

Richard Matthews: a Layman Overlooked

Brian E Beck

The Methodist Church in the village of Histon, just north of Cambridge, opened in 1896, is named 'The Matthews Memorial Church' after Richard Matthews, a native of the village. Displayed inside is a late 19th-century framed photo, given by the family, of an 1820s drawing of a fresh-faced, earnest young man, and a notice preserved from the opening, giving brief details about him. But in historical writing he is barely mentioned and his very considerable service to his church and to the anti-slavery movement is largely unknown. This paper seeks to give him some of the recognition he deserves.

The Matthews family were farmers in Histon in the 18th and early 19th centuries with considerable land holdings. Richard himself was born in April 1796, the son of Richard and Frances Matthews, who already had a daughter, Elizabeth, born in 1794. There were no other children. Methodism arrived in Histon at the end of the eighteenth century¹ and Richard senior and his wife were involved in its coming. By 1816 Methodists were worshipping in the now-widowed Frances' home. Three years later the young Richard took out a licence for a chapel, opened in 1822. By then he was already a local preacher and circuit records of 1823-5 show him as a class leader, circuit steward and involved in support for the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society. Those local commitments soon ended however, for in 1823 he was admitted to the Middle Temple to study for the bar and by 1825 he had moved to London, to be joined by 1828 by his mother and sister. On 25 April 1828 he was called to the bar and began in earnest his life's work as a lawyer in the courts, with chambers in London but practising on the Northern Circuit which embraced Lancashire, Yorkshire, County Durham and all points north. It is an indicator of his parents' relative affluence and status that he was able, with some supplement, of which more later, to meet the costs of his studies, and to be listed officially as the son of a gentleman.²

On 29 September 1835 Richard married Hannah Day from Histon, and the couple set up home in the recently-developed area of Barnsbury Park, worshipping in the newly-opened Liverpool Road Wesleyan church. The marriage was clearly a happy one, but ended sadly with Hannah's premature and painful death five years later, on November 27, 1840. Richard published a

memoir of her³ which gives a moving insight into the piety of the period, with their routine of daily prayers, her determination in spite of crippling pain to maintain her attendance at chapel, twice on Sunday and once in the week, and her refusal of drugs at the end – ‘I want my head quite clear.’ On 29 September 1843 Richard married again, Lucy Maria daughter of George and Mary Heald, of Garston, near Liverpool. Her father was a calico printer and very probably the older brother of James Heald the philanthropist, Member of Parliament for Stockport and benefactor of Didsbury College. Over the next ten and a half years Richard and Lucy had six children, four girls and two boys.⁴

The memoir of Hannah was not Richard’s only publication. Nine other titles carry his name and three more can be safely attributed to him, one of which is a collection of hymns and moral poems primarily by his sister Elizabeth, who set up a school for young ladies just round the corner from him.⁵ Most of the others were legal handbooks, digesting and giving advice on criminal law, the execution of wills and the newly-introduced legislation of 1836 for the civil registration of marriages and the registration of births and deaths. There were also pamphlets, including an open letter in 1830 to the Lord Chancellor advocating the civil registration of births, and a lecture given in a series attacking socialism, *Is Marriage Worth Perpetuating?*⁶ His interest in marriage law and registration was to serve the churches well, as we shall see.⁷

It is his work for the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion and the Anti-Slavery Society which most concern us here. The record in Histon Chapel outlines the details, almost certainly derived from his two surviving daughters who returned to Histon for the latter part of their lives, but scrutiny of original records reveals much more, and shows the extent to which the Methodism of his day, and in a crucial period the anti-slavery movement, depended on his services. From 1828 when he was called to the bar until 1851 he was a member of the Conference Committee of Privileges, and from its formation in 1843 of its sub-committee; he was a member of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society Committee over the same period 1828-1850,⁸ and from 1842-1851 a member of the Education Committee. Of his contribution to the last of these there appears to be no record, but of the first two more can be said. There is no reason to think that his service to education was any different from other committees: frequent attendance at meetings, membership of ad hoc sub-committees, giving formal opinions and acting professionally for the committee. It is a pity that, although committee minutes record requests for opinions and one can

sometimes gather from other sources what his views were, for the most part the content of these opinions is lost.

The Committee of Privileges was set up by the Conference in 1803 as a 'mixed' committee of ministers and professional laymen to 'guard our religious privileges' in an age when those privileges were few and precarious and non-Anglican communities subject to considerable legal disabilities. There are long gaps in the surviving minutes of the committee but they do exist for the ten years 1835-1845 and are revealing for the activities they embraced. They show that two laymen, Richard Reece, a solicitor, and Richard Matthews, the barrister, were the principal advisors and agents of the committee throughout the period.

To read through these minutes is to gain an insight into the problems the Wesleyans along with others had to contend with, local magistrates (often Anglican clergy) finding various petty excuses to put legal obstacles in their way. In one example a circuit preaching plan submitted in evidence that a preacher was travelling to an appointment and therefore exempt from road toll charges was rejected because it was not signed – but no direction was given by the magistrate as to who should do so! There were disputes as to whether preachers, either itinerant or local, were exempt from toll charges at all, and if so whether the exemption extended to midweek appointments, and as to what precise procedure had to be followed to secure a licence for a chapel for public worship.

Some court cases involved issues of great principle. A particularly distressing one in 1840 involved the vicar of Gedney in Lincolnshire who refused to bury a child in the churchyard on the ground that baptism by a Wesleyan minister was not valid. His was not the first instance, nor the last, but in spite of existing legal opinion that such baptisms were valid and general support by the bishops, he insisted, egged on by others, in taking his case to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which ruled against him. Matthews gave a formal opinion and later, with others, appeared as counsel for the church.

Equally momentous was a challenge earlier, in 1838, to the Wesleyan Model Deed. In 1832 the Wesleyan Conference had adopted the device of a model deed stating the trusts upon which church property was held, to be referred to in all subsequent deeds without the necessity and cost of spelling out the trusts afresh each time. The Conference had adopted the policy with care,

seeking the opinion of four counsel, including the Solicitor General, before doing so. All were favourable, and the Solicitor General's opinion was co-signed by Richard Matthews as junior counsel. Richard also addressed the Conference on the matter.⁹ However, in 1838 there was a serious challenge. In the village of Llanbister in what is now Powys, central Wales, a clergyman sold houses and land to the local Wesleyans which they settled on the model deed, and then gave them a larger sum with which to build a chapel. On his death his son challenged the transaction on a number of grounds, including the claim that the model deed had not been properly enrolled in Chancery, that it did not cover land and houses as well as chapels, and that the deed of sale ought to have specified the trusts in detail and not by reference to the model deed. Had he succeeded, not only would the local trustees have lost both their land and their chapel but the whole concept of a model deed would have been invalidated at a stroke. The case dragged on through two hearings and two appeals over two years, Richard Matthews appearing for the church, but in the end the church won its case. It is not surprising that two years running, in 1839 and 1840, the Conference recorded a vote of thanks to him and Richard Reece by name.¹⁰

Much of the Committee's attention had to be given to proposed legislation, and involved Matthews in sub-committees, the giving of opinions and, from time to time deputations. It is striking how easy it appears to have been for the Wesleyans to secure interviews with quite senior government ministers in an effort to get them to change their mind, and ministers' readiness on occasion to accept and incorporate amendments. It is evidence of the growing social standing and political importance of the connexion. Two such instances involved educational matters, and to modern eyes do not show the Wesleyans in a particularly attractive light. In both the Committee of Privileges met jointly with the Conference's Education Committee. In 1839 the government proposed a system of national education, which was to involve an establishment, publicly funded, for teacher training along with a model school. It was bitterly opposed, not only by the Wesleyans, principally on the grounds that it would allow religious instruction for Roman Catholic pupils to be based on the Douai version of the Bible. A more general objection, to which Jabez Bunting and Richard Matthews put their names in the committee, was that 'any attempt to instruct, in the same school, the children of the poorer classes (whose parents, in the exercise of their undoubted rights as men and Britons, belong to various Christian denominations) by teaching adapted to every prevailing variety of religious belief or opinion will...be found impracticable; and even if practicable....would, in many instances, produce among

the children so incongruously mingled together, a dangerous spirit of scepticism and unbelief.’¹¹
The proposed legislation was dropped.

A second instance of protecting denominational educational turf arose in 1843 over a proposed Factories Bill, designed to regulate the employment of children and provide for their education. Here the objections, voiced by Non-Conformists generally, focused on the dominant role given to Anglican clergy in the provision and control of schools, objections made sharper by reaction to the growing influence of the Anglo-Catholic movement. After intense lobbying, in which Matthews was involved, the educational clauses of the bill were dropped. What is sad in these episodes is how little interest the churches appear to show in the social needs the government were seeking to address, although the Wesleyans did create their Education Committee and expand their day schools after 1839.

Two other examples of legislative issues are worth mentioning. Consternation was caused in 1844 by a Bill to give Unitarians legal title retrospectively to chapels built before the Unitarians were legally recognised. Matthews attacked it in print as unnecessary and potentially subversive of the existing law of equity.¹² A major weakness was that the Bill provided that where there was no explicit doctrinal statement in a chapel trust deed (there was no more than a reference to Wesley’s Sermons and NT Notes in the Wesleyan model deed) an oral affirmation of what had been the teaching in the chapel over the past 25 years would determine its denominational allegiance. In the event negotiations between the Committee and the Government led to acceptable amendments. It was a particularly sensitive issue for the Presbyterians, many of whose congregations had turned Unitarian over the years and stood to gain a chapel as well.

The second example occurred a year later when the government attempted to introduce a Bill to regulate and supervise charities. In today’s regulatory environment it seems a timid affair, and we would regard trustee accountability as highly important, but it was an innovation which the Wesleyans strongly opposed, Matthews again being involved in sub-committees and giving a formal opinion. The Bill was defeated.

His support for the Wesleyan Missionary Society can be traced, as we have seen, to his early days at Histon, and in later years there is evidence he was in demand to chair public meetings.¹³
A far from exhaustive survey of the extensive minutes of the General Committee and its

subcommittees reveals a similar pattern of involvement to that of the Committee of Privileges, attendance at about half the meetings (absences no doubt attributable to professional duties) and his services called upon periodically for advice and action. Of particular note is his participation in the search for a permanent Mission House for the Society following the success of the Centenary Fund appeal of 1839. He was a member of the search committee that finally secured the City of London Tavern at the end of that year and he advised on (but did not draft) the trust deed upon which it was settled in 1841. He was also drawn into a dispute in 1839 concerning allegations against Isaac Whitehouse, a Wesleyan missionary in Jamaica, who had been accused by a Baptist missionary, John Clark, and a Quaker, Joseph Sturge, of possessing and ill-treating slaves. The allegations were vigorously denied, and Whitehouse was officially cleared, but the accusers persisted and Matthews volunteered to mediate, only to have his offer rejected by them on the grounds that he was a Wesleyan and committee member.¹⁴ Jamaica in fact occupied a good deal of the committee's attention in this period. In 1832 the mission there suffered considerable damage to its property from riots and was unable to get redress from the courts, the magistrates, like the planters generally, persistently showing hostility to the missionaries. Jamaica was a chartered colony, responsible to some extent for its own laws, so that the legal situation was unclear, and the Committee, with Matthews' assistance, pressed the British government for clarification, and for a declaration that the Toleration Act of 1812, which lifted some of the restrictions earlier imposed upon non-Anglican Protestants, extended to all the colonies.

But without question his contribution of greatest importance was in connection with the abolition of slavery, and on this his various professional interests in property questions, the legal status of Non-Conformist churches, marriage and registration came together in the service of the Missionary Committee and the Anti-Slavery Society. There is no doubt about his commitment. His earliest known publication, produced in 1824, possibly even before he left Histon, was a pamphlet under the pseudonym 'Anthropos', *The Rights of Man (not the Paines) but the Rights of Man in the West Indies*.¹⁵ It is a vigorous attack on slavery. Bodily freedom is a right, given by God, which is beyond all law. Its exercise has to be kept within bounds by law so as not to interfere with the rights of others, but it cannot be taken away. If therefore the slave is denied by the law the protection it ought to give him he has a right to rebel and no moral guilt can be attached to resort to violence. Appeals to history to justify slavery and arguments for merely ameliorating the condition, for delay, and for compensation for the planters are swept aside in a

call for immediate emancipation, and for a boycott of (subsidised) West Indian sugar and the use of East Indian instead, so as to undermine the planters' resistance. Reading it one is reminded of the debates in Britain after World War II about decolonisation, and cannot help wondering what Matthews would have made of the timid response of the British churches to the World Council of Churches' call for support for African liberation movements in the 1970s and 1980s.

It is intriguing to speculate what might have kindled his commitment to the abolitionist cause, which, judging by her published poems, his sister Elizabeth shared. Missionary Society and other publications were no doubt influential, and there were prominent abolitionists in Cambridge. But it is also to be noted that around the time Richard and his sister were born, the ex-slave and campaigner Olaudah Equiano (Gustavus Vassa) married a woman from Soham, twelve miles from Histon as the crow flies, and one of their daughters who died in infancy is buried at Chesterton, only three miles away.

So it comes as no surprise to find Matthews applying in 1825 for the vacant post of (employed) secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society¹⁶ or that when he resigned because of the pressure of professional duties he was immediately voted onto the committee as a member because of 'their sense of his zeal'. The Committee was a large one, some forty members, although its meetings rarely involved more than a handful, of which Matthews was frequently one. He must be considered one of the more active, though never prominent, supporters of the movement. But it was not until the cause was effectively won that he came into his own.

In the period after emancipation in 1833 the Anti-Slavery Society, along with the missionary societies, began to monitor the effect of the various laws in force and their effect on freed slaves. The matter was complicated by the distinction, already mentioned, between the Crown Colonies legislated for by the Westminster Parliament and the Chartered Colonies which had their own legislatures. Surveys were made, in which Matthews was involved, of the situation in the various jurisdictions. A particular issue concerned marital status. Prior to emancipation, although it was legally possible for slaves to be married in the Established Church with the permission of the owners, it was rare, and many were married informally by missionaries of the various non-Anglican churches which required cohabiting couples to be married before admitting them to Holy Communion. Once they became free persons, however, their status and entitlement to legal protection, inheritance and property rights were thrown into doubt, and if they had resorted to the

Established Church for (re-)marriage, their existing children would have been rendered illegitimate.¹⁷ Pressure was put on the British government to address the problem and various remedies were contemplated. It has to be remembered that until 1836 it was not possible in English law for people (apart from Jews and Quakers) to be legally married except in the Established Church, and one remedy suggested was to attach a clause to one of the two 1836 Acts which introduced civil marriage in England and the registration of births, marriages and deaths; another was to attach the clause to one of the Emancipation Amendment Acts which were found necessary after 1833, but neither of these came to anything. Eventually it was agreed with government that separate legislation would be required.

Richard Matthews was not the only lawyer involved,¹⁸ but he does seem to have taken the lead. In his capacity as a member of both the Anti-Slavery Society Committee and the Wesleyan Missionary Committee he appeared before a Parliamentary Select Committee in May 1836 and submitted written evidence in the July which led the Committee in its report to recommend that the issue be addressed. He was able to assure the Committee that he was acquainted with the legislation of every one of the West Indian Colonies. It was not until 1838 however that a Bill was finally drawn up. The Anti-Slavery Society Committee minutes show that it was Matthews, at the request of the Colonial Secretary, who drafted it. It passed into law by Order in Council in September 1838. It is a remarkable document. Not only does it provide retrospectively for the legal recognition of the existing marriages of former slaves, including partnerships where no religious ceremony of any kind had taken place, it also makes provision for the future which goes far beyond what would be the case in England until nearly the end of the century, in that it authorises non-Anglican ministers both to officiate at weddings and to act as registrars for them. The office of Authorised Person, obviating the need for the presence of a civil registrar, was not introduced in England until 1898. The Act must be regarded as Richard Matthews' most significant legacy to posterity.

But the battle was not yet over. Matthews' Act applied only to the Crown Colonies, for which the Westminster Parliament legislated directly. The Chartered Colonies, which had their own legislatures, had to be persuaded to come into line. Whether through reluctance or careless drafting it took some time for them to do so. The British government's trump card was that their legislation could be denied the royal assent. An act passed by the legislature in Nevis was disallowed after representations, with Matthews' aid, were made to the Colonial Secretary. The

Bahamas also provoked objections, as did Jamaica, but in 1840 the latter finally passed an Act of which Matthews, having noted some minor faults, observed, 'The measure surpasses my most sanguine expectations of Jamaica Legislation and I think we ought to be thankful and content.'¹⁹

It was the West Indies that captured Matthews' devotion. After the Anti-Slavery Society was wound down in 1839 he did not apparently associate himself with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society concerned with world-wide slavery, but he was involved (one of only two who were not officers of the Society) in the sub-committee of the Missionary Society dealing with Negro Schools in the West Indies.

In 1852 there came a public dispute between Matthews and his Church. The context was the massive defections and expulsions in consequence of the Fly-Sheets dispute of 1849-50 which cost the Wesleyan connexion over 100,000 members. In a pamphlet addressed to the President of the Conference²⁰ Matthews held that the expulsions were in contravention of the Conference's own published rules. In this he was relying on the text of a version of the *General Rules of the Methodist Societies* published in 1798, rather than, as the Conference did, on the revision of the *Large Minutes* published the previous year. At the heart of the dispute was the question whether the power of the Leaders' Meeting in expulsions was limited to determination of guilt, the sentence being decided by the itinerant Preacher, or extended also to sentencing. Matthews held the latter to be the rule stated in the 1798 publication and the one under which his father and family had first come into Methodism. It was not a new question; the issue dogged all the disputes of 1800-1850. It was complicated by the fact that the 1797 Conference had promised a publication of its rules, but included the letter containing that promise within the compilation of documents that formed the 1797 *Large Minutes*, leading to the supposition that the rules were to be found elsewhere. Discussion was made intractable by the development of the doctrine of the Pastoral Office, according to which the church's pastors had the divine right and duty to rule the flock, a doctrine Matthews dismisses as a 'new-fangled notion'.

The result was a somewhat indignant and condescending reply by William Arthur²¹ who nevertheless had little difficulty in showing that the 1798 booklet on which Matthews relied could not, by its contents, be the comprehensive collection of rules promised the year before. It is difficult to know what effect this dispute had on Matthews' relations with the church. In 1852 his name disappears from all Conference committees, but whether for this reason or because of

increased professional duties we cannot now know. It is reassuring however to note that the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* published an obituary in 1854, limited, as was common, to his Christian character, and included a more informative reference to him in conjunction with his sister's obituary in 1870.²² Still more significant is the warm tribute paid to him in the *Missionary Committee Minutes* a few days after his death, although he had not been a member of the Committee for nearly three years.

One other service Richard Matthews performed for his church deserves mention. In 1847 he published, anonymously, *A Companion to the Wesleyan Hymn-Book*, a collection of two hundred and twenty eight tunes for use with the words-only 1780 *Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People called Methodists* and its 1831 supplement, together with eighteen psalm chants.²³ It was published by the Conference Office. According to J T Lightwood²⁴ it was 'perhaps the most highly esteemed of all...and long remained a favourite both in church and home,' but although often reprinted it is surprisingly rare today. The music is set out unusually, alto-tenor-soprano-bass, and there are explanatory introductions, one (added in a second edition) explaining the layout of the music, another on the singing of chants, beside a more general preface which reveals Matthews' tastes. He laments the fact that many good hymns are falling out of use for want of a tune, and the 'highly inconvenient practice of requiring from the preacher before he enters the pulpit a list of the hymns he intends to use, by which he is intruded upon at a time when undisturbed composure is most desirable, and is prevented the use of any other hymn, however appropriate, which may afterwards strike his mind.' He urges singers to avoid 'gurgling' and drawling, and insists that the organ must lead and not drown. 'It is a mistake to suppose that congregational singing is improved by the performer always having his hands full of notes.' He says he began the compilation in manuscript for his small village congregation thirty years previously (i.e. about 1817, before the first Histon chapel was opened, when he was about twenty). It would be interesting to know whether at that stage it included the psalm chants.

In July 1852 Matthews was made a Serjeant-at-Law, and was widely expected to be made a judge.²⁵ Tradition preserved at the Histon church claims that he was offered two colonial judgeships, which he declined.²⁶ But time was running out. In September 1853 he made his will and on 24 February 1854 he died. He is buried, with his wife and sister and four of his children, in Highgate Cemetery.

Sadly, no biography will ever be written as no personal papers or letters appear to have survived. Apart from what he reveals of himself in the memoir to his first wife we can only guess at the sort of man he was. He was not particularly wealthy: he does not feature in the subscription lists for the 1839 Centenary Fund as a major donor.²⁷ He seems to have been a modest man, if that is the reason for his anonymous publications. But he was devoted to his church, to the cause of overseas missions, and particularly to the abolition of slavery²⁸ and as a preacher, musician and above all as a lawyer he brought his gifts (and a lot of his time) to the service of those causes and to his Lord. He was one who, in Charles Wesley's words,²⁹ 'engaged all his powers' to 'serve the present age, his calling to fulfil', and he deserves to be honoured.

© Brian E Beck July 2007

¹ The exact date is uncertain. Frank Tice in *The History of Methodism in Cambridge* [London: Epworth 1966] gives it as 1798, but the preacher involved, Thomas Pinder, was not stationed in the area until the following year.

² Social status rather than education was the primary consideration in admission to the Inns of Court in those days, but it is evident that both Richard and his sister were well educated, although it is not known by what means.

³ *The Last Days and Hours of Mrs Hannah Matthews* [London 1841].

⁴ The Bible he gave Lucy before their marriage still survives. Into it he inserted some collects and a table of daily readings through the year, three chapters in the morning, one at night, similar to the one he and Hannah had previously used.

⁵ *Original Hymns and Moral Poems for Children and Young Persons, by Elizabeth Matthews and R* [London, 2nd ed. 1835].

⁶ London 1840, a reply to a published series of lectures by the social reformer Richard Owen (1771-1858) arguing against the institution of marriage. Regrettably Matthews does not show up well, relying heavily on sarcasm and not, one would now think, addressing the underlying issues.

⁷ There is also extant a printed calendar, *An Almanac for Two Centuries*, constructed by him, enabling dates to be calculated from 1800 to 2000. Whether it was formally published, and if so, what circulation it enjoyed, is not known.

⁸ There are three gaps, 1832, 1837, 1846, because the committee operated a system by which members retired in rotation, to be re-nominated after a year.

⁹ B Gregory *Side Lights on the Conflicts of Methodism* [London: Cassell, 1899] p.93. His reference to 'Mr C Matthews' in that context must be a mistake.

¹⁰ It was a rare honour. There are only ten such tributes in the twenty-five years to 1850. Another was to Matthews in 1842 over the Gedney case.

¹¹ *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* 1839 pp.582f.

¹² *Strictures on the Dissenters' Chapels Bill* [London 1844].

¹³ E.g. *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* 1847 p.137, where his remarks are reported.

¹⁴ See George Smith *History of Wesleyan Methodism* [4th edition, London 1864] vol.3 pp.357f and *The Watchman* 1839 p.242.

¹⁵ The attribution is secure. The British Library copy contains a ms inscription '1824 by Mr Matthews of Histon Cambridgeshire' and the Histon Parish Magazine for June 1902 (when his daughter lived in the village) ascribes it to him.

¹⁶ It no doubt also helped to finance his studies.

¹⁷ See H Altink, *Journal of Social History* 38/1 (Fall 2004) pp. 81 ff.

¹⁸ Joseph Beldam and John Jeremie are also named.

¹⁹ WMMS Minutes 1 September 1841.

²⁰ *A Reprint of the Rules of the Methodist Societies...to which is added a Letter to the Rev John Hannah DD* [London: Simpkin Marshall 1852].

²¹ *Has the Conference Broken Covenant? A Protest and a Disproof* [London: John Mason 1852].

²² *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* 1854 p.671, 1870 p.1053.

²³ There can be no doubt about the authorship: (a) it is mentioned in the notice preserved at Histon, dating from the time when one of his daughters lived in the village; (b) Arthur, in the pamphlet mentioned above refers to 'the excellent *Companion*' in a way that implies that Matthews compiled it; (c) F B Westbrook in an apparently unpublished paper in the Methodist Church Musical Society archives refers to papers in the possession of a Miss Foster which include a letter to Matthews authorising publication of the copyright tune 'Judaea'. The letter, incidentally, makes it clear that the first publication was in 1847 not, as Lightwood believed, 1846. Also among Miss Foster's papers was a ms copy of part of the *Companion* bearing the signature of A J Moxley, organist of St Paul's Covent Garden, whose assistance in the compilation is acknowledged in the Preface.

²⁴ *The Music of the Methodist Hymn Book* [London: Epworth 1935] p.xx, c.f. the Introduction to the Tunes Edition of the 1933 *Methodist Hymn Book*, para.5.

²⁵ The serjeants were the most senior rank of advocates in the courts, with exclusive rights until 1846 to plead in the Court of Common Pleas, but in time their prestige was eclipsed by that of Queen's Counsel. There were no appointments after 1875 and the order died out.

²⁶ Judges were appointed at the time from the ranks of the serjeants. Family tradition regarded him as a judge, but official records fail to confirm it. It is probable that as a serjeant he presided over trials on circuit, as was often the case.

²⁷ 10 guineas from himself and 5 each from his wife, mother and sister. Some donors gave £1,000.

²⁸ He named his second son George Granville Sharpe.

²⁹ *Hymns and Psalms* 785 verse 2.