Andrew Chandler, *Anglicanism, Methodism and Ecumenism. A History of the Queen's and Handsworth Colleges*. I.B. Tauris, London/New York 2018, xi + 223 pp. ISBN 9781788312790. £72; US\$99.

Ministerial training whether in the Church of England or the Methodist Church in Great Britain has received little scholarly attention. It is good therefore to have a book-length study of an Anglican and an initially Wesleyan, and subsequently Methodist, theological college, which in the 1960s amalgamated.

In common with all the European 'established' churches of the Reformation, ministerial training in the Church of England primarily took place in the ancient universities which were Church foundations where almost all teachers were Anglican clergy. Ordination candidates studied Classics alongside the sons of the gentry and aristocracy for a bachelor's degree, and then either studied divinity for a master's degree, and/or continued studies with an experienced parish priest to deepen their theological knowledge, and learn to preach and undertake pastoral care. The university authorities and the priest then commended them to a bishop for examination for ordination. With England's rapid early nineteenth-century population growth, bishops' needs for clergy in poor industrial northern and Welsh parishes outstripped the universities' supply of candidates, and alternative routes to ordination, especially for poor men, were devised. The bishop of Chester established a college for non-graduates at St Bees in Cumbria in 1817, and the bishop of St David's, established a university college at Lampeter in Wales in 1827, and the bishop of Durham established a new university in Durham in 1833. The Queen's College in the expanding industrial town of Birmingham originated in 1825 as a school of medicine and surgery. This was a pioneering venture for medical training by apprenticeship and formal academic professional requirements for practising medicine were only introduced with the Medical Registration Act 1858. In the late 1830s and 1840s a number of small colleges were established by bishops and adherents of the newly developing church 'parties,' away from the worldly temptations of universities, to provide theological study and pastoral training for graduate ordination candidates, and also for non-graduates. In 1844 the medical college in Birmingham received a number of additional endowments to enable it also to train men for ordination in the Church of England, and it received a royal charter. Combining medical and ministerial training in one institution proved unsatisfactory. The theology department, only recruiting between three and fourteen students at any one time, was not financially viable. Legislation was secured in 1867 to separate medical and ministerial training into two institutions. Medicine went on to flourish, but theology did not.

CHURCH HISTORY AND RELIGIOUS CULTURE

© W.M. JACOB, 2019 | DOI:10.1163/18712428-09903017

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-NC 4.0 License.

Downloaded from Brill.com 04/26/2023 02:38:42PM
via free access

Meanwhile, the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion, which had gradually separated from the Church of England, established, despite misgivings about inhibiting the operation of the Holy Spirit by providing training for ministers, a Training Institution in four 'departments';—in Didsbury in Manchester in 1842, in Richmond near London in 1843, in Headingley in Leeds in 1869, and at Handsworth in Birmingham in 1880. Few candidates for the Wesleyan ministry had anything beyond an elementary education, so colleges needed to provide a broad and basic education in liberal arts as an introduction to theology. Tutors and lecturers were almost all autodidacts, and courses were old-fashioned and oblivious of current scholarship. Few candidates for ministry had funds to pay for tuition and board, and most stayed for only two years of training. Only after World War 1 did Handsworth College begin to flourish, with tutors who had studied at the ancient universities, opened from the 1870s to non-Anglicans, and links were developed with the growing new Birmingham University, and with German universities. Money was also raised by the Connexion to fund candidates' training.

The distinguished theologian, Charles Gore, who became first bishop of Birmingham in the early twentieth century, had founded a theological college in Mirfield in Yorkshire, and sought to strengthen relations between the Queen's College and Birmingham University but it failed to attract students and retain lecturers, and closed in debt in 1907. It reopened on a new site close to the University in 1923, but even with a higher calibre staff, and links with German universities and a broadening of the curriculum to include social studies, it failed to attract enough students to be economically viable. Only in the 1950s did links with Birmingham University begin to attract students to Queen's. With greater prosperity new buildings were constructed, and with a lack of alignment with the evangelical and catholic 'parties' in the Church of England, under the principalship of John Habgood later archbishop of York, the college began to flourish. In the context of 'conversations' between the Church of England and the Methodist Church about a union, an amalgamation of Queen's and Handsworth was proposed, on the Queen's site, because of its proximity to the University. The proposal was endorsed by the authorities of both churches, and came about in 1970. Unfortunately, the recommendations for a union between the Methodist Church and the Church of England were not endorsed by the Church of England's General Synod. In its first ten years the amalgamation flourished, partly because of the Methodist policy of directing ministerial candidates to particular training institutions. Anglican support was less enthusiastic.

Chandler's 'Postlude,' summarises the present role of the united colleges, as the Queen's Foundation, noting that, in addition to providing training for mod-

est numbers of prospective clergy for both churches, it provides a home for black and feminist theology and mission studies, which are not much regarded in either church. He also laments the lack of interest in either church in including scholarship, and, one might add especially historical scholarship, in their ministerial training.

This is a useful institutional history. It would have been more valuable if it had sketched a broader context for the two institutions in the development of training for the professions in England in the nineteenth century and about the origins and development of Anglican theological colleges, and had compared Queen's and Handsworth with similar institutions, and how they related to developments in their churches and wider society.

W.M. Jacob

King's College, London

wmjacob15@gmail.com