the ignorance of those whom they were trying to reach and the failure of Anglican prelates to provide a needed example. With all the assurance of an enlightened minority, the clerical abstainers asserted in their Annual Report for 1864: "The chief opposition to the Temperance Movement arises from ignorance of its real nature, character, and objects, and this ignorance fosters prejudice in the minds of many".⁶¹ In January, 1867, the Church of England Temperance Magazine concluded that episcopal patronage of the Church teetotal society would lessen the antagonism of

the drinking clergy who

see the cause looked coldly and suspiciously on by those whose stations or abilities demand respect, and they do not like to become singular unless they can quote some great names and high authorities on their side.⁶²

Hindered by limited finances, poor organization and relatively undistinguished positions, the promoters of the Church teetotal society relied heavily on their publications to provide this needed enlightenment to Anglican clergymen, no matter how high their station. A magazine, a tract, or a book could travel cheaply and far and could seek entry to social circles from which its writers might have been barred. The Society's chief publication, The Church of England Temperance Magazine, its temperance tracts and books were all to some extent aimed at the educated classes, especially the Anglican clergy. The Magazine, edited by Robert Maguire, and issued in monthly instalments from October, 1862, until December, 1872, was thought to occupy a special place in temperance literature. In the Society's Annual Report for 1864, members were urged to circulate the Magazine among the clergy, magistrates, and other "circles of influence" in their community.⁶³ The Report pointed out that: There are many who will not read other works on the temperance question, but who will read the Magazine.⁶⁴ As if in recognition of this, in 1864 the West of England Temperance League circulated 150 Magazines a month to clergy, magistrates and others in their area.⁶⁵ Additionally, "the gratuitous circulation fund" which was instituted by the

Church teetotal society at the end of 1863 made possible distribution of the Magazine to other influential people in the kingdom who were not willing to purchase it.⁶⁶

The clerical abstainers even redesigned the cover of their Magazine to celebrate the greater Church recognition which they expected increased circulation would bring. The new cover, introduced in January, 1864, featured a sketch of carved oak work which was said to typify the sort of decoration seen in British cathedrals "in honour of the Deans that have already joined us, and of the Bishops that are expected to join our ranks".⁶⁷ On either side of the sketch were medallions of Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's Cathedral which emphasized the same theme. From January to May, 1864, alone, the "gratuitous circulation fund" permitted 10,500 copies of the Magazine to be sent to the archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons and other clergymen in England, Wales, Ireland and the colonies. Magazines were also sent to domestic and colonial newspapers, as well as to other temperance societies.⁶⁸ This was done, according to Society officials, both to propagate their cause and to increase paid circulation.⁶⁹ By 1868, over £211, more than one-fifth of the Society's income, was devoted to the circulation of its Magazine.⁷⁰

Notwithstanding the occasional appeal to physicians, or magistrates or workingmen or ladies or children, the Church of England Temperance Magazine was primarily aimed at convincing the Anglican clergy to become abstainers.

The cover of each issue included a list of the clerical converts to teetotalism for that month; and a colation of the monthly lists was until 1869 published with the bound volumes of the Magazine for each year. To make their clerical readers comfortable with a movement which many still condemned as non-scriptural, the tables of contents always included an index, covering at least half a page, of the biblical references in each issue. Clerical objections to the movement were answered in a variety of ways and the movement's progress in the Church faithfully reported in news items and in a "Monthly Letter from our Own Correspondent".

The arguments advanced to convert the clergy to total abstinence represented variations on a limited number of themes. The most common of these were enumerated by an un-named correspondent from Mill Hill, Middlesex in a short article in the May, 1863, Magazine in which he volunteered "Some Considerations Which Induced Me to Join the Christian Temperance Society . . .":

- 1 - Because total abstinence is good for strength and labour in one's calling and for health, to enjoy life.
- 2 - Because it keeps me out of temptation from the company of Drinkers and Drunkards.
- 3 - Because it is an effectual guard against the sin of drunkenness, and the many sins to which it leads.
- 4 - Because it is everyone's duty to set an example, and to influence others.⁷¹

The same four arguments appeared frequently in Clerical Testimony in Favour of Total Abstinence. The book, published

in 1867 at the suggestion of a lady who donated £20, incorporated 28 articles from the Church of England Temperance Magazine in which Anglican clergymen gave reasons for their teetotalism.⁷² The Magazine, on announcing publication of the book, expressed the Society's hope that it would come "within the compass of all classes" and be

considered a fitting present to offer to the clergyman, professional man and other influential persons throughout the country, whose adhesion we would desire to gain to our cause.⁷³

To ensure such universal acceptability, the book was issued in three forms and prices: 1s. in "card covers", 1s.6d. "in boards" and 2s.6d "in elegant binding, with gilt edges . . . as would worthily occupy a place among the choice books of a drawing room table".⁷⁴

The Society's other publications also did not ignore the sensibilities of the better classes. In 1869, the main sermons and addresses which Henry Ellison had delivered to date on the drink question were issued in collected form, as The Temperance Reformation in the Church of England. The book revealed Ellison's usual concern to place the teetotal movement in a traditional social and theological context. A series of special teetotal tracts which the Society began to issue in 1863 were frankly designed to appeal as much to the educated classes as to the simple folk at whom such publications were usually directed.⁷⁵ On announcing publication of the tracts, the Society's executive admitted that "there is no dearth of temperance

tracts", but justified the special series on grounds of doctrine and taste. The Society's tracts were said to "combine ability of narrative with purity of doctrine and elegance of publication".⁷⁶ Printed on delicately-tinted paper, the tracts were considered fine enough for members to enclose in letters to their friends, but their colloquial style, large print and illustrations hopefully would make them attractive to humbler parishioners and poor country people.⁷⁷

The first four tracts, issued in March, 1863, with the titles A Pledge for a Pledge, A Strike, The Losings' Bank and Women Traps Beware, exemplified the kinds of rhetorical devices commonly employed by the teetotal press. In the first, the teetotal pledge was said to make unnecessary the pledge to the pawnshop which often followed a visit to the pub. The workingman attracted by the forbidden word "strike" found he was asked not to strike against his employer, but against alcohol. The Losings' Bank distinguished between the man who prospered by investing surplus income in the Savings Bank and the one who squandered his money in the tap-room. Women Traps Beware, described in the Society's Magazine as the "gem of the series", warned females of the dangers to soul and body to be found in the bottle.⁷⁸ In 1868, the Society issued a catalogue of their own tracts and others thought worthy of recommendation. There were special tracts for clergymen, district visitors, Sunday-school teachers and parents; for soldiers, sailors,

artisans and mechanics and for heads of businesses; and for abstainers and "moderate" drinkers, as well as for drunkards, publicans and brewers.⁷⁹

It would be impossible to determine the exact effect of the Society's publications in influencing prominent Anglicans to regard the temperance movement more favourably. There were, however, several signs that their influence was more limited than the Society would have wished. Even with the gratuitous circulation fund, distribution of the Church of England Temperance Magazine was described as late as 1872 as only "fair".⁸⁰ It was probably never extensive enough even to reach all of the domestic Anglican clergy, let alone other influential persons.⁸¹ Furthermore, the Society's policy of aiming its publications at influential people corresponded to a practice common among moral pressure groups in mid-Victorian England; and it can perhaps be assumed that bishops and other dignitaries wasted little time discarding much of the unsolicited improving literature which came with every post. Only thirteen of the 28 English and Welsh bishops even acknowledged receiving the bound volume sent to them of the Church of England Temperance Magazine for 1864.⁸² None of them was immediately persuaded to join the Church teetotal society. Nor did any of the prominent ecclesiastics who had received literature from the clerical abstainers even see fit to mention the existence of the Church teetotal society during the extensive discussions on intemperance in the Convocation of Canterbury in 1868 and

1869.⁸³

Distribution of the Society's publications to the non-teetotal press--whether secular or ecclesiastical--did little immediately to increase its support or recognition. The only coverage which had been given by the "wet press" to the May, 1862, London Coffee House Conference was a noncommittal news story in the Record and a sneering piece in the Saturday Review. The former, a favourite forum for Evangelicals, simply reported what had occurred at the Conference.⁸⁴ The latter, dedicated to exposing the pretentious in English society, characterized the deliberations of the abstaining clergy as "pious orgies" by pointing out that the London Coffee House was "neither more nor less than an ordinary tavern . . . [where] for one cup of coffee which it sells probably ten pints of alcohol are vended".⁸⁵

The Clerical Journal recognized the existence of the Society in a short article in May, 1863, but claimed "that the Society has met with very little sympathy hitherto".⁸⁶ The Society hastened to correct the Journal for publicly announcing something of which they had often complained in the privacy of their own circles. Henry Ellison wrote a letter to the editor and the Society put the Clerical Journal on the mailing list for its Reports and Magazines.⁸⁷ Ellison's letter was not printed; and the cover of the Society's Magazine with its lists of abstaining clergy became the subject of the Clerical Journal's next unfriendly piece in February, 1865. The second article condemned the

Society's executive for insisting on total abstinence as a condition of membership and found significance in the humble status of most teetotal clergymen. To promote teetotalism in place of moderation, was "vicious and self-destroying". The general absence of any important Church dignitaries among the clerical abstainers proved that the poor clergy would be more disposed to take the pledge than their wealthier confrères.⁸⁸ The clerical abstainers, who claimed to represent the entire Church on temperance matters, were obviously embarrassed by the Journal's stress on their failure to convert prominent Anglicans and the correct diagnosis that this was caused in great part by their overly strict emphasis on teetotalism. In a long letter which the Journal allowed printed in its next issue, William Caine emphasized that total abstinence was not inimical to Christian virtues, and he most strongly opposed the observation that the Church teetotal society could expect the support of none but the poor clergy.⁸⁹

The embarrassment of the clerical abstainers was doubled by a second attack in the Saturday Review for 16 December, 1865. The article, which in its title dismissed teetotalism as "The Puffery of Virtue", mocked the Society's practise of listing on its Magazine cover the names of current clerical abstainers.

What a thrill goes through the reader of the December number of the Magazine when he finds, among the list of abstainers, the 'Military Chaplain, Futtugurh', the chaplain at Foo Choo, a missionary at Palamcottah, and the incumbent of

Barrabool Hills It is deplorable, however, to find the fathers of the Church so sunk in a figuratively vinous sleep, that the Dean of Carlisle and the Bishop of Columbia are the only two dignitaries who figure in the teetotal directory. Still, let us cling firmly to the fact that the good cause is being sustained by humbler instruments all over the globe, from Wiggshall in Norfolk, and Pocklington in Yorkshire, to Mombas and to Barabool Hills.⁹⁰

In response, the Church of England Temperance Magazine characterized the article as "low, and poor, and paltry", and denied that the Society was seeking to parade the virtues of its members since total abstinence was after all not a virtue in itself but an expedient agency for good example.⁹¹ It was nonetheless apparent that by 1866 the humble status of most clerical abstainers was becoming an increasing source of embarrassment.

V

The Saturday Review was only slightly unfair in reducing the Society's 1865 list of teetotal dignitaries to Francis Close, the Dean of Carlisle, and George Hills, the Bishop of British Columbia. In addition to Henry Ellison, Prebendary of Lichfield and Reader to the Queen, and Evan Jenkins, Canon of Llandaff, the Society included among its teetotal supporters E.E. Allen a rural dean from the diocese of Carlisle, John Babington a canon from Peterborough, and Lord Wriothsley Russell.⁹²

George Hills, since 1859 the first Bishop of British Columbia, was the only abstaining bishop who supported the

Church teetotal society.⁹³ Hills had become a teetotaler while serving in the late 'forties as senior curate to W.F. Hook in Leeds. When he became Bishop of British Columbia he found teetotalism useful, particularly in dealing with the Indian whom he saw as "like a child who must be treated with kindness, and yet with firmness".⁹⁴ Although Hills agreed to become patron of the Church teetotal society during a visit to England at the end of 1863, he seems to have done no more than to preside at the Birmingham conference of abstaining clergy in December, 1863.⁹⁵ His name nonetheless headed the Society's list of supporters until 1870 when it was replaced by those of the non-teetotal Archbishops, Tait of Canterbury and Thomson of York.

From 1865 to 1873, the clerical abstainers added only three names to their list of teetotal dignitaries--Sir Lovelace Stamer, Bart., the future Bishop of Shrewsbury, in 1866 the Rector of Stoke-upon-Trent; Rev. Hugh Huleatt, Senior Chaplain to the Forces; and, most importantly, Archdeacon John Sandford.⁹⁶ Sandford attended his first meeting of the Church teetotal society in December, 1867, and was immediately appointed one of its vice-presidents.⁹⁷ His leadership during the next two years of the Committee on intemperance for the Convocation of Canterbury clearly advanced the temperance cause in the Church. Because of circumstances which will be discussed in the next chapter, however, Sandford's activities in Convocation did nothing to improve the status of the Church teetotal society until

the summer of 1872 when he agreed to Henry Ellison's plan for the reorganized Church of England Temperance Society.⁹⁸

Frederick Temple, who was named Bishop of Exeter in 1869, was not yet a teetotaler although the attention which had been paid him by local and national anti-drink organizations was beginning to show results. A speech he gave on 22 June, 1870, at an Exeter meeting of the United Kingdom Alliance was so sympathetic to prohibition that the Alliance had it printed in pamphlet form.⁹⁹ Two years later, while presiding over another Alliance meeting at Exeter, Temple suffered the indignity of constant heckling which finally provoked a brawl.¹⁰⁰ During the disorder, the platform on which Temple was standing with Sir Wilfrid Lawson of the Alliance and other dignitaries was invaded by some rowdy anti-prohibitionists. Temple called in the police and the speeches continued, but this did not prevent someone from throwing a bag of flour at the platform which completely covered Temple and whitened Sir Wilfrid Lawson's face. Temple bravely finished the meeting's business and so illustrated his growing sympathy for Alliance policy.

Temple, as a non-abstainer, was of course ineligible for membership in the Church teetotal society. He did, however, send his good wishes to the Lambeth Palace meeting which instituted the Church of England Temperance Society in February, 1873; he was one of the first bishops to become a C.E.T.S. vice-president and he promoted its work in his diocese. By 1876, he had joined the C.E.T.S. total abstinence

section and in 1891 Temple, then Bishop of London, succeeded Henry Ellison as the Society's general chairman.¹⁰¹ He resigned the C.E.T.S. chairmanship in 1896 when he was named Archbishop of Canterbury.¹⁰² As Bishop of Exeter and, after 1885, as Bishop of London, Temple also supported the Independent Order of Rechabites and was for a time President of the National Temperance League.¹⁰³

George A. Selwyn, who was appointed Bishop of Lichfield in 1867, could have become the first abstaining domestic bishop to head the Church teetotal society. He had become a teetotaler in response to colonial drinking problems he had encountered as Bishop of New Zealand before moving to Lichfield.¹⁰⁴ Before 1873, however, Selwyn's connection with the clerical abstainers seems to have been confined to his support for the political activities of the National Association.¹⁰⁵ In 1873, he became one of the first five episcopal vice-presidents of the new Church of England Temperance Society, as well as a member of the total abstinence wing of the C.E.T.S.; he was joined there the following year by a former New Zealand associate Bishop Charles J. Abraham, then his coadjuter at Lichfield.¹⁰⁶ Among original members of the Church teetotal society, T.D.H. Battersby and James Bardsley somewhat improved the social position of the clerical abstainers by becoming canons: Battersby was appointed a canon of Carlisle in 1866 and Bardsley a canon of Manchester in 1871.¹⁰⁷ Bardsley's new position enabled him in 1871 to have appointed a

Convocation of York committee on intemperance which extended to the north the work which Sandford's committee had performed in the Province of Canterbury.¹⁰⁸

The general failure of the abstaining clergy to convert important Anglicans to their principles both reflected and caused the slight exposure which they gained before 1869 in the highest Church circles. Teetotal clerics often used whatever influence they had to promote their Society. They of course emphasized the problem of intemperance at the clerical gatherings which they attended. By the end of 1863, the Church of England Temperance Magazine happily claimed that the "subject of Total Abstinence is becoming more and more a topic at Ruri-decanal meetings, and other gatherings of Clergymen".¹⁰⁹ Francis Close pleaded for the teetotal cause at the Carlisle Diocesan Clerical Union late in 1863 and at one of the meetings over which he presided of the annual Church Congress held in 1866 at York.¹¹⁰ The experiences of teetotal clerics at the Church Congresses however, show how difficult it was for them to gain a hearing at higher ecclesiastical levels. Henry Ellison's speech to the Congress at Oxford in July, 1862, marked the only occasion before 1873 when the subject of temperance was permitted a formal place on a Congress agenda.

The clerical abstainers often raised suspicions at Church Congresses not only by their low positions and their sometimes fanatical attachment to teetotalism, but in many cases by their Evangelicalism which was becoming increasingly

unpopular at these gatherings.¹¹¹ Francis Close, well-known for both his Evangelicalism and his teetotalism, discovered in 1866 such an uncongenial climate at the first Church Congress which he attended that he pledged never to return again.¹¹² Sympathisers to the teetotal cause had found at the 1866 Congress at York that the only way to have temperance mentioned was to manipulate discussion of a topic already on the agenda. The theme, "The Social Condition and Recreation of the People", inspired several comments on popular drinking problems. Close himself, who opened deliberations on the question the "Best Mode of Attaching the People to the Church of England", naturally pointed discussion towards a greater Church involvement in teetotal work.¹¹³

Officials at the next Church Congress at Wolverhampton in the fall of 1867 proved more resistant to such manoeuvres. The Church of England Temperance Magazine reported the attempts of several clergymen to introduce the subject of intemperance to the Congress which were frustrated by the chairman. Sir Lovelace Stamer, was allowed to speak briefly on teetotalism, but only late in the evening.¹¹⁴ Anticipating such difficulties, the Church teetotal society and other kindred organizations had taken other steps to influence the 1867 Congress. After they had failed to get the subject of intemperance a place on the Congress agenda, the executives of the Church teetotal society and of temperance organizations from Wolverhampton had organized

their own counter-meeting.¹¹⁵ According to Robert Maguire, the teetotal rival sessions were more attractive to the clergy than the regular Congress programme as: "Ours was a practical subject, and it interested them a good deal more than many of the more speculative topics that were set down in the business paper of the Congress".¹¹⁶ The account which the Church of England Temperance Magazine carried of the 1867 proceedings in Wolverhampton was more modest. The teetotalers' meeting at the local Temperance Hall had attracted many of those who could not get tickets to the customary Congress address to workingmen being held at the same time in the Agricultural Hall.¹¹⁷ The meeting was addressed by local teetotalers and by William Caine, Thomas Rooke and others from the Church teetotal society.¹¹⁸ The conveners of the meeting sent the Congress two petitions. The first, urging that parish teetotal societies become a part of the Church's parochial machinery, was read to the Congress by Bishop John Lonsdale of Lichfield. The other, asking Anglicans to press for a limitation in the number of beer shops, was displayed in the reception room to the Congress Hall and attracted some signatures, including those of Bishops Lonsdale and A.C. Tait of London.¹¹⁹

The annual attempts of the clerical abstainers to gain a hearing at the Church Congresses continued with little success until 1873 when the newly-founded Church of England Temperance Society gained a warm reception at the Congress held that year in Bath.¹²⁰ The new prestige which the subject

of temperance would enjoy regularly at Church Congresses after 1873 was anticipated somewhat at the 1869 Congress at Liverpool when Archbishop William Thomson and a few others supported a greater Anglican involvement in the temperance movement. Thomson argued that the question of temperance "ought to be the very province of the minister of Christ".¹²¹ Nonetheless, a writer in the Church of England Temperance Magazine, after praising Thomson for his "admirable" speech, lamented the characteristically small place which had been accorded the drink question as compared with more esoteric topics.

How the ruins of Sinai and Palestine are of more importance than the ruin of hundreds of thousands of souls in England I am, I confess, at a loss to conceive; and yet the former subject was in the judgment of the Congress Committee preferred to the latter.¹²²

NOTES

CHAPTER VI

¹The statement was made by the Rev. R. Prowde. Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d ser. I (November, 1869), 207.

²Convocation of Canterbury, Chronicle of Convocation, (15 June, 1869) Vol. 5, p. 245.

³William Thomson, cited in The Times (17 May, 1871), p. 8.

⁴Cited in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (March, 1873), 35.

⁵Ibid., loc. cit.

⁶3d ser. II (December, 1870), 221-222.

⁷3d ser. IV (November, 1872), 206.

⁸See Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d ser. III (January, 1871), 2; and Church of England Temperance Chronicle, III (February, 1875), 17.

⁹Weekly Record of the Temperance Movement, No. 319 (10 May, 1862), p. 165; and Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, n.p.

¹⁰Ibid., loc. cit.

¹¹Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. V (January, 1868), 12.

¹²Ibid., II (May, 1863), 63.

¹³Ibid., II (June, 1863), 66; and Dawson Burns Temperance History, (London, c. 1880), II, 84.

¹⁴Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report to Sixth Annual Report, 1864-1868, n. pps.

¹⁵Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, p. 24.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 25.

¹⁷He remained in this post until 1877 when he resigned it to become Vicar of Christ Church, Battersea. Church of England Temperance Chronicle, V (July, 1877), 111.

¹⁸Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Sixth Annual Report, 1868, n.p.; and Executive Minutes (5 April, 1881), n.p.

¹⁹Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (August, 1863), 136.

²⁰Ibid., II (October, 1863), 223.

²¹From 1866 to 1868 there was also an honorary secretary for finance, a layman James Stuart from Sudbury. Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Fourth Annual Report, 1866, n.p.; and Sixth Annual Report, 1868, n.p.

²²Church of England Temperance Chronicle, II (March, 1874), 37-38.

²³Church of England Temperance Society, Annual Report for the year ending 31 December, 1899, p. 36.

²⁴In his Temperance Landmarks, A Narrative of the Work and Workers, 1829-1879 (London, 1879), p. 67.

²⁵P. T. Winskill, Temperance Movement and its Workers (London, 1892), p. 154; and Frederick Sherlock, Henry John Ellison, (London, 1910), pp. 15-17. Ellison was also, from 1854 to 1873, a prebendary of Lichfield, and during his tenure as Vicar of Windsor, Reader to the Queen at Windsor Castle. The former post, however, was probably largely honorific and, according to Dean Wellesley, Victoria never required the services of her Reader. Letter of Gerald Wellesley to Henry Ellison (3 May, 1855). This letter is in the possession of Henry Ellison's grandson, Randall Ellison, to whom I am grateful for letting me see it.

- ²⁶Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, p. 24.
- ²⁷Ibid., pp. 24-25.
- ²⁸Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Third Annual Report, 1865, n.p.
- ²⁹Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Sixth Annual Report, 1868, n.p.
- ³⁰Thomas Rooke, Parochial Temperance Societies: Hints on their Formation (London, 1866).
- ³¹Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Fourth Annual Report, 1866, p. 28.
- ³²Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Sixth Annual Report, 1868, p. 7.
- ³³Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. V (June, 1868), 19.
- ³⁴See Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Fourth Annual Report, 1866, p. 28.
- ³⁵See below, pp. 254-258.
- ³⁶Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d ser. I (June, 1869), 104.
- ³⁷Rooke, however, remained as an honorary secretary of the Society.
- ³⁸Ibid., 3d ser. III (March, 1871), 41.
- ³⁹Church of England Temperance Chronicle, II (December, 1874), 193.
- ⁴⁰Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d ser. III (March, 1871), 48.
- ⁴¹Ibid., 3d ser. IV (June, 1872), 102.
- ⁴²Ibid., 3d ser. IV (January, 1872), 1.
- ⁴³Church of England Temperance Chronicle, III (February, 1875), 17-18.

⁴⁴Church of England Temperance Magazine II (February and October, 1863), 156-157, 200-1.

⁴⁵See Appendix D, for changes in the number of teetotal clerics from 1864 to 1872.

⁴⁶See Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. II (March, 1865), 69-71.

⁴⁷Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Manchester and Chester Diocesan Branch, First Annual Report (Manchester, 1868), p. 11.

⁴⁸Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d ser. I (October, 1867), 363.

⁴⁹See Appendix D.

⁵⁰Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Manchester and Chester Diocesan Branch, First Annual Report, pp. 1-16.

⁵¹Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Manchester and Chester Diocesan Branch, Quarterly Paper and Plan of District Meetings in Connexion with the Society. Fourth Quarter, 1868. Manchester, 1868.

⁵²3d ser. II (May, 1870), 91.

⁵³Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (February, 1873), 21.

⁵⁴Ibid., I (January, 1873), 9.

⁵⁵See Appendix D from which all of the following figures are derived.

⁵⁶The number of clergymen in England and Wales in 1861 was 19,195; and in 1871 was 20,694. Owen Chadwick, The Victorian Church, Part II (London, 1970), p. 244.

⁵⁷Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. IV (January, 1867), 4. In 1866, The Temperance Spectator estimated that there were over 600 clerical abstainers. (1 June, 1866, p. 8), as cited in Brian Harrison, Drink and the Victorians - The Temperance Question in England 1815-1872 (London, 1971), p. 181.

⁵⁸Church of England Temperance Magazine, V new ser. III (July, 1866), 195.

- ⁵⁹Ibid., loc. cit.
- ⁶⁰Ibid., new ser. III (July, 1866), 196.
- ⁶¹Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, p. 22.
- ⁶²New ser. IV (January, 1867), 42.
- ⁶³Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, p. 22.
- ⁶⁴Ibid., loc. cit.
- ⁶⁵Ibid., loc. cit.
- ⁶⁶Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, p. 23.
- ⁶⁷Church of England Temperance Magazine II (December, 1863), 288.
- ⁶⁸Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, p. 23.
- ⁶⁹Ibid., loc. cit.
- ⁷⁰Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Sixth Annual Report, 1868, n.p.
- ⁷¹Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (May, 1863), 55. Italics were in the original.
- ⁷²See ibid., new ser. IV (November, 1867), 345.
- ⁷³Ibid., loc. cit.
- ⁷⁴Ibid., loc. cit.
- ⁷⁵Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Church of England Temperance Tracts (London, 1864).
- ⁷⁶Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (March, 1863), 173.
- ⁷⁷Ibid., II (March, 1863), 173-174; and new ser. II (August, 1865), 250-251.
- ⁷⁸Ibid., loc. cit.

⁷⁹New ser. V (November, 1868), 336.

⁸⁰Ibid., 3d ser. IV (June, 1872), 102.

⁸¹The Society's expenditure for May 1871 to May 1872 was £ 648/19/1. (Ibid., loc. cit.). The price of the Magazine after 1869 was 1d. per month. If, as in 1868, about one-third of the Society's income was devoted to publication of the Magazine, monthly circulation was under 5,000 (c. 4,520).

⁸²They were: Longley of Canterbury; Thomson of York; Tait of London; Baring of Durham; Waldegrave of Carlisle; Hampden of Herford; Lonsdale of Lichfield; Jackson of Lincoln; Browne of Ely; Pelham of Norwich; Wigram of Rochester; Ollivant of Llandaff; and Thirwall of St. David's. Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. II (March, 1865), 96.

⁸³The Church teetotal society was first mentioned in the Convocation of Canterbury on 8 July, 1870, by Bishop C. J. Ellicott. Convocation of Canterbury, Chronicle of Convocation, Vol. 6 (8 July, 1870), pp. 627-628.

⁸⁴The Record, 5 May, 1862, p. 4. The following September, the Record refused to print a letter from Stopford Ram describing the annual teetotal Harvest Home at Pavenham, with the notice, "In reply to the Rev. Stopford J. Ram, we cannot conscientiously advocate the principle of Teetotalism." The Church of England Temperance Magazine informed the Record that no-one had asked the Record to support teetotalism. I (November, 1862), 63.

⁸⁵The Saturday Review, XIII (10 May, 1862), 527.

⁸⁶Cited in the Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (September, 1863), 192. The article had appeared in the Clerical Journal and Church and University Chronicle for 14 May, 1863.

⁸⁷The Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (September, 1863), 192.

⁸⁸The Clerical Journal and Church and University Chronicle, Vol. 16, no. 373 (9 February 1865), pp. 123-124.

⁸⁹Ibid., Vol. 16, no. 374 (23 February, 1865), p. 178.

⁹⁰The Saturday Review, XVI (16 December, 1865), 757.

⁹¹Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. III (January, 1866), pp. 19-20.

⁹²See Appendix B which lists the clerical dignitaries for 1864. No important additions had been made in 1865. Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Third Annual Report, 1865, p. 100. There were also other fairly well-placed clergymen on the Society's 1865 list from outside the British mainland, including the Seigneur of the Isle of Sark, the Dean of Guernsey and a dean and an archdeacon from Ireland, but they probably could do little to extend the Society's influence in England and Wales.

⁹³Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, p. 19.

⁹⁴Extracts from Bishop Hills' Journal, cited in Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. I (January, 1864), 27. See also, Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (December, 1873), 193-194.

⁹⁵Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, p. 19.

⁹⁶Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Sixth Annual Report, 1868, n.p.

⁹⁷Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. V (January, 1868), 12-13.

⁹⁸See below, pp. 301-305, 309, 331-334.

⁹⁹Frederick Temple, Bishop Temple on the Permissive Bill (Manchester, 1870).

¹⁰⁰The incident is described in E. G. Sandford ed., Memoirs of Archbishop Temple (London, 1906), I, 479.

¹⁰¹Church of England Temperance Society, Annual Report for the Year Ending December 31, 1902, pp. 5-7.

¹⁰²Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁰³Ibid., loc. cit. E. G. Sandford ed., Memoirs of Archbishop Temple, I, 484; and Church of England Temperance Society, Annual Report for the Year Ending December 31, 1902, p. 7.

- 104 Church of England Temperance Chronicle, III (October, 1875), 149.
- 105 Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d ser. I (April, 1869), 66.
- 106 Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (August, 1873), 124; II (July, 1874), 113.
- 107 Crockford's Clerical Directory (London, 1868), p. 415; and Crockford's Clerical Directory (London, 1885), p. 58.
- 108 See below, pp. 327-328.
- 109 Church of England Temperance Magazine, II (December, 1863), 287.
- 110 Ibid., loc. cit., and new ser. III (November, 1866), 352.
- 111 For a discussion of the Evangelicals' unpopularity at the Church Congresses, see Owen Chadwick, The Victorian Church, Part II, (London, 1970), p. 363.
- 112 Ibid., loc. cit.
- 113 Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. III (November, 1866), 352.
- 114 Ibid., new ser. IV (November, 1867), 323.
- 115 Ibid., loc. cit., and Robert Maguire, Temperance Landmarks, p. 64.
- 116 Ibid., loc. cit.
- 117 New ser. IV (November, 1867), 323.
- 118 Ibid., loc. cit.
- 119 Ibid., loc. cit.
- 120 Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (October, 1873), 161; and Robert Maguire, Temperance Landmarks, p. 65.

121

Dawson Burns, Temperance History, II, 113; and Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d ser. I (November, 1869), 219-220.

122

Ibid., p.219.

CHAPTER VII

TEMPERANCE AND THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY, 1868-1872

I

The increased, if not overwhelming attention, accorded the temperance question at the Liverpool Church Congress in the autumn of 1869 reflected interest aroused earlier in the year by Ellison's political movement and by the Report in June of the Committee on Intemperance which had been established the year before by the Convocation of Canterbury. William Thomson's strong plea for temperance at the Liverpool Church Congress came a few months after on 17 February, 1869, he had presided over the inaugural meeting at St. James Hall of the National Association for the Amendment of the Liquor Laws. The Association had been organized at a meeting in the Langham Hotel on 2 December, 1868, to meet the licensing legislation expected from the new Gladstone ministry. Its purpose was both to support the movement led by Ellison since 1866 against the beer shops and to extend it to a more comprehensive legislative attack against intemperance.¹

Reflecting the increased interest which the election of the Gladstone ministry had aroused in the drink question,

the St. James Hall meeting was the first gathering connected with the Church teetotal society to receive broad and influential support.² The list of speakers at the conference was both bipartisan and ecumenical. It included Sir Francis Crossley, M.P., for the Northern division of the West Riding, an advanced Liberal and supporter of Irish disestablishment as well as J. Abel Smith, M.P., for Hertfordshire, a Conservative and staunch supporter of the Church; Newman Hall, as well as Herbert Vaughan, editor of the Tablet and future Cardinal. Thomson was the first domestic prelate to preside over any meeting connected with the Church teetotal society; and the St. James Hall conference was the first to gain prominent support from all factions of the Church. Letters of encouragement were received from A.C. Tait, recently appointed Archbishop of Canterbury, and Bishops John Jackson of London, John Mackarness of Oxford, James Atlay of Hereford, W.C. Magee of Peterborough and John Selwyn of Lichfield. The well-known broad churchmen, A.P. Stanley, Thomas Hughes and Charles Kingsley, also sent greetings as did W.F. Hook, the teetotal High Church Dean of Chichester. The St. James Hall meeting was followed on 4 March, 1869, by a prestigious deputation to Gladstone and his home secretary Henry Bruce, urging that no new beer shops be permitted. The deputation was led by William Thomson and included the three new vice-presidents of the National Association, Bishops Magee, Atlay and Selwyn.³

Inspired by the success of the National Association,

promoters of the Church teetotal society found new hope that they might at last be granted the episcopal patronage for which they had so long waited. A spokesman for the Society wrote in the Church of England Temperance Magazine for April, 1869,

It is very cheering to see our bishops thus at length coming to the front in this part of the war between heaven and hell. Would they could see their way to join our Church of England Temperance Reformation Society! How much of the new impulse would they give it! How much of influence among the masses would they gain! Though we have not yet our natural leaders as a Church Society, we are endeavouring to wage the war, and we cannot but feel that God is blessing our feeble efforts.⁴

The writer of this plea did not yet realize that in order to gain its "natural leaders" the Church teetotal society would have to abandon total abstinence as a condition of full membership.

In February, 1868, Sandford, using his own influence and that of his friend A.C. Tait, had secured the appointment in Convocation of a committee on intemperance which was sufficiently prestigious to attract wide attention and cooperation in the Church and inactive enough for him to dominate. Consequently, the Committee's Report, which was discussed by Convocation in June, 1869, reflected at the same time Sandford's strong commitment to anti-drink movements and the Committee's aura of respectability. It also provided Henry Ellison and others with detailed guides on what measures would attract official Anglican support to both the National Association and the Church teetotal society.

II

Sandford had the sorts of personal, family and ecclesiastical connections which were generally lacking among clerical teetotalers. It was unusual to find any of the early teetotal clergy mentioned in the Dictionary of National Biography; yet not only was John Sandford's name included in the D.N.B., but those of his father Daniel, the Bishop of Edinburgh from 1806 to 1830; a brother, Sir Daniel Keyte a Greek professor at Glasgow University; and two nephews, Francis R., later the first Baron Sandford, who from 1868 to 1870 was an assistant under-secretary in the colonial office; and Sir Herbert Bruce Sandford, a veteran of the 1857 Indian Mutiny.⁵ John Sandford himself had been a Bampton lecturer in 1851 and examining chaplain from 1853 to 1860 to Bishop Charles Richard Sumner of Winchester.⁶

John Sandford was, by his own admission, a late convert to the temperance cause which he first embraced primarily as a means of Church defence. Probably early in 1867, he became convinced "that if the National Church would only occupy its proper place at the head of the Temperance movement, all other religious bodies would follow in its wake, and it might earn itself in this way the esteem and affection of the nation".⁷ Before he became a vice-president of the Church teetotal society at the end of 1867, Sandford had already joined the United Kingdom Alliance, become a teetotaler, and in June, 1867, presented notice of motion in the Convocation of Canterbury for the committee on intemperance which he

was to head the next year.⁸

Sandford's long friendship with A.C. Tait helped facilitate the extraordinary progress which the temperance movement made in the Convocation of Canterbury in 1868 and 1869 and later in the Church at large. Their friendship which went back to their boyhoods in Scotland had been intensified in 1842 during Tait's first year as headmaster at Rugby when he married Catherine Spooner whom he had courted at Sandford's Dunchurch home.⁹ During the Convocation enquiry and the negotiations which led to establishment in February, 1873, of the Church of England Temperance Society, John Sandford relied on his son Charles, Tait's chaplain, as a link between himself and Fulham or Lambeth Palace. Without the pressure from the Sandfords that he do so it is doubtful that Tait would have led the Church in the campaign against intemperance.

Although Tait had previously shown some interest in the temperance cause, his support in Convocation for Sandford's committee revealed the tendency which would mark his future relationships with the Church teetotalers. He usually spoke strongly in favour of temperance but left the active campaign against drink to others. On 18 February, 1868, supporting Sandford's motion to establish a committee on intemperance, Tait told the Upper House of Convocation that the committee would study "a subject the consideration of which is of the greatest importance to the morality and religion of the country".¹⁰ He added his view that an

inquiry into intemperance might be "of the greatest use" in reforming the licensing laws.¹¹ Tait, however, had to admit that the problem had not been "properly ventilated" in his own diocese of London; and so he had to rely for his remarks on petitions submitted from elsewhere. He spent some time discussing a petition sent from Birmingham in Sandford's diocese of Worcester.¹²

Supported by Tait, Sandford quickly pushed his proposal through Convocation and within three days the Committee on Intemperance had been constituted.¹³ It included among its nineteen original members three of the most influential deans of the Lower House: A.P. Stanley of Westminster, Henry Alford of Canterbury, and W.F. Hook of Chichester. The Committee also included James Fraser, soon to be appointed Bishop of Manchester.¹⁴ There is no evidence, however, that prominent Committee members contributed anything more than the weight of their names to the considerable task of collecting, compiling and publishing the mass of data found in the 1869 Report.

The three deans whose presence on the Committee the clerical abstainers noted with particular interest failed to make any practical contributions to its operation. When the names of the Committee members were first published, the Church of England Temperance Magazine observed editorially that they were pleased to see those of Hook whom they knew to be a teetotaler and of Stanley, "who no doubt will bring to its deliberations a mind already strongly predisposed to

estimate the Drink at its true value, as an ingredient of national misery".¹⁵ Alford, it was feared, would not cooperate.¹⁶ Both the fears and hopes expressed in the Magazine were in vain. The Chronicle of Convocation did not mention any participation by Hook in the discussion which met Sandford's Report in June, 1869; and both Stanley and Alford admitted they had done little or nothing to help Sandford in his investigations. Stanley seconded Sandford's resolution that the Committee's Report be adopted by Convocation, but confessed that he had not attended a single meeting of the Committee because he thought that he lacked sufficient time to do justice to so important a subject.¹⁷ Alford told Convocation that he had attended only one meeting of the Committee; but contrary to the expectations of the Church of England Temperance Magazine, he gave his "entire concurrence with the report and appendix".¹⁸

The brunt of the Committee's work necessarily fell on Sandford himself and was considered by his son Ernest to have contributed to a failure in his health and to his death in 1873. When in June, 1869, Sandford opened discussion on the Report in the Lower House of Convocation he said that

it has occupied, I may say, nearly eighteen months of my life. It has deprived me during that time of any rest whatsoever, and for some weeks, in consequence of the labour I had gone through, I was confined to my bed . . . ;¹⁹

Sandford never fully recovered from the over-exertion brought on by his temperance work in Convocation and elsewhere.

His death on his seventy-second birthday, in March, 1873, less than five weeks after the inaugural meeting of the C.E.T.S., was caused by an attack of typhoid fever which, according to his son Ernest became fatal "largely due to his great exertions in his old age and failing health in connection with the meeting, the Report, and temperance work generally".²⁰

No matter how inactive Sandford's committee members were, their prestige probably contributed to the rather good reception which he found among churchmen during his investigations. His enquiries had not been greeted with universal enthusiasm. During discussion of his Report in June, 1869, Sandford spoke of "several clergymen" who told him "that they did not consider intemperance a subject which at all required their attention";²¹ and he spoke with particular sarcasm about "one Canon of the Church, receiving, I believe, 1000l. a year [who] wrote to tell me that he was too much occupied with more important duties even to give me the names of the Clergy in his district". Sandford, however, regarded these incidents as exceptions "to the excessive kindness, co-operation and assistance I have received throughout the Province of Canterbury".

Despite the unfortunate consequences to his health, the necessity forced on Sandford of doing most of the Committee work himself at least afforded him considerable freedom to investigate and report on intemperance as he saw fit. The questionnaires which Sandford sent to the clergy, magistrates

and other influential persons in the 21 English and Welsh dioceses of the Province of Canterbury reflected his own teetotal bias. They implied both that intemperance was in fact a national evil and that its causes, results and remedies could be determined by eliciting responses to the particular questions asked. The questionnaires addressed to the clergy were organized under four headings: "I Extent of the Evil; II Probable Causes; III Results; and IV Remedies".²² Under each of the headings, suggestions were given as to the sort of information useful to the investigators. Under the heading, "extent of the evil", the clergyman was asked to specify the population of his parish; whether it was agricultural or manufacturing; the number of public houses and beer shops; the amount of intemperance in the parish and whether it was occasional or habitual; the distribution of intemperance according to sex and class; and the earliest age at which it began. There were only three probable causes suggested for intemperance: legislative enactments or absence of them; social or trade usages and supposed medical properties of intoxicating drinks. Yet the questionnaire suggested that the consequences of intemperance could adversely affect most aspects of human behaviour: morality, the practice of religion, Sunday observance, domestic happiness and comfort, working-class education and public health. Intemperance also bred crime, police corruption, pauperism, lunacy and attendant expenses to the community. Clerical correspondents were asked to suggest

remedies for intemperance under two headings: "Counteractions which have been found most efficacious in diminishing the occasions or checking the practice of Intemperance" and "Other means, whether Legislative or otherwise, which might be desirable".

The arrangement of topics in Sandford's questionnaire presumed the simplistic teetotal diagnosis of England's social and moral problems. Although the stated consequences of intemperance touched virtually every area in which England suffered problems, the only three causes of intemperance suggested were faulty licensing laws, social or industrial custom and medical myths. This, of course, implied that a great number of national problems could be virtually eliminated if intemperance were conquered. There was no suggestion in the questionnaire that intemperance itself could have been produced to a great extent by the great social and moral problems which it was supposed to have caused. The questionnaire also included weighted phrases which could have prejudiced those to whom it was addressed. In two places, it referred to the merchandising of alcoholic beverages with the pejorative expression the "traffic" and thus questioned the legitimacy of the entire liquor trade.²³ On the other hand, referring to the medical question which as has already been shown was in dispute among experts, the questionnaire decided the issue by referring to the "supposed medical properties of intoxicating drinks".²⁴ The bias of Sandford's questionnaire in its

arrangement of topics and its prejudicial language lessened the historical value of his Report. To the historian's further frustration, the Report itself did not include much of the important information which had been gathered in the survey.

To preserve the anonymity of participating parochial clergymen the names of their parishes, their population, their location, details to indicate whether they were industrial or rural and even the number of parishes which co-operated with the survey were all omitted. The Report contained a short introductory passage, which purported to summarize the Committee's findings and gave strong pleas for temperance measures, and a longer Appendix under topical headings which gave the views of the clergymen and others who submitted information on intemperance. Unfortunately, the views were published anonymously and identified only by consecutive numbers which made it impossible both to judge the bias of correspondents and to see connections between opinions given by the same persons on different aspects of the problem.

III

Sandford, naturally, was less interested in preserving records for history than in proving to his contemporaries the horrors of intemperance; and the historian must at least note the extent to which a considerable number of Anglican clergymen willingly co-operated with him by filling in his

skeleton outline with flesh and blood details. Most of those who answered the questionnaire seem to have accepted the biases implicit in it. The largest number of extracts in the Report presenting information which had not been requested by the Committee were sixty-two complaints by clergymen concerning the adulteration of alcoholic beverages.²⁵ Salt, tobacco and coculus indicus were the additives most frequently mentioned. Salt was thought to increase thirst and tobacco, coculus indicus and other drugs were used to heighten the intoxicating effect of the beverages imbibed. Fewer of those clergymen who responded to the questionnaire displayed reservations to its simplistic suggestion that intemperance could be blamed on licensing laws, social and industrial customs and faulty public education concerning the medical effects of alcohol. Only eight extracts appeared in the Report from clergymen who attributed intemperance to the inferior houses available to the poor.²⁶ One of those who suggested that Convocation support better housing for the poor shrewdly observed

So long as the cottages are such as to prevent the decencies of life from being observed, men will, I fear, be tempted to fly from the discomforts of home to the well-lighted, warm and cheerful tap-room at the Public-House . . . ,²⁷

Clerical correspondents provided details to illustrate all the causes of intemperance which had been suggested in the questionnaire. Forty-eight quotations were included in the Report from clergymen who blamed intemperance at least in part on the Duke of Wellington's 1830 Beer Shop Act and

the relatively uncontrolled sale of beer which had resulted from it.²⁸ One clerical correspondent characterized the two beer shops which in recent years had been established in his parish as the "very sinks of iniquity and vice".²⁹ Similar evidence was given concerning the effect of the public house in causing intemperance.³⁰ Numerous examples were extracted from clerical returns to the Committee of social and industrial customs which contributed to increased intemperance. One clergyman complained that the colliers in his parish were paid their wages in a public house which provided immediate temptation for squandering.³¹ Another reported that the supervisory colliers in his parish received their own wages and those of their workers in one large sum which encouraged them to retire to the pub to have the money changed.³² Several clergymen, particularly those from country parishes, complained that labourers often received a good part of their wages in intoxicating drink.³³ Many examples were given of intemperance resulting from the custom of holding in pubs club meetings, particularly of benefit and friendly Societies.³⁴ The Statute or Mopp fairs were also condemned as the breeding ground for intemperance and other vices. One clergyman wrote, "At the Fairs lads and girls are, I am convinced, ruined for life".³⁵

The clergy who co-operated with Sandford's enquiry also submitted evidence to support all the consequences of intemperance which had been implied in the questionnaire. Public houses were shown to have a corrupting effect on the

police force, whether this was because the policeman took bribes to wink at the publican's legal infractions, or whether it was because he indulged too liberally in the publican's products, or whether it was because his energies were over-extended by the additional duties which he had to exercise as a result of disorderly pubs.³⁶ Extracts from 83 clerical submissions were included in the Report to show the effects of intemperance on Church work. One clergyman stated emphatically, "It need hardly be said that Intemperance is the one fruitful source of irreligion".³⁷ Drunkenness was said to produce "prodigious immorality", "Sabbath desecration", and "practical atheism".³⁸ In most cases, the effect of intemperance on religion was described in general terms, but one clergyman blamed the favoured custom of Saturday night drinking for the low attendance at Sunday morning services.³⁹ Another claimed that the "Public-House robs the working man of the only time he has for self-improvement".⁴⁰ The sections in the Report treating the relationship between intemperance and crime and poverty mainly presented the views of magistrates and prison officials; but the clergymen cited often shared with the others the teetotaler's assumption that intemperance was the main cause of crime. One clergyman put the rate of crime caused by drunkenness at 80 per cent.⁴¹ Another described intemperance as the "root of crime and pauperism".⁴²

The Canterbury Report included an officially selected list of remedies for intemperance which had been submitted

to the Committee.⁴³ There were several recommendations designed to decrease the social importance of the pub and hopefully at the same time to increase parochial influence. The Committee urged that the payment of wages, the conduct of business and the meetings of benefit societies all be removed from the pub. The parish was advised to provide counterattractive facilities and activities to challenge the social importance of the pub, such as adult night-schools, libraries, workmen's clubs and tea and coffee rooms. Temperance teaching in Church schools and temperance societies, both for adults and young people, were recommended as educational means of reducing intemperance. Added to the Report, was a plea for improved dwellings for the poor.

There was also an extensive list of legislative remedies for intemperance.⁴⁴ The Report recommended the repeal of the 1830 Beer Shop Act and the complete suppression of the beer shops; Sunday-closing of public houses for all except bona fide travellers and earlier closing during the week. It also urged that the number of public houses be greatly reduced; that the licensing system be made uniform; that penalties for intoxication, to which the drunkard and publican were already subject, be enforced; that billiards, entertainment and dancing be forbidden on licensed premises; that the practice of using public houses for party committee rooms be prohibited and that public houses be closed in the boroughs on days of parliamentary election; that a special police force be created to inspect public houses for

adulterated drink and that duties on tea, coffee, chocolate and sugar be eliminated.

Sandford was able to present evidence in his Report that a considerable minority of Anglican clergymen shared his sympathy for the prohibitionist policy of the United Kingdom Alliance.⁴⁵ In the Report, however, he prudently did not directly recommend prohibition and thereby prejudice moderate Churchmen against all his findings. Instead, he advocated that "a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of Licenses should be placed in the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected--namely the inhabitants themselves--"46 In so doing, he left the advisability of prohibition an open question while he promoted local and democratic regulation of the liquor trade.

Extensive distribution of the Canterbury Report helped prepare Anglicans for the establishment of the Church of England Temperance Society in February, 1873. By October, 1872, according to a memorandum of Sandford's committee, the first two editions of the Report had already sold 15,000 copies and a third cheap popular edition sponsored by the United Kingdom Alliance had sold "many thousand more".⁴⁷ The effect of the Canterbury Report in revealing and provoking among Churchmen a strong interest in the drink question was complemented by a Report issued in February, 1872, by James Bardsley's Committee on Intemperance for the Convocation of York.⁴⁸ These two Reports, which were

purposely similar in their recommendations, also provided Henry Ellison and his associates with models which, in the summer of 1872, they used to formulate the objectives of the projected C.E.T.S.⁴⁹

IV

The 1869 Canterbury Report immediately stimulated and influenced the National Association for the Amendment of the Liquor Laws. John Sandford had attended the founding meeting of the National Association, at the Langham Hotel in December, 1868, and the influence of his Report showed clearly in the legislative position which the Association took during the parliamentary licensing debates from 1869 to 1872. All but one of the legislative remedies suggested by the 1869 Canterbury Report were included in the National Association's bill, which was drafted in 1869 and unsuccessfully presented to parliament in 1872 by four Liberal M.P.s, Sir Robert Anstruther, Thomas Hughes, Sir Harcourt Johnstone and Walter Morrison.⁵⁰ The exception, the Canterbury Committee's recommendation that the duties be repealed on tea, coffee, chocolate and sugar, was no doubt omitted as inappropriate to a licensing bill. The National Association's bill also included a suggestion which had been made within the body of the Report, but had not appeared among the recommended "legislative remedies", that publicans lose their licenses for allowing their premises to be used as brothels.⁵¹ The appearance of the Canterbury Report at a

time when licensing legislation was expected from the new Gladstone ministry must also have helped attract influential support to the National Association.

The relatively slower effect of the 1869 Canterbury Report in transforming by 1873 the Church teetotal society into the C.E.T.S. can be partly explained by the preoccupation of the temperance community with the licensing question then before parliament. Henry Ellison, in his old age, blamed the four-year delay in establishing the C.E.T.S. entirely on this factor. He told F.W. Farrar in an 1893 letter that only after the passing of Bruce's second licensing bill in the summer of 1872 "the ground seemed clear for bringing before the Executive a scheme of reconstruction with which my mind had lately been occupied".⁵² Ellison's explanation had considerable merit. The extent to which the Executive of the Church teetotal society focussed their attention and resources on the parliamentary licensing question has already been illustrated in the preceding chapter. There is some evidence, however, that Ellison was partly attempting by this explanation to delete from the historical record resistance to his plans for the C.E.T.S. which he had met at first from both his fellow clerical abstainers and from Sandford. In the original draft of his 1893 letter to Farrar, Ellison had admitted that his "mind had long been occupied" with the scheme of reconstruction which resulted in the formation of the C.E.T.S.⁵³ By replacing the word "long" with the word "lately", Ellison

did not have to recount the coolness which at first Sandford displayed to the Church teetotal society and the initial hostility of clerical abstainers to admitting non-teetotal churchmen as full members in the proposed organization.

Sandford's coolness to the Church teetotal society was revealed by his failure to mention even its existence either in the Report of his Committee or during Convocation's discussion of it in June, 1869. In February, when the Report had first appeared, the clerical abstainers had ignored the slight to their Society and praised Sandford in the Church of England Temperance Magazine for producing a document which was more thorough, more practical and bolder than they had hoped.⁵⁴ In commenting on Convocation's discussion of the Report in June, however, the Magazine expressed surprise that Sandford had not seen fit to mention the Church teetotal society, even though he had praised the Nonconformists and Archbishop Manning for their temperance work.⁵⁵ Sandford's slight of the clerical abstainers was seen as all the more surprising since he was a vice-president of the Church teetotal society and had attended its meetings. Sandford himself left no recorded explanation for ignoring the Church teetotal society in the Report and in Convocation. However, the Convocation discussion in June, 1869, showed that it would have been at best impolitic for him to have suggested that his Committee endorsed a Society which demanded that its members be teetotalers. When James Fraser, one of Sandford's own committee members, began a passionate

denunciation of fanatical teetotalism with the charge that, in advocating temperance, anti-drink circles were really promoting teetotalism, Sandford interrupted him with a non-committal, "not necessarily".⁵⁶

Fraser continued his attack, nonetheless, and proved that even among liberal churchmen, teetotalers were still sometimes considered to be no better than heretics or apostates. In his speech, Fraser compared the advocates of unfermented Communion wine to the Encratites. Anticipating the charge he would make at the 1873 Church Congress, Fraser also condemned the "many teetotalers [who] put total abstinence in the place of religion and make adherence to the temperance cause a substitute for all religious feelings and emotions whatsoever". Quoting scripture to make his point, Fraser warned Anglicans not to condemn "God's good creatures" or to dismiss even moderate drinking as sinful.⁵⁷ Fraser accompanied his attack on teetotalism with the suggestion which, in a somewhat amended version, would eventually form the basis for the Church of England Temperance Society. He recommended that an Anglican temperance organization be established with "two orders", a teetotal section for former drunkards and another for moderate drinkers.⁵⁸ Similar suggestions were made at the Liverpool Church Congress, the next autumn, and in January, 1870, by Bishop Charles J. Ellicott of Gloucester and Bristol while addressing some Bristol workingmen.⁵⁹

The reaction of clerical abstainers to Fraser's

suggestion showed the difficulty which Henry Ellison would have in convincing them to admit non-teetotalers to full membership in the Society. In July, the Church of England Temperance Magazine, referring to a shortlived temperance society patronized by Bishop Blomfield in the 1830's, informed Fraser that, "this experiment has been tried in our church, and was found unable to effect what Dr. Fraser evidently hoped from such a movement".⁶⁰ William Caine, after expressing "intense pain" that no one in Convocation had been able to correct Fraser's other "misapprehensions", devoted two other painfully intense articles in the Magazine to performing the task himself.⁶¹

Before 1872, the only concession which the clerical abstainers granted their drinking prelates was the creation in May, 1870, of associate membership for sympathetic, but non-abstaining Anglican dignitaries. This constitutional change was admittedly made as the only means both of attracting the influential patronage which for a year the clerical abstainers had vainly expected from supporters of the National Association and of, at last, securing some recognition from Convocation. The new status of associate membership, introduced at the Society's annual meeting on 13 May, 1870, at Willis' Rooms, was justified on the simple grounds that "as a Church Society for missions to the Intemperate ours ought to have some recognition from the rulers of our Church. . . ." ⁶² The change was announced in the presence of the meeting's chairman Bishop Ellicott, the first domestic

bishop to preside over any meeting of the Church teetotal society. It partially met the suggestion which Ellicott had made in his January temperance address in Bristol that a Church temperance organization should include sections for both teetotalers and for moderate drinkers.⁶³

The clerical abstainers made clear during the meeting their continuing hope that the bishops whom their new policy might attract as associate members would become teetotalers, and that until they did so they would not be considered full members of the Society. Ellicott, who was known to violate teetotal medical teaching by taking a little sherry and water for his health, had to take some good-humoured teasing from Robert Maguire who compared the Church teetotal society to a coach

There were those who were inside the coach and they meant to stay inside, and they would make the coach as elastic as possible, but those who could not come inside they would find room for outside. Now, the Right Rev. Bishop was one of those whom they had found room for outside the coach . . . and if the weather continued as unfavourable as it had been for the last two or three days, he would either ask for an umbrella or ask to be admitted inside the coach.⁶⁴

Ellicott responded, thanking Maguire for his "courteous compliment", but complaining that the coach "rarely possessed that commodious and elastic interior which Mr. Maguire had described". He added that for the time being he must stay outside, although he "tamely" expressed a hope that "at some time or other he might make himself comfortable inside".⁶⁵

The Church teetotal society gained some immediate benefits from creating in 1870 the status of associate membership for non-abstaining Anglican dignitaries. The Society found in Ellicott its first spokesman in the Convocation of Canterbury when in July, 1870, he introduced to the Upper House a memorial from the Church teetotal society urging Convocation "to take such steps as may seem best to give effect to the recommendation of its committee on intemperance".⁶⁶ On presenting the memorial, Ellicott informed the bishops present of the Society's recent constitutional change permitting non-abstaining associate members.⁶⁷ By the following September, the Society was able to announce the influential patronage for which it had so long waited. Archbishops Tait and Thomson became its patrons and Bishops Ellicott and Magee its vice-patrons.⁶⁸ By December, Bishops John Jackson of London and Harvey Goodwin of Carlisle had also become vice-patrons, as had George Hills, who now had to take a lower place because of the archiepiscopal patronage.⁶⁹

If the parliamentary drink question, which dominated the attention of the temperance community from 1869 to 1872, had been more encouraging to the clerical abstainers they might well have been satisfied with the sort of semi-official recognition they now received from their drinking episcopal patrons. However, Henry Bruce's second and more moderate licensing bill in August, 1872, was passed amid loud threats from the liquor interests and some Conservatives that they would vindicate the right to drink in the next

election. The clerical abstainers consequently had to assume the defensive position of trying to save the little they thought they had gained in the last four years. This meant not only attempting to secure Bruce's temperance legislation against the threats of drinkers and Conservatives, but acting to prevent the influential patrons whom they had recently won for the National Association and the Church teetotal society from transferring to James Taylor's rival organization. The National Union for the Suppression of Intemperance, which Taylor and John Garrett founded in April, 1871, had attracted wide support for the ultra-moderate licensing proposals of a Conservative back-bencher, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson. The best means of keeping important Anglicans on their patronage lists seemed to be to find some way of granting them full membership and at the same time securing official recognition from both Convocations for a re-organized Church temperance organization. By the summer of 1872, it had become apparent that both of these objectives could only be accomplished by removing total abstinence as a condition of full membership in the proposed Church temperance organization.⁷⁰

The chairmen at the last two annual meetings of the Church teetotal society, William Thomson and W.C. Magee, exemplified the futility of trying to convert the lords spiritual to teetotalism. As Ellicott had in 1870, both contradicted teetotal medical teaching by claiming to drink for reasons of health. Thomson, one of the strongest

episcopal advocates of the temperance movement, told the clerical abstainers at the 1871 meeting that his physician, "the keeper of his conscience in this matter", had forbidden him to stop drinking.⁷¹ Magee, who had agreed to preside over the 1872 annual meeting of the Church teetotal society under the mistaken impression that he would be addressing the National Association, confessed that he had once tried teetotalism for three months, but that his physician had warned him that, "if he persevered the consequences might be serious".⁷² In spite of the memorial which in July, 1870, Ellicott presented to the Convocation of Canterbury on its behalf, John Sandford continued officially to ignore the existence of the Church teetotal society. The reason he gave Henry Ellison for the suspended action of his committee over three years after its 1869 Report was that he was too ill to supervise its operation.⁷³ There is no evidence, however, that had he been well, he would have asked his committee to recognize a Society which demanded as a condition of full membership the teetotalism which one of its members identified with heresy and apostacy. Even in August, 1872, after Henry Ellison had won agreement from his fellow teetotal clergy for a reorganized temperance society with its non-abstaining section, Sandford at first lacked sufficient trust in his committee to give the plan provisional acceptance on their behalf. He agreed to do so only when it became impossible to convene his committee quickly enough to deal with James Taylor's organization.⁷⁴

NOTES

CHAPTER VII

¹Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d ser. I (February, 1869), 38.

²This discussion of the St. James' Hall Meeting is based on ibid., 3d ser. I (March, 1869), 45.

³Ibid., 3d ser. I (April, 1869), 66.

⁴Ibid., loc. cit.

⁵See Sidney Lee ed., The Dictionary of National Biography, The Concise Dictionary, (London, 1920), p. 1156. The two nephews were sons of Sir Daniel Keyte Sandford.

⁶G. LeGrys Norgate, "Sandford, John," Sidney Lee, and L. Stephens eds., Dictionary of National Biography (London, 1959-60), V, 275-276.

⁷Cited in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (April, 1873), 50.

⁸Ibid., loc. cit.

⁹See A. C. Tait and Charles Sandford, cited in William Benham ed., Catherine and Crauford Tait (New York, 1880), pp. 10-11; 141-142.

¹⁰Convocation of Canterbury, Chronicle of Convocation (London, 1868), Vol. 4, pt. 3, p. 1055.

¹¹Ibid., loc. cit.

¹²Ibid., loc. cit.

¹³Ibid., (19 February, 1868), Vol. 4, pt. 3, pp. 109-111; and (21 February, 1868), Vol. 4, pt. 3, p. 1302.

¹⁴The other members were H. E. J. Howard, Dean of Lichfield; Archdeacons Emery, Allen, Fearon, Freeman and Mackenzie; Canons Argles, Carus, Harvey, Oxenden, Kennaway and Woodgate; and Messrs. Gibbs, Lowther and Gillett. Ibid., (21 February, 1868), Vol. 4, pt. 3, p. 1302. Dean Howard died on 8 October, 1868. G. H. Townsend ed., The Handbook of the Year 1868 (London, 1869), p. 271.

¹⁵New ser. V (April, 1868), 98.

¹⁶Ibid., loc. cit.

¹⁷Convocation of Canterbury, Chronicle of Convocation (15 June, 1869), Vol. 5, pp. 249-250.

¹⁸Ibid., (15 June, 1869), Vol. 5, p. 232.

¹⁹Ibid., (15 June, 1869), Vol. 5, p. 242.

²⁰Ibid., (7 July, 1893), 3d ser. Vol. 10, p. 389. John Sandford died on 22 March, 1873.

²¹This and John Sandford's other statements in this paragraph are from ibid., (15 June, 1869), Vol. 5, p. 242.

²²The questionnaires can be found in Convocation of Canterbury, Lower House, Report by the Committee on Intemperance (London, 1869), pp. viii-x.

²³Ibid., p. viii.

²⁴Ibid., loc. cit.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 41-44.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 118-119.

²⁷Ibid., no. 1368, p. 118.

²⁸Ibid., pp. 19-21.

²⁹Ibid., no. 133, p. 21.

³⁰Ibid., pp. 26-28.

³¹Ibid., no. 297, p. 31.

³²Ibid., no. 298, p. 31.

³³Ibid., pp. 32-33.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 34-36.

³⁵Ibid., no. 370, p. 40.

³⁶Ibid., pp. 44-46.

³⁷Ibid., no. 523, p. 48.

³⁸Ibid., nos. 497, 531, 553, pp. 47, 49-50.

³⁹Ibid., no. 489, p. 47.

⁴⁰Ibid., no. 499, p. 47.

⁴¹Ibid., no. 772, p. 72.

⁴²Ibid., no. 777, p. 72.

⁴³In ibid., pp. 10-12.

⁴⁴In ibid., pp. 12-14.

⁴⁵There were 32 extracts from clerical submissions under the heading of "Popular Restraints on the Issue of Licences." Of these, 11 endorsed directly the Permissive bill of the United Kingdom Alliance; 9 others urged prohibition; 6 recommended local popular control; and 6 pleaded generally for a tighter licensing policy. Ibid., Nos. 1975-2007, pp. 154-156. Non-clerical correspondents gave similar evidence. Ibid., nos. 2008-2068, pp. 156-160.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 13.

⁴⁷Convocation of Canterbury, Lower House, "Supplementary Report by the Committee on Intemperance" (30 October, 1872), in Appendix to the Chronicle of Convocation, Vol. 9, p. 3.

⁴⁸Convocation of York, Lower House, Report by the Committee on Intemperance (York, 1872).

⁴⁹See below, pp. 331-332.

⁵⁰They were M.P.s respectively for Fifesh, Frome, Scarborough and Plymouth. Dod's Parliamentary Companion (London, 1872), pp. 156, 244, 276, 249.

⁵¹See "Intoxicating Liquor Law Amendment Bill," in Great Britain, House of Commons, Parliamentary Papers, 1872, Vol. II, p. 346, cl. 105.

⁵²Church of England Temperance Society Archives, Letter from Henry Ellison to F. W. Farrar (n.d. [c.1893]), p. 2.

⁵³Ibid., loc. cit.

⁵⁴3d ser. I (April, 1869), 61.

⁵⁵3d ser. I (July, 1869), 123.

⁵⁶Convocation of Canterbury, Chronicle of Convocation (15 June, 1869), Vol. 5, p. 259.

⁵⁷Ibid., loc. cit.

⁵⁸Ibid., loc. cit.

⁵⁹The suggestion was made at the Liverpool Church Congress by Rev. R. Prowde. Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d ser. I (November, 1869), 207. Ibid., 3d ser. II (March, 1870), 42.

⁶⁰Ibid., 3d ser. I (July, 1869), 22.

⁶¹Ibid., 3d ser. I (August and September, 1869), 155-157; 175-177.

⁶²Ibid., 3d ser. II (June, 1870), 102.

⁶³Ibid., loc. cit., and (March, 1870), 42.

⁶⁴Ibid., 3d ser. II (October, 1870), 191.

⁶⁵Ibid., loc. cit. This sort of low-grade repartée between Ellicott and the clerical abstainers continued, with several changes of image until in 1877 the Bishop's conversion to total abstinence was announced with a mixed metaphor in the Church of England Temperance Chronicle. Ellicott was said to have "at length crossed the Rubicon" and thereby to have accomplished "one more move of a 'Bishop' on our moral chess-board." VI (May, 1877), 67.

⁶⁶Convocation of Canterbury, Chronicle of Convocation (8 July, 1870), Vol. 6, pp. 627-628.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 628.

⁶⁸Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d ser. II (September, 1870), 164.

⁶⁹Ibid., 3d ser. II (December, 1870), 222.

⁷⁰All the points in the above paragraph are developed in the following chapter.

⁷¹Ibid., 3d ser. III (June, 1871), 102.

⁷²Ibid., 3d ser. IV (April, 1872), 103.

⁷³Letter from John Sandford to Henry Ellison
(22 August, 1872), no. 45. Lambeth Palace Library, Papers
of A. C. Tait, 1872, no. 45.

⁷⁴See below, pp. 323-334.

CHAPTER VIII

FROM PARISH TO PALACE:

THE PARLIAMENTARY DRINK QUESTION

AND THE FORMATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TEMPERANCE SOCIETY, 1869-1875

I

When on 4 April, 1871, Bruce brought to a head the parliamentary drink question by introducing his long awaited and soon to be unsuccessful first licensing bill, the supporters of the National Association stood ready to push him in a more radical direction. Of the five major proposals for licensing reform before Parliament during the first Gladstone ministry, those of the National Association were only less radical than the prohibitory scheme of the United Kingdom Alliance.¹ The sole purpose of the Alliance's bill which Sir Wilfrid Lawson annually presented to parliament was to secure legislative permission for three-fifths of the rate payers in any English or Welsh locality to prohibit absolutely the sale of intoxicating liquors. There were no provisions in the bill for any reform of the existing licensing system. The other four proposals, those advanced by Bruce for the government in

1871 and 1872, the bill proposed by Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson in February, 1872, and those of the National Association all represented detailed attempts to reform the existing licensing system. Of these, only the National Association, like the United Kingdom Alliance, advocated giving local rate payers substantial control over the liquor trade. The bills proposed by Bruce and Selwin-Ibbetson generally left licensing matters with the local justices. The government's bills provided for the rare consultation of rate payers on special matters; but Selwin-Ibbetson's bill left licensing entirely under magisterial control. The National Association's bills, by adopting the principle of the 1869 Canterbury Report, endorsed local popular control without necessarily advocating prohibition. Complete control over the issue of liquor licensing would be given to local boards consisting of five to nine members, to be elected by the ballots of resident rate payers.

In promoting the National Association's proposals, Henry Ellison exploited the vagueness of their local option clauses, and attempted to attract support from both opponents and advocates of prohibition. He often had to deny that the National Association was, as he wrote, "aiming at 'Prohibition' only by a more circuitous route".² Ellison did not dismiss the possibility, as he falsely prophesied in a letter to The Times in September, 1871, that prohibition might be appropriate at some future date when the people would be prepared for it by "increasing intelligence and

a closer knowledge of the subject".³ "In the meanwhile", as he wrote in the same letter, "it is progressive restriction which must prepare the way and lead up to it".⁴

Ellison frankly admitted that, in supporting local popular control, the National Association was imitating the United Kingdom Alliance which had "made it impossible for any measure to be proposed, much less carried, which does not, in some sort, recognize that principle".⁵ At the same time, probably to reassure the Association's prominent supporters, Ellison criticized the Alliance for too narrowly confining the local rate payer to a single choice between drink and prohibition.⁶ Ellison's attempt to win with the same licensing policy support from both the largely-Nonconformist supporters of the United Kingdom Alliance and the highest Anglican dignitaries, was admittedly aimed in part at improving inter-denominational relations. He described temperance as

the one subject which is found to be capable of uniting all religious opponents. On London platforms, in country school-rooms, Churchmen, Nonconformists, Roman Catholics are found to forget their differences, and to take common counsel and unite in common action for aggressive effort upon the terrible and common foe.⁷

The National Association's bills advocated the strictest closing hours and embodied the only proposal for restrictive licensing, then before parliament, which would have completely suppressed the controversial beer shops. The sale of alcoholic beverages would have been completely eliminated on nomination and election days. On Sundays, Christmas, and

days of public thanksgiving, licensed establishments could have sold alcoholic beverages from 1 to 3 p.m., and 8 to 10 p.m., only for consumption off the premises. The National Association's original bill provided for universal 10 p.m. closing. In their 1872 bill, however, London liquor outlets would have been permitted to remain open until 11 p.m. Beer shop licenses were to expire at the death of their current holders or for removal, insolvency or forfeiture.

Selwin-Ibbetson and Bruce, in addition to offering all liquor vendors more generous business hours, promised the beer shops a continued existence. Selwin-Ibbetson, who in 1869 had won government approval for an act which gave local justices control of beer shops, provided in his 1872 bill for nine different kinds of licenses, including one for beer shops. Bruce's bills proposed to treat beer shops as public houses.

II

The National Association and its Liberal parliamentary spokesmen seem to have been more interested in influencing the government's licensing legislation than in seeing their own bill enacted. Although the Association had prepared its bill in 1869, its promoters made no move to introduce it to Parliament until early 1871 when they had become impatient with the government's delays in presenting its legislation. Beginning in April, 1871, the National Association attempted

to press its bill on the Commons, partly by asking readers of the Church of England Temperance Magazine for that month to petition Parliament, requesting that the bill expected from Selwin-Ibbetson be rejected in favour of the National Association's.⁸ On 4 April, three days after the Magazine was published, the government's bill finally received first reading in the House of Commons.⁹ The strategy of the parliamentary spokesmen for the National Association at this point seems to have been similar to that which they would attempt in the next Session. They pressed for their own bill in the hope that in the committee stage the government would amend its legislation to gain their support. The May issue of the Magazine again asked support for the National Association's bill which "for boldness of dealing and simplicity of management" was said to "contrast strongly with the Government Bill".¹⁰ The National Association's promoters apparently did not realize in preparing these remarks for publication on 1 May that opposition to Bruce's bill would become so strong that it would have to be withdrawn before the committee stage.

On 17 May, about six weeks after he had introduced it, Bruce told the Commons that he had had to withdraw the bill because "it had excited such an amount of opposition that it could not possibly pass in what remained of the Session".¹¹ The interest in the proposed licensing legislation was described by the Annual Register as second that year only to that aroused by the question of army reform.¹²

Publicans, brewers, and distillers, aided in some cases by sympathetic Conservatives, organized opposition to the bill which even, on 27 April, provoked a noisy demonstration in the Westminster Palace Yard.¹³ Sir Wilfrid Lawson and his prohibitionists criticized Bruce's proposals, generally because they did not include the Alliance's plan for local option and specifically because they guaranteed all holders of present licenses at least ten more years of business.¹⁴

Because the bill had been so quickly killed some promoters of the National Association, who in later years realized that Bruce's 1871 proposals were the most advanced they could expect at that time, were caught condemning a bill which they only wanted to amend.¹⁵ The National Association, nonetheless, prepared to employ the same strategy to meet the amended licensing legislation which they expected from Bruce the following Session. On 22 May, 1871, they introduced in the Commons an unsuccessful bill which would have suspended the issue of all new liquor licenses until the drink question could be settled.¹⁶ The following September, Henry Ellison, in his two long letters to The Times, argued that of all the licensing proposals expected in the 1872 Session only the National Association's bill provided for local popular control of liquor sales and at the same time offered local rate payers a full range of options.¹⁷ The letters, which first appeared under the pseudonym "A Town Clergyman", were reprinted under Ellison's name in a National Association pamphlet, called

"The People and the Licensing Laws".¹⁸

The National Association's somewhat modified bill was introduced to Parliament on 10 February, 1872, by Anstruther, Hughes, Johnstone and Morrison. It failed to reach second reading and the Association threw its support to the government's bill which was introduced first to the House of Lords on 16 April by the Earl of Kimberley. This time, the promoters of the National Association had anticipated the partisan wrangling which would meet the government bill, even though Bruce had stripped it of some of the more controversial proposals which he had made the year before. In April, 1872, the Church of England Temperance Magazine warned Conservative leaders not to oppose good temperance legislation. The Conservatives were said to be

not at all aware how many good men and true are interested in the liquor laws legislation. They write to--or know perhaps only--of the noisy publican politicians who are trying to use the Conservative party for their own ends in the matter and they forget that, in the present state of politics and parties, a struggle on social rather than political questions may tell in the coming election.¹⁹

Most Conservatives, of course, were completely unaffected by advice offered them by the Church of England Temperance Magazine and the public reaction which met the passage of Bruce's second bill in August, 1872, convinced some of them that the next election might be won partly by opposing rather than supporting temperance legislation. The National Association and its successor after February, 1873, the legislative committee of the Church of England Temperance

Society, attempted to forestall Conservative threats to undo Bruce's 1872 licensing act, especially by restoring more generous business hours to liquor outlets. The National Association sent questionnaires to police chiefs and clergymen, the results of which showed overwhelming support for the 1872 Act. Early in 1874, on the basis of these returns, the C.E.T.S. legislative sub-committee distributed an election manifesto throughout the Province of Canterbury asking electors to "Vote for no Candidate who will not promise to oppose all attempts to reverse the Legislation of 1872, especially in the instance of opening and closing hours. . . ." ²⁰ In so doing, they helped intensify an issue which was already strong. The election, in February, 1874, was thought by contemporary observers as different as Gladstone and F.W. Newman to have been decided in great part by the licensing question. During the election campaign, Gladstone complained in a letter to his brother of "being borne down in a torrent of gin and beer". ²¹ Five years later, Newman, a prominent temperance advocate, recalled in a letter to Tait that because of election controversies over drink and education " . . . the Church was in many places dragged through the dirt by the combination of Beer and Bible". ²² Shortly after the election, the C.E.T.S. legislative sub-committee sent a delegation led by the Earl of Shaftesbury to the new Home Secretary R.A. Cross, asking the Conservative government not to extend legal hours for the sale of liquor. ²³ They failed to convince him, and Cross's

new licensing act, which came into effect on 12 October, gave residents of large towns an extra half-hour of drinking time.²⁴

III

The supporters of the Church teetotal society were particularly affected by the gloom which descended on the temperance community in the summer of 1872 as negative reaction grew to Bruce's licensing legislation. In addition to meeting political threats, the clerical abstainers had to contend with the administrative and financial slump which the Church teetotal society suffered because of their preoccupation with the parliamentary licensing question. They had also by that time seen the names of all but one of their episcopal supporters appear on the patronage lists of James Taylor's National Union. Taylor, supported by John Garrett, had founded the National Union in April, 1871, the same month as Bruce had introduced his first licensing bill and the National Union had promoted through the Church of England Temperance Magazine rejection of Selwin-Ibbetson's bill in favour of their own.

Taylor, the head of the Union, and Garrett, its secretary, had both created enemies among temperance reformers in the past. One of their most bitter opponents was James Bardsley, the pioneer teetotal cleric, a vice-president of the tri-diocesan branch of the Church teetotal society and chairman of the Convocation of York committee on

intemperance. In a letter circulated among leading ecclesiastics in the spring of 1872, Bardsley discounted Taylor's productive career as organizing secretary for the tri-diocesan branch of the Church teetotal society and described his life for the last five years as "one huge fraud". He went on to accuse Taylor of forming the National Union to provide himself and his friends with an income.²⁵ Bardsley's disagreements with Taylor and Garrett went back at least to 1867 when he had helped force Garrett's resignation as organizing secretary of the "Central Association for Stopping the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday". In March, 1867, Garrett had to resign from the "Central Association" which he had helped found the previous October, for endorsing on its behalf fairly moderate Sunday closing bills then before Parliament.²⁶ The bills were thought to violate strict teetotal sabbatarianism by proposing Sunday drinking off licensed premises, and with meals on the premises.²⁷ Bardsley, one of the vice-presidents of the Central Association, had joined with the majority of its supporters in denouncing Garrett for his revisionism and in securing his resignation. James Taylor, at that time a schoolteacher in Garrett's parish at Moss Side, near Manchester, was one of the minority who stood by Garrett.²⁸ The pamphlet war which followed had done little to restore the reputation of either Garrett or Taylor among strict temperance reformers.²⁹

The unpopularity of Taylor and Garrett in the temperance community increased when in April, 1871, they founded

the National Union despite the open opposition of the leading Manchester anti-drink organizations, including the Church teetotal society and the United Kingdom Alliance. According to P.T. Winskill, Taylor had tried the month before to win support for the projected temperance pressure group at a meeting which he called at the Manchester Mayor's Parlour.³⁰ His proposal was rejected 43 to 20, for the stated reason that there were already enough temperance organizations, and that to establish another would cause unnecessary friction and competition for members and funds.³¹ The name of the new organization, which they nonetheless founded in April, confirmed fears that Taylor and Garrett were trying to displace especially the United Kingdom Alliance and the National Association from ground which they presently occupied. "National Union" was a more familiar designation for Anglican organizations than was "National Association" with which it could easily be confused; and the latter part of the National Union's name bore some similarity to that of the "United Kingdom Alliance for the Total and Immediate Suppression of the Liquor Traffic".

The National Union's close identification with the licensing proposals of Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson further antagonized temperance reformers, most of whom were Liberals and virtually all of whom condemned his position as to moderate. Selwin-Ibbetson, who began with the premise that people had a right to drink, consistently proposed

legislation which suggested moderate temperance reforms while guaranteeing the liquor interests continued existence. He was on record as opposing the malt tax because, as he reported to Dod's Parliamentary Companion, it was "an unjust tax, not only upon agriculture, but upon the national beverage of the working class".³² The temporary act which in 1869 he negotiated through Parliament with the cooperation of the Liberal government invalidated the main complaint of temperance reformers against the beer shops by putting them under magisterial control, and thereby helped prolong their survival.³³ His unsuccessful 1872 licensing bill offered drinkers and the liquor interest the most generous terms available to them during the first Gladstone ministry.³⁴

Despite their lack of respectability in the temperance community, Taylor and Garrett quickly gathered for their new organization more influential support than had ever been enjoyed by the clerical abstainers. By June, 1872, the National Union's lists of patrons included the names of all six domestic episcopal patrons of the Church teetotal society: Tait, Thomson, Jackson, Goodwin, Magee and Ellicott.³⁵ The National Union also claimed as patrons Atlay of Hereford and Selwyn of Lichfield who had supported the National Association. The only domestic episcopal supporter of the National Association whose name was not included among the National Union's patrons was Bishop John Mackarness of Oxford whose connection with the National

Association seems to have consisted entirely of the letter he sent to their February, 1869 meeting at St. James Hall. The names of eight other English and Welsh diocesan bishops, who before 1872 had shown virtually no signs of favouring either the Church teetotal society or the National Association, also appeared on the National Union's list of patrons, together with those of the Roman Catholics, Archbishop Manning and Bishop James Browne of Shrewsbury.³⁶ Taylor and Garrett also claimed the support of such non-clerical dignitaries as Lord John Lawrence, chairman of the London School Board, and Lords John Russell, Alfred S. Churchill and Stratford de Redcliffe; the Marquesses of Exeter and Hertford; and the Earls of Shrewsbury and Talbot and of Man.

James Bardsley, who worked with William Thomson in connection with the Convocation of York's committee on intemperance, and Charles Sandford, as Tait's chaplain, were in good positions to persuade important bishops to withdraw their support from the Union. Bardsley's letter accusing Taylor of fraud reached Charles Sandford in April, 1872, and within a week he had called Tait's attention to it and transmitted it to the chaplains of John Jackson and William Thomson. Jackson, who had recently presided over a London Conference of the National Union, promised Tait through his chaplain that they would make a note of Taylor's name so that they could be "on [their] guard if he applies in this quarter".³⁷ Thomson's chaplain, who presumably had heard of the National Union directly from Bardsley himself,

Association seems to have consisted entirely of the letter he sent to their February, 1869 meeting at St. James Hall. The names of eight other English and Welsh diocesan bishops, who before 1872 had shown virtually no signs of favouring either the Church teetotal society or the National Association, also appeared on the National Union's list of patrons, together with those of the Roman Catholics, Archbishop Manning and Bishop James Browne of Shrewsbury.³⁶ Taylor and Garrett also claimed the support of such non-clerical dignitaries as Lord John Lawrence, chairman of the London School Board, and Lords John Russell, Alfred S. Churchill and Stratford de Redcliffe; the Marquesses of Exeter and Hertford; and the Earls of Shrewsbury and Talbot and of Man.

James Bardsley, who worked with William Thomson in connection with the Convocation of York's committee on intemperance, and Charles Sandford, as Tait's chaplain, were in good positions to persuade important bishops to withdraw their support from the Union. Bardsley's letter accusing Taylor of fraud reached Charles Sandford in April, 1872, and within a week he had called Tait's attention to it and transmitted it to the chaplains of John Jackson and William Thomson. Jackson, who had recently presided over a London Conference of the National Union, promised Tait through his chaplain that they would make a note of Taylor's name so that they could be "on [their] guard if he applies in this quarter".³⁷ Thomson's chaplain, who presumably had heard of the National Union directly from Bardsley himself,

wrote Charles Sandford that the organization had already caused the Archbishop of York "some consideration and anxiety" and that the attention of the York Convocation had been called to Taylor's activities.³⁸

Bardsley had also made quite sure that the Report of his committee on intemperance which had appeared in the previous February did not, to the advantage of Taylor and Garrett, divide northern supporters of the Church teetotal society and the National Association from their counterparts in the Province of Canterbury. The York Report emphasized intemperance among the higher classes, females and juveniles to a greater extent than had the Canterbury Report, but otherwise it repeated with northern accents the same sort of problems and remedies which had already been presented in 1869.³⁹ This of course meant that the York Report was greeted with less excitement than the Canterbury Report which already had the advantages of its earlier appearance and its connection with the more important southern Convocation. It also meant, however, that beginning in the early summer of 1872, Henry Ellison could negotiate establishment of the Church of England Temperance Society with most northern and southern clerical abstainers united to oppose the National Union.

Taylor and Garrett fought, with little success, to keep their important episcopal support and to prevent formation of the Church of England Temperance Society. In June, 1872, Taylor asked Tait to preside over the National

Union's third London Conference, as had Bishop Jackson and Earl Russell for the first two conferences.⁴⁰ Tait answered that he had to decline the invitation as he had "lately heard by no means satisfactory accounts of the Union", and he asked Taylor to withdraw his name from the organization's list of patrons.⁴¹ Garrett unsuccessfully urged Tait to change his mind.⁴² The National Union had to settle for Bishop Ellicott who on 12 July presided over its Conference in the Hanover Square Rooms.⁴³ The next month, The Times printed a letter from Garrett condemning plans for the Church of England Temperance Society, which Henry Ellison had recently announced in that paper, as too narrow in their reliance on teetotalism, too extreme in their advocacy of local popular control and too exclusively Anglican.⁴⁴

Ironically, Taylor and Garrett failed to stop establishment of the C.E.T.S. partly because they had enjoyed some success in keeping at least the appearance of influential support. Ellison's effective argument, that the only way to remove confusion created by the National Union was to recognize the Church teetotal society as an official Anglican body, depended on the ability of Taylor's organization to challenge Ellison's. By the summer of 1872, owing to the representations of Charles Sandford and James Bardsley, Taylor and Garrett had lost their most important episcopal supporters, Tait, Thomson and Jackson. They still, however, legitimately claimed the patronage of at least four domestic Anglican bishops and at least appeared to have the

support of several more.⁴⁵ The National Union, understandably, did not order new stationery each time one of its patrons asked that his name be removed from their list; and the letter-heads under which Taylor and Garrett sought increased support sometimes indicated patronage to which they were no longer entitled.⁴⁶ Confusion was compounded, as Ellison wrote to Tait in September, 1872, by the similar names of the National Association and the National Union. Ellison told Tait that Bishop Jackson had admitted to him not only that he had presided over the London Conference of the National Union, thinking that it was a meeting of the National Association, but that he had mistakenly thought Tait to have withdrawn his patronage from Ellison's organization rather than Taylor's.⁴⁷

IV

After long executive meetings of the Church teetotal society in the summer of 1872, Ellison won agreement for his plan to keep the Society's influential patrons by granting non-abstainers full membership in the re-organized Church temperance organization which he proposed.⁴⁸ Then, in a letter which The Times printed on 12 August, Ellison revealed the general outlines of a re-organized Anglican temperance society "commensurate with the Church itself". The Society would be constituted on a "more extensive platform", which "while securing for the Total Abstinence section its due place, shall gather into united action all--whether abstainers

or non-abstainers--who are willing to work together for the great end of temperance reform".⁴⁹ Ellison's letter to The Times was no doubt the first step in a plan to shame Anglican leaders, particularly John Sandford and his Convocation committee, into affording the Church temperance society broad and prestigious support before the National Union could further advance its quasi-official status. In the letter, Ellison admitted that he purposely wanted to present Church leaders with a completed plan for re-organization and he openly challenged them to devise a better scheme if they would.⁵⁰

Ellison and his supporters obviously prepared their outline for a Church-wide temperance organization with a view to its quick acceptance by the committees on intemperance of the two Convocations.⁵¹ The aims of the Society, arranged under two headings, "Moral, Educational and Social", and "Legislative", incorporated virtually all the suggestions made in the Canterbury and York Reports. The legislative objectives of the proposed Society included all but one of the recommendations which had appeared in the recent bill of the National Association which, in turn, had been derived from the Canterbury Report. The proposal regarding beer shops had been softened in keeping with the new legal status given them by Bruce's 1872 licensing act. The Canterbury Report and the National Association's bill had recommended complete repeal of the beer shops which were then, unlike ordinary public houses, not supervised by the local justices. The scheme for the Church temperance

society, recognizing that Bruce had put the beer shops with the public houses under the control of the local magistrates, proposed simply that the number of both be reduced. The only proposal of the Canterbury and York committees omitted in the draft objects for the re-organized society was the plea for improved lower-class housing made almost as an afterthought in the Canterbury Report and briefly repeated in the York Report. The only recommendation included in the draft proposal which had not appeared in the Convocation reports was an appeal for Ellison's Prayer Union.

Ellison's plan for a re-organized Church temperance society quickly obtained the approval of most northern authorities in both the Convocation of York's Committee on Intemperance and the tri-diocesan branch of the Church teetotal society.⁵² James Bardsley was no doubt even more eager than Ellison to put down the National Union. John Sandford and his Canterbury Committee on Intemperance, however, delayed execution of Ellison's plan until February of the following year. Sandford, as a Liberal and a staunch supporter of local popular licensing control, was anxious to stop the National Union from winning Church support for the ultra-moderate licensing proposals of the Conservative Selwin-Ibbetson. He admitted to Henry Ellison his hope that an officially-sanctioned Church temperance organization would cause "such men as Dr. Garrett and Mr. Taylor [to] vanish into empty space".⁵³ Sandford stressed, however,

that the existence of the National Union made it all the more important that an official Church temperance society should be organized carefully through the proper ecclesiastical channels. For this reason, on 19 and 22 August, 1872, he refused even to give Ellison's proposed organization provisional acceptance and he urged him not to proceed as he had planned with the election of officers until obtaining approval from the Canterbury Committee on Intemperance. He told Ellison that he hoped to convene the Committee in September or October.⁵⁴ Sandford sent his son Charles copies of his correspondence with Ellison and asked him to keep Tait informed of current developments. He attached a note complaining that "Mr. Ellison has always struck me as a self-sufficient person" and, although he was willing to make allowances for that, Ellison "should not be allowed to embarrass Church activity in a question so [sic] important".⁵⁵

At the beginning of September, Ellison, who knew from past experiences how unco-operative the Canterbury committee could be, visited John Sandford at Alvechurch where he finally convinced him to give the plan provisional acceptance. Sandford had recently failed in his first attempt to assemble a quorum of his committee to consider Ellison's proposals. He wrote his son Charles after Ellison's visit that he hoped to do so at the end of the month. In the meantime, he felt he could support the plan, which Ellison had agreed to modify in some particulars, and sent Charles a letter for Tait in which he asked the Archbishop to do the same.⁵⁶

During September, Ellison himself visited Thomson, Tait and Jackson and won their approval for the new organization.⁵⁷

Sandford was unable to assemble a quorum of his committee until 30 October when, at a Lambeth Palace meeting, they merely expressed general approval for the proposed C.E.T.S. in a conservatively worded memorandum.⁵⁸ The Committee did not meet with officials of the Church teetotal society or approve specifics of the planned C.E.T.S. until 14 February, 1873, at a meeting in the Jerusalem Chamber of the Westminster Palace Hotel.⁵⁹ The meeting, presided over by Henry Mackenzie the Suffragan Bishop of Nottingham in the absence of John Sandford who had fallen ill again, was presented with a fait accompli by Tait, Ellison, Rooke and West. The Committee approved the C.E.T.S. whose formation had been already unofficially announced the month before in the first issue of the Church of England Temperance Chronicle.⁶⁰

V

Publication of the first Chronicle, which was planned to co-incide with the New Year, began a period of respectability for the Anglican temperance movement which sharply contrasted with the modest beginnings of the Church teetotal society. Archbishops Tait and Thomson were the first presidents of the C.E.T.S.; and its first vice-presidents were Francis Close, John Sandford, James Bardsley and W. Romaine Callendar, a successful Manchester manufacturer, a vice-president of the United Kingdom Alliance, former president of the

tri-diocesan branch of the Church teetotal society, and from 1874 until he died in 1876, Conservative M.P. for Manchester.⁶¹ The chairmen of the forty-eight member C.E.T.S. council were Henry Ellison and Thomas Dale, a prominent Manchester builder and architect, who had been one of the first promoters of the tri-diocesan teetotal society. ⁶² Within the next two years, the C.E.T.S. Executive would include the entire episcopal bench and even the royal head of the Church. The improved financial and administrative status, expected from re-organization, was launched by an announcement in the first Chronicle that the C.E.T.S. treasurers and general secretaries at both its London and Manchester offices were prepared to accept donations towards a Guarantee Fund of £10,000.

Having won approval from the Canterbury Committee, the clerical abstainers continued preparations for the prestigious Lambeth Palace inaugural meeting which was held four days later on 18 February with Archbishop Tait as chairman.⁶³ The enthusiasm of prominent churchmen for the new C.E.T.S. seems to have been greater than expected. Organizers of the meeting, which began in the Lambeth Palace Library at 3:00 p.m., had apparently not expected the conference to last beyond sundown, as they had provided neither candles nor gas-lights. The number of letters of apology to be read from absent dignitaries and the number of speeches to be heard from those present were so great, however, that the last five speakers had to address the meeting in "almost

total darkness". William Thomson sent his good wishes to the meeting, as did Bishops Wordsworth of Lincoln, Moberley of Salisbury, Claughton of Rochester and Temple of Exeter. The speakers included Bishops E.H. Browne of Ely and George Selwyn of Lichfield; A.P. Stanley, John Sandford and Henry Ellison. Sir Harcourt Johnstone, Liberal M.P. for Scarborough and London chairman of the legislative sub-committee of the C.E.T.S.; and Hugh Birley, Conservative M.P. for Manchester, also spoke. Among the Conference's more silent participants were Viscount Sidmouth, Hugh Huleatt, Wriothsesley Russell and George Cruickshank, the illustrator of temperance works. Until darkness called the meeting to a complete halt, the speakers reviewed the past history of the temperance movement and urged comprehensive support for the C.E.T.S. which was repeatedly described as an excellent means for Anglicans to show others the social utility of the Church.

The sympathetic and extensive press coverage afforded the Lambeth Palace meeting contrasted with the scant and usually disparaging attention which had been given the London Coffee House Conference eleven years before. The Church of England Temperance Chronicle had to issue a special supplement to include extracts from the complimentary stories carried about the founding of the C.E.T.S. in both the secular and religious press.⁶⁴ These included newspapers as diverse as The Times, the Guardian, the Lancet, John Bull, the Church Times, the Rock and the Methodist Recorder.

Six days after the Lambeth Palace meeting, Tait sent the bishops and archdeacons in the Province of Canterbury a letter which Sandford had drafted for him, calling their attention to the new C.E.T.S. and asking them to promote it among the clergy and laity.⁶⁵ The letter was also circulated in the Province of York; and was supplemented there by the promotional activities of William Thomson who in 1874 presided over large gatherings to inaugurate C.E.T.S. branches at Hull and Middlesborough.⁶⁶ By the end of 1874, the C.E.T.S. could claim the "cordial adhesion" and "practical support" of the two Archbishops and all the bishops of England and Wales. In most cases, this meant that the bishops had agreed to become vice-presidents of the re-organized Society and had presided over the founding meetings of diocesan branches.⁶⁷

During the next year, the C.E.T.S. modestly began its social work and more ambitiously won royal patronage. The extensive social work which the C.E.T.S. would later undertake was launched in July, 1875, with its first "Street Stall for the people".⁶⁸ The street stall, a three-wheeled cart equipped with light lunches and both summer and winter beverages, was intended to provide workingmen in search of quick refreshment with a substitute for the pub. Although inspired by successful experiments in Paris and Vienna, the first street stall was especially designed for the C.E.T.S. It was christened in July by a gathering of dignitaries in the Lambeth Palace Gardens who tasted some of its wares and

pronounced them excellent. Fruit syrups, iced water, lemonade, milk, ginger-beer and gingerette were to be sold in the summer; hot milk, tea, cocoa and coffee in the winter.

Sandwiches, bread and butter and cake could also be purchased at the stalls. Within less than a year, there were C.E.T.S. stalls in centres throughout the kingdom.⁶⁹

In the summer of 1875, Queen Victoria, who had been sent special editions of the Canterbury and York reports on intemperance, agreed from Balmoral to the request of the two English archbishops and the C.E.T.S. Executive that she become the Society's patron. Thomas Biddulph sent the Queen's consent which she offered with the understanding that the C.E.T.S. was organized "on a basis which includes all who advocate Temperance without insisting necessarily on Total Abstinence".⁷⁰ He also conveyed the Queen's rather well-placed trust that "education and the enlightenment of the people together with improvements of their moral and physical condition will gradually do much to induce Temperance and to diminish the evils complained of--" The following October, the Queen's youngest son, Prince Leopold, gave practical effect to the new royal patronage by acting as chairman at the founding meeting of the C.E.T.S. Oxford diocesan branch of which he became president.⁷¹ The patronage of Victoria and her son was the ultimate mark of respectability for an organization which had grown out of the humble conflict between pub and parish.

NOTES

CHAPTER VIII

¹For a comparison of these proposals see Appendix E from which the following comparative discussion is derived.

²Henry Ellison, in his "The People and the Licensing Laws," in his Temperance Reformation Movement in the Church of England (London, 1878), p. 116 n.

³25 September, 1871, p. 4.

⁴Ibid., loc. cit.

⁵Ibid., loc. cit.

⁶Ibid., loc. cit.

⁷Ibid., loc. cit.

⁸3d ser. III (April, 1871), pp. 74-75.

⁹All references below to dates and progress of various licensing bills are from the appropriate indexes of Great Britain, Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3d ser., Vols. 198-210 (1869-1872).

¹⁰Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d ser. III (May, 1871), 87.

¹¹Great Britain, Parliament, House of Commons, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, (17 May, 1871), Vol. 206, p. 947.

¹²Annual Register, CXIII (1871), 3.

¹³Information contained in question of Sir Wilfrid Lawson to Henry Bruce, Great Britain, Parliament, House of Commons, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (27 April, 1871), 3d ser. Vol. 20, pp. 1779-80.

¹⁴Annual Register, CXIII (1871), 3.

¹⁵ See Henry Ellison's testimony of 19 June, 1877, to Great Britain, Parliament, House of Lords, Select Committee on the Prevalence of Habits of Intemperance, Third Report, in Irish University Press, British Parliamentary Papers, Social Problems Drunkenness, Vol. 3, p. 88, no. 8794.

¹⁶ The bill was introduced by Anstruther, Hughes, Morrison and Johnstone who have already been identified, and Wentworth Beaumont, Anthony Mundella, Joseph Pease and Sir Bernard Samuelson, M.P.s respectively for Northumberland South, Sheffield, Durham South and Banbury. Dod's Parliamentary Companion (London, 1872), pp. 166, 276-7, 285 and 298. The bill is in, Great Britain, Parliament, House of Commons, Parliamentary Papers, 1872, Vol. II, pp. 303-364.

¹⁷ 20 September, 1871, p. 10; 25 September, 1871, p. 4.

¹⁸ London, 1871.

¹⁹ 3d ser. IV (April, 1872), 61.

²⁰ Church of England Temperance Chronicle II (March, 1874), 49.

²¹ John Morley, Life of William Ewart Gladstone (London, 1903), III, 495.

²² The letter was written 18 November, 1879, and is in Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of A. C. Tait, Vol. 99, ff. 223-2.

²³ Church of England Temperance Chronicle, II (May, 1874), 82-83.

²⁴ 37 + 38 Victoria c. 49.

²⁵ Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of A. C. Tait, 1872, no. 79. There was no date on this letter. The italics were Bardsley's.

²⁶ See Central Association for Stopping the Sale of Liquors on Sunday, First Annual Report (Manchester, 1867), p. 9. There were separate bills for England (introduced by J. A. Smith, Bagley and Baines); and for Ireland (introduced by O'Reilly, Pim and Lord Cremore).

²⁷ Ibid., loc. cit.

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 1 and 9.

²⁹See, for example, John Garrett, A Letter to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury (London, 1867).

³⁰P. T. Winskill, The Comprehensive History of the Rise and Progress of the Temperance Reformation (Warrington, 1881), pp. 455-456.

³¹Ibid., loc. cit.

³²Dod's Parliamentary Companion (London, 1872), pp. 246-247.

³³The Act received Royal Assent on 5 July 1869. 32 and 33 Victoria c. 27.

³⁴See Appendix E.

³⁵The list of patrons in the following paragraph is taken from the National Union letter-head, in a letter from James Taylor to A. C. Tait (6 June, 1872), Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of A. C. Tait, 1872, no. 79.

³⁶The Anglican bishops were: Robert Bickersteth of Ripon, A. C. Hervey of Bath and Wells, Richard Durnford of Chichester, Edward Browne of Ely, Christopher Wordsworth of Lincoln, Connop Thirwall of St. David's, Joshua Hughes of St. Asaph, and Alfred Ollivant of Llandaff.

³⁷Letter of T. P. Garnier to Charles Sandford (18 April, 1872), in Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of A. C. Tait, 1872, no. 79.

³⁸Letter of E. C. Glynn to Charles Sandford (23 April, 1872), in ibid., loc. cit.

³⁹Convocation of York, Lower House, Report by the Committee on Intemperance (Manchester, 1872), pp. 4-5.

⁴⁰In a letter which he wrote to Tait (6 June, 1872), in Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of A. C. Tait, 1872, no. 79.

⁴¹Letter from Tait to Taylor (copy) (11 June, 1872), in ibid., loc. cit.

⁴²Letter from John Garrett to A. C. Tait (4 July, 1872), in ibid., loc. cit.

⁴³Information in a National Union advertisement in The Times (12 August, 1872), p. 8.

⁴⁴Ibid., (14 August, 1872), p. 8.

⁴⁵The four were Joshua Hughes of St. Asaph; A. C. Hervey of Bath and Wells; and James Atlay of Hereford, who had appeared on the National Union's list of patrons in June; and J. C. Campbell of Bangor, a new addition. In view of the great confusion concerning withdrawals from the Union's patronage lists, only those bishops whose names still appeared by 1883 are here considered legitimate. By then, they had had ample time to demand that their names be removed. National Union for the Suppression of Intemperance, Report for 1883 (Manchester, 1883), p. 3.

⁴⁶For example, Lord Shaftesbury's name was still on the National Union's list of patrons as late as 1882 although he claimed that he "withdrew from it many years ago." In letter from Shaftesbury to Rev. H. Birch (n.d.), (copy), in Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of E. W. Benson, 1883, no. 193.

⁴⁷In a letter (19 September, 1872), in Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of A. C. Tait, 1872, no. 142.

⁴⁸The following description of C.E.T.S. re-organization is taken mainly from the sources cited below. However, Henry Ellison's later recollections of the events of 1872-1873 have also been taken into account. The chief of these are his long letter to F. W. Farrar (n.d., c. 1893) in the C.E.T.S. Archives; and his historical articles in the Temperance Chronicle XXI (27 January, and 3 February, 1893), pp. 41 and 53. Also consulted was an historical memorial prepared by F. W. Farrar, in Convocation of Canterbury, Lower House, Report by the Committee on Intemperance (London, 1894), pp. 1-33, passim. Joseph Tucker left the Church teetotal society because of his opposition to the new dual basis. Henry Ellison, in Temperance Chronicle XXI (10 February, 1893), 65.

⁴⁹(12 August, 1872), p. 9.

⁵⁰Ibid., loc. cit.

⁵¹The draft objects are in Church of England Temperance Chronicle I (January, 1873), 8. See also Convocation of Canterbury, Lower House, Report of Committee on Intemperance (London, 1869), pp. 10-13; and Convocation of York, Lower House, Report of Committee on Intemperance (York, 1872), pp. 14-19.

⁵²This, despite the opposition of Thomas Clegg, the president of the tri-diocesan branch of the Church teetotal society, who like Tucker resigned. Henry Ellison in Temperance Chronicle XXI (10 February, 1893), 65.

⁵³Letter of John Sandford to Henry Ellison (copy) (22 August, 1872), Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of A. C. Tait, 1872, no. 145.

⁵⁴Letters of John Sandford to Henry Ellison (copy) (19 and 22 August, 1872), in ibid., loc. cit.

⁵⁵Letter of John Sandford to Charles Sandford (22 August, 1872), in ibid., loc. cit.

⁵⁶Letter of John Sandford to Charles Sandford (2 September, 1872), in ibid., loc. cit.

⁵⁷Information contained in letters from Ellison to Tait (19 September, 1872), and from Tait to Ellison (copy) (26 September, 1872), in ibid., loc. cit.

⁵⁸Convocation of Canterbury, Lower House, "Supplementary Report by the Committee on Intemperance," in Chronicle of Convocation, new ser., Vol. 1 (30 October, 1873), Appendix, pp. 1-4.

⁵⁹Information contained in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, I (March, 1873), 44-45.

⁶⁰I (January, 1873), 8-10; from which most information in the next paragraph is derived.

⁶¹For Callendar, see Dod's Parliamentary Companion (London, 1874), 177; and Church of England Temperance Chronicle, II (January, 1874), 1-2, and IV (March, 1876), 55-56.

⁶²For Dale, see ibid., II (June, 1874), 93.

⁶³The following description of the Lambeth Palace Meeting is derived from information in ibid., I (March, 1873), 34-42.

⁶⁴See ibid., I (April, 1873), 58-60; 65-68.

⁶⁵Printed in ibid., I (April, 1873), 55.

⁶⁶Ibid., II (April, and November, 1874), 55 and

180.

⁶⁷Ibid., II (December, 1874), 212.

⁶⁸Ibid., III (September, 1875), 133-135.

⁶⁹By May, 1876, places where street-stalls had been established included Dublin, Windsor, Cambridge, Eastbourne, Sunderland and Edinburgh. Ibid., IV (February and May, 1876), 40 and 91.

⁷⁰Letter from Thomas Biddulph to Henry Ellison (28 August, 1875), printed in ibid., III (October, 1875), 157.

⁷¹The meeting was held on 21 October, 1875, in the Oxford Town Hall. Ibid., III (December, 1875), 188-9.

CHAPTER IX

EPILOGUE, SUMMARY AND PROJECTIONS

I

The researcher who traces the beginnings of Anglican temperance reform faces problems which need not concern historians who study the origins of more familiar movements. Once having described formation of the Church of England Temperance Society, he cannot assume that its significance will be commonly recognized. This is partly because, like the Liberal party, the C.E.T.S. has lost most of the prominence it once enjoyed. Unlike the Liberal party, however, the C.E.T.S. suffers the further problem that few remember how important it used to be.

Disregarding educational organizations, the C.E.T.S. was probably the most extensive religious social agency in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Among other accomplishments, it has been given credit for laying the foundations for the modern probation system.¹ It also sponsored specialized departments for a wide variety of social and occupational groups and was linked with similar organizations around the world.

The purposes of this chapter, then, will be to assess what effects official recognition in 1873 had on the Anglican

temperance movement and to describe briefly the development of C.E.T.S. social work before 1900. The extensive political activities of the Victorian C.E.T.S. will have to be ignored.

This chapter will also have the more conventional aims of summarizing some of the conclusions made in this thesis and briefly suggesting possible reassessments in the general social and religious history of nineteenth-century England.

II

The experiences of Bishop Sam Wilberforce's two sons, Basil and Ernest who became teetotalers in 1873, illustrate the need not to over-estimate support which the C.E.T.S. derived from the Anglican establishment. In October, 1873, Basil, the thirty-one year old Rector of St. Mary's Southampton, and one of his curates attended their first teetotal meeting in Dock Street where they heard a convincing address by a young book-seller. Both immediately became teetotalers and the following month Basil, in co-operation with all four curates at St. Mary's, founded a C.E.T.S. teetotal branch.² He later also became a C.E.T.S. vice-president and joined both the United Kingdom Alliance and the militant heavily Nonconformist teetotal organization, the Blue Ribbon Army. Ernest, a year older than Basil, became a teetotaler shortly after he was named Vicar of Seaforth in 1873.³ He publicly took the pledge with his wife; established a C.E.T.S. parochial branch and

was appointed with John W. Bardsley, co-honourary secretary of the Chester diocesan C.E.T.S.

The symbolic importance of gaining for the teetotal cause two young grandsons of William Wilberforce was fully exploited by clerical abstainers who had always liked to compare their movement with the campaign to abolish slavery.⁴ As they advanced in the Church, both Wilberforces also helped satisfy the constant search of abstaining clergymen for well-placed ecclesiastics willing to give the example of a teetotal life. Ernest, however, was more successful in winning ecclesiastical promotion than Basil who in 1873 was considered the more promising of the two. Basil's accession to the teetotal cause was celebrated with the highest honour the C.E.T.S. afforded its distinguished patrons, a front-page biography in the Church of England Temperance Chronicle, complete with engraved portrait.⁵ Ernest, whose pledge-taking won no special notice in the Chronicle, was admitted even by his biographer to have been at first over-shadowed by Basil.⁶ Yet, Ernest steadily advanced in the Church while Basil did not. In 1878, Ernest was appointed Canon of Winchester, in 1882, first Bishop of Newcastle and, in 1895, Bishop of Chichester, the office he held until his death in 1907.⁷ Basil's highest ecclesiastical appointment was to the archdeaconry of Westminster, a post he assumed in 1890 when the former archdeacon, his friend F.W. Farrar, was appointed Dean of Canterbury. Farrar had become a teetotaler shortly after moving to Westminster in 1876 partly because

of Basil Wilberforce's influence and also to do something about the social problems he encountered in the streets and lanes surrounding the Houses of Parliament.⁸

Basil's limited ecclesiastical success no doubt partly stemmed from his frequent tendency to advocate teetotal and prohibitionist principles virtually without regard for the limits of ecclesiastical and even royal tolerance. He undoubtedly antagonized important ecclesiastics to a greater extent than Henry Ellison who, according to his obituary in The Times, missed important Church promotions because of his temperance affiliations.⁹ In 1877, Basil clashed with Bishop Charles Wordsworth of Lincoln by writing to Archbishop Tait of Canterbury on behalf of teetotalers in Wordsworth's diocese who had been denied episcopal permission to receive Communion using unfermented wine.¹⁰ Tait characteristically refused on jurisdictional grounds to support the teetotalers.¹¹ Five years later, Basil in a bold pamphlet attacked the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for permitting public houses to be operated on Church-owned property.¹² The charge was one Wilberforce had made as early as October 1875. At a C.E.T.S. meeting in the Manchester Free Trade Hall, he had demanded that the Church sever all connections with the liquor interests on the grounds that "she will save herself from disestablishment by nothing more surely than by going in heart and soul for the disestablishment of the liquordom of England!"¹³ The 1882 pamphlet, however, by provoking a reply from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, more clearly emphasized Wilberforce's growing reputation in the Church as a troublemaker.¹⁴

The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, admitting in an 1883 Report that there were public houses on their land, argued that they often lacked the power to prohibit them because of the nature of the leases they held. In granting new leases, the Commissioners were careful to limit the number of pubs permitted in each area. The Report characterized as impractical the complete prohibition of pubs from Church property and challenged the accuracy of some of Wilberforce's charges.

Basil Wilberforce's temperance activities also earned him a snub from the Prince of Wales whom he dared criticize for presiding at an annual meeting of the Licensed Victualler's Association and a firm rebuke from Dean Gerald Wellesley of Windsor for publicly referring without permission to Queen Victoria's opinions.¹⁵ Basil sometimes even embarrassed the C.E.T.S. by his faint praise for its prestigious non-teetotal section.¹⁶

His brother Ernest was usually more careful in promoting temperance to respect the sensitivities of Anglican officials and theologians. Ernest's biographer claimed that his prudent participation in the Church temperance movement actually aided his advancement by helping him overcome a youthful reluctance to assert himself.¹⁷ It was perhaps appropriate that in 1896, the year after he became Bishop of Chichester, Ernest was appointed chairman of the C.E.T.S., succeeding Frederick Temple.¹⁸

As Basil Wilberforce knew all too well, the royal and episcopal support of the C.E.T.S. had their limits. The

qualified patronage of Victoria and Prince Leopold was often over-shadowed by the prodigious and sometimes uncompromising tastes and appetites of the Prince of Wales. On at least one occasion, Basil Wilberforce's friend, F.W. Farrar who was expecting Edward for dinner, overcame his teetotal principles sufficiently to seek advice on the Prince's favourite alcoholic beverages.¹⁹ In 1887, the Queen herself "did not see her way to authorize publication" of a C.E.T.S. memorial pleading for a sober golden jubilee.²⁰ Anglican bishops, even though they generally commended the Society's dual basis, sometimes embarrassed its teetotal wing by ill-timed condemnations of fanatical total abstinence or of restrictive licensing legislation.

Basil Wilberforce's conflict with Christopher Wordsworth in 1877 over the Communion wine question was not the first disagreement between the Bishop of Lincoln and the teetotal clergy. As Archdeacon of Westminster, Wordsworth had warmly supported John Sandford's efforts of 1868 to promote the temperance cause in the Convocation of Canterbury.²¹ As Bishop of Lincoln, however, Wordsworth comforted publicans and angered clerical abstainers by delivering an anti-teetotal sermon in his Cathedral on 5 October, 1873. In the sermon, Wordsworth admitted the propriety of teetotalism in exceptional cases but condemned the pledge as "unscriptural" and productive of "lying". He feared the pledge might "raise up a whole generation of hypocrites."²² Publicans published extracts of Wordsworth's sermon in large print and distribu-

ted them throughout the country.²³ The clerical abstain- 351
ers, who regarded Wordsworth's sermon as his refusal to en-
dorse the C.E.T.S., answered his objections in the Church
of England Temperance Chronicle and encouraged sympathizers
in the Diocese of Lincoln to help change the Bishop's mind.

By December, 1875, Wordsworth had been persuaded to
support temperance work and he issued a pastoral letter urg-
ing his clergy to found C.E.T.S. branches.²⁴ Although in
the letter he again condemned excessive reliance on the
teetotal pledge, the Bishop was thanked in the Chronicle for
his "courtesy and kindness".²⁵ The short truce which
followed between Wordsworth and the Anglican temperance com-
munity was broken in 1877 when the Bishop prohibited the
use of unfermented Communion wine in his diocese and sought
to extend the ban throughout the Anglican Church. His views
won almost universal acceptance in the Convocation of Canter-
bury in 1883 and at the 1888 Lambeth Conference.²⁶

James Fraser, whose remarks to the Convocation of
Canterbury, in June, 1869, had helped inspire the dual basis
of the C.E.T.S., provoked cries of "No, No," from clerical
abstainers during the 1873 Church Congress at Bath when he
repeated his charge that teetotalers sometimes made a rival
religion out of total abstinence.²⁷ Fraser, then Bishop of
Manchester, inspired an immediate rebuke from the teetotal
Vicar of Long Whittenham Berks., and the fears of clerical ab-
stainers that their cause would suffer in the diocese where
they had recently enjoyed their greatest successes. In the

summer of 1873, however, Fraser, after recording again his³⁵² opposition to fanatical teetotalism as well as to temperance legislation of any sort, agreed at the Manchester Mayor's Parlour to become a C.E.T.S. vice-president and to promote the Society's activities.²⁸ Like Basil Wilberforce, he was rewarded with a front-page biography in the Chronicle, complete with engraved portrait.²⁹

Bishop W.C. Magee of Peterborough perhaps caused clerical abstainers their greatest embarrassment. A single speech he delivered in the House of Lords on 2 May, 1872, against the United Kingdom Alliance's policy of permissive prohibition won for Magee the lasting scorn of temperance reformers, including some C.E.T.S. supporters. During his speech, Magee made a somewhat prophetic statement which both the Alliance's friends and enemies quickly reduced to a slogan. Magee actually said

. . . if I must take my choice - and such it seems to me is really the alternative offered by the Permissive Bill - whether England should be free or sober, I declare -- strange as such a declaration may sound, coming from one of my profession -- that I should say that it would be better that England should be free than that England should be compulsorily sober. I would distinctly prefer freedom to sobriety, because with freedom we might in the end attain sobriety, but in the other alternative we should eventually lose both freedom and sobriety.³⁰

The simplified version of Magee's statement, "better England free than England sober", became one of the most popular maxims of temperance controversy and survived long after the Bishop's death. It was repeated as recently as 1934 by Stanley Baldwin in a speech at Ashridge.³¹

During Magee's life-time, the equally irritating praise

of publicans and condemnation of temperance reformers served to make him all the more impatient with attempts to make the British people sober by act of Parliament.

Ironically, Magee's famous speech was delivered the same day as he presided over the last annual gathering of the Church teetotal society under the mistaken impression that he was attending a meeting of the National Association.³² In the speech, Magee had made a reservation which might have been interpreted as a qualified defence of National Association legislative policy. Although he was "strongly opposed to the Permissive Bill", he did "wish that the ratepayers should have some voice -- not an absolute and sole voice, but some voice in the regulation of the liquor traffic".³³ As a vice-president of both the National Association and the Church teetotal society, Magee had supported, sometimes actively, programmes of the clerical abstainers. The latter nonetheless, often proved no better than other temperance reformers in distinguishing between what Magee actually said and what he was accused of saying. The Church of England Temperance Magazine reported Magee's participation in the 1872 annual meeting of the Church teetotal society without mentioning the offending speech which he had delivered earlier that day.³⁴ Two months later, however, William Caine attacked Magee in the Magazine and impudently suggested that if the Bishop

would obey the Codex Justinian, and every week visit the prisoners in his diocese...he would discover that the "freedom" to drink intoxicating liquors had deprived many of them committed to his charge of their true freedom....³⁵

Magee had to suffer similar but usually more polite rebukes in Church temperance publications until his death in 1891 which was reported in the Temperance Chronicle with a reference to his famous slogan.³⁶

At first disregarding the criticisms of clerical abstainers for his 1872 speech, Magee became one of the earliest episcopal supporters of the C.E.T.S. founded the next year. He was one of the first ten English bishops who became C.E.T.S. vice-presidents and in February, 1874, he sent his clergy a pastoral letter strongly recommending that they support the new organization.³⁷ By January, 1876, however, Magee no longer felt he would be welcome at Church temperance gatherings. Refusing an invitation to attend, with the Wilberforces, Archbishop Thomson and the local bishop William Jacobson, a meeting to inaugurate the Chester diocesan C.E.T.S., he wrote,

I should not like to have declined the offer of the C.E.T.S., and yet, if I may judge from the number and character of temperance utterances that I have lately been receiving from all parts of England I should hardly have proved a persona grata to such a meeting as you anticipate.³⁸

The same year, his views on prohibition were attacked in a pamphlet by Prebendary R.M. Grier of Lichfield, a C.E.T.S. teetotaler and Alliance supporter.³⁹ As time advanced, although Magee's name remained on C.E.T.S. lists of episcopal supporters, he became increasingly hostile to the Society's legislative and other policies.

Even those bishops who eagerly promoted the C.E.T.S. usually took great pains not to compromise the responsibi-

lities of their episcopal offices by over-zealous temperance activities. A.C. Tait's support for the Anglican temperance effort had quickly made possible establishment of the prestigious C.E.T.S. and the organization became an important part of his programme to improve inter-denominational relations and so help save the Established Church. Tait nonetheless was always careful to expound temperance principles within a wider context of generally-accepted Anglican moral attitudes and thereby avoided the criticism that he attacked intemperance while ignoring other vices. His first two charges to his own diocese of Canterbury, in 1872 and 1876, were used by Church teetotalers to prove archiepiscopal support for their movement, but the brief references in them to "the evil of intemperance" were part of a detailed listing of contemporary failings.⁴⁰

Tait balanced his temperance work with consideration for the liquor interests. A troubled country pastor who wrote asking the Archbishop's permission to delay establishing a C.E.T.S. branch in his parish because he did not wish to upset the local publicans was told to "use [his] own judgment."⁴¹ During an 1876 temperance campaign in east London, Tait said that he knew "personally some of the most estimable and religious men in the United Kingdom who are engaged in this trade."⁴²

Tait's contributions to the Church temperance movement, of course, formed only a small part of his extensive political and pastoral duties as Archbishop of Canterbury.

His official biography scarcely mentions his temperance activities and a first-rate study of Tait written recently by Peter Marsh completely ignores them.⁴³ Unlike Thomson who frequently attended meetings to initiate C.E.T.S. work in the northern province, Tait presided over only one such gathering, at Croydon in January, 1878, to inaugurate the Society in his own diocese of Canterbury.⁴⁴ Even when Tait found time to promote temperance, the pressure of his other archiepiscopal duties often intruded. Although he presided over five of the first six C.E.T.S. anniversary meetings held each May in the Lambeth Palace Library, he was on time only twice.⁴⁵ Ironically, in May, 1877, on one of the two occasions when he attended an entire meeting he had to confess that he was able to do so only by missing a meeting of his House of Lords' Committee on Intemperance.⁴⁶

Even Frederick Temple, the nineteenth century's best-known teetotal bishop, was careful not to let his temperance principles take precedence over his episcopal responsibilities. As Bishop of London in 1894, Temple suppressed his earlier prohibitionist sympathies and prudently advised Archbishop E.W. Benson of Canterbury to refuse a United Kingdom Alliance request for endorsement.⁴⁷ When he was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury himself the next year, Temple resigned as C.E.T.S. chairman, a position still too controversial to be held in conjunction with the highest episcopal office in the Church.

III

Despite the Prince of Wales' drinking habits, the

hostility of some bishops and the qualified support of others, the merger of the Church temperance movement with the Anglican establishment clearly advanced the crusade against drunkenness. Without sacrificing their teetotal principles, clerical abstainers were given a large share of the influence, wealth and prestige available in the Church. They were thereby enabled within ten years to transform the C.E.T.S. into one of the most extensive religious social agencies in the kingdom, and to escalate greatly the war between parish and pub.

Brian Harrison, in his invaluable study of the nineteenth-century English temperance movement, saw the formation of the C.E.T.S. as "in some ways" involving

a return to the basis of the old British and Foreign Temperance Society -- in that it once more attracted the wealthy into temperance work and repudiated any sectarian insistence on teetotalism.⁴⁸

His judgment was generally correct. The C.E.T.S. won the support of more prominent persons than the British and Foreign Temperance Society had ever enjoyed. By the 'eighties, aristocratic C.E.T.S. vice-presidents included the Dukes of Westminster, of Marlborough and of Leeds; the Earls of Harrowby, of Chichester, of Meath and of Shaftesbury and Lords Lyttleton, Calthorpe and Derwent.⁴⁹ Wealthy business and professional men as well as politicians also served as C.E.T.S. vice-presidents. The best-known was Lord Chief Justice Coleridge. Others included the Hon. Justice Denman, Sir Richard E. Webster, Attorney-General, Col. Hon. Francis C. Bridgeman, M.P., Hon. G.N. Curzon and W.H. Houldsworth,

M.P.⁵⁰ The founding of the Women's Union in 1876 also attracted to C.E.T.S. work some of the leading ladies of English society. Among these were the wives of Archbishop Benson and Bishops Temple and Jackson, as well as the Duchesses of Westminster and Sutherland, the Countess of Meath, the Marchioness of Tavistock and Lady John Manners.⁵¹

By sanctioning the C.E.T.S., abstaining clerics indicated their willingness to work with non-teetotalers to combat intemperance, and thereby, in Harrison's words, somewhat "repudiated any sectarian insistence on teetotalism." Unlike the British and Foreign Temperance Society, however, the Victorian C.E.T.S. had only a teetotal pledge. Clerical abstainers doggedly resisted efforts to introduce into the Society a moderation pledge. They were successful until 1904 when the C.E.T.S. Executive approved a semi-teetotal pledge which permitted drinking with meals.⁵² Until then, the functions of the "abstaining" section and the "non-abstaining" or "general" section were kept quite distinct. Separate membership lists were compiled at the parochial and diocesan levels for the two sections and dual May meetings were held annually in London, one for teetotalers at Exeter Hall and the other for non-abstainers at Lambeth Palace. The function of clerical abstainers was to fight drunkenness by practising and advocating teetotalism. Non-abstaining members were not expected to promote even the moderate use of drink, but to fight a rear-guard battle against intemperance by attacking its social, legislative and other causes. They were to do this by helping implement the recommendations of the Canterbury

and York reports on intemperance.⁵³ Even Dawson Burns, who ordinarily countenanced no compromise of teetotal or prohibitionist principles, approved in glowing terms the C.E.T.S. dual basis.

No-one can indeed measure the potentiality of usefulness involved in the two principles - the one of personal abstinence, the other of co-operation for securing reformed social conditions, reformed customs, and reformed legislation.⁵⁴

Far from limiting the extension of teetotalism, establishment of the C.E.T.S. greatly facilitated its spread. In 1872, there were an estimated 300 parochial teetotal societies, about one for every 50 English and Welsh parishes.⁵⁵ Ten years later, there were C.E.T.S. branches in more than one-fifth of the parishes in the twenty-three English dioceses which that year had submitted reasonably complete returns.⁵⁶ In these twenty-three dioceses and the two Welsh dioceses of Llandaff and St. Asaph there were more than 339,687 members of parochial C.E.T.S. branches. Over 160,000 of these were juvenile teetotalers.⁵⁷ Probably, about three-quarters of the adult members were teetotalers; the others members of the C.E.T.S. general section.⁵⁸

Even more striking, was the progress which increased respectability afforded the Church temperance movement in areas which had previously been almost impenetrable. Before 1873, the movement had scarcely touched either the largely rural dioceses of Oxford and Ely or the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Yet by 1882, there were 221

parochial C.E.T.S. branches in the diocese of Oxford as well as university branches in 14 colleges.⁵⁹ The diocese of Ely had 181 parochial branches and temperance work was well under way at Cambridge. Within nine years after the C.E.T.S. was founded, Oxford and Ely were second and fourth among the dioceses of England with the most C.E.T.S. branches; Manchester was first with 260 branches and Lichfield third with 185. The diocese of London with 95 branches was by 1882 only twelfth, having been surpassed by Ripon (with 150), Winchester (with 123), York (with 119), Salisbury (with 116), Rochester (with 98), and Liverpool (with 97). Aided greatly by official recognition, the geographical distribution of parochial teetotalism had begun more clearly to reflect the concentration of Anglican influence.

The official status of the C.E.T.S. also helped extend the Anglican temperance movement in virtually all parts of the world where English was spoken. It promoted greater contacts between temperance reformers in the homeland and their counterparts overseas; and the C.E.T.S. in co-operation with kindred British and European groups initiated an organized movement to keep drink from their colonies' native peoples. By 1887, there were C.E.T.S. branches in the United States, Canada, Newfoundland, the West Indies, Africa, Gibraltar, India, New Zealand, Australia and Ceylon.⁶⁰

In many cases, the branches owed more to indigenous influences than to examples from the mother country, but increasingly Anglican clergymen who went abroad took with

them teetotal principles which they propagated on arrival. The American version of the C.E.T.S. was established directly under the influence of the parent organization. In August, 1881, Robert Graham left his post as C.E.T.S. organizing secretary in the Province of York to initiate the Church Temperance Society for the Protestant Episcopal Church of America.⁶¹ Graham was aided the following year in promoting the American organization by Bishop Anthony Thorold of Rochester a teetotaler of four years who travelled with him throughout the western states.⁶²

The 1881 Lambeth Conference helped link Anglican temperance organizations around the world. The bishops at the Conference, led by Frederick Temple of London, issued several documents praising the temperance movement, including an encyclical letter and a report by a special committee.⁶³ One of the Committee's recommendations was that Anglican dioceses abroad appoint agents to correspond with the London C.E.T.S.⁶⁴ Twenty such correspondents were appointed within the next two years; and reports of Anglican overseas initiatives against drink began to appear regularly in the Temperance Chronicle.⁶⁵

A comprehensive and prestigious organization to combat intemperance among native peoples in European colonies was inaugurated on 30 March, 1887 at a meeting in Prince's Hall, Piccadilly. At Henry Ellison's invitation, Frederick Temple presided over the meeting which officially formed the "United Committee for the Prevention of the Demoralization

of the Native Races by the Liquor Traffic".⁶⁶ The United Committee was supported by most British missionary and temperance organizations.⁶⁷ In September, 1887, representatives of the United Committee, attending the International Alcoholic Congress at Zurich, helped form a permanent committee of European temperance reformers dedicated to eradicate native intemperance.⁶⁸ The members of the United Committee were encouraged by a strong statement issued the following August by Anglican bishops attending the Lambeth Conference. After urging governments to "wipe out the grievous stain" of native intemperance, the bishops added their grief

that it would be possible to say, with any most distant resemblance of truth, that it would be better for native races that Christian nations should never come into contact with them at all.⁶⁹

At home, the merger of the Church temperance movement with the Anglican establishment provided clerical abstainers with the resources to launch massive social programmes. Drawn by the important patronage essential to Victorian fund-raising, the annual income of the Society's London office increased from about £ 650 in 1872 to over £ 4,500 in the financial year 1873-1874 to over £ 12,100 nine years later.⁷⁰ This was in addition to a healthy growth in funds at the diocesan level which in 1883 almost equalled the income of the central office and undetermined financial improvement in the parochial branches.⁷¹

The C.E.T.S. organized agencies to fight drunkenness

among a wide variety of occupational and social groups. Its agricultural division, organized in 1884 with a full-time agent, attempted to advance teetotal principles in rural England and Wales.⁷² British farmers were urged to take the pledge; to observe non-alcoholic Harvest festivals; to discontinue part-payment of wages in beer and to use recipes for non-intoxicating beverages sent them by the Society. The C.E.T.S. Army division, by 1883 claimed to have 25,000 teetotal soldiers on its rolls.⁷³ There were also by 1889 a few C.E.T.S. Navy branches although for the most part temperance work among sailors was left to Miss Agnes Weston's Royal Naval Temperance Society with which the Society had been linked since 1881.⁷⁴ Commercial seamen had their own C.E.T.S. division and the Society was affiliated with the "Thames Church Mission" and the "Missions to Deep Sea Fishermen".⁷⁵

The United Kingdom Railway Temperance Union, founded as a special C.E.T.S. branch in 1883, gathered within the next sixteen years the names of 19,950 teetotal employees of U.K. trains.⁷⁶ Beginning in 1889, visitors to British sporting events and fairs were met by C.E.T.S. missionaries from the Race Course and Van Mission. Within two years, the Mission was operating three vans as mobile restaurants and centres for the distribution of temperance propaganda.⁷⁷ The Church Temperance Benefit Society, organized in 1878 to provide a substitute for pub thrift groups, accumulated by 1903 a capital of £44,000 and had 180 lodges in England and Wales with 9,500 members.⁷⁸

One of the most specialized C.E.T.S. social agencies was the Mission to Cabmen and Busmen, undertaken from 1880 to 1890 by Thomas Ryan, himself a cabman.⁷⁹ For a number of reasons, cabmen were thought to be particularly vulnerable to regular intemperance. Tardy clients were expected by custom to offer their drivers something to drink as they waited. In return for bringing them clients, some business houses gave a 3d. coupon redeemable at local pubs. And cabmen were known voluntarily to take alcoholic relief from the effects of the weather or the boredom of irregular business. The Mission to Cabmen had some success in persuading prominent citizens to offer cabmen non-alcoholic refreshment while they waited. Shelters were established where cabmen could redeem their 3d. coupons for tea, coffee, soft-drinks and food. They were given blankets and mittens to protect them from the weather and a number of diversions, including libraries, bible classes, and games to compensate for loss of the bottle. The money cabmen saved from the pubs was invested for them in mission provident clubs.

The Missions to Cabmen had been first founded as a special department of the C.E.T.S. Police Court Mission. The Police Court Mission, which will be discussed in greater detail below, had been established in 1876 to rescue drunkards found at London's magistrate's benches. In 1890, the Police Court Mission assumed work among cabmen as part of its regular duties. By then, there were 15,000 cabmen connected with the Mission.

The missions to Police Courts and cabmen both employed the services of the C.E.T.S. Women's Union. C.E.T.S. ladies helped supervise operation of cabmen's shelters and stocked their libraries. Occasionally, they even invited cabmen to temperance meetings in their stately homes.⁸⁰ They also accompanied Police Court missionaries on their rounds, approaching female prisoners to rescue them from drunkenness, prostitution, and other moral and social vices.⁸¹

The Women's Union, founded in June, 1876, amid a growing belief that female intemperance was increasing, also worked among the general population. As early as March, 1871, the Church of England Temperance Magazine had condemned "ignorant and well-meaning lady tipplers" who drank enough to approach and even rival Irish biddies of St. Giles."⁸² A similar though more polite note was registered the following year in the Convocation of York Report on Intemperance. In May, 1876, the month before the Women's Union was founded, the Lambeth Palace anniversary meeting of the C.E.T.S. had been especially preoccupied with the problem of female intemperance; and a special conference had been called to determine how women could contribute to the Church temperance movement.⁸³ The result was the founding in June, 1876, of the Women's Union. Within five years, the Union had 55 branches.⁸⁴

Although theoretically the Union operated on the premise that drunkenness knew no class barriers, in practice most attention was given to the more noticeable intemperance

of working-class women. The Women's Union instituted temperance societies for servants in 1881, for restaurant workers in 1887, and in 1905 formed a committee to press for an end to the employment of bar-maids.⁸⁵ By the end of the nineteenth century, C.E.T.S. women had also operated short-term homes for discharged female prisoners at London, Liverpool and Blackburn; institutions for female alcoholics at North Finchley, West Kensington and Liverpool and temperance agencies in several work-houses.⁸⁶

Upper and middle-class ladies were not entirely neglected by the Women's Union. On their behalf, the Union urged that Grocers' Spirit Licences be eliminated mainly because of the temptations they offered ladies with credit accounts.⁸⁷ Women's Union homes for female inebriates provided for "drawing-room" patients as well as "kitchen" and "work-room" patients.⁸⁸ For the most part, however, privileged ladies were considered the promoters rather than the beneficiaries of Anglican temperance reform.

The Womens' Union worked harder to convert children of the privileged classes to teetotalism. In 1881, they founded the Juvenile Union to alert better-class children to the evils of drink by sponsoring special events in parishes, and at public schools and other educational institutions.⁸⁹ The Juvenile Union and its twentieth-century successor, the Young Crusaders' Union, were however, the least successful of C.E.T.S. youth operations. The Juvenile Union was probably established in no more than 150 parishes.⁹⁰ The failure

to attract the children of influential Anglicans to teetotalism was blamed on the competition of other youth teetotal organizations, especially the Band of Hope, and "the prejudices and opposition on the part of many parents" to a movement which might make "little prigs" of their children.⁹¹

After twenty-two years of work among middle and upper class children, the Women's Union had to admit in 1903 that "at present the children of the working classes receive far more definite instruction in elementary scientific temperance than any others".⁹²

This was at least partly due to the much greater success of C.E.T.S. social and educational work among working-class children. By 1898 there were 451,446 juvenile teetotalers in Anglican parishes about four and a half times the number of abstaining adults.⁹³ The C.E.T.S. had also helped persuade school boards and Anglican education authorities to introduce temperance lessons to their students; and in many cases, the C.E.T.S. had provided the class-room material to be used for the lessons.⁹⁴ The C.E.T.S. also sponsored annual competitions to find the student most knowledgeable about the dangers of alcohol and the glories of temperance.⁹⁵ There was a great variety of C.E.T.S. publications for young people including special newspapers, a handbook for C.E.T.S. workers in juvenile branches, and extensive text-books covering the moral, physiological, social and economic benefits of temperance.⁹⁶

The Police Court Mission deserves special treatment because it illustrated the frequent tendency of C.E.T.S. social

agencies to develop beyond their original function of combatting intemperance. The Police Court Mission started simply in July, 1876, with the appointment of an agent to rescue drunkards at London magisterial benches.⁹⁷ The first Police Court Missionary, George Nelson a veteran both of the Cold-Stream Guards and Henry Ellison's parish teetotal society, was employed by the Mission until March, 1885, when he was transferred to the Society's Army division.⁹⁸ His initial duties were entirely devoted to the defeat of intemperance. As well as visiting drunkards in London police courts, he was expected to organize half-hour temperance meetings in metropolitan factories and commercial houses.⁹⁹ The Police Court Mission quickly expanded both numerically and in scope. By 1881, there were seven police court missionaries, in the metropolitan area and one in Liverpool.¹⁰⁰ Two years later, the number of missionaries had grown to 41; and by 1913, 153 C.E.T.S. police court missionaries, including 20 women were visiting 415 courts in England and Wales.¹⁰¹

It became apparent as early as the Mission's first year of operation that drunkards found in police courts could not be permanently reformed simply by pressing into their hands Bibles, tracts and pledge-books. In November, 1876, George Nelson had already realized the necessity of continuously supervising converts won at the police court to prevent their back-sliding. That month, the Church of England Temperance Chronicle asked its readers to help Nelson in "following up individual cases of drunkenness . . . by definite and organ-

ized visitation of all cases".¹⁰²

Nelson's experiences and those of an increasing number of C.E.T.S. police court agents contributed in later years to improved understanding of tendencies both to drunkenness and criminality. Home visits and other services to discharged prisoners played a major part in future Police Court missionary work. In 1890, the 41 missionaries visited 18,881 cases in their homes; and met 19,684 recently discharged convicts at prison gates. They also returned home 978 persons, mostly girls and young women or placed them with friends; assisted 10,357 cases with money, shelter, food, clothing and tools or "stock in trade"; intervened to save the jobs of 80 people; and found either temporary or permanent employment for 1,134.¹⁰³ Men and boys recently released from prison were often placed temporarily in the Mission's own labour yards where they earned modest wages chopping wood or making mats until they could be found more gainful occupations. By 1891, there were labour yards at Ealing, Liverpool, Croydon, Hastings, Northampton and Dover.¹⁰⁴ Their number increased in future years and they were supplemented by short-stay homes and establishments especially for delinquent boys.¹⁰⁵

By 1891, the Police Court Mission had clearly outgrown its original preoccupation with drunkenness and anticipated many rehabilitative techniques of the modern probation system. In recognition of this, when the first state probation officers were appointed in 1906 the Liberal government, approving a C.E.T.S. request, agreed to employ the Police

Court missionaries. The missionaries, although performing the functions of state probation officers, were still paid and supervised by the C.E.T.S.¹⁰⁶

In addition to C.E.T.S. social agencies conducted from London and Manchester, diocesan and parish branches sponsored a wide range of savings clubs, counterattractive agencies and other organizations for the material and spiritual improvement of teetotalers. As Appendix F shows, in 1883, these included in the Diocese of Lichfield alone 20 "penny banks", 55 reading rooms, coffee rooms, and libraries, 39 athletic clubs and 20 musical bands.

IV

This study has been concerned with tracing the beginnings of organized temperance reform in the Church of England from 1835 to 1875. The Anglican teetotal movement stemmed from clerical fears that early industrial society was threatening the traditional balance of community life between the parish and the pub. The pub became more attractive as the parish declined in influence. Workingmen, frequently suffering from severe conditions of social and ideological disorientation brought on by advancing industrialism, found in the pub refreshment, solace and company. Teetotal clerics attempted to arrest the decline of parochial influence by reclaiming their people from the pub.

Rather than trying to impose overly strict Christian principles on an unwilling working class, the few Anglican clergymen who endorsed teetotalism before 1855 often had to make painful social, personal, and professional sacrifices

to accept a movement to which they had been introduced by workingmen. In becoming abstainers, clergymen thought they risked social ostracism, loss of financial support from the liquor interests, damaged health and the charge that they co-operated too closely with Nonconformist enemies of the Church. Even more serious were the fears of Evangelicals that in accepting from workingmen a movement deeply rooted in liberalism they would at the same time endanger the customary downward direction of their philanthropy and the other-worldly orientation of their teleology.

Evangelical clergymen, who became abstainers in increasing numbers after 1855, were generally helped by a number of mid-nineteenth century developments to regard teetotalism more positively. Drink was becoming socially less important among educated people. Medical research was helping to destroy exaggerated notions of alcohol's benefits. A new feeling of social harmony was somewhat breaking down antagonistic relations between classes. Working-class teetotalers, often aided by middle-class colleagues, were taking more congenial approaches to clergymen whose support they were seeking. And intensified concern among Anglicans for the condition of England's poor helped clergymen, specifically Evangelicals, regard teetotalism more seriously. More important than any of these general developments were the relationships experienced at the parish level between Evangelical clergymen and workingmen, especially teetotalers. The five future leaders of the Church teetotal movement became

abstainers in the period 1855 to 1862 after experiencing difficulties attracting workingmen to the parish church or in keeping the respect and allegiance of teetotal parishioners.

On endorsing teetotalism, Evangelical clergymen overcame the social, personal and professional fears which had previously kept them from the movement. They developed theories which answered their most serious objections that teetotalism threatened to reverse both the customary downward movement of Evangelical reforming influences and the upward direction of Christian teleology. Teetotalism was made respectable by a theologizing process which subordinated its secular practices and objectives to spiritual exercises and goals. By officially assuming control of a movement to which they had been led by working-class parishioners, clerical presidents of parish teetotal societies assured themselves that they were exhibiting social example and leadership entirely consistent with the Evangelical tradition.

Christianized teetotalism, however, retained much of its liberal legacy. Like other teetotalers, the clerical abstainer assumed the liberal's emphasis on individual behaviour at the same time as he accepted his limited understanding of poverty's role in causing social distress. Teetotalers explained poverty and social misery without indicting liberal principles and offered a solution for both which accorded perfectly with liberal emphases on

self-help. Attributing social problems to the drinking habits of individuals, teetotalers provided an easy explanation for abundant poverty in prosperous England of the Crystal Palace without attacking the social anarchy of a laissez-faire society which allowed the wealthy to become wealthier at the expense of the poor. Offering to improve individual behaviour by eliminating the drinking habits which caused the misconduct of the poor, teetotalers proposed only a relatively minor social adjustment which would leave undisturbed the liberal framework of society. The failure of the Evangelical teetotaler to understand poverty's place in causing social distress was illustrated by an editorial in the Church of England Temperance Magazine for December, 1862, which owed more to Ricardo than to Christ.

Poverty is not the fruitful cause of evil -- it is DRINK: which first lives upon the people's money, thus makes them poor, then drives them out upon the cold streets with burning passions, equal to any deed of daring, nerved for any deed of wrong -- the ready victims of crime and degradation.

It is a well-known fact that a season of poverty or distress always shows a corresponding decrease of crime. It was so during the severe winter of 1860-61 . . . and in the north of England, at the present time, during the lock-up of the cotton-mills, there is evidence to show that crime has been on the decrease; that the bodily health of the people has improved, and the number of the deaths has gradually diminished in proportion to the increase of want and destitution.¹⁰⁷

In accepting the naiveté of the teetotaler's approach to social distress, the clerical abstainer nonetheless accepted his ambition and optimism to an extent new in the Evangelical tradition. Teetotalers were engaged in a

specialization of liberal goals and activities which were as ambitious as those of the more general liberal movement. The teetotaler considered that the liberal's goal of eliminating the individual's ignorance, immorality, ill health and wastefulness could best be achieved by attacking drunkenness as the cause of all his problems. Once having eliminated in one stroke drunkenness and all the other impediments to individual success which stemmed from it, the national social problem, which in the liberal view was essentially the sum of individual problems, would vanish.

The same argument when expressed by the Evangelical teetotaler leaned more heavily on religious terminology, but it embodied the same kind of diagnosis and promise as that of the liberal teetotaler. In the Church of England Temperance Magazine editorial for December, 1862, drunkenness was described as the parent "of a thousand, and a thousand woes", which could be removed if drink were eliminated.

Strong drink and Drunkenness have filled the land with crime and shame, and sorrow and anguish; . . . Strong drink is a stimulant to evil, and a provocative of crime. It runs through all our national miseries, and meets us at every turn . . . Take away Strong Drink, and we pluck up by the root a thousand evils; at one fell swoop, we sweep away the dust and degradation of centuries, that linger with us still.108

On the local level then when the parish clergyman declared war on the pub, he was expressing more than a desire to attract its patrons to church. Like the liberal teetotaler, he was engaged in an effort to remove impediments

which kept drinking workingmen from realizing their full potential. To eliminate their drinking was the key to removing other bad habits which kept them from success. The Evangelical teetotaler had the optimism, derived whether he knew it or not from the liberal basis of teetotalism, that such a goal was attainable. The connection of parochial teetotalism with more general liberal goals was shown in the Evangelical minister's involvement with other forms of social aid. Like Mrs. Wightman, many Evangelical abstainers combined their teetotal work with special educational operations, savings associations and counterattractive agencies. Their reasons for so doing were both to make permanent the teetotalism of their parishioners by providing outlets for the time, energy and money which they might otherwise have devoted to drink and to provide further possibilities of self-improvement to those who had renounced drunkenness. The considerable success which clerical teetotalers had in attracting workingmen to the parish, as a result of this sort of programme, suggests that the introduction of teetotalism into parochial life meant more than a simple campaign to eliminate working-class drunkenness.

Parochial teetotalism was often the nucleus of a general attempt to make the parish more relevant to workingmen in its boundaries by preparing them for fuller participation in industrial society. In attempting to attract the workman from the pub to the parish, the clerical teetotaler

was not simply attacking his drinking habits but doing something to relieve the problems which had made him overly-dependent on the pub. The workingman's failure to adjust his spending habits to the new industrial society, which was often expressed in his waste of surplus money on alcoholic drinks, was attacked initially by eliminating his expenditure on drink and in the long run by encouraging him to save the money so redeemed for a period of greater need. The loneliness and anonymity of industrial society which had increased the importance of the pub as a community centre were often met in parochial teetotal societies by varied social and recreational programmes.

If the pub had assumed the position of community centre once enjoyed by the parish because it mirrored the disorientation of workingmen not yet adjusted to the rhythm of industrial life, the attempt by the teetotal cleric to regain for the parish its former role as community centre often necessitated the restructuring of parochial activities to suit this new rhythm. Night-classes, mechanics' institutes, and other educational projects of parish teetotal societies introduced the reformed drinker to training which could better prepare him for industrial society and make less necessary the solace he found in the pub. The attacks of parochial teetotalers on drunkenness and on the wider social problems which they saw related to it provided an immediacy to parochial activities, lacking in the traditional parish which had been more suitable to the

relatively predictable and consistent rhythm of rural life. Parochial teetotalism was at the centre of an attempt to provide a newly-defined Christian ethos which synthesized Christian principles with those of a liberal industrial society. When parochial teetotal clerics pushed their teetotal doctrines step-by-step up the hierarchical ladder from the parish to Convocation to Lambeth Palace, they were introducing into the life of the National Church a greater relevance to industrial England.

Evangelical teetotalers also inherited from workingmen who had converted them a boldness in dealing with their ecclesiastical superiors useful to such a strenuous push. Working-class teetotalers who continued to influence clerical abstainers in parish societies may also have contributed to the uncompromising attitude which the latter often displayed when attempting to convert important churchmen to the movement.

Members of the Church teetotal society often maintained teetotal and even prohibitionist principles as unbending as those of Nonconformists with whom they often co-operated informally and in organized anti-drink campaigns. Henry Ellison's attempts to moderate their approach showed little success until after 1869 when it became apparent that only in this way could clerical abstainers achieve the kind of prestigious Church support they thought so necessary. In the meantime, clerical abstainers continued to develop the close relationships which they had enjoyed with Nonconformists

in temperance circles.

Abstaining clerics were conscious of Nonconformist attempts to diminish the Church's power and were to some extent engaged in competition with them for the allegiance of workingmen. They nonetheless somewhat agreed with Nonconformist critics that the Church had often neglected its social obligations and found in the frequent working-class estrangement from all organized religion a more basic problem than inter-denominational competition. Clerical abstainers co-operated with Nonconformists to promote the Christian allegiance of workingmen and their adjustment to industrial society. In so doing, they made more credible their claim to expertise on the disestablishment question. Teetotal clerics argued that Nonconformists were less interested in disestablishment than in seeing the Church fulfill its social obligations. They proposed to their ecclesiastical superiors that disestablishment could be avoided if the Church's resources were applied to a co-operative Nonconformist-Anglican attack on intemperance.

After 1869, Archbishops Tait and Thomson and other important prelates took their proposition seriously; and for the first time clerical abstainers saw within reach the kind of official recognition they thought they needed to extend their influence. The main obstacle to winning influential Anglicans to their cause, however, was the insistence of many clerical abstainers that their Society be conducted on firm teetotal principles.

By 1869, teetotal clerics were faced with a dilemma. After seven years of operation, the Church teetotal society had recorded few successes. Lacking adequate finances, the clerical abstainers had been unable to achieve the kind of efficient administration at the central and diocesan levels which might have permitted expansion. Membership figures for the Church teetotal society which rose slowly, or in some dioceses not at all, silently mocked the teetotal clergy's claim to represent the entire Anglican Church. Clerical abstainers, characteristically, blamed their limited success on the ignorance of those whom they were trying to reach and the refusal of important churchmen to provide needed example. They tried to dispel ignorance by extensive distribution of the Church of England Temperance Magazine and their other publications. By using whatever influence and ingenuity was at their disposal, they also attempted to reach important churchmen. The extreme difficulty which teetotal clerics had before 1873 in receiving favourable press notice or any attention at Church Congresses revealed the virtual failure of both attempts.

The Convocation of Canterbury's Report on Intemperance and the reaction of important churchmen to its appearance in 1869 further disappointed clerical abstainers. John Sandford, through his own influence and that of his old friend A.C. Tait, had steered through Convocation a strong Report which reflected his own commitment to teetotal principles. His refusal before 1872 to even mention the

Church teetotal society in the Report or in Convocation offended clerical abstainers who had once again allowed their hopes to rise. Other important ecclesiastics showed by supporting the National Association and slighting the Church teetotal society that their interest in defeating intemperance stopped short of personal abstinence. James Fraser openly expressed the strong reservations to teetotalism which to some extent he shared with his episcopal brethren.

Chastened, the teetotal clerics in 1870 created a new status of associate membership to accommodate their non-abstaining prelates. They seemed at that time, however, unwilling to go any further. Their minds were changed by the critical situation in which they found themselves two years later after the parliamentary licensing question had been at least temporarily settled. By 1872, many clerical abstainers feared that what little they thought they had gained in recent licensing legislation might be lost in a political reaction led by the drink interests. They also had to contend with administrative and financial slumps which the Church teetotal society suffered after temporary settlement of the parliamentary drink question. The two organizations were further threatened by the attempts of James Taylor and John Garrett to entice their prominent supporters to the National Union for the Suppression of Intemperance.

Faced with the possibility of seeing Taylor and Garrett

lead the Anglican establishment farther right on the drink question, the teetotal clergy finally agreed with Henry Ellison that non-abstainers should be permitted full membership in the reorganized temperance organization which he proposed to them in the summer of 1872. They thereby made possible establishment of the C.E.T.S., which having been inaugurated at the Lambeth Palace Meeting the following February, quickly began to initiate the ambitious social programmes which have been briefly described in this chapter.

The extensive social agencies sponsored by the C.E.T.S. were all in some way related to eradicating intemperance. As the development of the Police Court Mission showed, however, they sometimes outgrew their original preoccupation with drunkenness and applied their resources to defeating more basic problems of which drunkenness was often symptomatic. This was in keeping with the intentions of C.E.T.S. founders who expected the influential general or non-abstaining section to attack the remote causes of intemperance. It also continued, however, tendencies already present when Anglican initiatives against intemperance had been conducted entirely on teetotal lines. Clerical abstainers had often found it necessary to supplement their teetotal work with programmes for the general improvement of working-class parishioners. Establishment of the C.E.T.S. now made available to them the respectability and resources to do so more ambitiously.

The broader and stronger attack on the pub thereby

facilitated, did not, of course, succeed in re-establishing the parish as the centre of modern community life. In some ways the Anglican temperance movement may have carried with it the seeds of its own decline. The danger that the movement would be dismissed as irrelevant increased to the extent that it succeeded in promoting sobriety. As workingmen became more sophisticated by participating in the activities of parish teetotal societies the possibility grew that they would look elsewhere for their social, economic and political improvement. Anglicans, as well as Non-conformists, sometimes brought with them the organizational skills they acquired in parish teetotal societies to labour unions or political associations. To the extent that the Anglican temperance movement achieved its wider objective of helping British workingmen adjust to industrial society its reason for existence further declined.

In the long run, the Church temperance movement may even have helped expedite the declining importance of the Anglican parish in the English community. The temperance movement represented a phase in the British workingman's push towards fulfillment, recognition, equality and prosperity. As these goals were approached, not only the pub became less important in his life, but often the parish. If confident, respected, enfranchised and financially comfortable people sometimes have less need for alcoholic solace, they also often show less inclination to seek religious comfort. Eric Hobsbawm has shown that membership drives of nineteenth century

Wesleyan Methodists were most successful during times of economic deprivation and social unrest.¹⁰⁹ Conversely, the figures for Church attendance in the period since the C.E.T.S. was founded almost a hundred years ago indicate the increased secularism which accompanied extension of social equality and prosperity.¹¹⁰ The secular historian, concerned less with the workingman's loss of piety than with his economic, political and social development should note the contribution of the C.E.T.S. to the making of the English working-class.

This study suggests possible reappraisals in several areas of the general social and religious history of which it is a part. The success of local workingmen in converting parish clergymen to their teetotal principles indicated working-class influence on Anglican vicarages to an extent so far unrecognized by historians except perhaps by those who have studied Christian socialism. Desmond Bowen has shown the effects of middle-class thinking on the ideological and social dispositions of the Anglican Church.¹¹¹ The experiences of clerical abstainers reveal corresponding influences by workingmen. Future studies of other social movements Anglican clergymen supported may produce similar evidence.

Teetotal clerics also showed greater abilities to accommodate the liberal principles of Victorian society than Evangelicals are usually thought to have possessed. Robert Wearmouth has recorded qualifications to the essential conservatism which Elie Halévy and others have found in

Methodist Evangelicalism.¹¹² The practical acceptance by Evangelical abstaining clerics of many liberal assumptions which underlay the teetotal movement perhaps suggests the need for a parallel reassessment of Anglican Evangelicalism. The massive infusion of liberal principles which accompanied the wide-spread introduction of teetotalism into Anglican parishes after 1875 may help provide historians with missing links between the Bible-thumping Evangelicalism of William Wilberforce's time and the social gospel of his grandson Basil's generation.

The Anglican parliamentary temperance platform was built on political relationships more complex than is generally recognized. John Glaser has persuasively argued that the decline of the British Liberal Party in this century owed much to its increasing dependence during the Victorian period on dictates from the Nonconformist conscience, including commitment to parliamentary temperance reform.¹¹³ The pressure on Liberals to assume a strong stand against drink was probably applied at least as vigorously by Anglican leaders as by Nonconformists. Until the first world war, Anglican bishops frequently urged both parties to support temperance legislation. Liberals proved most sensitive to such pressure. Asquith's highly controversial licensing proposals in 1908 resembled more the C.E.T.S. proposals for restrictive licensing than the prohibitionist policy of the largely Nonconformist United Kingdom Alliance.¹¹⁴ Their most prominent supporter among religious leaders was

Archbishop Randall Davidson of Canterbury.¹¹⁵

Anglican prelates from Tait to Davidson often displayed the tendency partly inherited from the teetotal clergy, of co-operating with Nonconformists on the temperance question at the same time as they resisted their attempts to diminish the power of the Established Church. As they had been in the first Gladstone ministry, the future of both drink and the Church continued to be linked in the minds of politicians and Nonconformist leaders, as well as some Anglican prelates. The times of most intense parliamentary debate on liquor licensing -- 1869 to 1872, 1880 to 1883, 1892 to 1894, 1902 to 1904 and 1906 to 1908 -- were also periods when the role of the National Church, especially in education, was under closest scrutiny. Further research is needed to determine to what extent parallel timing of these two questions was coincidental or deliberate; how consciously Anglican officials attempted by supporting temperance legislation to win concessions from government leaders; the response of politicians to such attempts; and the reaction of Nonconformists to Anglican involvement in parliamentary temperance reform. The Church temperance movement may in fact have helped in a secondary way to prevent disestablishment.

The exact extent to which Anglican attacks on drink lessened Nonconformist offensives against the Church of course cannot be determined. There was, however, probably some truth in the judgment of W.S. Caine, a prominent Baptist

teetotaler and prohibitionist and sometime M.P. for Scarborough.

The Church of England has done more to postpone the day of disestablishment by its temperance work than by any other to which it put its hand. It has made the Church the Church of the people, in a sense in which it never has been before, and by means of its Temperance Society is doing a magnificent work.¹¹⁶

Disestablishment never became for Nonconformists as pressing a goal as rescuing the masses from drunkenness and irreligion. Nonconformists, by working with Anglicans to attain both ends, somewhat compromised their attacks on the Established Church. They also, by successfully urging that the Church use its resources to propagate sobriety and faith, gave evidence for Anglican claims that the Church had not outlived its social utility. Many of those who wrote to Archbishop Davidson in 1908, supporting his strong position on the licensing question were Nonconformists, some of whom praised the moral power of the Church.¹¹⁷ Nonconformists had paid the Church similar compliments since the beginning of the Anglican teetotal effort.

The contribution of the Anglican temperance movement to saving the Established Church should not be exaggerated. Militant Nonconformists found enough shocking examples of bishops drinking in public and otherwise countenancing or being supported by the liquor interests to fill pamphlets illustrating the virtue of temperance and the vices of the Church. The Church of England's national position was surely saved primarily not by the Anglican

temperance movement but by the increasing irrelevance of disestablishing it. The reasons for disestablishment diminished as the civil equality of Nonconformists increased; as administrative, educational and social institutions were secularized; and as the parliamentary power of the Lords, both spiritual and temporal, was reduced.

By the end of the first world war, those Nonconformists who still preached disestablishment, often found themselves dismissed by a more secular society unconcerned with old religious disputes and applauded by an increasing number of Anglicans. As the Church found ways of financially supporting itself with less recourse to an increasingly indifferent State, more Anglicans began to appreciate the ideal, renewed by the Oxford movement, of an autonomous Church. A recent statement by Archbishop Michael Ramsay of Canterbury shows how far this idea has progressed among churchmen. Ramsay told the Observer in April, 1971: "If I could wake up next week and find the Church disestablished, I should be glad."¹¹⁸ Tait would not have been pleased.

NOTES

CHAPTER IX

¹F.J.O. Coddington, "The Father of the Rescue Squad", Bulletin of the Magistrates' Association, VII (May - June, 1945), 106-107.

²Basil Wilberforce's conversion to teetotalism is described in G.W.E. Russell, Basil Wilberforce, a Memoir (London, 1917), p. 51.

³J.B. Atlay, The Life of the Right Reverend Ernest Roland Wilberforce First Bishop of Newcastle-on-Tyne and Afterward Bishop of Chichester (London, 1912), pp. 40-41. (Hereafter referred to as Life of Ernest Wilberforce; and P.T. Winskill, The Temperance Movement and its Workers (London, 1892), III, 155.

⁴See, for example, Bishop Charles Abraham's speech to the 1876 Church Congress at Plymouth, as cited in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, IV (1 November, 1876), 174-181.

⁵II (1 September, 1874), 141-142.

⁶J.B. Atlay, Life of Ernest Wilberforce, p. 40.

⁷Sidney Lee ed., The Dictionary of National Biography. The Concise Dictionary (London, 1920) II, 468.

⁸Frederick Farrar, Reasons for Total Abstinence (London, 1855), pp. 3-5; and his obituary in Church of England Temperance Society, Forty-first Annual Report, 1902, p. 45.

⁹Ellison's obituary appeared in The Times, 26 December, 1899, p. 7.

¹⁰See Basil Wilberforce's letter to A.C. Tait (20 August, 1877), in Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of A.C. Tait, 1878, no. 146.

¹¹See draft of Randall Davidson's letter to Henry Macdougall (15 October, 1877), ibid., loc. cit.

¹²Basil Wilberforce, The Established Church and the Liquor Traffic: Being a Letter Addressed to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, (London, 1882).

¹³Basil Wilberforce, cited in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, III (1 December, 1875), 205.

¹⁴See Church of England, Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England, Report of Select Committee on Public Houses (London, 1883), pp. 1-3 from which the following discussion is derived.

¹⁵G.W.E. Russell, Basil Wilberforce, a Memoir, p. 55.

¹⁶See his speech of 26 October, 1875, at the Manchester Free Trade Hall, as reported in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, III (1 December, 1875), 205.

¹⁷J.B. Atlay, Life of Ernest Wilberforce, pp. 39-40.

¹⁸See Henry Ellison's letter to Ernest Wilberforce [1896], in ibid., pp. 302-303.

¹⁹See the letter from Dean W. Lefroy of Norwich to F.W. Farrar [1897], in Canterbury Cathedral Library, Papers of F.W. Farrar in packet marked "Cathedral fund". Lefroy recommended that Farrar stock for the Prince sparkling Assmanhausen, port and "whiskey!!!" [sic].

²⁰Henry Ellison, cited in Church of England Temperance Society, Executive Minutes (29 March, 1887), n.p.

²¹Church of England Temperance Magazine, new ser. V (April, 1868), 98.

²²Charles Wordsworth, cited in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, II (1 February, 1874), 29.

²³Information in the following two sentences is from ibid., loc. cit., and ibid., I (1 December, 1873), 201.

²⁴Ibid., IV (1 January, 1876), 16.

²⁵Ibid., loc. cit.

²⁶See Convocation of Canterbury, Chronicle of Convocation (10, 11 April; 3, 5 July, 1883), 3rd. ser. Vol. 1, pp. 1, 2, 23, 56, 121, 122, 188 and 189. The vote for Wordsworth's resolution was unanimous in the Upper House

and 72-68 in favour in the Lower House. Also see, encyclical letter issued by the bishops attending the 1888 Lambeth Conference, in Church of England, The Six Lambeth Conferences 1867-1920, Compiled under the direction of Lord Davidson of Lambeth (London, 1929), p. 10.

²⁷Information on the 1873 Church Congress is from Church of England Temperance Chronicle, 1 (1 November, 1873), 179.

²⁸Ibid., II (1 September, 1874), 157-158.

²⁹Ibid., II (2 November, 1874), 177-178.

³⁰W.C. Magee, cited in Great Britain, Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (2 May, 1872), 3d. ser. Vol. 211, p. 86.

³¹The speech, called "In Defence of Freedom", was delivered at Bonor Law College and can be found in National Union of Conservative Association, Tracts and Leaflets (British Museum, 1933-1935). Baldwin mistakenly attributed the remark to "Bishop Wilberforce". I am grateful to Dr. Patrick Kyba, now of the University of Guelph, for directing me to this source.

³²Information in Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d. ser. IV (June, 1872), 103.

³³W.C. Magee, cited in Great Britain, Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (2 May, 1872), 3d. ser. Vol. 211, p. 86.

³⁴3d. ser. IV (June, 1872), 103-104.

³⁵Ibid., 3d. ser. IV (August, 1872), 147.

³⁶XX (9 May, 1891), 225.

³⁷Bishops Temple of Exeter, Hervey of Bath and Wells, Selwyn of Lichfield, Baring of Durham, Goodwin of Carlisle, Ellicott of Gloucester and Bristol, Browne of Winchester and Woodford of Ely became C.E.T.S. vice-presidents in 1873; Magee and Jackson of London, early in 1874. Church of England Temperance Chronicle I (1 August, 1 September, 1 November, 1 December, 1873), pp. 124, 144, 180 and 200; II (1 May, 1874), 81.

³⁸W.C. Magee, cited in J.B. Atlay, Life of Ernest Wilberforce, p. 39.

³⁹A Reply to the Bishop of Peterborough's Speech in the House of Lords on Intemperance. With a Letter from the Right Rev. Bishop Magee (London, 1876).

⁴⁰Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d. ser. IV (1 November, 1872), 206; and A.C. Tait, Some Thoughts on the Duties of the Established Church of England as a National Church. Being Seven Addresses Delivered at his Second Visitation (London, 1876), p. 87 and Appendix.

⁴¹Note on letter from George W.D. Hingston of Fanborough, Kent, to A.C. Tait (4 May, 1876), in Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of A.C. Tait, 1876, no. 122.

⁴²A.C. Tait, cited in Church of England Temperance Chronicle, IV (1 May, 1876), 84.

⁴³See Randall Davidson and William Benham, Life of Archibald Campbell Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury, 2 vols. (London, 1891), II, 518. Peter Marsh, The Victorian Church in Decline, Archbishop Tait and the Church of England, 1868-1882 (London, 1969).

⁴⁴Church of England Temperance Chronicle, IV (March, 1876), 51.

⁴⁵Information from ibid., II (1 June, 1874), 94; III (1 June, 1875), 82; IV (1 June, 1876), 94; V (1 June, 1877), 85; VI (11 May, 1878), 290; VII (17 May, 1879), 315.

⁴⁶A.C. Tait, cited in ibid., V (1 June, 1877), 85.

⁴⁷Letter of Frederick Temple to E.W. Benson (8 December, 1894), in Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of E.W. Benson, 1894, L5. Benson took Temple's advice and even used some of the expressions Temple had suggested in drafting his reply to Lawson. (14 December, 1894), in ibid., loc. cit.

⁴⁸Drink and the Victorians The Temperance Question in England 1815-1872 (London, 1971), 184.

⁴⁹Church of England Temperance Society, Nineteenth Annual Report, 1881, n.p.; Twenty-third Annual Report, 1885, p. 6; and Twenty-fourth Annual Report, 1886, n.p.

⁵⁰Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-sixth Annual Report, 1887, p. 6.

⁵¹Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-third Annual Report, 1885, n.p.

⁵²Church of England Temperance Society, Executive Minutes, June and July, 1904, pp. 77 and 80.

⁵³Robert Maguire, Temperance Landmarks, A Narrative of the Work and Workers, 1829-1879 (London, 1879), p. 81

⁵⁴In his Temperance History (London, c. 1880), II, 190-191.

⁵⁵Information is derived from, Convocation of Canterbury, Lower House, Report of the Committee on Intemperance (London, 1894), part 2, p. 10.

⁵⁶The remaining figures in this paragraph are derived except where indicated from, Church of England, Official Year Book of the Church of England. (London, 1883), pp. 158 and 210. These figures do not include the four Welsh dioceses or the following English dioceses: St. Allan's, Exeter, Lincoln and Sodor and Man. There were in the remaining twenty-three dioceses C.E.T.S. branches in 2,443 of the 14,468 parishes.

⁵⁷Church of England Temperance Society, Twentieth Annual Report, 1882, p. 13. There were 160,357 juvenile teetotalers from the twenty-two dioceses whose returns specified age differences.

⁵⁸The ratio for 1882 was not known. In 1891, however, over three quarters of the Adult Members were teetotalers. Church of England Temperance Society, Thirtieth Annual Report, 1891, p. 42.

⁵⁹Figures in this paragraph are derived from Church of England, Official Year Book of the Church of England, 1883, pp. 158-159.

⁶⁰Church of England Temperance Society; Nineteenth Annual Report, 1881, p. 15; Twentieth Annual Report, 1882, p. 15; Twenty-fourth Annual Report, 1886, p. 30; and Twenty-fifth Annual Report, 1887, p. 46.

⁶¹Church of England Temperance Society, Executive Minutes, 2 August, 1881, n.p.

⁶²C.H. Simpkinson, The Life and Work of Bishop Thorold Rochester 1877-91 Winchester 1891-95 (London, 1896), p. 241.

⁶³Church of England, The Six Lambeth Conferences 1867-1920, pp. 106, 107, 119.

⁶⁴ Church of England Temperance Society, Council Minutes, 22 October, 1888, n.p.

⁶⁵ Church of England Temperance Society, Executive Minutes, February and March, 1889, n.p.

⁶⁶ Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-fifth Annual Report, 1887, p. 90.

⁶⁷ Printed page, inserted in Church of England Temperance Society, Executive Minutes, 29 March, 1887.

⁶⁸ Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-fifth Annual Report, 1887, p. 91.

⁶⁹ Church of England, The Six Lambeth Conferences 1867-1920, pp. 128-129.

⁷⁰ Figures derived from Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d. ser. IV (June, 1872), 02; Church of England Temperance Society, General Balance Sheet January, 1874 - 31 March - 1875; and Twenty-second Annual Report, 1884, p. 150. The actual amounts were ~~£~~ 4,519/2/6 ~~£~~ 12,137/2/0.

⁷¹ Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-first Annual Report, 1883, p.6. The actual amount ~~£~~ 11,142/13/10 included parish receipts in only 2 dioceses.

⁷² Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-second Annual Report, 1884, p. 17; and Weekly Board Minutes, 22 April, 1884, n.p.

⁷³ Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-first Annual Report, 1883, p. 12.

⁷⁴ Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-eighth Annual Report, 1889, p. 19.

⁷⁵ Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-third Annual Report, 1885, p. 26; and Twenty-fourth Annual Report, 1886, p. 29.

⁷⁶ Church of England Temperance Society, Thirty-eighth Annual Report, 1899, p. 41.

⁷⁷ Church of England Temperance Society, Thirtieth Annual Report, 1891, pp. 23-25 and Appendix A, pp. 38-40.

⁷⁸ Church of England Temperance Society, Board Minutes, 17 December, 1889, n.p.

⁷⁹This discussion of the Missions to Cabmen is derived from Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-fifth Annual Report, 1887, p. 64; and Twenty-ninth Annual Report, 1890, pp. 45-47.

⁸⁰For example, Lady Bralazon, later Lady Meath, invited a group of cabmen to her home at Lancaster Gate in 1887. Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-fifth Annual Report, 1887, p. 64.

⁸¹See Church of England Temperance Society Twenty-sixth Annual Report, 1887, p. 74.

⁸²Third ser. III (March, 1871), 41.

⁸³Church of England Temperance Chronicle, IV (1 June, 1876), 105-106.

⁸⁴Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-first Annual Report, 1883, p. 13.

⁸⁵Church of England Temperance Society, Twentieth Annual Report, 1882, p. 14; Twenty-fifth Annual Report, 1887, p. 42; and Forty-fourth Annual Report, 1905, pp. 96-101.

⁸⁶Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-sixth Annual Report, 1887, p. 24; Thirty-second Annual Report, 1893, pp. 34-38; and Thirty-fifth Annual Report, 1896, p. 28.

⁸⁷Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-second Annual Report, 1884, p. 5.

⁸⁸Church of England Temperance Society, Thirty-fifth Annual Report, 1896, p. 31.

⁸⁹Church of England Temperance Society, Nineteenth Annual Report, 1881, pp. 22-27.

⁹⁰This was the highest number of branches mentioned. Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-sixth Annual Report, 1887, p. 57.

⁹¹Church of England Temperance Society, Council Minutes, 1888, n.p. and Forty-second Annual Report, 1903, p. 31.

⁹²Ibid., loc. cit.

⁹³Church of England Temperance Society, Thirty-seventh Annual Report, 1898, p. 49. The number of abstaining adults was 129,141. The number of non-abstaining adults was 41,462. Ibid., loc. cit.

⁹⁴Church of England Temperance Chronicle V (1 May, 1877), 69; Church of England Temperance Society, Executive Minutes, 6 January, 1880, n.p. and Thirtieth Annual Report, 1891, p. 200.

⁹⁵Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-sixth Annual Report, 1887, p. 14.

⁹⁶Church of England Temperance Society, Nineteenth Annual Report, 1881, p. 14.

⁹⁷Church of England Temperance Chronicle, IV (1 July, and 1 August, 1876), 125 and 139.

⁹⁸Church of England Temperance Society, Executive Minutes, 3 March, 1885, n.p.

⁹⁹Church of England Temperance Chronicle, IV (1 August, 1876), 139.

¹⁰⁰Church of England Temperance Society, Nineteenth Annual Report, 1881, pp. 13 and 19.

¹⁰¹Church of England Temperance Society, Fifty-second Annual Report, 1913, pp. 23-24.

¹⁰²IV (1 November, 1876), 185.

¹⁰³Church of England Temperance Society, Thirtieth Annual Report, 1891, pp. 19-23. The figures were admitted to be incomplete.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., loc. cit.

¹⁰⁵By 1907, there were 18 C.E.T.S. Labour yards and homes for men and boys in various parts of England and Wales. Church of England Temperance Society, Forty-sixth Annual Report, 1907, p. 25.

¹⁰⁶Church of England Temperance Society, Executive Minutes, April and October, 1906, pp. 120 and 129; and Forty-sixth Annual Report, 1907, pp. 22-23.

¹⁰⁷I (December, 1862), 67-68. Capitalized letters were in the original.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., loc. cit.

¹⁰⁹In his, "Methodism and the Threat of Revolution, History Today, VII (November, 1957), 115-124.

¹¹⁰Only 25% of those English people surveyed in a

1966 Gallup Poll attended any services at least once a month. "A Quarter of Population Go to Church on Sundays", The Times, 29 April, 1966, p. 8.

111 In his, The Idea of the Victorian Church a Study of the Church of England 1833-1889 (Montreal, 1968).

112 Elie Halevy, England in 1815, Vol. 1 of a History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century, 6 vols., (London, 1961).

113 In his, "English Nonconformity and the Decline of Liberalism", American Historical Review, LXIII (January, 1958), 352-363.

114 Church of England Temperance Society, Twenty-seventh Annual Report, 1888, pp. 7-8.

115 The Times, 18 March, 1908, p. 14. He was supported by most Anglican Bishops.

116 W.S. Caine, cited in Official Year Book of the Church of England, 1883, p. 158.

117 A random sample of mail sent Davidson on his support for the Asquith Licensing Bill showed that of 62 laypeople who specified their denominational allegiance, 37 Anglicans opposed his stand, and only 14 supported it; no Nonconformists opposed his stand and 11 supported it. Lambeth Palace Library, Papers of Randall Davidson, four green boxes marked "Temperance and Licensing, 1907-1908."

118 p. 25.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I PRIMARY SOURCES

A. MANUSCRIPTS

Benson, E.W. Papers. Lambeth Palace Library.

Davidson, Randall. Papers. Lambeth Palace Library.

Ellison, Henry. Letter to F.W. Farrar, n.d. [c.1893].
Church of England Temperance Society Archives. Church
House, Westminster.

Farrar, F.W. Papers. Canterbury Cathedral Library.

Longley, Charles. Papers. Lambeth Palace Library.

Tait, A.C. Papers. Lambeth Palace Library.

Temple, Frederick. Papers. Lambeth Palace Library.

Wellesley, Gerald. Letter to Henry Ellison (3 May, 1855).
In possession of Randall Ellison, Esq.

Wightman, J.B. Personal Annotated Bible. Church of England
Temperance Society Archives. Church House, Westminster.

B. PRINTED GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Great Britain. Parliament. An Act for Regulating the Sale
of Intoxicating Liquors, 35 & 36 Victoria c.94. Public
General Statutes, 1872, pp. 681-727.

- - - - - . - - - - - . Census of 1861. Parlia-
mentary Papers, 1862, Vol. 50, pp. 1-189.

- - - - - . - - - - - . Census of 1861. Parlia-
mentary Papers, 1863, Vol. 53, pt. 1, pp. 89, 102-103.

- - - - - . - - - - - . Hansard's Parliamentary
Debates. 3d ser. Vols. 198-210 (1869-1872).

- . ----- . Religious Worship, England and Wales, 1851. Parliamentary Papers, 1852-1853, Vol. 79, pp. 188-238, 301.
- . ----- . House of Commons. A Bill to Amend the Laws Relating to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors. Parliamentary Papers, 1872, Vol. 2, pp. 303-397.
- . ----- . Intoxicating Liquor Laws Amendment Bill. Parliamentary Papers, 1872, Vol. 2, p. 346.
- . ----- . Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Bill). Parliamentary Papers, 1871, Vol. 2, pp. 489-588.
- . ----- . Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill. Parliamentary Papers, 1871, Vol. 4, pp. 449-452.
- . ----- . House of Lords. Select Committee on the Prevalence of Habits of Intemperance, 1877. Third Report. Irish University Press. British Parliamentary Papers. Social Problems. Drunkenness. Vol. 3.
- . ----- . Spiritous Liquors Licensing Bill. Parliamentary Papers, 1872, Vols. 5-6, pp. 243-342.
- C. PRINTED CHURCH DOCUMENTS
- Church of England. Convocation of Canterbury. Chronicle of Convocation. Vol. 3, part 2 - 3d ser. Vol. 11 (1860-1894). The new series began in 1873; the third series in 1883.
- . ----- . Lower House. Report by the Committee on Intemperance. London, 1869.
- . ----- . Report by the Committee on Intemperance. London, 1894.
- . ----- . Supplementary Report by the Committee on Intemperance, 30 October, 1873. Chronicle of Convocation, new ser. Vol. 1, Appendix, pp. 1-4.
- . ----- . Convocation of York. Lower House. Report by the Committee on Intemperance. Manchester, 1873.
- . ----- . Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England. Report of the Select Committee on Public Houses, agreed to a meeting of the Committee held 10th May, 1883. London, 1883.
- . ----- . Official Year Book of the Church of England. London, 1883.

- - - - - . The Six Lambeth Conferences 1867-1920.
Compiled under the direction of Lord Davidson of Lambeth.
London, 1929 [1920].

- - - - - . The Year Book of the Church. A Record of
Work and Progress in the Church of England. London,
1882.

D. PUBLISHED PROCEEDINGS OF NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL
TEMPERANCE CONFERENCES

British and Colonial Temperance Congress. British and
Colonial Temperance Congress. Edited by Frederick
Temple. London, 1886.

Centennial Temperance Conference. One Hundred Years of
Temperance. A Memorial Volume of the Centennial
Temperance Conference, held in Philadelphia, Pa.,
September, 1885. New York, 1886.

International Temperance and Prohibition Convention.
Proceedings of the International Temperance and Prohibi-
tion Convention, held in London, September 2nd, 3rd,
and 4th, 1862. Edited by J.C. Street, F.R. Lees and
D. Burns. London, 1862.

International Temperance Conference, 1876. Centennial
Temperance Volume. A Memorial of the International
Temperance Conference held in Philadelphia, June, 1876.
New York, 1877.

National Temperance Congress. Proceedings. London, 1885.

Temperance International Conference, 1880. Temperance
International Conference. Edited by H.C. Rudd and
H.T.C. Cox. Melbourne, 1880.

World's Temperance Congress, 1893. Temperance in All
Nations, History of the Cause in all Countries of the
Globe, Together with Papers and Essays, Addresses and
Discussions of the World's Temperance Congress Held by
the National Temperance Society, Chicago, June, 1893.
Edited by J.N. Stearns. New York, 1893.

World's Temperance Congress, 1900. Journal of the Proceed-
ings. London, 1900.

World's Temperance Convention. The Proceedings of the
World's Temperance Convention. London, 1846.

E. RECORDS AND PUBLICATIONS OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY TEMPERANCE ORGANIZATIONS

British Temperance League. Report of Public Meeting to Promote the Use of Unfermented Wine at Communion: Held in Music Hall, Edinburgh, on the Evening of Tuesday, 13th April, 1875. . . . Edinburgh, 1875.

Central Association for Stopping the Sale of Liquors on Sunday. Annual Meeting of the Central Association for Stopping the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors During the Whole of the Twenty-Four Hours of Sunday; Held in the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, On Friday, November 1st, 1867. Manchester, 1867.

- - - - - . First Annual Report. Manchester, 1867.

Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society. Church of England Temperance Magazine. New ser. I - 3d ser. IV (1864-1872). The third series began with the January, 1869 issue. See also Church of England Total Abstinence Society and Church of England Temperance Society.

- - - - - . Clerical Experiences of Total Abstinence. Edited by Thomas Rooke. London, 1867.

- - - - - . Parochial Temperance Societies: Hints on their Formation. Written by Thomas Rooke. London, 1866.

- - - - - . Annual Report [s], 1864 and 1868.

- - - - - . Manchester and Chester Diocesan Branch. First Annual Report. Manchester, 1868.

- - - - - . - - - - - . Quarterly Paper and Plan of District Meetings in Connexion with the Society. Fourth Quarter, 1868. Manchester, 1868.

- - - - - . Manchester, Chester and Ripon Diocesan Branch. Minutes of Bradford Auxiliary Committee, March, 1871. Bradford, 1871.

Church of England Temperance Society. Annual Report[s], 1873-1914.

- - - - - . The Church of England Temperance Chronicle. January, 1873 - April, 1888. Until 1876, this newspaper was issued monthly; thereafter weekly. Continued as Temperance Chronicle.

- - - - - . Church of England Temperance Tracts, Nos. 1-12. London, 1891.
- - - - - . Council Minutes. 20 May, 1873 - 12 May, 1879. (partly manuscript).
- - - - - . The Duty of Sunday School Teachers in Reference to the National Sin of Intemperance. Written by Alfred Sargent. n.d. [c.1876].
- - - - - . Executive Minutes. 27 May, 1879 - November, 1914. (partly manuscript).
- - - - - . Hints for the Formation and Conducting of Branch and Parochial Societies. London, 1873.
- - - - - . Intemperance: Its Bearing Upon Agriculture. Written by John Abbey. London, 1883 [1881].
- - - - - . Jubilee Book of the Church of England Temperance Society and Guide to the Bazaar. London, 1887.
- - - - - . A Practical Guide For the Formation and Management of . . . Branches of the Church of England Temperance Society. Written by T.D. Spain. London, 1876.
- - - - - . Sixty Years Old. A Short History of a Great Work, 1862-1922. London, 1922.
- - - - - . The Temperance Chronicle. May, 1888 - 21 August, 1914. Weekly newspaper. Continuation of the Church of England Temperance Chronicle.
- Church of England Total Abstinence Society. Church of England Temperance Magazine. I-II (October 1862 - December, 1863).
- - - - - . Prospectus of the Church of England Total Abstinence Society. London, 1862.
- London Temperance Hospital. London Temperance Hospital. London, 1875.
- - - - - . The Non-Alcoholic Treatment of Disease. London, 1876.
- National Association for the Amendment of the Liquor Laws. The People and the Licensing Laws. Written by Henry Ellison. London, 1872.

National Temperance League. "Church of England Conference on Temperance", Weekly Record of the Temperance Movement, No. 319 (10 May, 1862), pp. 163-165.

- - - - - . A Hand-Book of Temperance History. The National Temperance League's Annual for 1881. London, 1882.

- - - - - . "Proposed Conference of Clergymen of the Church of England", Weekly Record of the Temperance Movement, No. 318 (3 May, 1862), p. 150.

- - - - - . Temperance in the School, Opinions of the Bishop of Exeter [Frederick Temple], Rev. Canon Hopkins.... London, 1878.

National Union for the Suppression of Intemperance. Report for 1883. Manchester, 1883.

United Committee for the Prevention of the Demoralization of the Native Races by the Liquor Traffic. The Liquor Traffic with Native Races. Letter from the Archbishop. Written by E.W. Benson. London, 1887.

- - - - - . Memorial . . . to the President and Members of the International Anti-Slavery Conference of Powers, Now Assembled at Brussels. London, December, 1889.

United Kingdom Alliance. Address to the General Baptist Conference. Manchester, 1865.

- - - - - . A Full Report of the Proceedings of the Ministerial Conference on the Suppression of the Liquor Traffic held at Manchester, June, 1857. Manchester, 1857.

- - - - - . Methodism and the Liquor Traffic: Including Memorials to the Wesleyan Conference. Manchester, n.d.

- - - - - . Report, 1862.

F. BOOKS, PAMPHLETS AND ARTICLES BY NINETEENTH-CENTURY TEMPERANCE REFORMERS

Arthur, Uncle. Alarming Conspiracy Against Some of the Most Eminent Ministers and Professing Christians in England! As Demonstrated in the Consideration of the Question, Is it a Sin for Ministers and Professing Christians to Use Intoxicating Drinks as Beverages? Sheffield n.d. [c.1870].

- Baker, W.R. The Curse of Britain: An Essay on the Evils, Causes and Cure of Intemperance. London, 1838.
- Barker, Joseph. The Life of Joseph Barker written by himself. Edited by J.T. Barker. London, 1880.
- Bayly, Mrs. [Mary]. Ragged Homes and How to Mend Them. London, 1860 [1859].
- Booth, William. In Darkest England and the Way Out. London, 1890.
- Bowley, Samuel. An Address to Christian Professors. London, 1858.
- - - - - , et al. The Christian Church and the Temperance Movement. London, 1883.
- Buckingham, J. Silk. An Earnest Plea For the Reign of Temperance and Peace. . . submitted to the visitors of the Great Exhibition etc. London, 1851.
- - - - - . National Evils and Practical Remedies, With the Plan of a Model Town. London, 1849.
- Burns, Dawson. The Bases of Temperance Reform. London, 1872.
- - - - - . Christendom and the Drink Curse. London, 1875.
- - - - - . Local Option. 6th ed. London, 1909 [1885].
- - - - - . Temperance History. A Consecutive Narrative of the Rise, Development and Extension of Temperance Reform. 2 vols. London, 1889.
- - - - - . Temperance in the Victorian Age. London, 1897.
- Caine, William, ed. A Biographical Key to the Picture Containing One Hundred and Twenty Portraits of Temperance Reformers. Collected by Thomas Lythgoe. Manchester, 1860.
- Caine, William. Drinking in Schools and Colleges. A Paper Read Before the Prohibition and Temperance Convention in London. To which are added Notes on the Responsibility of the Clergy and the Wine of the Lord's Supper. Manchester, 1865.

- - - - - . Letter to the Clerical Journal and University Chronicle, Vol. 16, no. 374 (23 February, 1865), p. 178.
- - - - - . Thoughts for Christians on Bible Wines and Temperance. Manchester, 1875.
- Close, Francis. Two Sermons Preached on August 18th and August 25th 1839 to the Chartists and Female Chartists Respectively of Cheltenham. 2 vols. in one. London, 1839.
- - - - - . Why I Have Taken the Pledge. London, 1861.
- Couling, Samuel. History of the Temperance Movement In Great Britain and Ireland. London, 1862, 1880.
- Cruikshank, George. The Bottle, In Eight Plates. London, 1847.
- - - - - . The Glass and the New Crystal Palace. London, 1853.
- Dearden, Joseph. A Brief History of Ancient and Modern Teetotalism; with a short account of drunkenness, and the various means used for its suppression. Preston, 1840.
- - - - - . A Brief History of the Commencement and Success of Teetotalism. Preston, 1840.
- Dow, Neal. The Reminiscences of Neal Dow, Recollections of Eighty Years. Portland, Maine, 1898.
- Ellison, Henry. "The Call to Help". A Sermon Preached in Windsor Parish Church, On Sunday Evening, February 11th, 1866. Windsor, 1866.
- - - - - . "Church of England Temperance Society", in J.N. Stearns, ed. Temperance in all Nations, I, 207-214.
- - - - - . Sermons and Addresses on Church Temperance Subjects. London, 1894.
- - - - - . The Temperance Reformation Movement in the Church of England. London, 1869, 1878.
- Farrar, Frederick W. Abstinence From Evil. London, 1880.
- - - - - . Talks on Temperance (sermons delivered at Westminster Abbey). New York, 1877.

- - - - - . The Vow of the Nazarite. London, 1877.
- Firth, R. An Essay on Sacramental Wine In Which is Shewn the Sinfulness of Using Intoxicating Wine in the Holy Eucharist. London, 1841.
- French, Richard Valpy. Nineteen Centuries of Drink in England. 2nd ed. London, 1884.
- Gale, Henry. How the Church Alone Can Save the Nation from the Consequences of the Drinking System. London, 1877.
- - - - - . Temperance Papers. London, n.d. [c.1862].
- Garrett, John. A Letter to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury Respecting The Sunday Liquor Traffic. London, 1867.
- Gough, John B. Autobiography and Orations. London, 1855.
- - - - - . Autobiography and Personal Recollections of John B. Gough. Springfield, Mass., 1869.
- - - - - . The Farewell Oration of John B. Gough in Exeter Hall. London, 1860.
- - - - - . Orations on Temperance. London, n.d. [c.1883].
- Grier, R.M., ed. Clerical Memorial to the Bishops on Intemperance. Rugeley, Staffs., 1877.
- Grindrod, R.B. Bacchus. An Essay on the Nature, Causes, Effects and Cure of Intemperance. London, 1839.
- Gustafson, Axel. The Foundation of Death: A Study of the Drink Question. London, 1884.
- Hoyle, William. Intemperance and Crime; their Causes and Remedies. London, 1864.
- - - - - . Our National Resources and How They Are Wasted. London, 1871.
- - - - - . Temperance and the Gospel. An Argument on Christian Duty Addressed Especially to Wesleyan Methodists. London, 1886.
- - - - - . The Question of the Day; or, Facts and Figures For Electors and Politicians. London, 1874.

- Inwards, Jabez. Memorials of Temperance Workers: Containing Brief Sketches of Nearly One Hundred Deceased and Worthy Labourers. London, 1879.
- Jeffreys, Archdeacon [Henry]. The Religious Objection to Teatotalism [sic]. London, 1840.
- Kerr, Norman. Unfermented Wine a Fact. A Review of the Latest Attempt to Show that the Existence of Unfermented Wine among the Ancients was Impossible. London [1879].
- Kirk, John. Britain's Drawbacks: A Brief Review of the Chief of those National Errors which Retard the Prosperity of our Country. 3d ed. Glasgow, 1868.
- Lees, F.R. National Intemperance and the Remedy As Illustrated From the U.S. Manchester, 1871.
- - - - - . The Text-Book of Temperance. London, 1871.
- Legh, Henry E. How to Make a Temperance Speech with Numerous Outlines and Addresses. London, 1892.
- Lewis, David. Britain's Social State. Glasgow, 1879.
- - - - - . The Drink Problem and its Solution. London, 1881.
- - - - - . The Drink Traffic in the Nineteenth Century. London, 1885.
- Livesey, Joseph. Lecture on Malt Liquor. Preston, 1832.
- Logan, William. The Early Heroes of the Temperance Reformation. Glasgow, 1874.
- Maguire, Robert. First Words on Temperance. London, 1861.
- - - - - . Pastoral Letter Addressed to the Congregation of St. James, Clerkenwell. London, 3 May, 1859.
- - - - - . Temperance Landmarks, a Narrative of the Work and Workers, 1829-1879. London, 1879.
- Manning, Henry Edward. The Temperance Reform. London, 1882.
- - - - - . The Temperance Reformation: The United Kingdom Alliance and Local Option. Two Speeches . . . At Newcastle-on Tyne, September 4th and 5th, 1882. London, [1882].
- McCree, George W. Old Friends and New Faces. London, 1883.

- Marsh, Catherine. English Hearts and English Hands; or the Railway and the Trenches. Edited by F. Chalmers. New York, 1858.
- Mitchell, Kate. The Drink Question: Its Social and Medical Aspects. 2nd ed. London, 1891.
- Nelson, E. The Use of Ardent Spirits in a Professing Christian A Great Sin, A Discourse Delivered Before the Temperance Society in Woburn, December 14, 1829. Boston, 1830.
- Newman, F.W. Professor F.W. Newman on the Drink Traffic. Manchester, 1871.
- - - - - . Why the People Ought to Have a Veto on Sale of Drink: Manchester, 1867.
- Peek, Francis. "Intemperance: Its Prevalence, Effects, and Remedy", Contemporary Review, XXIX (December, 1876), 28-43.
- Powell, Frederick. Bacchus Dethroned. (Prize Essay). London, 1870; New York, 1878.
- Reid, William. The Communion Wine Question; a Plea for the Fruit of the Vine. Glasgow, 1873.
- - - - - . The Temperance Cyclopaedia. Glasgow, 1851.
- Richardson, B.W. The Temperance Lesson Book. London, 1878.
- Robinson, W.W. A Clergyman's Reason For Teetotalism. London, 1854.
- Sherlock, Frederick. Henry John Ellison, Founder of the Church of England Temperance Society. London, 1910.
- - - - - . Heroes In the Strife. London, 1881.
- - - - - . Illustrious Abstainers. London, 1880.
- Smith, James. The Temperance Reformation, Its Claims Upon the Christian Church. (a prize essay). London, 1875.
- Stanley, Edward. Addresses and Charges of Edward Stanley, Late Bishop of Norwich. Edited by A.P. Stanley. London, 1851.
- Stowell, Hugh. Lecture on the Permissive Maine-Law Movement, and Against the Wine Licensing Scheme. Delivered under the Auspices of the Huddersfield Alliance. April, 16, 1860. Manchester, 1860.

The Teetotalers, Wesleyan Conference, and the Sacrament, A Letter to the Ministers and Members of the Methodist Societies in the Resolution of Last Conference. By a Wesleyan. 2nd ed. Leeds, 1841.

Temple, Frederick. Bishop Temple on the Permissive Bill. Manchester, [1870].

- - - - - . National Aspects of the Temperance Reformation. London, 1884.

- - - - - . Occasions of Stumbling. A Sermon Preached at St. Mary's Nottingham on the Occasion of the Visit of the C.E.T.S. Autumnal Council. London, 1894.

Thompson, Henry, B.W. Richardson, F.W. Farrar, Edward Baines et. al. Moderate Drinking. Speeches. . . London, 1877.

Whittaker, Thomas P. "The Liquor Traffic: Should It Be Prohibited?", Dublin Review, XXXIII 3d ser. (July, 1879), 1-32.

Wightman, J.B. Annals of the Rescued. London, 1861.

- - - - - . Arrest the Destroyer's March. London, 1877.

- - - - - . Haste to the Rescue or Work While it is Day. London, 1860.

Wilberforce, Basil. The Established Church and the Liquor Traffic: Being a Letter Addressed to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. London, 1882.

Winskill, Peter T. The Comprehensive History of the Rise and Progress of the Temperance Reformation from the Earliest Period to September, 1881. Warrington, 1881.

- - - - - . The Temperance Movement and its Workers. A Record of Social, Moral, Religious and Political Progress. 4 vols. London, 1892.

- - - - - . Temperance Standard Bearers of the Nineteenth Century. A Biographical and Statistical Dictionary. Manchester, 1897.

Wright, Frank. Upwards of One Hundred Testimonials From Clergymen, Ministers, Elders, Deacons and Secretaries of Churches of Every Denomination, In Favour of the Use of Unfermented Wine Made and Sold by Frank Wright. . . London, 1875.

G. OTHER NINETEENTH-CENTURY PUBLICATIONS

- "The Abstaining Clergy", The Clerical Journal and Church and University Chronicle, Vol. 16, No. 373 (9 February, 1865), p. 123.
- "The Bible and Strong Drinks", Westminster Review, CIII (January, 1875), 23-29.
- "Does Alcohol Act As a Food?" Cornhill Magazine, VI (September, 1862), 319-329.
- "The Fall of Mr. Gladstone's Government", Dublin Review, new ser., XXII (April, 1874), 450-461.
- Froude, Hurrell. Remains. London, 1838.
- Harcourt, William. Local Option and the Liquor Traffic. Manchester, 1888.
- Lovett, William. The Life and Struggles of William Lovett in his Pursuit of Bread, Knowledge, and Freedom. London, 1876.
- "The Physiological Influences of Alcohol", Edinburgh Review, CXLII (July, 1875), 74-89.
- Proceedings of the Oecumenical Methodist Conference Held in City Road Chapel. London, 1882.
- "The Puffery of Virtue", The Saturday Review, XVI (16 December, 1865), 757.
- The Record, January, 1862 - June, 1862.
- The Rock, January, 1868 - December, 1868.
- Tait, A.C. Some Thoughts on the Duties of the Established Church of England as a National Church Being Seven Addresses delivered at his Second Visitation. London, 1876.
- "Teetotalism and the Church of England", The Saturday Review, XIII (10 May, 1862), 527-528.
- The Times, 1871 and 1872.
- Wilberforce, William. Private Papers of William Wilberforce. Edited by A. M. Wilberforce. London, 1897.
- "Women and Alcohol", Spectator, 18 February, 1871.
- Wordsworth, Charles. On Temperance Societies. Lincoln, 1873.

II SECONDARY SOURCES

A. BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Gustafson, Axel. The Foundation of Death: A Study of the Drink Question. London, 1884, pp. 503-562.

Harrison, Brian. "Drink and Sobriety in England 1815-1872 A Critical Bibliography", International Review of Social History, XII (1967), 204-276.

London School of Economics. A London Bibliography of the Social Sciences. London, 1931-1936.

Toronto Public Libraries. Bibliography on Temperance. Toronto, n.d.

B. ATLAS, DICTIONARIES AND DIRECTORIES

The Annual Register, CXIII-CXIV (1871-1872).

Cassel's Complete Atlas. London, n.d. [c.1861].

Crockford's Clerical Directory. London, 1865, 1868, and 1885.

Dod's Parliamentary Companion, 1871, 1872 and 1874.

Lee, Sidney, ed. The Dictionary of National Biography. The Concise Dictionary. London, 1920.

Lodge, Edmund. The Peerage and Baronetage of the British Empire. London, 1875.

Simon, André L. A Dictionary of Wines, Spirits and Liquors. New York, 1963.

"Temperance Movement", Chamber's Encyclopaedia. London, 1868, IX, 347-352.

Townsend, G.H. The Handbook of the Year 1868. London, 1869.

Who was Who, 1916-1928. London, 1929.

C. BIOGRAPHIES

Aitken, W.F. Frederick Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury. London, 1901.

- Atlay, J.B. The Life of the Right Reverend Ernest Roland Wilberforce, First Bishop of Newcastle - on Tyne and Afterward Bishop of Chichester. London, 1902.
- Bayne, Ronald. "Farrar, Frederick William", in L. Stephens and S. Lee, eds. Dictionary of National Biography, Second Supplement, 1901-1911. London, 1959-1960, 9-12.
- - - - - . "Livesey, Joseph", in L. Stephens and S. Lee, eds. Dictionary of National Biography. London, 1959-1960, XI, 1259-1260.
- Bell, G.K.A. Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury. London, 1938.
- Benham, William. Catherine and Crawford Tait. New York, 1880.
- Benson, A.C. The Life of Edward White Benson Sometime Archbishop of Canterbury. 2 vols. London, 1900.
- Bickersteth, Montague C.A. Sketch of the Life and Episcopate of the Right Reverend Robert Bickersteth, Bishop of Ripon, 1857-1884. London, 1887.
- Birmingham, Joseph. A Memoir of the Very Rev. Theobald Matthew. New York, 1941.
- Boase, George C. "Close, Francis", Dictionary of National Biography, V, 579.
- - - - - . "Maguire, Robert", Dictionary of National Biography, XII, 776.
- "Canon Ellison", Illustrated London News. New York edition. XXVI (13 January, 1900), 43.
- Carus, William. Memoirs of the Life of Rev. Charles Simeon, M.A. New York, 1847.
- Coupland, Reginald. Wilberforce. London, 1945.
- Davidson, R.T., and William Benham. Life of Archibald Campbell Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury. 2 vols. London, 1891.
- Diggle, John W. The Lancashire Life of Bishop Fraser. London, 1891.
- "Ellison, Henry John", in Frederick Boase, ed. Modern Biographical Dictionary. London, 1963, [1912], V. 224.

- Ervine, St. John. General William Booth of the Salvation Army. New York, 1932.
- Farrar, Reginald. The Life of Frederick William Farrar. New York, 1904.
- Fells-Smith, Charlotte. "Burns, Dawson", Dictionary of National Biography, Second Supplement, 1901-1911, pp. 272-273.
- Fletcher, J.M.J. Mrs. Wightman of Shrewsbury, The Story of a Pioneer in Temperance Work. London, 1906.
- Forster, E.M. Marianne Thornton, 1797-1883, A Domestic Biography. London, 1956.
- Gill, J.C. Parson Bull of Byerley. London, 1963.
- - - - - . The Ten Hours Parson. Christian Social Action in the Eighteen-Thirties. London, 1959.
- Hodder, Edwin. The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury. 3 vols. London, 1887.
- Hopkins, M.A. Hannah More and Her Circle. New York, 1947.
- Hughes, Thomas. James Fraser. Bishop of Manchester. A Memoir 1818-1885. London, 1887.
- Hutton, Arthur W. Cardinal Manning. London, 1894.
- Killen, W.D. Memoir of John Edgar, D.D. Professor of Systematic Theology for the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Belfast, 1867.
- Kingsley, Charles. Letters and Memoirs of His Life. Edited by his wife. London, 1877.
- Kirk-Smith, H. William Thomson Archbishop of York. His Life and Times 1819-1890. London, 1958.
- Lemire, J.M. Le Cardinal Manning et son action social. Paris, 1894.
- Liddon, Henry P. Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey. 4 vols. London, 1893-1897.
- Macdonell, J.C. The Life and Correspondence of William Connor Magee. Archbishop of York and Bishop of Peterborough. 2 vols. London, 1896.
- Magnus, Philip. Gladstone. London, 1954.

- Marsh, Peter. The Victorian Church in Decline, Archbishop Tait and the Church of England, 1868-1882. London, 1969.
- Meacham, Standish. Henry Thornton of Clapham, 1760-1815. Cambridge, Mass., 1964.
- Morley, John. The Life of William Ewart Gladstone. 3 vols. London, 1903.
- Moule, H.C.G. Charles Simeon. London, 1892.
- Norgate, G. LeGrys. "Sandford, John", Dictionary of National Biography, V, 275-276.
- Overton, J.H., and Elizabeth Wordsworth. Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln 1807-1895. London, 1888.
- Prothero, R.E. The Life and Correspondence of Arthur Penhryn Stanley. London, 1894.
- Purcell, E.S. Life of Cardinal Manning. 2 vols. London, 1898.
- Rawnsley, H.D. Harvey Goodwin, Bishop of Carlisle: A Biographical Memoir. London, 1896.
- Reid, Wemyss, ed. The Life of William Ewart Gladstone. London, 1899.
- "The Rev. H.J. Ellison, M.A.", The Church Portrait Journal, A Monthly Paper for Church People, I (October, 1877), 97.
- "The Rev. R. Maguire", The Blue Ribbon Official Gazette and Gospel Temperance Herald, IV (27 May, 1885), 161.
- Russell, G.W.E. Basil Wilberforce. A Memoir. London, 1917.
- - - - - "Lawson, Sir Wilfrid", Dictionary of National Biography, Second Supplement, 1901-1911, 428-431.
- Sandford, E.G. Memoirs of Archbishop Temple. 2 vols. London, 1906.
- Stanley, A.P. Memories of Edward and Catherine Stanley. London, 1880.
- Stephens, W.R.W., ed. A Memoir of Richard Durnford, Sometime Bishop of Chichester. London, 1889.

Sumner, George Henry. Life of Charles Richard Sumner Bishop of Winchester and Prelate of the Noble Order of the Garter During a Forty Years Episcopate. London, 1876.

"Thomas Bouffler", The Blue Ribbon Official Gazette and Gospel Temperance Herald, IV (20 May, 1885), 154.

Thomas, Ethel H. The Life and Letters of William Thomson Archbishop of York. London, 1918.

Turner, Ralph E. James Silk Buckingham, 1786-1855, A Social Biography. London, 1934.

Ward, William. The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman. 2 vols. London, 1913.

Westcott, Arthur. Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, Sometime Bishop of Durham. 2 vols. London, 1903.

Williams, T. J. Priscilla Lydia Sellon. London, 1950.

D. OTHER BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Ausubel, Herman. In Hard Times: Reformers among the Late Victorians. New York, 1968.

Baird, R. Histoire des sociétés de tempérance des Etats-Unis de l'Amerique, avec quelques détails sur celles de l'Angleterre, de la Suede, et autres contrées. Paris, 1836.

Barbu, Zevedei. Democracy and Dictatorship: Their Psychology and Patterns of Life. New York, 1956.

Benn, A.W. History of English Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century. 2 vols. New York, 1962, [1906].

Bowen, Desmond. The Idea of the Victorian Church, A Study of the Church of England, 1833-1889. Montreal, 1968.

Briggs, Asa. The Age of Improvement, 1783-1867. London, 1960.

Brown, Ford K. Fathers of the Victorians: The Age of Wilberforce. Cambridge, 1961.

Burn, W.L. The Age of Equipoise. New York, 1965.

Burnett, J. Plenty and Want: A Social History of Diet in England from 1815 to the Present Day. London, 1966.

- Campbell, Richardson. Rechabite History: A Record of the Origin, Rise and Progress of the Independent Order of Rechabites and Salford Unity. Manchester, 1911.
- Carter, H. The English Temperance Movement: A Study in Objectives. London, 1933.
- Chadwick, Owen. The Victorian Church. 2 parts. London, 1966, 1970.
- Christensen, T. Origin and History of Christian Socialism, 1848-1854. Aarhus, 1962.
- Clapham, John. An Economic History of Modern Britain Free Trade and Steel 1850-1886. Cambridge, 1967.
- Coddington, F.J.O. "The Father of the Rescue Squad", Bulletin of the Magistrates' Association, VII (May-June, 1945), 106-107.
- Cornish, F.W. History of the English Church in the Nineteenth Century. 2 parts. London, 1910.
- Cowherd, R.G. The Politics of English Dissent. The Religious Aspects of Liberal and Humanitarian Reform Movements from 1815 to 1848. London, 1959.
- Davies, R. and G. Rupp, eds. A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain. London, 1965.
- Dingle, A.E., and Brian Harrison. "Cardinal Manning as Temperance Reformer", Historical Journal, Vol. 12, No. 3 (1969), pp. 485-510.
- Dodd, A.H. "The Nonconformist Conscience in Public Life", Hibbert Journal, XXVI (January, 1938), 212-224.
- Elliott-Binns, L.E. The Early Evangelicals: A Religious and Social Study. London, 1953.
- Ensor, R.C.K. England, 1870-1914. London, 1936.
- Faber, Geoffrey. Oxford Apostles, A Character Study of the Oxford Movement. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1954.
- Fahey, David. "Temperance and the Liberal Party - Lord Peel's Report, 1899", The Journal of British Studies, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 132-159.
- Faulkner, H.U. Chartism and the Churches: A Study in Democracy. New York, 1916.

- Glaser, John F. "English Nonconformity and the Decline of Liberalism", American Historical Review, LXIII (January, 1958), 352-63.
- Halévy, Elie. A History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century. 6 vols. London, 1961.
- Hall, M. Penelope, and Ismene V. Howes. The Church in Social Work. A Study of Moral Welfare Work Undertaken by the Church of England. London, 1965.
- Hanham, H.J. Elections and Party Management: Politics in the Time of Disraeli and Gladstone. London, 1959.
- Harrison, Brian. "The British Prohibitionists, 1853-1872. A Biographical Analysis", International Review of Social History, Vol. 10, part 3 (1970), pp. 375-467.
- - - - - . Drink and the Victorians. The Temperance Question in England 1815-1872. London, 1971.
- - - - - . "Drunkards and Reformers: Early Victorian Temperance Tracts", History Today, XIII (March 1963), 178-185.
- - - - - . "The Power of Drink", The Listener, Vol. 81, No. 2081 (13 February, 1969), pp. 204-206.
- - - - - . "Religion and Recreation in 19th Century England", in Papers Presented to the Past and Present Conference on Popular Religion (7 July, 1966). London, 1966.
- - - - - . "The Sunday Trading Riots of 1855", Historical Journal, Vol. 8, No. 2 (1965), pp. 219-245.
- - - - - . The Temperance Question in England, 1829-1869. 2 Vols. Unpublished D. Phil. Thesis. Oxford, 1965.
- - - - - . "Two Roads to Social Reform: Francis Place and the 'Drunken Committee of 1834'", Historical Journal, Vol. 11, No. 2 (1968), pp. 272-300.
- - - - - . "'A World of Which We Had No Conception': Liberalism and the Temperance Press, 1830-1872". Victorian Studies, XIII (December, 1968), 125-158.
- - - - - , and Barrie Trinder. "Drink and Sobriety in an Early Victorian Country Town: Banbury 1830-1860", The English Historical Review, Supplement 4. London, 1969.

- Hayier, M.H.C. The Vision of a Century: 1853-1953: The United Kingdom Alliance in Historical Retrospect. London, 1953.
- Heasman, Kathleen. Evangelicals in Action: An Appraisal of their Social Work in the Victorian Era. London, 1962.
- Heilpern, John. "At Home With Cantaur", The Observer, 18 April 1971, p. 25.
- Hinton, R.J. English Radical Leaders. New York, 1875.
- Hobsbawn, E.J. "Methodism and the Threat of Revolution in Britain", History Today VIII (November, 1957), 115-124.
- Hollis, Patricia, and Brian Harrison. "Chartism, Liberalism and the Life of Robert Lowery", English Historical Review, LXXXII (July, 1967), 503-535.
- Hyslop, Sir R.M. The Centenary of the Temperance Movement, 1832-1932. London, 1932.
- Inglis, K.S. Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England. London, 1963.
- - - - - . "Patterns of Worship in 1851", Journal of Ecclesiastical History, XI (April, 1960), 74-86.
- Johnson, W. Branch, "The Inn as Community Centre", The Amateur Historian, II (April - May, 1955), 134-137.
- Keating, Joseph. The Drink Question. Catholic Studies in Social Reform. London, 1914.
- Kendall, H.B. History of the Primitive Methodist Church. rev. ed. London, 1919.
- Kitson, Clark, George. The Making of Victorian England. Being the Ford Lectures Delivered before the University of Oxford. London, 1962.
- Lallemand, Ludger, M. Perrin, J.L.P. Duroy, et al. Du Rôle de l'alcool et des anesthésiques dans l'organisme. Paris, 1860.
- Longmate, Norman. The Waterdrinkers. London, 1968.
- Mackenzie, Fred A. Sober By Act of Parliament. London, 1896.
- Marx, Karl, and F. Engels. On Britain. Moscow, 1953.

- Mathias, Peter. The Brewing Industry in England 1700-1830. Cambridge, 1959
- - - - - "The Brewing Industry, Temperance and Politics", The Historical Journal, Vol. 1, No. 2 (1958), pp. 97-104.
- Newsome, David A. The Wilberforces and Henry Manning. Cambridge, 1966.
- Owen, David. English Philanthropy, 1660-1960. Cambridge, 1964.
- Pickering, W.S.F. "The 1851 Religious Census - a Useless Experiment?" The British Journal of Sociology, XVIII (September, 1967), 382-407.
- Pittman, D.J., and C.R. Snyder, eds. Society, Culture and Drinking Patterns. New York, 1962.
- Pratt, Edwin A. The Licensed Trade. London, 1907.
- "A Quarter of Population Go to Church on Sundays", The Times, 24 April, 1966, p. 8.
- Richardson, A.E., and H.D. Eberlein. The English Inn Past and Present. A Review of its History and Social Life. London, 1925.
- Rowntree, Joseph, and Arthur Sherwell. The Temperance Problem and Social Reform. New York, 1900.
- Rutland, Janetta. "How Intemperance Has Been Successfully Combated", New Review, VI (January - June, 1892), 76-88; 460-471.
- Soloway, Richard A. Prelates and People, Ecclesiastical and Social Thought in England, 1783-1832. London, 1969.
- Thistlewaite, F. The Anglo-American Connection in the Early Nineteenth Century. Philadelphia, 1959.
- Thompson, David M. "The 1851 Religious Census. Problems and Possibilities", Victorian Studies, XI (September, 1967), 87-97.
- Thompson, E.P. The Making of the English Working Classes. London, 1963.
- Townsend, Henry. The Claims of the Free Churches. London, 1949.

- Townsend, W.J., H.B. Workman and G. Eayrs. A New History of Methodism. London, 1909.
- Vidler, Alex R. F.D. Maurice and Company. Nineteenth Century Studies. London, 1966.
- Vincent, John. The Formation of the Liberal Party. London, 1966.
- Warner, Wellman J. The Wesleyan Movement and the Industrial Revolution. London, 1930.
- Wearmouth, Robert F. Methodism and the Working Class Movements of England, 1800-1850. London, 1937.
- Webb, Sidney, and Beatrice. The History of Liquor Licensing in England Principally from 1700 to 1830. London, 1903.
- - - - - . The Parish and the County. Vol. I of English Local Government from the Revolution to the Municipal Corporations Act. 8 vols. London, 1906-1929.
- Wilson, G.B. Alcohol and the Nation. A Contribution to the Study of the Liquor Problem in the United Kingdom for 1800-1935. London, 1940.

MAP SHOWING THE LOCATION OF CLERICAL ABSTAINERS
IN ENGLAND AND WALES IN 1864



See following pages for code and notes.

CODE AND NOTES TO APPENDIX A

The municipalities named on the map had 3 or more teetotal clerics in 1864.

- - 1 Teetotal cleric
- - 10 Teetotal clerics

No. on Map	Region	County	No. of Teetotal clerics - 1864
	<u>North</u>		42
1		Cumberland	13
2		Northumberland	4
3		Westmoreland	8
4		Durham	17
	<u>North-West</u>		50
5		Lancashire	41
6		Cheshire	9
7		<u>Yorkshire</u>	28
	<u>North-midlands</u>		33
8		Derbyshire	14
9		Nottinghamshire	2
10		Lincolnshire	10
11		Rutlandshire	1
12		Leicestershire	6
	<u>West-midlands</u>		81
13		Shropshire	11
14		Staffordshire	16
15		Herefordshire	6
16		Worcestershire	7
17		Warwickshire	20
18		Gloucestershire	21
	<u>East</u>		24
19		Norfolk	11
20		Suffolk	5
21		Essex	8

Appendix A--Continued

No. on Map	Region	County	No. of Teetotal Clerics - 1864
	<u>South-midlands</u>		19
22		Oxfordshire	3
23		Northamptonshire	7
24		Huntingdonshire	2
25		Buckinghamshire	3
26		Bedfordshire	2
27		Hertfordshire	2
28		Cambridgeshire	-
-		Middlesex	-
	<u>South-west</u>		31
29		Cornwall	4
30		Devonshire	4
31		Somersetshire	8
32		Wiltshire	5
33		Dorsetshire	10
	<u>South-east</u>		32
34		Berkshire	6
35		Hampshire	7
36		Surrey	2
37		Kent	10
38		Sussex	7
		<u>London</u>	42
		<u>Isle of Man</u>	9
		<u>Guernsey</u>	4
		<u>Isle of Wight</u>	2
		<u>Isle of Sark</u>	1
	TOTALS	England (incl. islands)	398
		England (mainland)	382
		Wales	28
		England and Wales (incl. islands)	426

The names and locations of the teetotal clerics are listed by diocese in, Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, pp. 3-15.

Appendix A--Continued

Repetitions have been eliminated by the author. Places have been located mainly with the aid of Cassel's Complete Atlas, London, n.d. [c. 1861].

APPENDIX B

The Positions Held by Teetotal Clerics in
the English and Welsh Dioceses in 1864.

<u>Parish Clergymen</u>		
Curates	120	
Rectors	57	
Ministers	6	
Vicars	49	
Incumbents	137	
Lecturer	1	
Chaplains (I. of Man)	3	
	373	373
<u>Chaplains to Poor-Law Unions</u>		
City of London	1	
Minster	1	
Halifax	1	
Wolstanton and Bursleam	1	
	4	4
<u>Chaplains to Jails</u>		
Borough of Portsmouth	1	
County of Worcester	1	
City of Shrewsbury	1	
	3	3
<u>Chaplains to Seamen</u>		
North Shields	1	
Bristol	1	
Swansea	1	
	3	3

Appendix B--ContinuedChaplains to Armed Forces

Devonport	2	
Newport (I. of W.)	1	
Woolwich	<u>1</u>	
	4	4

<u>Chaplain</u> to Earl of Albemarle		1
--------------------------------------	--	---

Evangelical Home Missions

Church Pastoral Aid Society	3	
London Diocesan Home Mission	4	
Jews' Society (Louth Lincs.)	1	
Islington Protestant Institute	1	
Lords' Day Observance Society	<u>1</u>	
	10	10

Educational Institutions

Fellow - Durham U.	1	
Head Master - Marine School S. Shields	1	
Head Master - Grammar School Haverfordwest	1	
Ass't Masters - Repton School	2	
Professor - St. David's College, Lampeter	1	
Kensington Grammar School	1	
South Metropolitan Schools, Sutton	1	
Chaplain, Royal Laboratory, Devenport	<u>1</u>	
	9	9

"Dignitaries"

<u>Deans</u>		2
Francis Close (Carlisle) and W. Guille (Guernsey)		

Appendix B--Continued

<u>Rural Dean</u>				
E. E. Allan (Diocese of Carlisle)			1	
<u>Canons</u>				
J. Babington of Peterborough			3	
Lord W. Russell of Windsor				
Evan Jenkins of Llandaff				
<u>Seigneur</u>				
W. Collings of Isle of Sark			1	
<u>Prebendary</u>				
Henry Ellison of Windsor			1	
			—	
			8	8
	<u>Total</u>	415		
	Retired 2	+ 2		
	No positions given	+ 9		
		—		
			426	total clerics in England and Wales.

The positions of most ~~teetotal~~ clerics in 1864 are given in Church of England and Ireland ~~Temperance~~ Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, pp. 310, 3-15. Crockford's Clerical Director[ies] for 1864 and 1868 were also consulted.

APPENDIX C

Distribution of Teetotal Clerics in 1864 as Compared with
Strength of Anglican Church in Proportion to Other
Denominations and to Total Population, as well as with Rate of Population Increase

	No. of Teetotal Clerics ²	Proportion % of Church Sit- tings to Total No. ³ of Sittings, 1851 ³		Proportion % of Attendants at most Numerously Attended Services, 1851 ⁴		Proportion % of Attendances to Total Pop., 1851 ⁵		Decennial Rate % of Pop. In- crease ⁶	
		Provided by Church of England	Provided by Others	Church of England	Non-Con- formists	R.C.s	All Denominations		
A. By Region ¹									
England + Wales	426	51.9 *	48.1 *	51.70 *	43.25 *	5.05 *	58.39 *	12	
England	398	55.64 *	44.35 *	51.70 *	43.25 *	5.05 *	58.39 *	12	
Wales	28	30.65	69.35	21.14	77.66	1.20	82.62	11	
B. By County									
West-midlands	81	60.67	39.33	56.20	39.36	4.44	54.59	14	
North-west	50	48.25	51.75	43.51	36.79	19.70	45.62	18	
North	42	47.40	52.60	42.65	49.51	7.84	41.87	19	
North-midlands	33	54.12	45.88	43.30	54.45	2.25	63.07	6	
South-east	32	65.33	34.67	66.44	32.11	1.45	61.13	13	
South-west	31	56.02	43.98	51.12	48.08	.80	72.76	2	
East	24	62.07	37.93	62.10	37.05	.85	72.84	3	
South-midlands	19	57.61	42.39	55.22	44.02	.76	80.03	5	
B. By County									
London	42	59.3	40.7	57.46	34.63	7.91	37.01	19	
Lancashire	41	47.7	52.3	41.88	35.97	22.15	44.05	19	
Yorkshire	28	45.70	54.30	38.98	56.47	4.55	54.97	13	
Gloucestershire	21	56.1	43.9	61.67	35.51	2.82	65.55	6	
Warwickshire	20	60.0	40.0	58.02	34.80	7.18	48.86	17	
Durham	17	37.8	62.2	34.26	56.35	9.39	42.63	32	
Staffordshire	16	53.8	46.2	47.83	45.84	6.33	48.83	22	
Derbyshire	14	46.0	54.0	40.49	56.32	3.19	58.47	13	
Cumberland	13	53.1	46.9	57.67	35.69	6.64	37.28	5	

NOTES TO APPENDIX C

¹The counties included in these regions are the same as those indicated in the notes to Appendix A. All the regions of England are included here except London and Yorkshire which for the purposes of this study are listed with the counties.

²The figures in these columns are derived from information in Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, pp. 3-15.

³These figures are from Great Britain, Parliament, Religious Worship, England and Wales, 1851, Parliamentary Papers, 1852-1853, Vol. 79, p. 301. Figures calculated to one decimal point are as they were in the Census; those calculated to two decimal points are averages of counties calculated by the author from information in the Census.

⁴These figures were calculated by the author from statistics given in ibid., Vol. 79, pp. 188-238. In order to avoid employing the greatly-criticized formulas which Horace Mann used in the Census to account for multiple attendances, only attendances at the most numerous-attended service of each denomination were included by the author in this study.

⁵These figures were calculated by the author from statistics given in ibid., loc. cit. Horace Mann's equally-criticized techniques for determining who should be expected to attend religious services and who should not have also been avoided. The author has simply calculated the proportion of the total attendances at the religious services of all denominations in each area to the total population for those areas.

⁶Great Britain, Parliament, Census of 1861, Parliamentary Papers, 1863, Vol. 53, pt. 1, pp. 89, 102-103.

*These figures represent averages calculated by the author of the figures for each of the regions of England given below in each column.

APPENDIX D

Changes in the Number of Teetotal Clerics in England and
Wales, from 1864 to 1872 - According to Dioceses.

I.	<u>Province of York</u>	<u>1864</u>	<u>1866</u>	<u>1872</u>
	York	17	19	20
	Carlisle	21	23	22
	Durham	21	19	16
	Chester	18	35	49
	Manchester	31	34	71
	Ripon	11	14	29
	Sodor and Man	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>
	Totals	128	154	215
II.	<u>Province of Canterbury</u>			
	<u>A. English Dioceses</u>			
	Canterbury	9	11	10
	London	37	43	42
	Winchester	22	20	14
	Bath and Wells	9	12	11
	Ely	6	8	12
	Exeter	9	8	16
	Gloucester and Bristol	19	22	28
	Hereford	10	10	10
	Lichfield	36	48	47
	Lincoln	11	10	14
	Norwich	15	17	11
	Oxford	12	16	17
	Peterborough	15	18	12
	Chichester	7	9	6
	Rochester	11	8	5
	Salisbury	15	11	15
	Worcester	<u>26</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>20</u>
	Totals	269	298	290

APPENDIX D cont'd.

	<u>1864</u>	<u>1866</u>	<u>1872</u>
<u>B. Welsh Dioceses</u>			
Bangor	3	4	1
Llandaff	8	8	5
St. Asaph	6	7	5
St. David's	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>
Totals	29	31	23
Totals Province of Canterbury	298	329	313
<u>III. Totals</u>			
England	397	483	505
Wales	<u>29</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>23</u>
England and Wales	426	514	528

Figures are derived from Church of England and Ireland Temperance Reformation Society, Second Annual Report, 1864, pp. 3-15; and Fourth Annual Report, 1866, pp. 29-40; and Church of England Temperance Magazine, 3d ser. IV (October, November and December, 1872), 187-193; 206-213; 222-228.

APPENDIX E

Outline Of Main Proposals For Licensing Legislation In 1871-1872

(The "Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill" of the United Kingdom Alliance proposed that the mayor of a borough or the poor-law guardians of the parish be ordered to prohibit entirely the sale of intoxicating liquors in their jurisdictions after they had been so instructed in a vote by 3/5s of the rate-payers. Great Britain, House of Commons, Parliamentary Papers, 1871, Vol. 4, pp. 449-452).

Sponsor	National Association 1869-1871	National Association 1872	Government 1871	Government 1871	Selwin-Ibbetson 1872
Title	Intoxicating Liquors Licensing Bill.	A Bill to Amend the Laws Relating to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors.	Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Bill).	An Act for Regulating the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors.	Spiritous Liquors Licensing Bill.
Licensing Authority	Licensing Board of 5-9 members, elected by local rate-payers.	Licensing Board of 6-9 members, elected by local free-holders and rate-payers	Justices. (In certain cases, rate-payers may negative by 3/5s vote number of licenses granted).	Justices.	Justices.

Appendix E (continued)

Sponsor	National Association 1869-1871	National Association 1872	Government 1871	Government 1872	Selwin-Ibbetson 1872
Powers of Licensing Authority	To regulate conduct and number of public-houses.	To regulate conduct and number of public-houses.	To regulate conduct and number of public-houses.	To regulate conduct and number of public-houses.	To regulate conduct and number of public-houses.
Formula to Determine Number of Public-Houses		FOR INNS ONLY Licensing Districts in A. Towns under 1000-1 1-2000-2, etc. B. Other Places under 500 - 1 500-1000 - 2 etc.	Licensing Districts in A. Towns under 1500 - 1 pub 1500-3000 - 2 pubs 3000-4000 - 3 pubs B. Other Places under 900 - 1 pub 900-1200 - 2 pubs 1200-1800 - 3 pubs.	Eliminated in 1872 Act.	No more than 1 licensed premises to every 300 inhabitants.

Appendix E (continued)

Sponsor:	National Association 1869-1871	National Association 1872	Government 1871	Government 1872	Selwin-Ibbetson 1872
Beer-Shops	All to be eliminated on death of present owners; or vacation of licenses, by removal, insolvency or forfeiture.	Same as 1871 bill.	To be treated like public-houses.	To be treated like public-houses.	To be given special licenses.
Business Hours	I. Nomination and Election Days, Good Friday and other days appointed by Parliament - closed whole day. II. Sunday, Christmas and Public Thanksgiving days - (i) for consumption on premises - closed all day.	Same as 1871 except:	I. London and towns over 10,000 (i) Sunday, Christmas, Good Friday, Public fast and thanks-giving days. A. For consumption off premises - closed except 12:00-3:00 P.m. 5:00-9:00 P.m. B. For consumption on premises - closed all day.	I. London (i) Sunday, Christmas, Good Friday - closed except 1:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m.-6:00 p.m.-11:00 p.m. (ii) Other days - closed except 5:00 a.m.-11:00 p.m.	I. For consumption off premises. (i) Sunday, Christmas, Good Friday, Appointed Thanksgiving and fast days -closed except 11:30 a.m.-2:30 p.m. 8:00 p.m.-11:00 p.m. (ii) Ordinary days - closed except 7:00 a.m.-10:00 p.m.

Appendix E (continued)

Sponsor	National Association 1869-1871	National Association 1872	Government 1871	Government 1872	Selwin-Ibbetson 1872
Business Hours (continued)	<p>(ii) For consumption off premises closed except 1:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m. 8:00 p.m.-10:00 p.m.</p> <p>III. Ordinary Days - closed 10:00 p.m. to ----- a.m.</p>	<p>II. Other Places</p> <p>(i) Sunday, Christmas, Good Friday, Public Fast and Thanks-giving days - A. Inns, etc. closed except 12:30-3:00 p.m.</p> <p>5:00-9:00 p.m.</p> <p>B. Other pubs -closed except 1:00-3:00 p.m. 7:00-9:00 p.m.</p> <p>(ii) Ordinary Days - closed except 7:00 a.m.-9:00 p.m.</p>	<p>II. Other Places</p> <p>(i) Sundays, Christmas, Good Friday - closed except 12:30-2:30 p.m.*</p> <p>6:00-10:00 p.m.+</p> <p>(ii) Other days - closed except 6:00 a.m.-11:00 p.m.</p> <p>Hours of business could be varied at the discretion of the local justices:</p> <p>*1:00-3:00 p.m. 6:00 a.m.-closing time from 9:00 to 11:00 p.m.</p> <p>opening time from 5:00 to 7:00 a.m.</p> <p>closing time from 10:00-12:00 p.m.</p>	<p>II. Public-house, beer-shop and bar licenses for consumption on premises</p> <p>(i) Sunday, Christmas, Good Friday, Appointed thanksgiving and fast days - closed except 12:30 p.m.-2:30 p.m.</p> <p>8:00p.m.-11:00 p.m.</p> <p>(ii) Ordinary Days - A. London - closed except 6:00 a.m.-</p> <p>12 midnight.</p> <p>B. Towns, 2500+ closed except 6:00 a.m.-11:00 p.m.</p> <p>C. Elsewhere closed except 6:00 a.m.-10:00 p.m.</p>	<p>II. Public-house, beer-shop and bar licenses for consumption on premises</p> <p>(i) Sunday, Christmas, Good Friday, Appointed thanksgiving and fast days - closed except 12:30 p.m.-2:30 p.m.</p> <p>8:00p.m.-11:00 p.m.</p> <p>(ii) Ordinary Days - A. London - closed except 6:00 a.m.-12 midnight.</p> <p>B. Towns, 2500+ closed except 6:00 a.m.-11:00 p.m.</p> <p>C. Elsewhere closed except 6:00 a.m.-10:00 p.m.</p>

Appendix E (continued)

Sponsor	National Association 1869-1871	National Association 1872	Government 1871	Government 1872	Selwin-Ibbetson 1872
Special Features		<p>For INNS ONLY New victual- lers' Licenses, granted in proportion to population density would be auctioned to highest bidders. Bids would be calculated as a percentage of the annual value of the licensed premises.</p>	<p>License holders would be given 10 year period of grace after which all licenses would expire. New licenses would then be granted (according to population density), for the next ten years to the highest bid- ders. Bids would be cal- culated as a percentage of the annual value of the licensed premises.</p>	<p>Eliminated in the 1872 Act.</p>	<p>The magis- trates were specifically ordered to refuse licenses on only three grounds: (i) if the proposed license holder is per- sonally dis- qualified (ii) If the pro- posed premises are disqualified according to "value and fitness" (iii) If there is already more than one licensed pre- mises per 300 persons.</p>
Sources	<p>Church of England Temperance Magazine 3d ser. III (May, 1871), 87-89.</p>	<p>Great Britain Parliament, House of Commons, Parliamentary Papers, 1872, Vol. 2, pp. 303-397.</p>	<p>Great Britain Parliament, House of Commons, Parliamentary Papers, 1871, Vol. 2, pp. 489-588.</p>	<p>35 & 36 Victoria, c.94 in Great Britain, Parliament, Public General Statutes, 1872, pp. 681- 727.</p>	<p>Great Britain, Parliament, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, 1872, Vols. 5-6. pp. 243-342.</p>

APPENDIX F

Social Agencies of Two C.E.T.S. Diocesan Branches in 1883.

A. Diocese of Oxford

Coffee and Reading Rooms	65
Village Reading Rooms	43
Working Men's Clubs and British Workmen	21
Penny Banks	179
The returns from twelve banks, six towns, and six villages showed the number of depositors in one year to be 2,638; the amount deposited to be [£] 960 3s.4d.	
Drum and Fife Bands, various.	
Coffee Barrows, several.	
Temperance Hotels	16
Coffee and Temperance Refreshment Houses	12
Café, Coffee, and Cocoa House Limited Liability Companies	6
Temperance Choirs and Musical Societies, Cricket Clubs, &c., not ascertained, but there are numbers.	
Parochial Branches	221
Members from 15,000 to 20,000.	
Great Western Railway Branch at Oxford	1
Ladies' Diocesan Branch	1
University Branches in 14 Colleges	24
A large number have discontinued giving beer to men in the hay and harvest field.	
Sick and Benefit Societies	2
Flower Shows in connection with the work, various.	
Temperance Bell-ringing Societies, several.	

B. Diocese of Lichfield

Cocoa Houses	44
Sick and Benefit Societies	12
Penny Banks	20
Funeral Guilds	2
Brass, Drum and Fife, Concertina, and Reed Bands	20
Reading Rooms, Coffee Rooms, and Libraries	55
Workmen's Clubs	8
Lifeboat Crew	1
Flower Shows	8
Athletic Clubs	39

APPENDIX F - Continued

Coffee Stalls and Barrows	6
Provident Societies, Prayer Unions, Temperance Choirs, Guild Rooms	39
Mechanics' Institutes, Working Men's Hall, Military Branch, Canal Branch, and Police Court Agency	7
British Workmen Public-Houses, Institute, and Hand-Bell Ringers	10

Source: Church of England, Official Year Book of the Church of England, (London, 1883), pp. 158 and 160.

The Oxford diocesan C.E.T.S. social agencies were described as "to a considerable extent the direct results of the work of the C.E.T.S." ibid., p. 158.

Those in the diocese of Lichfield, based on returns which "are far from complete", were characterized as "the direct results of the establishment of the Church of England Temperance Society. . . ." ibid., p. 160.

END OF

REEL