

GLOUCESTER AND THE 1904-05 WELSH REVIVAL by Simon Carpenter

During 1904 Wales was swept by one of its once regular evangelical Christian revivals that energized and enlarged the churches, and transformed the atmosphere of many of the towns and villages. In Gloucester, as in many other places, prayer meetings for a revival to also happen in the city are reported to have multiplied as news from Wales spread, "bringing about an eager desire on the part of Christians to evangelise their townsfolk, and on the part of nominal Christians and the un-churched to hear the message. The movement swept the town ..."¹

Gloucester at this time was a city of some 60,000 souls. These were spiritually served by the cathedral and just over 30 churches, about half of which were nonconformist. One of the leading nonconformist churches of the day with just over 350 members was Brunswick Road Baptist Church, where married father of two, Rev. William Rice, then in his late forties, was the minister. It was he who, by inviting a couple of young Welsh evangelists to the city to lead meetings, introduced the revival to Gloucester.

Arguably, the section of Welsh society most affected by the revival, and most used to spread its message, were the young people and students. Among them were the students at Pontypridd College. Several of them attended a revival meeting at Abereynon as sceptics, but emerged from it convinced that the movement was genuine. So much so that they could not then concentrate on their studies and, out of a student population of 51, by January 1905 only six remained in Pontypridd. The rest were out working to spread the revival.²

Three of the college's students, A.E. Thomas, T.F. Bosanko and A.T. Philips accepted Rice's invitation to Gloucester, although tiredness and an imminent exam prevented A.T. Philips from staying, and he returned to Pontypridd before the meetings started.³ Details are hazy about the three, although it is known that Mr. Thomas was the son of a publican whose business was suffering due to the revival. He was also reported to be a "slim dark man, and evidently the younger of the two."⁴

As William Rice later recalled: "Through some friends I got into touch with two young Welshmen ... who have been working with Mr. Evan Roberts" (the main figure behind the revival in Wales), "and invited them to come here and hold a series of revival meetings. They were led to accept the invitation ..." He then, "called the Free Church ministers of the city together and asked them if they would like to co-operate in the movement and share in the blessing which I felt quite sure would come. I am glad to say they were all willing to do so."⁵ At this time, Gloucester had a Free Church Council to which all the local main non-conformist churches were affiliated.⁶



Rev. William Rice

However, it appears that this was very much a last minute arrangement, that Rice acted on his own in issuing the invitation, and that his own church was the last to know of the plans. It has to be said though that his Deacons were very supportive of his actions, as the minutes of their meeting of 20 January 1905 show: "The pastor ... proceeded to read letters he had received from Mr. Thomas (a Welsh student), who with two others, had been conducting meetings in Worcester and Malvern offering to come to Gloucester for a like purpose, letters having been read from the secretary of the Free Church Council ... and others, it was resolved that should God lead them here that we were willing to throw open the doors of the church ..." ⁷

THE BACKGROUND

In 1905 nationally there was still a prevailing moral/religious sentiment that had been planted in society since the cultural changes brought about by the earlier 18th & 19th century evangelical revivals. And in Gloucester there was also a strong evangelical and nonconformist tradition, partly due to the influence of the locally born George Whitefield, one of the main international leaders of the 18th century Christian revival, and also those other local evangelical heroes, Bishop Hooper and Robert Raikes.



East End Tabernacle, Derby Road

Possibly the most actively evangelical church in the city at the turn of the twentieth century was the East End Tabernacle in Derby Road, whose membership had grown from 82 in 1891, when it was set up out of an existing Railway Mission, to 250 by 1905. Its minister was a local man, Edwin Spring, who like George Whitefield before him had attended the Crypt School in the city. His church was affiliated to the U.S. denomination, the Disciples of Christ (still in existence, though not now in the UK). Their building in Derby Road was constructed with the denomination's help, and opened to warm local support particularly from the local Presbyterian minister, George Smith.⁸

and long-standing evangelical Anglican presence in the city, notably through Rev. John Luce. He was the highly respected and much loved vicar of St. Nicholas, Westgate Street who is reported to have always had good working relations with the local non-conformist churches,⁹ and is the only Gloucester church leader known to have personally, and approvingly, visited the revival centres in South Wales.¹⁰ Despite this, William Rice and the other Free Church ministers chose not to include him or his church in the arrangements for the Gloucester revival meetings.

However, there was also a strong



Rev. Edwin Spring

THE MEETINGS

It was decided to host meetings, initially for a week, starting on Monday 30



Brunswick Road Baptist Church and Raikes Memorial School

January 1905, every evening in the largest of the city centre non-conformist churches, starting with Brunswick Road Baptist Church, which with a capacity of 1,100 was the largest church at that time. At each meeting, as well as the two Welsh evangelists, there was also a platform party consisting of a selection of the local Free Church leaders. Apart from William Rice, other regular members of this group included Rev. George Smith from the Presbyterian Whitefield Memorial Church, Park Road (now known as James Forbes United Reformed Church), Rev. William Porter from Tyndale Congregational Church, Barton Street, Rev. William Hogan, in his early 30s the youngest of the group, from the Baptist Free Church - a church set up after a division in the ranks of Brunswick Baptist Church ten years earlier,¹¹ and finally the last of the core group was Edwin Spring.

Several of the early meetings were reported in the *Citizen* soon after, usually on the day following, and in the reports they were all said to be packed out, with many also in overflow meetings or forced to wait outside.

The first meeting was given a substantial report in the following day's *Citizen*. Brunswick Road Baptist Church was apparently "crowded," the meeting yielded "over 40" converts, and set the tone for the rest of the week and beyond. On the following night there were crowds at Southgate Congregational Church (capacity 700) and an overflow meeting was also held in the adjoining lecture hall which the evangelists and platform party took turns in attending. Many also were waiting in the street outside. Several converts were reported to have been "gathered in". The main meeting broke up at 9.30pm.

On the evening after, the *Citizen* reported that "every available inch of space" was used at the 600 seater Whitefield Memorial Church, and the schoolroom attached to the church was also crowded. The church had been full from an hour before the meeting was due to begin. The meeting progressed with enthusiastic singing, fervent praying and appeals from the evangelist, Mr. Thomas. Between 50 and 60 were reported to have responded. The meeting was closed well after ten o'clock.

Many of that crowd were probably also at the prayer meeting held in the Raikes Memorial School, Brunswick Road Baptist Church in the afternoon prior to the next day's evening revival meeting in Northgate Wesleyan Church. Again the church, which held 1,013, was crowded out an hour before the scheduled start time of the evening meeting. And again the pattern followed open prayer for people to be saved, particularly people with drink problems, and hymns led from the congregation with occasional appeals and exhortations from one of the Welsh evangelists. This time, both were at the front, and during the course of the evening Mr. Thomas prayed

THE REVIVAL IN GLOUCESTER.

MEETING AT TYNDALE CONGREGATIONAL

Christ?' 'Who will be the first?' he pleaded long and often; and then, as still no one responded, 'will not one come to Him tonight?' Came in sorrowful, almost tremulous voice. 'I will,' faintly responded someone in the hushed congregation. 'God bless you, sister. God bless you,' said the Evangelist. 'Who will be the next?' was now the appeal. 'I will,' came almost immediately from another in the audience, and so on until some thirty had declared for a reformed life ..." The meeting closed soon after, but not before it was also announced that the revival meetings would be continued through the following week.

that "Gloucester might be shaken from end to end and sinners come in by the score." The *Citizen* reported that during the meeting: "Mr. Bosanko made the appeal 'who will come to



Tyndale Congregational Church

Tyndale Congregational Church in Barton Street, an impressive Victorian gothic building which held 850, was the venue for the following night, Friday, and on the Saturday evening the setting was the 800 seater Corn Exchange in Southgate Street, home of the Baptist Free Church, and more of the same followed. As the *Citizen* put it: "The meeting was practically a replica of those that have proceeded, prayer, praise and testimony following one another for the greater part of the evening."

Sunday saw the evangelists speaking in the morning to a gathering of children and young people at Rycroft Chapel, the Wesleyan Methodist church in Conduit Street and then later on in the morning at Brunswick Road Baptist Church.

In the afternoon "a crowded meeting was held at the East End Tabernacle when the two evangelists were supported by William Rice and Edwin Spring. Mr. Bosanko is then reported to have told the congregation that since they had been on this mission the two of them "had been seriously considering the question of baptism, whether it was essential or not. He considered that he was not wrong in not being baptised until he had been convinced he felt that the Spirit of God led them to Gloucester in order that they might know this truth and have an explanation of the subject and he had to thank his dear friend Mr. Spring, their minister, for teaching him with regard to baptism. Now that they were convinced that this was essential, and as they had promised the Lord to obey him in all things they had decided to be baptised that evening at Brunswick Road. They thought of being baptised there that afternoon, but as there would be a much larger number at Brunswick Road they had deferred it accordingly. After the appeal a number of inquirers went into the schoolroom. In the evening packed meetings were held in the Brunswick Road church and Raikes' School when the baptism took place. There was again a large number of inquiries." Why they should call Edwin Spring "their minister" is not now known.

A DISAGREEMENT

They may have told the afternoon's congregation of their plans, but no-one thought to inform the other members of the platform party for the evening meeting. This led to a public row that was somehow overlooked by William Rice in his report for the *Baptist Times*.¹²

"On Sunday night, from six o'clock till eleven o'clock, my church was packed with about 1,500 people, and our school hall with some 600 more, and the road outside was blocked by a dense crowd, waiting for the chance to come in as some left the buildings. At this service I had the joy of baptizing the two Welsh evangelists. They had been exercised in mind on the subject, and last week being convinced it was their duty to obey the Lord's command, they requested baptism at my hands. Before entering the water they stated their reasons for observing this ordinance. It was a most impressive service, and before it closed between forty and fifty declared themselves on the Lord's side."

Actually, before the first evangelist went into the baptismal pool, one of the platform party publicly took issue with his testimony, as was later reported in a letter to the

Citizen: "What must have been the feelings of the vast congregation ... when the Evangelist mentioning the subject of baptism he was instantly and vigorously interrupted by one of the ministers on the platform, who in tones of passion declared against his remarks. It was evident the sympathies of the audience were with the fearless Evangelist, as was shown by their emphatic applause when he made his statement." The minister would have been objecting to the fact that the evangelists were being baptised by total immersion, a form of this Christian initiation ceremony not accepted by all denominations – particularly not in 1905.

THE GLOUCESTER REVIVAL. MEETING AT SOUTHGATE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH.



Rev. George Smith

Rev. George Smith, on behalf of all the Free Church ministers other than William Rice and Edwin Spring, but including William Hogan, the other city Baptist minister, had a letter published in the *Citizen* on the issue of the day after, pointing out that they "had no knowledge that such a ceremony was contemplated by the Evangelists or by the minister of Brunswick Road Church. We deeply regret that it should have happened in the midst of a united and un-denominational Mission, and that such a controversial subject as Baptism should have been introduced at all."

In the following day's *Citizen*, the paper reported not only the good news that "there is no evidence of waning interest in the revival meetings ... The Southgate Congregational Church was crowded for Tuesday evening's meeting, and the same earnestness and enthusiasm

was manifest throughout. No reference was made by the evangelists to the controversy which has arisen over the baptismal incident." Indeed, the evangelists were still in an upbeat mood as Mr. Thomas is reported to have said to the newspaper correspondent that "they had found no English town they had visited more prepared for a revival than Gloucester, nor anywhere else had the results been so good, over 300 converts having already been made in the city."

However the same issue also reported that: "We have received several letters with reference to the baptism of the Welsh evangelists and the Rev. G. M. Smith's communication on the subject. Some of the opinions expressed on both sides are too personal for publication, and other correspondents deal with the necessity or otherwise of Baptism – a subject upon which we have no intention of allowing a discussion in our correspondence columns." A couple of extracts of letters were then quoted from. A William Rees wrote "I am surprised that the Rev. G. M. Smith should take exception to any person in a matter affecting their conscience and at a time best suited to themselves ... If Mr. Smith is speaking with the authority and consent of the ministers of the churches named ... then we have evidence of the existence of a very narrow spirit, which will do more harm to the revival than any number of baptisms. The secret of the letter of Mr. Smith is that he and his confederates were not consulted as to the wisdom of the proceedings. What a pity! For now they have gathered up their garments and are sulking in their tents." Another correspondent, "G.P." echoed these sentiments by saying: "Does it not seem a great pity that the wonderful work which through God's blessing is being carried out in this city should be interfered with for a moment by the unfortunate attitude taken up by some of the ministers ... "

However an H. Nurse replied in the following day's paper: "Mr William Rees may rest assured, without putting in any "ifs", that Mr. Smith when writing had the authority and consent of the ministers named in his letter. The "narrow spirit" mentioned by your correspondent, however does not exist with them, but is rather to be found with those who so influenced the evangelists that they have given a denominational bias to what should be, and what was up to Sunday last, an undenominational revival."

This immediately prompted three published responses, including one from one of the evangelists, another from Edwin Spring, and one from an earlier correspondent, William Rees.

A. E. Thomas, after saying that he had no wish to take part in any controversy raised by his and T. F. Bosanko's baptisms, nevertheless wanted to make a couple of points clear. "First, we were not influenced by any person (not even the pastor of Brunswick Road), neither was it "drummed" into us by anyone else. It is a matter over which my colleague and myself have spent much earnest prayer for the past five weeks, and I may state that Mr. Rice had no idea that we contemplated such an ordinance until Sunday morning. Again, we have not 'placed the revival movement on a denominational basis' because I distinctly stated that we were not baptised to belong to the Baptist denomination."

Edwin Spring also had a letter published on that day (Friday 10 February) – the day of the last meeting before the two evangelists moved on to lead missions in Saul and Tewkesbury. Mr. Spring gave some more background to the decision by the evangelists to be baptised. He claimed that the question arose in their minds "out of Mr. Bosanko himself reading Acts 2 at their first meeting, and to his brother having recently been immersed. Mr. Bosanko had given a great deal of thought to the matter before coming to Gloucester. Having come to the conclusion that it was their clear duty to be immersed, they decided to be so on the first opportunity which presented itself – namely, on the Sunday. Those who know Mr. Bosanko and Mr. Thomas personally, know that they are not easily influenced apart from the Word of God ..."

William Rees took a different line: "I accept without reservation the assurance of Mr. Nurse that the letter of Mr. Smith voiced the views of the ministers of the churches named by him. This fact only accentuates the bitterness of spirit which found expression in deep but vain regrets. Mr. Nurse may also rest assured that, taking the revival meeting held subsequent to the dreadful action of the Evangelists as a criterion, the so-called influence brought to bear on them and their yielding to it has not given the revival a denominational bias, but rather the contrary; the influence for good is intensified, and the revival is taking a firmer hold on the minds of the people, thus showing that the deep regrets of the ministers are brushed aside. The Evangelists are held in

greater esteem to-day than at any time since their visits to Gloucester. Surely Mr. Smith and his friends must know that there was a more manly and Christian course open to them to give expression to their feelings than to rush to the public Press. As exponents of the word of God, they know there are rules laid down for their guidance, which they should have acted upon. I hope they will profit by the knowledge that their deep regrets have only been like a voice in the wilderness, and set at naught by the onward march of the spirit of truth."

This was too much for Mr. Nurse who immediately fired off a response to all three letters, which was published the following day. He pointed out that: "Mr Spring is quite correct in assuming that I referred to Mr. Rice and himself as having influenced the evangelists over this question of baptism, for in your issue of Monday last I read that at the meeting at the East End Tabernacle on Sunday afternoon Mr. Bosanko stated: 'He had to thank his dear friend Mr. Spring, their minister, for teaching him with regard to baptism.' I cannot accept Mr. Spring's



Whitefield Memorial Church

statement that the evangelists decided to be immersed on the first opportunity which presented itself, as the same report says: 'They thought of being baptised there that afternoon, but as there would be a much larger number at Brunswick Road they had deferred it accordingly.' If Messrs. Bosanko and Thomas had wished to be immersed simply and solely in their individual capacity, may I ask Mr. Spring why there should be a large number of persons present? Can the rite of immersion only be performed in the presence of a crowd? The only logical conclusion is that it was done in this way so as to put the baptism as part of the revival programme. I was not present in the Brunswick Road church on Sunday night, so I did not hear Mr. Thomas make the statement to which Mr. Spring alludes, but I will again quote from Monday's 'Citizen': 'Now that they were convinced that it was essential' etc. Either baptism is essential or it is not. If it is, why have the evangelists not preached it at all their meetings? If it is not, then why say that it is, and why be publicly immersed in the midst of an undenominational revival? Your correspondent Mr. Rees still clings to his phrase 'bitterness of spirit.' I hope some of the 'bitterness' will vanish when he reads this. He is

most unfortunate in his choice of words. Who has said that the action of the evangelists was 'dreadful?' It certainly was very unwise, and calculated to lead men's minds from the main issue. What more manly and Christian course could be taken than the one adopted by Mr. Smith and his fellow ministers? There was no 'rushing to the public Press.' It was a simple, straightforward explanation of their position. I hope Mr. Rees will, to use his own words, 'profit by the knowledge' that there are still a few left in Gloucester who like fair play, whether in a game of football or a religious revival."

The meetings had ended, the evangelists had now moved on, and there were no more letters after this.

OPPOSITION

If a public row wasn't enough, there were also several disturbances in the streets after the evening meetings that ultimately resulted in the police acting to prevent any further spontaneous outdoor street celebrations or processions by the exuberant revivalists. After the first Thursday meeting for example, which was held at the Whitefield Memorial Church, Park Road it was reported that "At eleven o'clock the space between the Royal

Hotel and the Midland Railway Station was thronged by a crowd of several hundred persons, who indulged in hymn and prayer."

On the following night, after the meeting in Northgate Wesleyan Chapel there was a spontaneous open-air meeting in Market Parade. And the next night also after the main evening meeting in Tyndale Congregational Church there was a meeting held in the street.

This phenomenon did not escape the attentions of the *Citizen's* readers, one of whom who signed himself "Vox" had a letter published in Saturday's (4 February) edition. He gave the advice that: "I think it would be better for the whole 'Revivalist Movement' if those taking part were satisfied with a two or three hours' meeting, instead of carrying them on in the streets when all reasonable people are supposed to be in bed. Many who take part in these almost midnight meetings are young girls, whose parents would be sending to fetch them home if they were at a 'social,' 'party,' or any other worldly enjoyment at that hour. There does not appear much difference between drunken man rolling home singing 'Come home Bill Baily,' and three apparently respectable men and women tramping home at one o'clock in the morning singing the 'Glory Song' at the top of their voices. I do not dispute that much good may come of the 'movement,' but at the same time this sort of thing will soon turn into ridicule."

Two replies to "Vox" appeared in Monday's edition (6 February) including this from Mr. W. E. Hogg: "The letter signed 'Vox' may or may not be true as regards some of its statements, and the difference between 'Come home, Bill Baily' and the 'Glory Song' may not be apparent to our friend, but whatever the opinion or attitude of the people of Gloucester may be towards the revival services and the methods of conducting them, I feel certain that the spectacle of cowardly blackguardism on the part of some towards a singer of the 'Glory Song' as witnessed in Southgate Street on Saturday night, and the conduct of the drunken opposition in preventing anyone getting near enough to render aid to the young Christian, who, whilst praying, was subjected to several blows upon the chest, as also the supineness of the plain-clothed police officers, who merely looked on, and, by their silence sanctioned the un-English and degrading conduct of so-called men, is to be deeply regretted ... to some of us who see in the revival an answer to the prayers and efforts of Sunday school teachers and Christian workers, these things are a source of great joy and gladness, and lead us to say 'To God be the glory, great things He hath done.' We would therefore implore those who differ from us in these matters to refrain from abuse and brute force, to act the man, to come to the meetings and see and hear for themselves; above all not to quench the Spirit of God, but respond to His loving call so that when the 'Roll is called up Yonder, they'll be there.'"

If Saturday night was not very pleasant, Friday night also had its ugly side, which the Welsh evangelists both referred to during the Saturday evening's meeting. There were apparently some ugly scenes in the neighbourhood of the India House public house. Mr. Thomas said that "if ever the devil had manifested his work he did so on Friday night, but he thanked God there were still Christians who had the courage to stand up and face an infuriated mob of drunken men. He had never witnessed a scene like it in his life and it carried his mind back to the days of persecution ... Mr. Bosanko ... also referring to Friday night's scenes, he said he had never seen such tricks of the devil before. Some had said that the Revivalists were mad.



Northgate Wesleyan Chapel

THE GLOUCESTER REVIVAL.
DISORDERLY SCENES IN THE STREET.
THE POLICE INTERFERE.

If they were, their madness did not lead them to dance the 'cake walk' like the men and women did round the open-air meeting on Friday night. It was an awful revelation."

In fact, as William Rice also recorded, "several of the open air meetings at night (had) been interrupted by a numerous band of anti-Revivalists organised by the publicans,¹³ but on Saturday night the culminating point was reached. After the meeting in the Corn Exchange, a procession was formed and the services of the Salvation Army band were requisitioned. The "opposition" followed the procession to its several stopping places. Eventually a big lamp carried by the band was smashed, and the big drum and some of the other instruments of the band were severely handled. The situation was beginning to assume an ugly aspect, but the timely arrival of the police prevented a more serious collision. A few words from Inspector Weaver quickly and quietly dispersed both sections of the crowd." Rice was therefore more forgiving than Mr. Hogg of the police, while making a severe accusation against the publicans for organising the opposition to the revivalists. An accusation deserving of further research.

This was the last post-meeting gathering. After the Sunday evening meeting in Brunswick Road Baptist Church the *Citizen* reports that "an attempt was made to hold an open-air demonstration in the street, but the police very quietly and effectively made the crowd "move on", and the street was soon clear." A similar thing happened after the following evening's meeting.

THE RESULTS

In crude terms the results of a revival are measured in terms of numbers of people who respond to the message and are, in evangelical Christian terms, "saved." As mentioned earlier a *Citizen* report in the issue of Wednesday 8 February quoted Mr. Thomas as saying that up to that point "over 300" had indicated this. William Rice in his *Baptist Times* report written on the same day said "some 400 have confessed their faith in Christ, and the blessed work is going on apace." A prudent figure is probably around 350 from 10 days with three days still to go. Assuming the growth rate continued at the same rate, this would mean around 450 responses for the full two-week mission.

A clue as to who those people were is found in two reports written a few months after the mission. In the Brunswick Road Church's Deacon's report of 1906,¹⁴ covering the year 1905, it is reported that the result of the "labour" of the Welsh evangelists is "men and women transformed and renewed." Membership of the church grew by 61 during the year, 43 of which by baptism, which William Rice comments is "specifically cheering to note (that)...large increase has been mainly by baptism and from amongst the young life of our congregation."¹⁵

And in another report for the year, this time to the Gloucestershire and Herefordshire Association of Baptist churches the same church reported that "all well" in connection with the work of the church. "Since the beginning of the present year especially, there has been a revival of interest and enthusiasm in all departments. A large number from the School and Congregation have decided for Christ, and we are gathering in the fruit of past labour."¹⁶ For Brunswick at least, the main converts seem to have been drawn from the young fringes of the church.

But it was not all good news for the church during that year as the Deacons also cryptically report: "The past year has been marked by light and shade. We have had experiences 'full of splendour and light,' like unto the days of the Son of Man upon earth; and anon we have had to tread the valley of the shadow ..."¹⁷

The regional report for 1906 is missing, but for the following year, the year William Rice resigned from the pastorate due to ill health, the report reads: "We have suffered from what would appear to be a reaction after the revival; compared with our experiences then, things have flagged somewhat."¹⁸ The membership figures for the few years around 1905 are –

1904 – 362
1905 – 375
1906 – 403

1907 – 395 ¹⁹

For the Free Baptist church there is no report given for 1905, only the news that William Hogan had resigned and moved to a church in another part of the country.²⁰ In 1907 however, it is reported that the church has had a year of "progress and consolidation, there is an increase in membership and several agencies have done good work .." The membership figures for this church show –

1904 – 224

1905 – 225

1906 – 208

1907 - 215 ²¹

No growth at all in other words, and in fact a dip after the departure of William Hogan.

The picture of what happened with other churches after the revival is not known, but there are a couple of clues about the East End Tabernacle. This church seems to have had quite a fluid membership as shown by the figure for 1904 of 247 including 33 additions and 41 losses.²² Nothing is reported for 1905, but in 1906 the church secretary reported that: "We have suffered a period of financial depression, and have just "marked time." However, it also reported that "We have had the joy of having a mission conducted by W. Durban, which strengthened the members, and slightly added to our numbers."²³

Brunswick Baptist Church therefore gained over 60 as a result of the revival meetings. But what happened to the other 350 plus converts as yet must remain a mystery.

Acknowledgements

The pictures and newspaper cuttings have been reproduced with the kind permission of Gloucestershire Collection, Gloucester Library.

References

- ¹ J. Edwin Orr, *Flaming Tongue: the impact of 20th century revivals*, Moody, 1973.
- ² *Citizen*, 31 January 1905.
- ³ *Ibid.*
- ⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁵ *Baptist Times*, 17 February 1905.
- ⁶ Smart's City of Gloucester Directory 1906-07.
- ⁷ Gloucestershire Record Office (GRO) D4373 2/4.
- ⁸ G. Barr, *Edwin Henry Spring*, 1934, p. 27.
- ⁹ *Victoria County History of Gloucestershire (VCH Glos) IV* p. 210.
- ¹⁰ R. B. Jones, *Rent Heavens: the revival of 1904*, South Wales Bible Training Institute, 1931.
- ¹¹ *VCH Glos IV* p.321.
- ¹² *Baptist Times*, 17 February 1905.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴ GRO D4373
- ¹⁵ GRO D4373.
- ¹⁶ 63rd Report of the Annual Meetings of the Gloucestershire & Herefordshire Baptist Association, June 1905, p. 14.
- ¹⁷ GRO D4373.
- ¹⁸ 65th Report of the Annual Meetings of the Gloucestershire & Herefordshire Baptist Association, June 1907, p. 14.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 63rd and 65th reports.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 63rd report.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 63rd and 65th reports.
- ²² G. Barr, *Edwin Henry Spring*, 1934, p. 56.
- ²³ G. Barr, *Edwin Henry Spring*, 1934, p. 57.