



# Enlightenment and Dissent

No. 21 2002

Enlightenment  
and Dissent

No. 21 2002

## CONTENTS

### Page

viii Editorial

### Documents

- 1 Preface and Introduction to John Disney's Diary.  
*D O Thomas*
- 42 John Disney's Diary. 1 January 1783 – 17 May 1784  
*D O Thomas*
- 128 Charles Polhill and *The Chronicle of the Kingdom of Cassiterides*  
*Sheldon Cohen*
- 137 *The Chronicle of the Kingdom of Cassiterides*  
*Sheldon Cohen*

### Review Articles

- 163 The different faces of Mary Wollstonecraft *Pam Clemit*
- 170 Enlightenment in Australia *Anthony Page*

### Reviews

- 183 Gillian Russell and Clara Tuite eds., *Romantic sociability: social networks and literary culture in Britain 1770-1840*,  
*Damian Walford Davies*
- 189 Robert Rix ed., 'A Political Dictionary Explaining the True Meaning of Words' by Charles Pigott. A facsimile of the 1795 Edition,  
*Martin Fitzpatrick*
- 193 Anthony Page, *John Jebb and the Enlightenment Origins of British Radicalism*,  
*Emma Vincent Macleod*
- 195 Pamela Edwards, *The Statesman's Science: History, Nature, and Law in the Political Thought of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*  
*Tim Milnes*
- 198 Martin Fitzpatrick, Peter Jones, Christa Knellwolf eds.  
*The Enlightenment World* *Alan P.F. Sell*

- 209 William Gibson, *Enlightenment prelate: Benjamin Hoadly* (1676-1761), *D O Thomas*
- 215 Sheldon S Cohen *British Supporters of the American Revolution 1775-1783. The Role of the 'Middling-level' Activists* *Peter D G Thomas*

217 **Books received**

## **Editorial**

It is with great sadness to report that not long before this journal went to the press, our founding editor, and editor emeritus, D O Thomas, died after a short illness. We are, however, grateful that his enormous contribution to *Enlightenment and Dissent* and to Enlightenment scholarship more generally had already been recognized in the festschrift for him which constituted the millennial issue of this journal. That contribution has continued through to this issue which includes his valuable edition of John Disney's diary from 1783 to 1784. The diary is not a confessional document, although it contains informative personal concerns, but overall it constitutes a wonderful record of Disney and his circle. All this is described by 'D O' in careful detail and he takes the opportunity to examine Disney's religious ideas in relation to his contemporaries, most notably Theophilus Lindsey. His analysis of the relationship between reason and revelation brings new light to bear on the subject and his conclusion is not one that one might expect for this group of 'liberal' theologians. 'D O' did not belabour his infirmities, but it is humbling to note that he carried out this impressive work when he had minimal eyesight. Nor did he demur from reviewing William Gibson's book on Hoadly, in whom he had a particular interest. Once again we see his discriminating intelligence at work, notably in the contrast which he draws between Hoadly and Samuel Clarke. His passing is a great loss to us. He was a fine scholar and a wise and warm friend. We extend our deepest condolences to his widow Beryl and daughter Janet, who did so much to support him in his work.

Last year we lost a member of the editorial advisory board with the death of D A Rees, Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford. Readers of the journal will recall his reviews, notably of works in Greek, and two wide ranging articles on the Enlightenment. He was an enthusiastic supporter of the journal and made his extensive knowledge available to us on many occasions. Indeed, 'D O' was often able to test his ideas out on him, as he had exceptional recall of classic texts in the history of philosophy. We extend our sympathy to his widow, Una.

We are mindful of the slippage which has occurred with recent issues and are doing our best to prevent any further deterioration. However, it may be necessary in the near future to combine issues in order to catch up with the years.

We are pleased to welcome to the editorial board, as review editor, Dr. Anthony Page of the University of Tasmania. Readers may know his fine study (herein reviewed), of *John Jebb and the Enlightenment Origins of British Radicalism* (Westport, Connecticut and London, Praeger, 2003), a small part of which first appeared in this journal. He is an energetic researcher in the field of late eighteenth-century radicalism, and we are delighted that he has agreed to take charge of reviewing in the journal.

MHF  
JD

## JOHN DISNEY'S DIARY

*D O Thomas*

### Preface

Shortly after he became an assistant minister to Theophilus Lindsey at the Unitarian chapel in Essex Street, London, in November 1782, John Disney kept a diary. The transcription of this diary, which is printed in the following pages, details the events of his life from 1 January 1783 to 17 May 1784. The manuscript of the diary, formerly in the library of Mr. Brent Gratton Maxfield, and now in the possession of the editor, is contained in a notebook of 188 pages, 20 of which were left blank by Disney. It is bound in quarter leather. The volume measure 19cms by 12 cms. Care has been taken to make the transcription a faithful representation of the text. There are many abbreviations in the diary. Where it is reasonably certain to whom or to what they refer they have been extended: ADB is extended to Archdeacon Blackburne (Disney's father-in-law), Dff to Disney ffytche (Disney's brother), and SD to Samuel Disney (Disney's cousin). Where it is not reasonably certain how an abbreviation should be extended, a conjecture is placed within square brackets. Where there is uncertainty about a transcription, it is followed by a query placed in round brackets. Although the aim in general has been to reproduce a faithful copy of the text, in some instances punctuation has been modernised: for example, many dashes have been omitted as has the period following Mr and Dr.

In the course of a year Disney called on and was called on by a considerable number of relatives, friends, acquaintances; these he dutifully recorded. An attempt has been made to identify as many as possible of these persons and to show how they were related to members of the Disney and Lindsey families. What emerges is a picture of how these families were related to the gentry of Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire, how Lindsey and Disney were acquainted with the leaders of Rational Dissent both in the metropolis and in the country at large, how they were acquainted with members of the Royal Society, of the Society of Antiquaries and of the 'Club of Honest Whigs'. Where a name has been identified a note is attached to the first instance of its occurrence: where it is annotated, either an identification occurs earlier in the text or the relevant person has not been identified.

*John Disney's Diary*

A large debt of gratitude is owed to those who have helped in the preparation of this document: to the staff of the Nottingham Archive for access to materials concerning the Disney family; to the late Eric Price for locating documents and transcribing them; to Miss Lynda Hotchkiss of Lincoln Archive for information concerning the Turnor family; to Dr. Grayson Ditchfield, to Dr Martin Fitzpatrick, to Mr P A L Jones; to Mr. John Stephens and Dr David Wykes for making documents available to me, collecting information and checking references during the time that I have been unable to visit libraries myself. I owe a special debt of gratitude to my wife, Beryl, without whose untiring patience in reducing the anarchy of my typescript to order, this document would have never troubled the printer. I am indebted to Mr. John Stephens for enabling me to acquire the manuscript, and Mr. Brent Gratton-Maxfield who compiled the genealogy of the Disney family which I acquired at the same time.

**Introduction**

John Disney, the author of the diary, was born at Lincoln on 29 September 1746. Because there are three other John Disneys in the story it will be convenient to refer to him from time to time as JD. His father John Disney (1700-1771) was High Sheriff of Nottingham in 1732. His mother Frances (1709-91) was the daughter of George Cartwright of Ossington. She was married to J D's father on 29 December 1730; they had nine children including Mary, Lewis, Frederick, and J D himself. At the time the diary was kept Frances, who survived her husband by twenty years, was living at a house in Eastgate, Lincoln which he had built. J D's father was, as his will shows, a man of substantial property. He left to his wife, in addition to the house at Eastgate, property at Swinderby, Aigle and Woolhouse in Lincolnshire, and at Wigsley and Carlton in Nottinghamshire. To Frederick he left £1,000, and to JD £2,000 (these sums in addition to gifts made in his lifetime). The bulk of the property went to Lewis, including estates at Flintham, Hawkesworth and Middlethorpe in Notting-hamshire, and lands at Leverton in Lincolnshire, and at Cottam, and Sutton-on-Trent in Nottinghamshire. He also be-queathed to Lewis the advowsons to vicarages, one at Swinderby in Lincolnshire and the

*D O Thomas*

other at Thorney in Nottinghamshire.<sup>1</sup> JD's grandfather, also John Disney (1677-1730), was Vicar of St Mary's, Nottingham and the author of a celebrated treatise *An essay on the enforcement of the law against immorality and profaneness* (1708). He married Mary, a daughter of Dr William Woolhouse of North Muskham.

JD was educated at Wakefield Grammar School under John Clarke and subsequently at Lincoln Grammar School under the Rev. John Emeris. It was intended that he should make the law his profession, and he was entered at Middle Temple in or about 1762, but he was prevented by ill-health from pursuing that course. On 15 June 1764 he was admitted to Peterhouse, Cambridge, as a pensioner. While he was at Cambridge he came under the influence of Edmund Law, the Master of Peterhouse and the Knightsbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy, and was drawn into the circle of those who entertained radical views in philosophy and theology and who found it difficult to accept the tenets of Trinitarian orthodoxy, men like John Jebb, Edward Evanson, Robert Tyrwhitt and Gilbert Wakefield. JD was ordained deacon in 1768, and when Edmund Law became Bishop of Carlisle in that year he appointed him his honorary chaplain. On 15 September 1768 he received the Freedom of the City of Nottingham. In 1770 he received the degree of Bachelor of Laws and in the same year was ordained priest and instituted Vicar of Swinderby on the presentation of his father, and Rector of Panton, on the presentation of his brother-in-law, Edmund Turnor of Stoke-Rochford and Panton in Lincolnshire, both livings in Lincolnshire.<sup>2</sup>

Right at the outset of his ministry, JD's conduct of services was influenced by the anti-Trinitarian views that he had developed at Cambridge; he dispensed with the Apostles' Creed and later with the Liturgy and the Nicene Creed. At this time he was also politically active, becoming a member of the Association to promote a petition for the relief of clergymen and teachers from subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, a petition which came to be known as The Feathers Tavern Petition. In 1773 he published *A*

---

<sup>1</sup> See Summary of John Disney's Will, died 1771, proved 1772: 'Summary of Wills', Nottingham Archives, Ref. DD N-191/11.

<sup>2</sup> Edmund Turnor (1719/20-1805) married Mary (1731/2-1818), JD's sister Turnor, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

*John Disney's Diary*

*short view of the controversy occasioned by 'The confessional'*, the influential work written by his then future father-in-law, Archdeacon Francis Blackburne. In the July of that year he was appointed Commissioner of the Peace for the division of Kesteven.

In 1774 J D married Jane (1746-1808), the eldest daughter of Francis Blackburne (Rector of Richmond and Archdeacon of Cleveland), and half-sister to Hannah, wife of Theophilus Lindsey. On their removal to London in November 1782, J D and Jane had three surviving children: Frances Mary (b. 1775), John (b. 1779), and Algernon (b. 1780). Frances Mary, to whom J D frequently refers as 'my dear little Fanny' was for the period which the diary covers, a delicate child, her health constantly giving cause for concern. She married Thomas Jervis (1748-1833), a Unitarian minister some twenty-seven years her senior. John, LL.D., FRS, and FSA, became a barrister and Recorder of Bridport. Algernon entered the Army. Like many families in the eighteenth century, the Disneys were afflicted by high infant mortality. In the first twelve years of their married life, they had seven children, four of whom died in infancy: Elizabeth (b. 1775), Catherine (b. 1778), Elizabeth Collyer (b. 1783) and Jane (b. 1786).<sup>3</sup>

In 1776 J D was awarded the degree of D.D. at Edinburgh with the support of Edmund Law. This award was feasible because Edinburgh did not require subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles as a precondition for the award of academic honours. In 1778 J D was elected a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries and in 1780 he joined the Nottinghamshire Association for economic retrenchment and constitutional reform. By this time he was finding it increasingly difficult to stay within the Church of England and in 1782, much to the dismay of his father-in-law, the Archdeacon, he threw up all his preferments and agreed to join Lindsey in Essex Street as his assistant. In *Reasons for resigning the Rectory at Panton and the Vicarage at Swinderby in Lincolnshire; and*

---

<sup>3</sup> John Disney's father and mother, John and Frances Disney, were also afflicted by infant mortality: of their nine children, five died in infancy. MS. An abbreviated pedigree of the family of Disney, see Preface above p.2.

*D O Thomas*

*quitting the Church of England,*<sup>4</sup> he explained why he could not remain a minister in the Church of England. He had hoped that the Feathers Tavern Petition would have relieved the difficulties of those clergymen and teachers who could not accept the Trinitarian doctrines enshrined in the Creeds and who could not in conscience subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles as they were required to do. His own theological position which, as we shall see, was substantially the same as Lindsey's, included the doctrine of the Unity of the Godhead and the doctrine that God alone is to be worshipped. These doctrines are founded, he believed, on the Scriptures which are exclusively the true foundation of belief and faith. Like Lindsey, J D owed much to Chillingworth's doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture; all that is necessary for salvation is to be found within it, and there is no need to add to it. All attempts to require acceptance of doctrines that are contrary to Scripture are heretical in that they exalt the human above the divine. He maintained strenuously that many of the doctrines upheld by the Church of England, including the doctrine of the Trinity and the doctrine of the divine status of Christ, have no warrant in Scripture.

J D believed that the truths of Scripture are accessible to all men, and that, in consequence, all men have a duty to cultivate their understanding of what Scripture contains. In this respect he shared Samuel Clarke's conviction that in interpreting and following Scripture 'all men must understand with their own understanding'.<sup>5</sup> Not only is it a duty to determine for oneself what is true, it is also obligatory not to profess or appear to profess what one does not believe to be true. The duties of candour require that it is better to leave the church than subscribe to what one does not believe to be true. J D was careful not to claim that others should of necessity do what he had done. He was aware that many ministers in the Church found it difficult to decide whether or not they should stay in the Church for the same reasons that had troubled him. His *apologia* was not intended to bind others to the same course of action. It is a

---

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit. (London 1782), 13, reprinted in *Six tracts, in vindication of the worship of the One God* (London, 1794). I am indebted to Mr John Stephens for making the text of this document available to me.

<sup>5</sup> *The Scripture doctrine of the Trinity*, in *The works of Samuel Clarke*, D.D. (4 vols., London, 1738), I, 5.

### *John Disney's Diary*

consequence of the view that every man should do his best to enlighten his own conscience and do what he thinks to be right: that no one is entitled to prescribe in religious matters what another should believe or be guided by. It was in this spirit that J D held that although there is in Scripture a truth that is accessible to all, every man must be governed by his own sense of what that truth is, and what action it demands.

The nature and strength of J D's political opinions may be gathered from *A sermon preached in the Parish Church of Swinderby ... on Friday, February the 8th, 1782, being the day appointed by His Majesty's proclamation for a General Fast*. In it he attacks the Administration's policies in America, particularly the attempt to subjugate the colonies by force and to deprive them of their liberties. He lamented that 'the hateful attempt to subjugate a free people, should hazard the loss of those liberties which have been the wonted boast and blessing of our country'.<sup>6</sup>

In November 1782 JD and his wife Jane together with their three children, Frances Mary, John and Algernon took up residence in Essex Street, London to be near the chapel which Lindsey had opened in 1778. In this diary, which J D kept for the period 1 January 1783 to 17 May 1784, he recorded the activities of the day, the discharge of his duties as a minister and his preparations for Sunday, his social activities, his literary labours, the business he transacted for his family and relatives, the people who called to see him and those upon whom he called. It would be extremely difficult now to identify all those who are named in the diary – well over three hundred – but it is possible to identify enough of the persons who are named to yield an appealing picture of the life he led, his relations with the members of family, his duties as a Unitarian minister and the details of his literary and social activities. It also throws light upon those who supported the newly founded Unitarian cause in Essex Street and his relations with prominent Anglicans and Dissenters.

---

6 Op.cit. (London, 1782), 14.

*D O Thomas*

**The Disney family:**

John and Jane Disney were affectionate parents devoted to the welfare of their family. The surviving daughter, whom J D always refers to as 'dear Fanny', went at the age of seven to a boarding school at Whitelands, Chelsea run by Mrs Grignion. J D was always solicitous about her, frequently visiting her, and when she was ill, for the child's health was delicate, bringing her in a coach to be nursed at home. No trouble was spared for she was carefully attended by Drs Jebb, Saunders and Sharpe. At one time she suffered an eye complaint for which the use of leeches was prescribed. J D was very fond of walking with his children, Fanny, John and Algernon, in the gardens of Inner and Middle Temple and in Lincoln's Inn Gardens. On 28 November 1783, when they were in St. James' Park the children saw the King, and 'made their best compliments, and received most gracious notice in return'. J D took the children to see some of the interesting events of the day; on 11 November they went to see the Lord Mayor's Show, and on the following day to see the King going 'to the House'; on the 28 February 1784 they went into the Strand to see Mr Pitt 'pass into the City'.

J D's father had died in 1771, but his mother was still living at the time the diary was kept at Lincoln. J D kept in close contact with her, visiting her when on holiday, writing to her frequently and transacted business for her.

J D's sister Mary had married Edmund Turnor of Panton Hall and had a large family by him. Throughout the diary J D refers to her as 'Sister Turnor'. Her son, Edmund Turnor jun.(1754-1829) was, like J D, a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries. J D's elder brother Lewis (1738-1822), had added the name of ffytche to his own when he married Elizabeth (d.1787), the only daughter of William ffytche, Governor of Bengal. Frederick (1741-1788) pursued a military career. He was appointed captain in the 21st Regiment of the Foot, and was promoted Major in 1780. He saw service in America under Burgoyne and Carlton.

Other members of the family figure prominently in the diary. Samuel Disney (1737/8-1786) who became Vicar of Halstead in Leicestershire, was one of J D's cousins. He and J D shared a grandfather in John Disney, Vicar of St Mary's Nottingham, and a

### *John Disney's Diary*

grandmother in Mary, the daughter of Dr William Woolhouse of North Mushkam. Samuel Disney (1705-1741), the father of the Samuel Disney who was J D's cousin, was the fourth son of John and Mary Disney; he became a Fellow of Corpus Christi, Cambridge in 1729 and a lecturer at Wakefield College in 1731. In 1732 he married Margery, the youngest daughter of Francis Procter of Thorpe. They had three children, two of whom died in infancy, the only surviving child being Samuel, J D's cousin. This Samuel Disney entered Clare Hall, Cambridge in 1755, and later, because he was prevented by a stipulation in the statutes of the College from becoming a Fellow, since he possessed private property to a certain amount, he studied for the degree of Bachelor of Civil Law which he obtained in 1761. After a curacy at Ripley and a perpetual curacy at Hedlington he became Vicar of Halstead in 1768. He married Ann, daughter of Christopher Wilson, a residentiary at St.Paul's who became Bishop of Bristol in 1783. Samuel was no radical in doctrinal matters, and although he supported the petitioners for relief from subscription, he himself had no difficulty in subscribing to the Thirty-nine Articles. Although they differed on this fundamental issue, Samuel and J D remained on amicable terms each respecting the other's right to exercise his own judgement. J D for his part did not expect others to take the step that he had taken when he left the Church and did not show ill-will to those who did not follow him. Samuel for his part thought that it was better that those who could not accept the articles and the creeds should leave the Church rather than stay within it on fraudulent and deceptive terms. J D admired his cousin's candour and tolerant spirit. Although Samuel was conservative in most matters, doctrinal and practical, in one respect, however, he did exhibit reforming tendencies: in his papers there was found one entitled 'Considerations on Pluralities' in which he expressed reservations about accepting more than one benefice. This paper was published in *Sermons on various subjects* (1788). True to his principles, Samuel refused to accept additional preferments in the Church.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> For the genealogical and biographical details relating to Samuel Disney and his family, see J D's preface to Samuel Disney, *Discourses on*

### *D O Thomas*

Throughout the period covered by the diary J D was in close contact with several of the descendants of his father's relatives. His aunt Martha had married Metcalfe Proctor, and their daughter, Catherine, married John Howard, Earl of Effingham, who became Governor of Jamaica in 1789. Through his mother Frances, JD was connected with the extensive Cartwright family who figure prominently in the history of the gentry in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire. In 1731 Frances's sister Anne had married William Cartwright of Markham. They had five sons and five daughters, several of whom had careers of distinction. The eldest, William, served in the Treasury; the second son, George (1739-1819) was aide-de-camp to the Marquis of Granby and became well known for his publication, *Journal of sixteen years residence in Labrador*; the third son, John (1740-1824) won fame as Major John Cartwright, the ardent political reformer; the fourth son, Edmund (1743-1823) became famous as the inventor of the power-loom; and the fifth son, Charles, won distinction in a naval engagement with the Dutch in which he captured the fort of Commendam on the African coast.<sup>8</sup> Other members of the Ossington branch of the Cartwrights (as distinct from the Markham branch) who figure in the diary include Dorothy, who married Henry, Lord Middleton, and Mary, wife of Sir Charles Buck. They were the daughters of George Cartwright of Ossington.<sup>9</sup> Although many descendants of the Cartwrights appear in the diary there does not seem to be much evidence that they sympathised with J D's defection from the Church of England or that they supported the Unitarian cause in Essex Street. There may, however, be one exception: although he did not attend the chapel in Essex Street there is some evidence to suggest that Major John Cartwright was Unitarian in his theology.<sup>10</sup>

---

*various subjects* (London, 1788).

<sup>8</sup> F D Cartwright ed., *The life and correspondence of Major Cartwright* (2 vols., London, 1826; reprint New York, 1969), I, 3.

<sup>9</sup> See M S [M. Strickland], *A memoir of the life, writings, and mechanical inventions of Edmund Cartwright* (1843), reprint with intro. by Kenneth G Ponting (New York, 1971), 5n.

<sup>10</sup> See Rachel Eckersley, 'John Cartwright: radical reformer and Unitarian?' *Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society* (T.U.H.S.), XXII, no. 1 (April 1999), 37-53.

### *John Disney's Diary*

Major John's brother, Edmund (1743-1823), was perpetual curate of Brampton, near Wakefield from 1779, and Rector of Goadby Marwood from 1785. There does not seem to be any evidence to suggest that he shared his brother's theological or political views.

On Jane Disney's side of the family there was her father Archdeacon Francis Blackburne, her step-sister Hannah, wife of Theophilus Lindsey, her brother Francis, Vicar of Brignall in Yorkshire, and her sister Sarah, who married John Hall, Vicar of Chew Magna in Somerset. The delineation of family connections confirms, if ever confirmation were required, that the nascent Unitarian denomination was, whatever it was to become, an offshoot of the Church of England. When he broke away from the Church, Theophilus Lindsey was determined, in all but his radical theological convictions, to retain the forms of Anglicanism. It is also evident that neither in Jane's family nor in J D's were defections from the Church vigorously supported by other members of their families. Quite the contrary. Archdeacon Blackburne was appalled that both of his sons-in-law felt it necessary to leave the Church. It was not that he was violently opposed to their campaign for reform, for he had been one of the strongest supporters of the Feathers Tavern Petition, but he was firmly convinced that more would be achieved by staying within the Church and fighting for reform from within. Blackburne believed that secession from the Church would result in 'utter ruin' for the petitionary movement. Furthermore, he disapproved of the theological opinions held by his sons-in-law: 'If I believed as Messrs Lindsey and Disney say they believe, I should certainly think that I had no right to profess myself a Christian.'<sup>11</sup>

A striking illustration of the ways in which the Disney family was bound up with the life of the Anglican Church is to be found in the career of J D's brother, Lewis Disney ffytche. He was patron of the living of Woodham Walter in Essex. The living became vacant in 1780 due to the death of the incumbent, Foote Gower, and on 2

---

<sup>11</sup> See John Gascoigne, *Cambridge in the age of the Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1988), 197. For Blackburne see also Martin Fitzpatrick, 'Latitudinarianism at the parting of the ways: a suggestion', in *The Church of England 1609-1833*, ed. John Walsh et al. (Cambridge, 1993), 209-227.

*D O Thomas*

January 1781 ffytche presented his clerk, the Reverend John Eyre, to the Bishop of London for institution. The Bishop was informed, however, that Eyre had given his patron a bond, in a large penalty, to resign the rectory at any time upon his request. When Eyre confirmed that this was so, the Bishop refused to institute him to the living, whereupon ffytche started an action against the Bishop in the Court of Common Pleas. He was initially successful, but when an appeal was made to the House of Lords, the previous judgements of the lower courts were reversed.<sup>12</sup> As may well be imagined the outcome of the dispute was far from pleasing to the Disney family, and loud were the complaints against the betrayal of justice. After Disney ffytche's failure to secure the institution of his own nominee, J D asked his brother, as a favour to him, to accept the nomination of a Mr Fisher by John Lee, the Solicitor-General. Why J D wanted to please 'Honest Jack' Lee in this way is not clear, except that both men were members of the 'Honest Whigs' Club and Lee supported the Unitarians at Essex Street. Lee subscribed £100 to the building of the chapel in Essex Street in 1776.<sup>13</sup> The law-suits in which Lewis Disney ffytche was involved illustrate, if illustration were needed, how many private persons regarded the right to present to a living in the Church of England as a piece of property which they were entitled to dispose of as they thought fit. J D, as we have seen, owed his two livings in the Church to his relations: Swinderby to his father, Panton to his brother-in-law. Lindsey, even after he had left the Church, still retained the right to present to Chew Magna, and when the vacancy arose, gave the living to his brother-in-law, John Hall.<sup>14</sup> No one doubts that men like Francis Blackburne, Lindsey, Samuel Disney and J D were men of integrity, willing, as their careers show, to sacrifice personal interests if keeping to their principles required it. Blackburne refused further preferments when that involved re-subscribing to the Thirty-nine Articles. Lindsey might well have become a Bishop had he been content to remain within the Church.

---

<sup>12</sup> See *The English reports; The House of Lords*, vol. I (London, 1900).

<sup>13</sup> H McLachlan, *Essays and addresses* (Manchester, 1950), 52.

<sup>14</sup> See G M Ditchfield, 'Theophilus Lindsey: from Anglican to Unitarian', Friend's of Dr. Williams's Library Fifty First Lecture (London, 1998), 22 and n.135.

### *John Disney's Diary*

Samuel Disney refused additional preferments because of his objections to pluralities. J D himself did not find the decision to leave the Church an easy one. What, perhaps, seems strange to modern critics is that they saw no difficulties in the right to dispose of livings in the Church being in private hands, and that they saw no impropriety in placing members of their own families in positions of privilege and emolument.

### **Cambridge Connections**

Since many of those who played a prominent part in the movement for clerical reform and many of the leaders of the nascent Unitarianism were educated at the University of Cambridge, it is hardly surprising to find that J D's diary bristles with Cambridge graduates. Francis Blackburne, J D's father-in-law and the author of *The Confessional* (1765), the prime text for the petitionary movement, had been a student at Catharine Hall, and Lindsey himself had been a student and later a Fellow of St John's. When J D entered Peterhouse in 1764, the Master of the College was Edmund Law who had considerable influence in the development and dissemination of rationalist theology throughout the eighteenth century. In 1764 Law was elected Knightsbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy, and in 1768 he became Bishop of Carlisle. On that occasion, as has been noted, he made J D his honorary chaplain. Law's works include a translation of Archbishop King's *De origine mali* (1731), *Considerations on the state of the world with regard to the theory of religion* (1745) and an edition of the works of John Locke (1777). But perhaps the work that was most pertinent to J D's intellectual development in the 1770's was his *Considerations on the propriety of requiring subscription to articles of faith* (1774), in which he maintained that while members of the clergy should be required to comply with the liturgy, rites and offices of the Church, it was not reasonable to require them to profess belief in specific articles of doctrine. It should be noted, however, that Law did not draw the practical conclusions that Lindsey and J D did. He did not leave the Church of England, he did not play any active part in the movement to secure relief from subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and he did not sign the Feathers Tavern petition.

*D O Thomas*

Edmund Law's son, John Law (1745-1810), also figures in the diary. In 1782 he had become Bishop of Clonfert in Ireland, and was later to become Bishop of Killala (1787), and Bishop of Elphin (1795). In his undergraduate days at Cambridge he was a contemporary of William Paley, with whom he established a life-long friendship.<sup>15</sup> In 1770 he was elected to a fellowship at Christ's college and later became Archdeacon of Carlisle. In a letter to Samuel Johnson dated 7 November 1779, Boswell said that Law was 'a man of great variety of knowledge, uncommon genius, and, I believe, sincere religion'.<sup>16</sup>

A contemporary of Lindsey's at Cambridge was William Chambers (1724-177) one of the radical theologians who, according to J C D Clarke, enjoyed 'a minor vogue' at Cambridge. He was an undergraduate at St. John's and shared Lindsey's dislike of clerical subscription and the Trinitarianism of the Anglican creeds.<sup>17</sup> He became Rector of Thorpe Achurch in Northamptonshire at the early age of twenty four and, apparently, revised the liturgies without incurring the displeasure of his Bishop, John Hinchliffe of Peterborough. One of his sisters, Rosamund (d.1792) married John Sargent (1715-91), who owned Halstead Place in Essex and was M.P. for Midhurst (1754-61) and West Looe (1765-68). Several of the Chambers and Sargent families appear in J D's diary, including William Chambers's widow (who lived until 1809), Christopher Chambers, a merchant in Mincing Lane, and John and Rosamund Sargent.

Another luminary of his Cambridge days, Dr. John Jebb (1736-1786) figures prominently in the diary. A radical in theology and politics, Jebb threw up his preferments in the Church of England in 1775 and began studies to qualify as a medical practitioner. In 1777 he qualified as a Doctor in Physic and set up a practice in London. In this capacity he attended to J D's family from their arrival in London without charging fees. J D and Jebb shared affinities in

---

<sup>15</sup> For Law's friendship with Paley, see M L Clarke, *Paley* (London, 1974), *passim*.

<sup>16</sup> *Boswell's life of Johnson* (new edn., London and New York, 1953), 1043.

<sup>17</sup> See G M Ditchfield, 'The Rev. William Chambers, D.D.(1724 - 1777)', *Enlightenment and Dissent*, 4 (1985), 3-12.

### *John Disney's Diary*

theology and politics. After Jebb's death in 1786 J D wrote a memoir which prefaced the collected edition of Jebb's works.

Another Cambridge scholar to come under the influence of Edmund Law was Gilbert Wakefield (1756-1801), one-time Fellow of Jesus College. In his *Memoirs* he recalled a 'noble sermon' that Law preached on 5 November 1773 in which he maintained 'that the spirit of popery was not confined to popish countries; that spiritual tyranny consisted in imposing other articles, as terms of communion, than what Christ had given; that religious liberty was too valuable a right to be complimented away; and that every effort to oppress conscience should be opposed. In short no *petitioner* would have wished him to say more'.<sup>18</sup>

### **John Disney's debt to Theophilus Lindsey**

Throughout the period under review J D's relations with Lindsey seem to have been very good. Lindsey was twenty three years JD's senior, and J D seems to have been deferential, always giving Lindsey a title and never referring to him as brother-in-law. None of the tension that is said to have existed between Jane Disney and her step-sister Hannah Lindsey surfaced in the diary although one may wonder why the Disneys went house-hunting away from Essex Street.<sup>19</sup> When Lindsey opened his chapel in Essex Street in 1774 he cast about for someone to help him. J D was not his first choice: his immediate choice was John Jebb who gave up his preferments in the Church of England in 1775, but Jebb demurred, preferring a career in medicine. Lindsey then approached William Robertson of Rathvilly, headmaster of Wolverhampton School, 'the father of Unitarianism in Britain',<sup>20</sup> but he was deterred by a threat of per-secution for teaching without a licence and he wished to defend his position. Charles Toogood was also approached.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> *Memoirs of the life of Gilbert Wakefield, B.A.* (2 vols., London, 1804), I, 93.

<sup>19</sup> McLachlan, *Essays and addresses*, 51.

<sup>20</sup> It should be noted that there are two other candidates for this honour: John Biddle (1615-62) and Thomas Emlyn (1663-1741).

<sup>21</sup> Ditchfield, 'Theophilus Lindsey: from Anglican to Unitarian', 6.

*D O Thomas*

James Lambert<sup>22</sup> and Paul Henry Maty<sup>23</sup> were also considered. Lindsey and JD had been brothers-in-law since JD's marriage in 1774, and Lindsey had stayed with JD for a few days when he was on his way to London to open his chapel when they studied Samuel Clarke's annotations on the Book of Common Prayer. This volume was to play a very influential role in the development of the liturgies used by Unitarians in the late eighteenth and in the nineteenth century.<sup>24</sup> Earlier than this both men would have been well known to each other through their membership of the Clerical Association which submitted the Feathers Tavern Petition to Parliament. The failure of this attempt to relieve Anglican clergymen and teachers from subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles proved to be the decisive factor which led both men to leave the Church of England.

In *The apology of Theophilus Lindsey M.A., on resigning the Vicarage of Catterick, Yorkshire*, Lindsey, as the title indicates, sets forth the reasons why he threw up his benefice in the Church of England. The main reason was doctrinal: his inability to accept orthodox Trinitarianism in so far as it centred on the concept of a Triune Deity composed of three persons of equal divine status: God, Christ and the Holy Spirit. In place of this belief he affirmed the Unitarian doctrine that there is only one God and that He is a unity. A corollary of this fundamental principle is that Christ is not divine in the way that God is divine. Lindsey denies that Christ is of the same substance as the Godhead and that he was with God from all eternity. In place of the doctrine of the consubstantiality and co-eternity of Christ he holds to the doctrine of 'the simple humanity of Christ'. According to Lindsey, although Christ is not divine in the way that God is divine, he has several special functions and

---

<sup>22</sup> Alexander Gordon, *Addresses biographical and historical* (London, 1922), 270.

<sup>23</sup> H McLachlan ed., *Letters of Theophilus Lindsey* (Manchester 1920), 25. See Theophilus Lindsey, *Conversations on Christian Idolatry...* (London, 1792), 134.

<sup>24</sup> A Elliott Peaston, *The Prayer Book reform movement in the XVIIIth century* (Oxford, 1940), 15. For Lindsey's account of his debt to Clarke, see Theophilus Lindsey, *The apology of Theophilus Lindsey, M.A. on resigning the vicarage of Catterick, Yorkshire* (London, 1774), 185 ff.

*John Disney's Diary*

several unique powers. Lindsey also holds that Christ is not an appropriate object of worship and that to worship and address prayers to him is idolatrous. In this he differed from Faustus Socinus, the founder of Socinianism, who held that although worshipping Christ is not essential, it is permissible.<sup>25</sup> But although Christ is not of the same status and nature as God, none-theless he is God's primary instrument in securing the salvation of mankind.

Lindsey uses the phrase 'the simple humanity of Christ' to assert that Christ was not divine in the way that God is divine and that he is not a God in the way that the Trinitarians hold that he is. But if the phrase is taken to mean that Christ was just an ordinary human being, it can be very misleading for, according to Lindsey, Christ had several functions and powers that are not attributable to ordinary human beings. Christ is variously described as God's messenger, His messiah, His mediator between God and men. He has the titles of Lord and Master. He has been sent to teach men the way to salvation. He can perform miracles, and ultimately he will judge mankind. Lindsey summed up the attributes of Christ in the following terms: 'Christ is the primary instrument in the hands of God, the appointed teacher, law-giver, and judge of mankind and his apostles those that were under him in bringing mankind to virtue and a blessed immortality.'<sup>26</sup>

It is clear from the text of the *Apology* that Lindsey believed that theological disputes of the kind that centre on the status of Christ are to be resolved by reference to the Scriptures; there is no other court of appeal.<sup>27</sup> In this respect Lindsey follows in the tradition exemplified in Samuel Clarke's *The Scripture doctrine of the Trinity* (1712). Underlying Lindsey's acceptance of the Scriptures as the final court of appeal is the conviction that they present us with a coherent, self-consistent body of truths as befits its role as a divinely inspired revelation of God's will for mankind. The type of

---

<sup>25</sup> Lindsey, *Apology*, 139. Cf the account of Socinus's views which Lindsey gives in *Conversations on Christian idolatry* in which he holds that Socinus believed that it was right to worship Christ and was hostile to those who did not share his opinions in the subject, op. cit, 146n -147n.

<sup>26</sup> Theophilus Lindsey, *A sequel to The apology on resigning the vicarage of Catterick, Yorkshire* (London, 1776), 78.

<sup>27</sup> Lindsey, *Apology*, 23.

*D O Thomas*

textual criticism embodied in Evanson's *The dissonance of the four generally received Evangelists* (1792) is not anticipated in any measure in the *Apology*.

In an eloquent account of how he came to make his decision to leave the Church of England, Lindsey makes it clear that it was not an easy decision and that it had been preceded by many years of mental travail. He was reluctant to leave the profession for which he had been destined and educated and in which he had served for so many years. He had wondered why he could not follow the example of abler men than himself who though sharing beliefs not dissimilar to his own, had remained at ease within the Church. He had wondered whether his difficulties and anxieties over doctrinal matters had been the result of years spent in comparative isolation and which more frequent consultation with colleagues in the profession might have dispersed. He had wondered too whether he was justified in refusing to accept obligations that had been defined by civil government whose authority to provide for the peace and well-being of the community had a Divine sanction. He wondered too whether it might not be better rather than leave the Church to stay within it (as his father-in-law, the Archdeacon, and Joseph Priestley counselled) and work for reform in the hope that the time would eventually come when the authorities would be prepared to relax the requirements that he found so irksome.

The crucial issue was what Lindsey termed 'the point of worship'.<sup>28</sup> After wrestling with his moral perplexities for many years he came to be persuaded that he could no longer in the conduct of services as a minister appear to accept the beliefs expressed in the creeds and the liturgies about the nature of the God he worshipped. He felt a strict obligation to worship the Father and only the Father and that he ought not in candour do or appear to do anything that was contrary to this. Moreover, to subscribe to anything that was not required by Scripture or anything that was contrary to it was to exalt a form of worship that was devised by humans above that prescribed by God.

The event that determined Lindsey to leave the Church was the failure of the Feathers Tavern Petition to secure relief for clergy-

---

<sup>28</sup> McLachlan ed., *Letters*, 47; and Lindsey, *Apology*, 210.

### *John Disney's Diary*

men and teachers from subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. What that movement sought was to enable clergymen and teachers to substitute for the Articles a declaration that the Scriptures contained the word of God. When this petition failed Lindsey felt that he had no option other than to leave the Church.

In 1776 Lindsey published *A sequel to the Apology*. This long work contains materials that were initially intended to be published in the *Apology*. It is largely devoted to showing how an analysis of the concepts used in the Scriptures support the basic doctrines of the Unitarians as we have outlined them above: the unity of the Godhead, the simple humanity of Christ and the doctrine that God alone is to be worshiped. Lindsey is concerned to show that the first verse in the Gospel according to St John: 'In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God and the word was God' has been frequently misinterpreted as establishing the consubstantiality and co-eternity of Christ with God. The error lies, Lindsey maintains, in identifying the word with Christ, whereas it would be more appropriate to hold that the word is an equivalent for wisdom. The error is produced by a misleading tendency to personify what there is no need to personify, where there is no need to treat a noun as a proper name.<sup>29</sup>

In a later work, *Conversations on the divine government*, Lindsey employs a similar technique to expose the error of treating the names Satan, the Devil and The Evil One as referring to a principle of evil. In interpreting the significance of the accounts of Christ's temptation in the wilderness, Lindsey maintains, it is inappropriate to take the noun devil as referring to an evil principle with the implication that the temptation is a battleground where the cosmic principle of good is embattled against a principle of evil. It is more appropriate to think of the temptation as a confrontation against an adversary, of human dispositions that threaten the enjoyment of a life lived in accordance with the aims and purposes that God intends for mankind.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> *Sequel*, 101-117.

<sup>30</sup> Theophilus Lindsey, *Conversations on the Divine Government, shewing that everything is from God* (London 1802), 196-206.

*D O Thomas*

*Sequel* also contains illuminating accounts of how Lindsey conceived the character of the Deity. He rejected the orthodox doctrine of the atonement that is embodied in the Thirty-nine Articles on the ground that it represents the Deity demanding the sacrifice of his own innocent son as indispensable for the redemption of mankind. He presents a more gentle, a more merciful, and a more forgiving characterization of the Deity than is to be found in the Articles. God is not inexorable in demanding the punishment of those who violate the moral law. Those who commit evil are in danger of punishment and exclusion from the community of the blessed, but to those who repent and return to the paths of virtue, God will show mercy. Lindsey viewed with abhorrence the notion that the evil caused by wrong-doing can only be cancelled by the suffering of the innocent and he rejected the notion that the salvation of mankind could only be accomplished by the sacrifice of God's innocent son on the Cross. In *Conversations on Christian Idolatry* he explained that for him the significance of Christ's suffering lay in his willingness, once the work that he had been sent to do had been accomplished, to remain loyal to the truths he had proclaimed and in his refusal to save his life by denying them.<sup>31</sup> He criticises a celebrated passage in *The theory of moral sentiments* in which Adam Smith defends the orthodox account of the doctrine of atonement. He writes:

One is sorry to read the following account in an able modern writer, who speaking of man's 'repentance, sorrow, humiliation, contrition at the thought of his past wrong conduct', goes on to say 'He even distrusts the efficacy of *all these* and naturally fears lest the *wisdom of God* should not, like *the weakness of man*, be prevailed upon to spare the crime, by the most importunate lamentations of the criminal, *Some other intercession, some other sacrifice, some other atonement* he imagines must be made for him, beyond what he himself is capable of making before the purity of the divine justice can be reconciled to his manifold offences. The doctrines of revelation coincide, in every respect, with those original anticipations of nature; and, as they teach us

---

<sup>31</sup> Lindsey, *Christian idolatry*, 115.

*John Disney's Diary*

how little we can depend upon the imperfections of our own virtue, so they show us at the same time that *the most powerful intercession* has been made, and that the most dreadful atonement has been paid for our manifold transgressions and iniquities.<sup>32</sup>

Had our author consulted the Bible itself he must have found it to speak a very different language, for Almighty God there declares, that he wants no foreign intercession, no satisfaction, no dreadful atonement to be paid, but is entirely satisfied with the sincere repentance of the sinner himself, and requires no more to restore him to his favour. *When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness, that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right he shall save his soul alive.* Ezekiel xviii.27. And Christ himself informs us that it was purely out of his benignity and kindness to the human race, that God appointed him to be the instrument of his mercy to them. John iii.16. God so loved the world that he gave his beloved son to them, that every one that believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life.<sup>33</sup>

It will have been noted that whereas Adam Smith points to a convergence of natural theology and revelation as the foundation of the truth of the doctrine of the atonement, Lindsey bases his case in the interpretation of revelation alone. Lindsey's claim that his argument is based upon Scripture raises some important questions about the role of reason in his theological system. It is quite clear that rational procedures are required to determine the meaning and

---

<sup>32</sup> Lindsey quotes from the concluding paragraph of section 12 of the third chapter of the second book of *The theory of moral sentiments*. See the Glasgow edition edited by D D Raphael and A L Macfie (Oxford, 1976), 91n.-92n. Four editions of *The theory of moral sentiments* were published before Lindsey's *Sequel* appeared in 1776. Internal evidence suggests that he might have used either the second (1761), the third (1767) or the fourth (1774). The paragraph was omitted in the sixth (1790) edition which appeared in the last year of Smith's life. On the controversy over the reasons why Smith omitted the paragraph in this edition see Appendix II to the Glasgow edition, 383-401.

<sup>33</sup> *Sequel*, 420-422.

*D O Thomas*

significance of the sacred texts, but this leaves open the question whether or not the infallibility and reliability of Scripture can be established by the appeal to reason. Lindsey frequently asserts that ‘in the Bible is the oldest and most authentic history of the world and of the human race’,<sup>34</sup> and that what may be derived from revelation is superior to what may be derived from other sources. It is only through the Scriptures that we can come to know what God intends for mankind, and that there is an after-life in which the virtuous will reap the rewards due to their virtue, and the wicked will suffer the punishments merited by their wrong-doing. For this reason it would seem that for Lindsey the role of reason is limited to interpretation and clarification of what is said in Scripture.

It may, however, be alleged that for Lindsey there is one exception to the rule that revelation is superior to any other source of knowledge. While it is true that the course of human destiny can only be known by revelation, the moral law can be known by the exercise of reason. There is more than one access to knowledge of moral good and evil. In addition to revelation there is the natural light of reason,<sup>35</sup> which is assumed to be in harmony with revelation. Lindsey holds that there is an immediate and direct communication from God to the heart and mind of man, through the operation of the ‘secret voice’ of God.<sup>36</sup>

In investigating these claims it is important to distinguish questions of access from questions of authority. It does not follow from the fact that through the exercise of reason we can determine the content of the moral law, that the bindingness of that law lies in its rationality. It may well be the case for Lindsey that what makes the law binding upon humans is it being commanded by God. Similarly, although it is God’s intention that mankind should enjoy happiness, and that, accordingly, we should all do our utmost to promote the welfare and happiness of our fellow-creatures as well as our own, it is not the fact that obedience to the moral law secures these ends and purposes that makes obedience obligatory, but the fact that it is commanded by God.

---

<sup>34</sup> Lindsey, *Divine government*, 65.

<sup>35</sup> Lindsey, *Christian idolatry*, 71ff.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 71, 72 and 91, 92.

### *John Disney's Diary*

If it were asked how do we know that what purports to be a revelation of the mind and will of God is what it purports to be, Lindsey would answer that the authority of the prophet and teacher was signalled by their ability to perform miracles but he is careful to note that this does not mean that the obligatoriness of what they command and the truth of what they say is grounded in the capacity to perform miracles. The bindingness of what they say is grounded in the will of God.

It is worth noting here that from the fact that it is by the exercise of reason that we can clarify the meaning and significance of Scripture it does not follow that we can determine God's intentions for mankind independently of revelation. If the content of the moral law can be determined by the natural light of reason, it does not follow that the place of obedience to the moral law in the wider scheme of things can be determined by reason independently of Scripture. If it could be, then revelation would be superfluous. If I am right in my contention that for Lindsey the focus of our knowledge of God's will for mankind lies in the Scriptures, the appeal to reason is limited and circumscribed, for reason, acting independently of Scripture, cannot determine the nature of God's intentions for mankind, nor how obedience to the moral law fits into God's intentions or even how and why the moral law is binding upon humans.

Lindsey's acceptance of the doctrine that the Scriptures are a revelation of the mind and will of the Deity, and, as such, are superior to any human sources of authority, lays upon him an obligation to defend the infallibility of the sacred texts as a guide in matters of belief and practice. His staunchness in defence of revelation on these grounds can be seen in a late work entitled *Conversations on the divine government* which was published in 1802. In it he criticises, with some asperity, remarks made by Shaftesbury in his *Miscellaneous reflections*. Shaftesbury had expressed his disapprobation of the prophet Abraham's willingness to sacrifice his son and he pointed out that Abraham's institution of the practice of circumcision was probably not so much prescribed by Divine mandate as borrowed from the Egyptians. Shaftesbury noted what he regarded as the excessive severity of the discipline imposed by Moses, as in the case of the man who was stoned to

*D O Thomas*

death for gathering sticks on the Sabbath,<sup>37</sup> and he deprecated the violence with which the Israelites destroyed the other nations in Canaan. Lindsey objected that Shaftesbury was too prone to be guided by prejudice, that he revelled in putting incidents in the most unfavourable light, and that he ignored the defences of practices that can be found in the circumstances and needs of the times.<sup>38</sup> Severity in punishments had been required to maintain the observance of the laws and severity in eliminating idolatrous practices was justified even where it involved destruction of the innocent if it was necessary to prevent the innocent of future generations being overwhelmed by vicious practices.<sup>39</sup> Lindsey did not confine his efforts at vindication to the heroes and prophets of the Old and New Testaments. He also sought to confirm the authenticity of the Bible as the revealed will of God, and, more sweepingly, to show that the history recorded in the Bible demonstrates that God exercises a providential care over the fate of mankind. Lindsey's theodicy follows in the lines made familiar by Leibniz. God is omniscient, omnipotent and benevolently disposed to mankind. 'There is nothing of which we can be so absolutely certain, or which is so clearly demonstrable to us as that there is an intelligent God and benevolent Creator of all things.'<sup>40</sup> It follows from these fundamental principles that God seeks nothing but the happiness and betterment of mankind. We can take it for granted that the Creator governs His creation so as to fulfil the purposes that He has for the human race. What appears to be evil to those who suffer it has a part to play in his system. His purpose is not just to make men happy, but to make them worthy of it and to lead them to enjoy those blessings that can only be enjoyed by a voluntary commitment to observe the moral law. Without suffering evils men would not develop the character and dispositions that enable them to experience the greatest blessings. Accordingly, God not only tolerates evil, he deliberately appoints it.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Numbers, xv.32-36.

<sup>38</sup> Earl of Shaftesbury, *Characteristics* (3 vols, London, 1737), III, 52ff. and 124.

<sup>39</sup> Lindsey, *Divine government*, 32ff.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 18.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 143.

### *John Disney's Diary*

Lindsey gives some examples to illustrate the workings of the Divine economy. Suffering is beneficial where it checks and humbles pride;<sup>42</sup> pains are beneficial in warning us of impending disasters and stimulating us to do what is necessary to prevent them; diseases are beneficial in stimulating our industry and in leading us to find cures and methods of prevention. Some of these examples challenge the credulity of the reader: death is beneficial in that it makes room for future generations, and sudden death either prevents or shortens suffering.<sup>43</sup>

Lindsey argues that in the world as we know it, there is an balance of good over evil,<sup>44</sup> but such a contention does not secure his claim that all evil is essential to the production of good. What Lindsey needs to argue is not just that good exceeds evil, but, that what evil there is, is indispensable to the enjoyment of the higher goods, that is those goods that could not be realised without the toleration of evil. It is difficult to see what procedure could establish that all the evils that men suffer are essential. One is left with the feeling that the justification of evil in the universe, whether natural or moral, is a matter of faith rather than one of demonstration.

A comparison of the substance of J D's *Reasons* with Lindsey's *Apology* shows that they shared the same views on doctrinal matters: that the Deity is a Unity, that only God is to be worshipped, that Christ is not a God although a human being endowed with exceptional powers and privileges.

J D followed Lindsey in affirming the supremacy and sufficiency of Scripture, 'the impregnable rock' which contains all that is needed to secure the edification and salvation of mankind.<sup>45</sup> From this fundamental principle it follows that no human authority has the right to impose on Christians articles of belief that either contradict, or are not in agreement with, or do not derive from the

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 181.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 50.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 117.

<sup>45</sup> *Reasons for resigning the rectory at Panton and the vicarage of Swinderby, in Lincolnshire; and quitting the Church of England* (London, 1782), 4.

*D O Thomas*

Scriptures.<sup>46</sup> J D also followed Lindsey in holding that everyone should obey his own conscience on questions of religious belief. J D would not allow that he could subscribe to articles and creeds on the ground that such subscription could be regarded as purely formal, and, as such, not requiring the full assent of the heart and understanding.<sup>47</sup>

Celebrated divines of the Church of England had advocated a more relaxed attitude to the articles and creeds to accommodate those who had difficulties in accepting all that was contained in them. John Bramhall (1594-1663), Archbishop of Armagh, maintained ‘We do not hold that our Thirty-nine Articles to be such necessary truths, “without which there is no salvation”, nor enjoin ecclesiastical persons to swear unto them, but only to subscribe them, as theological truths, for the preservation of unity among us, and the extirpation of some growing errors’.<sup>48</sup> J D would agree wholeheartedly with the Archbishop that the Thirty-nine Articles were not to be looked upon as essential to saving Faith, but would have disagreed as wholeheartedly that one could subscribe to what one did not believe to be true just to accommodate differences of opinion within the Church.

That J D accepted the doctrine that sincere repentance accompanied by virtuous practice will always recommend a person to God’s mercy is manifest in a sermon that he preached on the text, ‘Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand’ (Matt.iv.17). As the title of the sermon, ‘Repentance and amendment of life inseparable’ indicates, repentance and acknowledgement of sin by themselves are not enough to merit God’s mercy, for repentance must be accompanied by a commitment to virtuous practice. And, as Priestley maintained, it would be more than dangerous to rely upon last-minute conversions. Sincere repentance, however, accompanied with a commitment to virtuous practice will secure reconciliation for the sinner to God. Like Lindsey, JD did not hold

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 15-16.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 10, 11.

<sup>48</sup> John Bramhall, *Works* (5 vols., Oxford, 1842), II, 201. On the intellectual origins of Lindsey’s belief that one should only subscribe to what one believes to be true, see Ditchfield, ‘Theophilus Lindsey: from Anglican to Unitarian’, 8-11.

*John Disney's Diary*

that something more than repentance and virtuous behaviour was required for this to be possible, and, like Lindsey too, JD rejected the notion that in the divine scheme of things man's redemption is only made possible by the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross. But while the truly repentant will be saved, the unrepentant will be excluded from 'future peace and joy, for happiness cannot dwell with iniquity'.<sup>49</sup>

To those who argue that repentance is unnecessary on the ground that God in his goodness will overlook our sins on account of 'our constitutional proneness' to commit them, JD replies, 'that we are placed in a state of probation, not of perfection; in a state of responsibility, not of impunity: that though we have passions that may dispose us to do what is wrong, we have reason given us to regulate and direct them, and that, though vice may boast her pleasures for a season, virtue gives peace, and joy, and happiness in the life that now is, in the closing scene of it, and at the resurrection of the just.'<sup>50</sup>

When JD identifies what is or could be meant by the phrase 'The Kingdom of Heaven' he gives three interpretations: (a) the present state of the Gospel; (b) the spiritual world as contrasted with the temporal; and (c) the abode of future happiness, which only the just will enjoy.<sup>51</sup>

It is intriguing to note that JD does not include in his interpretation of the phrase, 'The Kingdom of Heaven' any reference to the apocalyptic element in the Gospel, the second Coming when the Kingdom will be established on earth. Was it just possible that this traditional interpretation was beginning to lose its appeal?

In 1812 JD edited and published a revised edition of William Melmoth's *The great importance of a religious life considered*.<sup>52</sup> In

---

<sup>49</sup> John Disney, *Sermons* (2vols., London, 1793), I, 425.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid, 415.

<sup>52</sup> [William Melmoth], *The great importance of a religious life considered* (1711; 2nd edn. revised, London and Bath, 1812). William Melmoth, the elder (1666-1743) was a lawyer. His tract was published anonymously and his authorship remained a secret long after his death. The work proved very popular, perhaps on account of its 'hedonistic piety'. It went into many editions and more than forty thousand copies

*D O Thomas*

editing this tract, J D, by his own admission, omitted passages which expressed theological views that he did not find acceptable or in line with his own Unitarian beliefs. But he had no difficulty with the advice that Melmoth gave on practical matters. The main aim of the tract was to assert that the best way to achieve happiness in this world and to ensure its enjoyment in the life to come is to obey God's commandments. What is particularly relevant to our present concerns is Melmoth's repeated assurances that repentance and a commitment to a life of virtue will reconcile the sinner to God. The sincere repentant can look forward to a life of eternal happiness, the stubborn unrepentant to a life of unremitting misery. It is quite likely that it was this repeated reassurance that stimulated J D to publish his edition of the tract. It shows the extent to which J D agreed with Lindsey on the question of redemption.

In 1793 Lindsey resigned from his ministry at Essex Street, to be succeeded by J D who officiated there as sole pastor until 1805. In the year he resigned Lindsey published *A discourse addressed to the Congregation at the chapel in Essex Street, Strand, on resigning the pastoral office among them*. He did not give this address when he was due to give it because he was so overwhelmed by the expressions of affection that he received from those present that he could not proceed. So he decided to publish it instead. In it he summarized the main articles of belief that were professed by him during the period that he was minister at Essex Street.<sup>53</sup>

The fundamental principles of this 'rational religion' were those which he had expounded in his *Apology*: the unity of the Godhead, the simple humanity of Christ, and the doctrine that God alone is to be worshipped. The rejection of the divinity of Christ did not mean, Lindsey insisted, that Unitarians were not Christians; although Christ was not a God incarnate, he was a messenger from God, divinely inspired to act as mediator between God and man and endowed with special powers, such as the power to perform miracles. Lindsey accepted the belief that there is an after-life, of a day of judgement and a period of rewards and punishments, the

---

were sold in the period between 1766 and 1784, *Dictionary of National Biography*.

<sup>53</sup> Op.cit. 8, 45, 69-70.

### *John Disney's Diary*

scriptural doctrine of a Second Coming and the belief that all creation is under the providential care of its Creator. He rejected the Calvinist doctrine of atonement and was abhorred by the notion that God demands and accepts the punishment of the innocent. Lindsey repeated his conviction that God is merciful and that He will accept the sincere repentance of the wrong-doer accompanied by a return to a life of virtue. There is little to suggest that during the period he was the pastor at Essex Street there were many significant changes in his beliefs on doctrinal and practical subjects, save perhaps his rejection under the influence of Priestley of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth.<sup>54</sup> The core of his position had been established during the long years of intellectual travail before he left the vicarage at Catterick and little came thereafter to lead him to question the basic principles of his Unitarianism.

Similarly, there is little to suggest that J D ever came to make substantial changes in his theological beliefs after he left the Church and started keeping his diary.

### **John Disney's Activities**

At the chapel in Essex Street, on all Sundays other than the first in the month, Lindsey officiated in the morning and J D in the afternoon. On the first Sunday the pattern was different, J D preached and read prayers in the morning while Lindsey presided at the communion table, and Lindsey preached and read prayers in the afternoon.

Lindsey's quarrel with the Church of England was almost exclusively doctrinal. He wished to remove the Trinitarian elements from the Creeds and the Thirty-nine Articles in favour of replacing

---

<sup>54</sup> In the *Prayer Book Reformed* which he used when he opened his chapel in Essex Street, Lindsey retained the phrases 'conceived by the Holy Spirit' and 'born of the Virgin Mary'. In 1793 he omitted the Creed in which these phrases were contained. See J T Rutt ed. *The theological and miscellaneous works of Joseph Priestley, LL.D., F.R.S* (25 vols., London 1817-1835), XX, 491. In *Sequel* (1776), 151, Lindsey asserted that Christ was created by the Father in a miraculous way (i.e. born of a Virgin). See also *Sequel*, 492. For Priestley's discussion of this question see *An history of early opinions concerning Jesus Christ* (1786), Rutt ed., *Works of Priestley*, VII, 57ff.

*D O Thomas*

them with Unitarian principles. In all other respects, excepting the use of the surplice, he wished to retain as far as possible traditional forms of worship. Worship was to be liturgical, hence the importance of Samuel Clarke's revision of the Common Book of Prayer. If time-honoured creeds were to be rejected, this did not mean that all formularies in the conduct of services were to be abandoned. Sermons and prayers were still to be read and litanies responded to. There is a sense in which Lindsey and JD wished to perpetuate the forms of Anglicanism outside the Established Church, and this, in some measure, might account for J D's aversion to extempore preaching and praying when he attended services conducted by Joseph Fawcett.

From the diary it is clear that J D read both his sermon and his prayers, which he spent a considerable time during the week composing and transcribing. He seems to have been very conscientious, very anxious to discharge his duties to the best of his abilities. At the beginning of his ministry at Essex Street he was very apprehensive, fearful that he would not win the approval of the congregation, sometimes quite depressed by his prospects, and much relieved when he thought he was winning the confidence of his hearers.

One of the more important activities in which J D was engaged in this period concerned the foundation of *The Society for promoting the Knowledge of the Scriptures*. The prime mover was John Jebb and the Society was instituted at Essex House on 29 September 1783. Present on that occasion were Lindsey, Jebb, Mr Warburton, Mr Kettle and J D who was appointed Secretary to the Society. Jebb drew up 'The Sketch of a Plan' which was prefixed to *Commentaries and addresses* (1786),<sup>55</sup> and re-published in Vol. II of the collected edition of Jebb's *Works* which appeared posthumously in 1787.<sup>56</sup> J D concluded his part in the production of the plan on 9 November 1783. Thomas Belsham names some of the original supporters of the Society, and several of them figure in the diary as persons with whom J D was in frequent contact: they

---

<sup>55</sup> This work, published in two volumes, contained contributions from Dodson, Jebb, Lindsey, Garnham, Tyrwhitt and Henry More of Leskiard.

<sup>56</sup> See *The works ... of John Jebb* (3 vols., London, 1787), II, 190. J D contributed 'Memoirs of the life of the author' to volume I of this edition.

*John Disney's Diary*

include John Calder, Michael Dodson, Andrew Kippis, John Lee, Richard Price, and William Tayleur of Shrewsbury. Other supporters were Edmund Law, Joseph Priestley, Samuel Shore, Jun., Joshua Toulmin, and William Turner.<sup>57</sup>

Another influential group to which JD belonged was the Society of Antiquaries to which he had been elected a Fellow in 1776. Other Fellows mentioned in the diary include Thomas Brand-Hollis, Maxwell Gartshore, Andrew Kippis, John Nichols, William Saunders, and JD's nephew, Edmund Turnor, jun. Another group was the well-established club which met at the London Coffee House on Ludgate Hill. This club which Benjamin Franklin had been a member of, and which was dubbed by him 'The Club of Honest Whigs', met fortnightly on Thursdays during the season and was composed largely of Dissenters.<sup>58</sup> Those of its members who feature in JD's diary include John Calder, Joseph Jefferies, Andrew Kippis, John Lee, Lindsey, Richard Price, Joseph Priestley and Abraham Rees. The first time JD attended was on 6 February 1783 where he found the meeting 'large and agreeable'. On the same day he had been introduced to the Society of Antiquaries by Andrew Kippis and taken by him to the Royal Society. JD seems to have been a regular attender at the Club and in the period covered by the diary, just over sixteen months, he was present at least 15 times. He noted that on 13 November 1783 John Adams and John Jay were present at the Club. At the time, they were involved on behalf of the Americans in negotiations with British. It is perhaps significant that soon after his arrival in Essex Street JD should have been introduced to a Club largely made up of Dissenters and one which Lindsey was himself a member of. It is also noteworthy that many of the members had been friends of Franklin during his long stay in this country, many of whom had been influenced by him to support the American rebels.

In the same year, 1783, JD published the second edition of his *Reasons for resigning the rectory of Panton, and the vicarage of*

---

<sup>57</sup> Thomas Belsham, *Memoirs of the late Reverend Theophilus Lindsey* ... (London, 1812), 176-77.

<sup>58</sup> See Verner W Crane, 'The Club of Honest Whigs: Friends of Science and Liberty', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 4<sup>th</sup> ser. XXIII, No. 2 (Apr. 1955), 210-244; D O Thomas, *The honest mind* (Oxford, 1977), 142-143.

*D O Thomas*

*Swinderby...*<sup>59</sup>. The following year he wrote ‘Prefatory account to the memoir of William Robertson’ which appeared in *Gentleman’s Magazine*, Vol. LIII (1783). In this period too he worked on his *Memoirs of the life and writings of Arthur Ashley Sykes* which was published in 1785. Another venture in which he was engaged was a collaboration with William Hopkins on the production of *A friendly dialogue between a common Unitarian Christian and an Athanasian* which was published in 1784. This work actually contained two dialogues, one composed by Hopkins and the second by J D himself. This project which is referred to by J D as Hopkins’s *Attempts* is designed to secure a return to scriptural forms of worship, a claim which occurs in the extended title of the work. Later, J D wrote a memoir of Hopkins which was prefixed to the second (1787) edition of Hopkins’s *Appeal to the common sense of all Christian people*.

In addition to his clerical duties and his own publications J D was generous in helping other authors. In May 1783 he looked over part of the proof of Priestley’s *Appeal*. This, presumably, was the 1783 edition of *An appeal to the serious and candid professors of Christianity* which was published by Joseph Johnson, at St Paul’s Churchyard, in 1783.<sup>60</sup> J D was a frequent caller on Johnson, who had been of assistance to Lindsey in helping him to settle in Essex Street. J D proof-read a sheet of Gough’s edition of William Camden’s *Britannia*. He made an index for Lindsey’s *An historical view of the state of the Unitarian doctrine and worship from the Reformation to our own times* (1783). He subscribed to and collected subscriptions for A M Cox’s *Joseph*; and he gave substantial help to William Hopkins in the production and publication of his translation of *Exodus*, transcribing the manuscript, arranging with Johnson for its publication, and correcting the proofs.

J D’s reading was wide and eclectic. In the period under review he read Paley’s *Principles of moral and political philosophy* which was dedicated to Edmund Law. This he read before it was published in 1785 and he thought it ‘a most excellent work’. He

---

<sup>59</sup> See n. 45. The second edition, like the first, was published by Joseph Johnson in London.

<sup>60</sup> Robert E Crook, *A bibliography of Joseph Priestley* (London, 1966), 6, TR/14.

### *John Disney's Diary*

also read Paley's sermon on the consecration of John Law as Bishop of Clonfert at Dublin Castle, which was published under the title, *A distinction of orders in the Church defended upon principles of public utility*.<sup>61</sup> Richard Watson's *Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury* he commended as 'a sensible, and honest letter promising much good'. He read Joseph Priestley's *An history of the corruptions of Christianity* (1782); his *Institutes of natural and revealed religion* (1772); his *The proper constitution of a Christian church* (1782)<sup>62</sup> and his *Letters to Dr Horsley* (1783). He read Andrew Kippis's *Considerations on the provisional treaty with America and the preliminary articles of peace with France and Spain*. He also read Kippis's *Life of Sir John Pringle*. Other works by Dissenters to claim J D's attention were William Turner of Wakefield's *Charge* on the ordination of his son (William Turner of Newcastle), which he thought 'a masterly performance', Joshua Toulmin's edition of Henry Scougel, *The life of God in the soul of man: or, the nature and excellency of the Christian religion* (Taunton, 1672?); Fownes' *Sermon at the funeral of Job Orton*, and John Howard's *The state of the prisons in England and Wales* which was a present from the author. That J D should read the works of the Latitudinarians and of those Dissenters who embraced Unitarianism is not unexpected; what is more surprising is that he should have read Tom Paine's *A letter to the Abbé Raynal* which he thought 'a valuable work by an able hand'.

J D enjoyed listening to sermons – which not all preachers do. Among those mentioned in his diary are Richard Watson, Andrew Kippis, Abraham Rees, and Joseph Fawcett. On 10 April 1783 J D went to the monthly meeting at Carter Lane to hear an 'excellent' sermon preached by Andrew Kippis on Lamentations, iv.1, 'How is the gold dimmed' in an exhortation to a revival of the religious spirit. His appraisal of Joseph Fawcett was not so complimentary. He returned from hearing him at The Old Jewry on 2 February 1783 dissatisfied, 'his language florid and accurately spoken, but there seemed more of the Actor than serious Preacher. No portion

---

<sup>61</sup> Clarke, *Paley*, 30.

<sup>62</sup> The text of a sermon preached at The New Meeting, Birmingham on 3 November 1782. Crook, *Bibliography*, TR/195.

### *D O Thomas*

of the Scripture read'. On 23 March 1783 'his [Fassit's] matters and manner all calculated more to entertain than to edify'. It seems likely that J D who followed in the tradition of reading sermons and set prayers found extempore preaching and praying, in which the preacher depended upon the inspiration of the moment, unacceptable.

#### **Benefactors**

Lindsey's action in throwing up his preferment and leaving the Church was courageous, heroically so for many of his friends disapproved of what he did, notably his father-in-law, the Archdeacon. Moreover, he was poor and, as Alexander Gordon relates, when he took up residence in Essex Street he lived in somewhat straitened circumstances, having had to sell part of his library.<sup>63</sup>

Although initially Lindsey's venture attracted generous support from some high-ranking members of society – Shelburne, Grafton, Charles James Fox, and John Lee were contributors<sup>64</sup> – Lindsey was disappointed in the support he received from Anglican clergymen and the success of his venture came to depend very largely on the continued support of a number of benefactors who were of assistance not only to the chapel but to Lindsey and J D personally. One such was Thomas Brand-Hollis. Born Thomas Brand he added Hollis to his name when he inherited a large fortune on the death of Thomas Hollis, the ardent republican philanthropist, who died on 1 January 1774. Brand-Hollis was a committed Unitarian and a supporter of political reform.<sup>65</sup> He helped Major John Cartwright establish the Society for Constitutional Information, and he supported Christopher Wyvill in his attempts to secure the reform of Parliament. He gave substantial help to Joseph Priestley after the Birmingham riots. In his will he bequeathed to J D his estate at The Hyde, at Ingatestone in Essex which he had inherited from his father. It was this accession to

---

<sup>63</sup> Gordon, *Addresses*, 267.

<sup>64</sup> McLachlan, *Essays*, 52.

<sup>65</sup> John Disney, *Memoirs of Thomas Brand-Hollis Esq* (London, 1808), 7-8. Brand-Hollis and Disney collaborated in preparing the three volume edition of John Jebb's *Works* which was published in 1787.

### *John Disney's Diary*

wealth that enabled J D to retire from the ministry in 1805.

Elizabeth Rayner was a benefactor both to Essex Street Chapel and to the Disney family. She was one of the first of Lindsey's hearers when he came to Essex Street in 1774.<sup>66</sup> When Priestley ceased to be Shelburne's librarian and moved to Birmingham, she helped him with presents amounting to 500 guineas. Priestley wrote in his memoirs, 'Her's is, indeed, I seriously think, one of the first Christian characters that I was ever acquainted with, having a cultivated comprehensive mind, equal to any subject of theology or metaphysics, intrepid in the cause of truth, and most rationally pious.'<sup>67</sup> When she died in 1800, she left in her will £2,000 to Priestley, to Lindsey the lease of a house in Clapham and £1,000 in 4% stock, £2,000 to Dr William Blackburne, a physician, and £1,000 to J D.<sup>68</sup> She was also generous to J D's family: when Elisabeth Collyer was born in 1783, the baby being given Mrs Rayner's maiden name, she settled £500 upon the young infant. Mrs Rayner lived at Sumbury, near Harrow, and entertained the Lindseys and the Disneys there. According to Thomas Belsham, when Lindsey was joined by J D at Essex Street, to assist in defraying the expenses of two ministers, Mrs Rayner settled an annuity on Lindsey of £50 for the rest of his career in the ministry.<sup>69</sup>

Another benefactor of the Essex Street Chapel was Richard Reynolds (1730-1814) of Little Paxton Hall at Paxton in Huntingdonshire. He was a landowner and a grandson of Dr Reynolds, Bishop of Lincoln. He had been a contemporary of Lindsey at Cambridge and although he did not share Lindsey's theological beliefs, he remained loyal and supportive when Lindsey opened his chapel in Essex Street.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>66</sup> Belsham, *Memoirs of Lindsey*, 119-121. *The Monthly Repository of Theology and General Literature*, IV (1809), 2.

<sup>67</sup> *Autobiography of Joseph Priestley*, intro. Jack Lindsay (Bath, 1970), 116.

<sup>68</sup> See Ditchfield, 'Theophilus Lindsey: from Anglican to Unitarian', 14, and n.78; Elizabeth Rayner's will, PRO, PROB/11/1345/552. ff.264-273.

<sup>69</sup> Belsham, *Memoirs of Lindsey*, 156.

<sup>70</sup> D O Thomas and W Bernard Peach, *The Correspondence of Richard Price* (3 vols., Durham N.C & Cardiff, 1983-1994), III, 207n.

### *D O Thomas*

William Tayleur (1713-1796), frequently referred to as Tayleur of Shrewsbury, was educated at Westminster and at Christ Church, Oxford. According to Thomas Belsham, he had adopted Unitarian beliefs in his early twenties and longed for an opportunity to worship in a Chapel devoted to Unitarian principles. When Lindsey opened his chapel Tayleur transferred more than £500 in Government stocks to a fund to support the new building.<sup>71</sup> Priestley, too, benefited from his generosity. In his memoirs, he writes that Tayleur had ‘at different times remitted me considerable sums, chiefly to defray expences incurred by my theological inquiries and publications’.<sup>72</sup> Priestley dedicated his *Letter to a philosophical unbeliever* to Tayleur.<sup>73</sup>

Another generous benefactor to the chapel at Essex Street who figures in the diary was the eccentric Irish scientist, Richard Kirwan (1733-1812). He inherited the family estate in Ireland when his brother was killed in a duel. Although he was called to the bar in Ireland he gave up the law to devote himself to scientific pursuits. Kirwan, who was known to Priestley as an advocate of the theory of phlogiston, resided in London from 1777 to 1783, and during that period was a supporter of Lindsey’s chapel.<sup>74</sup> He was also a founder member and chairman of the Coffee House Philosophical Society which met fortnightly during the season to discuss scientific topics. This lasted from 1780 until 1787 when Kirwan returned to Ireland. He was FRS and a Copley medallist (1782). In 1799 he became President of the Royal Irish Academy.

The support of these benefactors was indispensable to the survival of the cause at Essex Street and to a great extent compensated for the relative failure of Lindsey and his co-adjudicators to enlist more support than it did from Anglican clergymen and from those whose initial enthusiasm was not sustained. It was the support of these benefactors that enabled the

---

<sup>71</sup> Belsham, *Memoirs of Lindsey*, 139.

<sup>72</sup> *Autobiography*, 118.

<sup>73</sup> Rutt ed., *Works of Priestley*, IV, 313; VIII, 562.

<sup>74</sup> Belsham, *Memoirs of Lindsey*, 142-43, and T H Levere and G Le Turner eds., with contributions from Jan Golinski & Larry Stewart, *Discussing chemistry and steam: the minutes of a Coffee House Philosophical Society, 1780-1787* (Oxford, 2002).

*John Disney's Diary*

cause to survive until it was more broadly and more securely based among the Dissenters.

**Anglican clergymen:**

Many Anglican clergymen feature in the diary. Those whom I have been able to identify as known personally to JD include: Francis Blackburne, Archdeacon of Cleveland (JD's father-in-law); Frank Blackburne, Vicar of Brignal, Yorkshire (JD's brother-in-law); Edmund Cartwright, Rector of Goadby Marwood; Andrew Chambers, Vicar of Swinderby (JD's successor in the parish); Andrew Clarkson, Rector of Langwith, Derbyshire; Thomas Dalton, Vicar of Carisbrook, Isle of Wight; Benjamin Dawson, Rector of Burgh, Suffolk; Samuel Disney, Vicar of Halstead, Leicestershire, (JD's cousin); John Edwards, Rolleston, Notts.; Heneage Elsley, Rector of St Bennet, Gracechurch Street, London; Edward Evanson, former Vicar of Tewkesbury; Mr Fisher, Rector of Woodham Walter; John Hall, Vicar of Chew Magna Somerset, (husband of Sara, Jane Disney's sister); William Hopkins, Vicar of Bolnay, Sussex; Edmund Law, Bishop of Carlisle; John Law, Bishop of Clonfert; Robert Lock, Vicar of Farndon, Notts.; Mr Oliver, Holme, Notts.; William Manning, Rector of Diss, Norfolk; William Ramsden, Master of Charterhouse; William Rastall, Rector of Thorpe, Notts.; Thomas Seddon, Vicar of Norton Disney, Lincs.; Mr Simpson, South Scarle, Notts.; Richard Skinner, Rector of Bassington, Lincs.; and Christopher Wyvill, Vicar of Black Notley, Essex.

It is clear that JD kept in close contact with many of his former colleagues in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire when he lived in Essex Street, after his arrival in London. He retained pleasant and affectionate memories of these friendships. Some thirty years later he wrote of the time he was a priest in the Church, 'I knew, and greatly respected, several of the clergy, and while I resided among them, and after my resignation of my preferment, received from them all kindness and attention, though I conscientiously seceded from the communion of the established church, to worship the God of my fathers in the way which some call "heresy"'.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> John Disney, *Remarks on the Bishop of Lincoln's charge directed to the clergy of his diocese* (Bath, 1812), 33-34.

*D O Thomas*

Many named in the above list were country clergymen. But however sympathetic they may have been to J D's theological views, it does not appear that they were prepared on that account to leave the Church of England. There may well have been different reasons for this. Some felt, like Archdeacon Blackburne, that though reform was badly needed, it was better to remain within the Church as this promised more effectual means of securing it. Furthermore, although many were convinced that some reforms were needed, they were not necessarily in agreement as to what should take priority. Samuel Disney, J D's cousin, though he was opposed to pluralities, did not find that he could not subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles. Again, some found that in practice their bishops did not prevent their adjusting the services to their convictions. J D's bishop, Hinchliffe of Lincoln, did not appear to have interfered with his refusal to use the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed. Lastly, secession would have posed problems for those who had families to support and no private fortune. If they were to leave the Church where would they find alternative employment? For some clergymen it might have been a consolation to accept the notion that the Articles were not 'articles of belief' but 'articles of peace'.<sup>76</sup>

With the exception of William Ransden and Heaneage Elsley none of the Anglican clergymen listed above resided in London and it may well be that not many of those resident in London had a significant bearing on the way Unitarianism developed in the metropolis. Whereas J D was not in regular contact with many Anglican clergymen resident in London, he was in regular contact with several Dissenting ministers, as we shall note below.

It has long been known that Lindsey was disappointed by his failure to secure widespread and permanent support from members of the establishment, and by his failure to persuade other Anglican divines to follow his example in setting up an independent ministry. It may well be that when J D joined him in Essex Street at the end of 1782 the future of Unitarianism in the metropolis was at no long distant date to be largely in the hands of the Dissenters.

The following list is of Dissenting ministers and scholars who

---

<sup>76</sup> See above n.48.

*John Disney's Diary*

feature in the diary together with, where relevant, the name of the chapel where they officiated: Rochemont Barbauld, minister at Stoke Newington, John Calder, formerly minister at Poor Jewry Lane before the dissolution of the society there; Newcome Cappe, minister at St Saviourgate, York; William Christie of Montrose, minister of the Unitarians at Montrose; Joseph Fawcett, who succeeded Hugh Farmer at Walthamstow in 1780; Edward Harwood; classical scholar and theologian; Thomas Jervis, who succeeded Abraham Rees at St Thomas's, Southwark; Andrew Kippis, minister at Prince's Street, Westminster and editor of *Biographica Britannica*; William Leechman, Principal of Glasgow University; Richard Price, minister at Gravel Pit, Hackney; Joseph Priestley, minister at The New Meeting, Birmingham; Abraham Rees, minister at St. Thomas's, Southwark, and at Old Jewry; Joseph Towers, morning preacher at Newington Green; Matthew Towgood; William Turner, minister at Westgate Chapel, Wakefield; William Turner Secundus, minister at Newcastle; Gilbert Wakefield, tutor and writer; George Walker, minister at Nottingham; Thomas Wren, minister at High Street Chapel, Portsmouth. A glance at this list will show that JD was, in the first year of his residence in London, in contact with most of the leaders of Rational Dissent in the country: Joseph Priestley, Richard Price, Andrew Kippis, Joseph Towers, George Walker, and Abraham Rees.

**Priestley's influence**

Relations with the Dissenters were strengthened right from the start of Lindsey's venture in Essex Street. One of the most influential factors in Lindsey's intellectual development, especially in the period after his opening of the chapel in Essex Street, was his friendship with Joseph Priestley. Even though the reasons why, and the ground upon which, Lindsey broke with the Church had been established before the two men met, yet for both in the course of their friendship their intellectual positions were strengthened and consolidated. They first met on 19 June 1769 when Priestley, then a minister at Mill Hill, Leeds, and William Turner visited

*D O Thomas*

Archdeacon Blackburne and Lindsey was there.<sup>77</sup> During the period that Priestley was Shelburne's librarian and companion, they had several opportunities to meet when Priestley spent part of the winters at Shelburne's town house in London. As Robert E Schofield observes, Lindsey was Priestley's closest friend,<sup>78</sup> and it is clear that they held each other in the highest regard. In *A sermon preached December 31, 1780 at the New Meeting, Birmingham, on undertaking the pastoral office in that place* Priestley wrote, 'In every situation I shall consider it as my glory to have been in fellowship with that society, and still to keep an occasional communication with it' and to Lindsey he refers in a footnote; 'quo mihi non devinctior alter'.<sup>79</sup>

Priestley acknowledged that he owed to Lindsey much of his zeal for the doctrine of the Divine Unity and that he rarely published anything of significance on theological matters without first consulting Lindsey and his wife. It was Lindsey who, as we have seen, persuaded Priestley to adopt the name Unitarian rather than the name Socinian.<sup>80</sup> Priestley dedicated *An history of the corruptions of Christianity* to Lindsey and in that dedication he praised Lindsey's candour, courage, and willingness to sacrifice himself in the pursuit of the truth. He also acknowledged that he hoped to emulate Lindsey in avoiding 'indulging in too much asperity' in criticising others.<sup>81</sup>

After leaving Shelburne's employ and becoming minister at the New Meeting in Birmingham, Priestley preached for Lindsey at Essex Street in his springtime sojourns in the capital. JD notes that on Sunday, 27 April 1783 Priestley officiated with Lindsey at the chapel in the morning, and that in the following year on 17 April Priestley officiated in the morning. On many theological points Priestley and Lindsey were in complete agreement. They both

---

<sup>77</sup> Robert E Schofield, *The Enlightenment of Joseph Priestley: a study of the life and works from 1723-1773* (Pennsylvania, 1997), 162-3.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>79</sup> 'There is no one to whom I am more strongly attached.' Rutt ed., *Works of Priestley*, XV, 42.

<sup>80</sup> Gordon, *Addresses*, 272.

<sup>81</sup> Joseph Priestley, *An history of the corruptions of Christianity* (2 vols., Birmingham, 1782.), dedication, ix.

*John Disney's Diary*

accepted the main tenets of Unitarianism: the Unity of the Godhead, the simple humanity of Christ and the notion that God alone is to be worshipped. They both accepted the doctrine of universal salvation<sup>82</sup> and they both rejected the Calvinist doctrine of atonement. Of the latter Priestley writes in trenchant terms. In *A letter to a layman on the subject of the Rev. Mr Lindsey's proposal for a reformed English Church*, he claims that the Thirty-nine Articles misrepresent the character of the Deity. 'He is ... exhibited as a Being who condemns men for involuntary errors, who has irreversibly doomed a great part of the human race to everlasting destruction, and who saves the rest only on account of the cruel death and sufferings of his innocent Son.'<sup>83</sup>

In *Conversations on Christian idolatry* Lindsey expounds what he thought were Priestley's contributions to human betterment. He wrote:

[I]f in any thing Dr Priestley will deserve to be particularly remembered as a benefactor of mankind, it will be for the light that he has thrown on theological subjects, and the Scriptures. And upon a general view of what he has accomplished in this way (supposing him to be mistaken in some points, for I do not deem him infallible) he seems to have been raised up by providence, to help to preserve divine revelation and the gospel from being overwhelmed with idolatry and superstition, and from being totally rejected by the rational part of mankind.<sup>84</sup>

There is a tension in Priestley's thought between on the one hand the wish to promote the doctrine of progress, and on the other the desire to return to and recover the life and faith of the Early Church, between seeking the amelioration of the human condition by the application of reason to the solution of human problems and the rediscovery of a way of life before Christianity became corrupted by superstition and selfishness. Following Priestley, as far as theology and religious practice went, Lindsey was captivated by the desire to return to the pure and simple life of the Early

---

<sup>82</sup> *Institutes of natural and revealed religion*, in Rutt ed., *Works of Priestley*, II, 64n.

<sup>83</sup> Rutt ed., *Works of Priestley*, XXI, 31.

<sup>84</sup> Lindsey, *Christian Idolatry*, 17.

*D O Thomas*

Church, both in religious belief and practice and he found in Priestley's work an additional stimulus to rediscover Christianity in its pristine condition. There is, I believe, a tension in Lindsey's thought similar to the one which I have alleged is present in Priestley's. On the one hand Lindsey is a disciple of the Enlightenment, dedicated to criticising accepted beliefs in the light of reason, dispelling superstition all in the name of the pursuit of truth. At the same time he was devoted to identifying a special place for the Scriptures in the scheme of things, and recognising them as an infallible and reliable revelation of God's purpose for mankind. The two positions can only be defended jointly if it can be maintained that the Scriptures can be seen to be a coherent and a self-consistent presentation of a body of knowledge. Difficulties arise either where it appears that one part of Scripture is out of harmony with another part or where the values apparently espoused in Scripture are in conflict with the tradition of the Enlightenment. Take, for example, the apparent conflict between the defence of the freedom of conscience, so dear to the Dissenters, and the insistence throughout the Bible that there is only one way to salvation. This is seen in Lindsey's defence of the Israelites in their claim that it was God's will that they should destroy the other nations in Canaan on the ground that their beliefs were erroneous and their practices morally vicious. Another example lies in the difficulty of maintaining that all men have access to the truth with the view that one group or nation has a special status in the eyes of God. Similar tensions and conflicts can be detected in Disney's theology. As disciples of the Enlightenment *and* biblical Christians, it is interesting to ask how Lindsey and Disney would have resolved these difficulties if pressed. Would they have admitted that no parts of Scripture could be allowed that were rationally indefensible, or would they have claimed that Scripture has an authority and a sanction that exceeds what may be derived from the exercise of reason. Does the truth for Lindsey and Disney remain a mystery?

D O Thomas  
Aberystwyth

## **JOHN DISNEY'S DIARY: I JANUARY 1783 – 17 MAY 1784**

### **1783**

Wednesday, January 1: Walked into the City and afterwards with Mr Lindsey<sup>1</sup> to call on Dr Jebb<sup>2</sup> Bishop of Carlisle,<sup>3</sup> and dined with

---

<sup>1</sup> Theophilus Lindsey (1723-1808). Educated at Leeds Grammar School and St. John's College, Cambridge. In 1753 he became Rector of Kirby Wiske, in Yorkshire, in 1756 Rector of Piddletown in Dorset and in 1763 Vicar of Catterick. After the failure of the Feathers Tavern Petition, which sought relief for clergymen from subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, he resigned his benefice and moved to London where he began to take Unitarian services at Essex House in Essex Street on 17 April 1774.

<sup>2</sup> John Jebb (1736-1786) Educated at Dublin University and at Peterhouse, Cambridge. He was confirmed Fellow of Peterhouse in 1761 and in 1764 he became Rector of Ovington and in 1769 Rector of Fixton. In 1771 he was appointed to the Feathers Tavern Committee for conducting the application to Parliament for relief from subscription (Jebb maintained that clergymen should only be required to subscribe the validity of Scripture as the foundation of their faith). In September 1775 he resigned his preferments in the Church of England and in 1776 left Cambridge and settled in Craven Street, London. In 1777 he became a Doctor of Physic at St Andrews, and in 1779 was elected FRS. In 1780 he helped to establish the Society for Constitutional Information. In 1783 he moved to Parliament Square, London. Disney edited and contributed a memoir to Jebb in a three volume edition of his Works (1787). See Anthony Page, ‘Enlightenment and a “Second Reformation”: the religion and philosophy of John Jebb (1736-1786)’, *Enlightenment and Dissent*, no 17 (1998), 48-82.

<sup>3</sup> Edmund Law (1703-87), Bishop of Carlisle. Educated at Carmel, Kendall Grammar School and St John's College, Cambridge. In 1727 he was elected Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. He held the following appointments: 1743 Archdeacon of Carlisle; 1756 Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge; 1764 Knightbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge; and in 1768 Bishop of Carlisle. In 1731 he published a translation of Archbishop King's *De origine mali*, but perhaps his most influential work was *Considerations on the state of the world, with regard to the theory of religion* in which he argued for a progressive revelation through time of Christian truths. In 1774 following the fate of the Feathers Tavern Petition he published *Considerations on the propriety of requiring a subscription to articles of faith* in which while allowing that members of the clergy should be required to comply with the liturgy, rites

*John Disney's Diary*

him, Mrs Lindsey<sup>4</sup> and my wife<sup>5</sup> at Mrs Rayner's.<sup>6</sup> Employed at home in the evening. May the New Year, under the Blessing of God, improve my usefulness and acceptableness with HIM; and add to my satisfactions in this Life. Received letter from Archdeacon Blackburne.<sup>7</sup>

Thursday, January 2: Edmund Turnor<sup>8</sup> called upon me. Employed the day in adjusting some papers and accounts. Dined at Mr

---

and offices of the Church, he maintained that it was unreasonable to require them to profess belief in specific matters of doctrine.

<sup>4</sup> Hannah Lindsey, née Elsworth (1740-1812), daughter of Joshua and Hannah Elsworth (who subsequently married Francis Blackburne, Archdeacon of Cleveland). Brought up in the Blackburne household from the age of four. Stepsister to Jane, J D's wife.

<sup>5</sup> Jane Disney (1746-1809), daughter of Archdeacon Francis Blackburne. She married J D on 17 November 1774. When she and J D moved to Essex Street they were accompanied by their three children, Frances Mary (see note 44), John (see note 73), and Algernon (see note 105).

<sup>6</sup> Mrs Elizabeth Rayner (1714-1800) lived at Sunbury where she entertained the Lindseys and the Disneys. For her benefactions to Lindsey, Priestley and the Disney family see the Introduction, p.34, and Ditchfield, 'Theophilus Lindsey: from Anglican to Unitarian', 14.

<sup>7</sup> Francis Blackburne (1705-1787). In 1727 he entered Catherine Hall, Cambridge. In 1739 he became Rector of Richmond and in 1750 he was collated to the Archdeaconry of Cleveland. In 1744 he married Hannah Elsworth whose daughter became the wife of Lindsey. In 1767 he published the influential *The confessional*. When Lindsey threw up his preferments in the Church of England he did not approve; he maintained that the reformers should fight for what they sought from within the Church and wrote a pamphlet *An answer to the question 'Why are you not a Socinian?'* to justify his position. When J D threw up his preferments he too met with the same disapprobation. Blackburne's children include Francis, Vicar of Bignall, Yorkshire; Sarah, who married John Hall, Vicar of Chew Magna; and William, a physician.

<sup>8</sup> Edmund Turnor jun. (1755-1829), antiquary. He was the eldest son of Edmund Turnor of Stoke Rochford and Panton Hall in Lincolnshire and Mary the daughter of John Disney of Nottingham. He was thus J D's nephew. He was elected FSA in 1778 and FRS in 1786. M.P. for

*John Disney's Diary*

Lindsey's. My wife confined up stairs by a cold caught the preceeding day.

Friday, January 3: Walked to the Sun Fire office to insure my furniture and books. In the afternoon called on Dr Jebb. Writ two prayers for Sunday.

Saturday, January 4: Walked into the City, and called also on Dr Jebb, and at Payne's Bookseller.<sup>9</sup> Writ several letters. My wife confined with her cold. Writ letters to my Mother,<sup>10</sup> Archdeacon Blackburne, Mr Chambers,<sup>11</sup> Mr Ward,<sup>12</sup> Mr Bland.<sup>13</sup>

Sunday, January 5: Preached at Essex Street Chapel in the morning. Mr Lindsey reads prayers, and in the afternoon I read prayers and he preached. Drank tea at Mrs Lindsey's with Mr Shore, jun.,<sup>14</sup> Kettle<sup>15</sup> and Kerwen.<sup>16</sup> My wife confined with her cold.

---

Midhurst, Sussex from 1802 to 1806. *Dictionary of National Biography (DNB)*.

<sup>9</sup> Either John Payne who kept a shop with Joseph Johnson in Paternoster Row in the period 1768 to 1770, and who, after fire destroyed their premises there in 1770, opened on his own in Marsham Street, Westminster where he remained until 1792. (See Ian Maxted, *The London book trade 1755-1800* (London, 1977), 172-173, or Thomas Payne (1719-99), who kept a shop in Mews Gate, Castle Street, Leicester Fields, from 1750 until 1790, trading as Thomas Payne and Son from 1776 until 1790. See Plomer, Bushell and Dix, *A dictionary of the booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1726-1775*, 195.

<sup>10</sup> Frances Disney, J D's mother, was born in 1709, the youngest daughter of George Cartwright of Ossington. She married John Disney (1700-1771) on 20 December 1730. Her husband died in 1771 but she continued to live at a house in Eastgate, Lincoln which her husband had built. She died in 1791.

<sup>11</sup> Either Rev. Andrew Chambers, who succeeded J D as Vicar of Swinderby or Christopher Chambers of Mincing Lane (see n.24).

<sup>12</sup> Edward Ward of S. Scarle, Yorks. Died on 9 March 1783. See *Gentleman's Magazine*, LIII (1783), pt.1, 271.

<sup>13</sup> Mr Bland, a surgeon living at Newark.

<sup>14</sup> Samuel Shore, jun.; he became a member of the Committee at New College, Hackney.

*John Disney's Diary*

Monday, January 6: Forwarded several small matters. Went with my wife to Dr Jebb for his advice, when he generously renounced all fee henceforth and for ever. Read Scougal's Life of God in the Soul of Man (Mr Toulmin's edition)<sup>17</sup> - a good book but wanting many erasures and corrections.

Tuesday, January 7: Called on Dr Jebb (who afterwards visited my wife) and on Dr Kippis.<sup>18</sup> Dispatched several errands at the shops. Received letter from Mr Allin.

Wednesday, January 8: Went into the city - received my wardrobe and bookcase from Neash (?) safe without injury and had the same put up in my study in the afternoon. Received letter from sister and Miss Turnor.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Godfrey Kettle, Gower Street, London. See Subscription List [hereafter 'SJ'] in John Disney ed., *The works, theological, medical, political and miscellaneous of John Jebb, F.R.S.* (London, 1786).

<sup>16</sup> Richard Kirwan (1735-1812), chemist, mineralogist, meteorologist. FRS 1780. Founder-member and Chairman of the Coffee House Philosophical Society which met fortnightly in the season until 1787. Copley medallist 1782. President of the Royal Irish Academy 1799. A vigorous defender of the theory of phlogiston. A Unitarian and a strong supporter of the chapel in Essex Street. See Thomas Belsham, *Memoirs of the late Reverend Theophilus Lindsey ...* (London, 1812), 142, and T H Levere and G L'E Turner, *Discussing chemistry and steam: the minutes of a Coffee House Philosophical Society, 1780-1787* (Oxford, 2002).

<sup>17</sup> Henry Scougal, *The life of God in the soul of man, or, the nature and excellency of the Christian religion*. New corrections and additions by J. Toulmin (Taunton, 1782). Joshua Toulmin (1740-1815), from 1765 to 1803 he was minister to the General Baptists at Taunton.

<sup>18</sup> Andrew Kippis (1725-95). Educated at Northampton under Doddridge. From June 1753 he was pastor at Princes St Chapel, Westminster. In 1763 he became tutor in classics and philology at Hoxton Academy, and in 1786 Professor of Belles Lettres at New College, Hackney. Elected FSA in 1778 and FRS in 1779.

<sup>19</sup> Miss Turnor. Edmund Turnor and his wife Mary (J D's sister) had a large family which included four daughters: Elizabeth Frances who married Samuel Smith of Hertfordshire; Mary, who married Sir William Foulis; Diana, who married Sir Thomas Whichcoyt; and Frances. Lincolnshire Archives. See n.130 below.

*John Disney's Diary*

Thursday, January 9: Attended the further regulating some of my books - walked in the Temple Gardens with my children. Called with Mr Lindsey on Mr Brown, Mr S. Heywood,<sup>20</sup> and dined and drank tea at Mr Serjeant's<sup>21</sup> meeting Messrs. Tarlton, and Bearin. Writ to Mr Allin.

Friday, January 10: Called on Mr Cadell,<sup>22</sup> Dr Jebb, Dr Ramsden<sup>23</sup> and did some business at the shops. Afterwards dined and drank tea at Mr Chambers's<sup>24</sup> (with Mr and Mrs Lindsey and Mr Arnold), my wife staying at home. Received letters from Cousin Samuel Disney<sup>25</sup> and Rev. R. Clarke.

Saturday, January 11: Confined to the house by a complaint in my eyes, apparently the remaining effect of my illness just before I left Swinderby. Dr Jebb visited me, and by his direction I was bled by leeches on my temples, and in the evening blistered.

---

<sup>20</sup> Samuel Heywood (1753-1828), sergeant-at-law, judge. Educated at Warrington Academy and Trinity Hall, Cambridge (where he absented himself from chapel on the grounds that he was a Unitarian). Called to the bar on 2 July 1772. His publications include *The right of Protestant Dissenters to a compleat toleration asserted* (1787) and *High Church Politics* (1790).

<sup>21</sup> John Sargent (1715-91) of Halsted Place in Kent. Director of the Bank of England (1753-67). M.P. for Midhurst (1754-61) and for West Looe, (1765-68).

<sup>22</sup> Thomas Cadell (1742-1802), publisher and bookseller in the Strand. In 1758 he was apprenticed to Andrew Millar, becoming his partner in 1765 and succeeding to the business when Millar retired in 1767. William Strahan became his partner in 1780. Cadell retired in 1793 and died at his house in Bloomsbury in 1802.

<sup>23</sup> Rev. Dr William Ramsden, Master of Charterhouse. When Theophilus Lindsey came to London to establish the Unitarian chapel in Essex Street, he stayed with Ramsden. See *Monthly Repository*, I (1809), 1.

<sup>24</sup> Christopher Chambers, merchant with business premises in Mincing Lane. He was a cousin to Dr William Chambers (1724-1777), one time Rector of Achurch and a friend of Lindsey. He had a house at Morden, Surrey where he lived with Sophia and Frances Chambers, sisters of Dr William Chambers.

<sup>25</sup> Samuel Disney, J D's 'cousin Disney' (1737/8-1786). See Intro. pp. 34-5.

*John Disney's Diary*

Sunday, January 12: Confined by my disorder and the operation of my blister.

Monday, January 13: Confined at home, but attended to several little matters to forward our settlement and get clear of workmen and shopmen. Writ letter to Samuel Disney and received from my Mother and Archdeacon Blackburne.

Tuesday, January 14: Myself confined at home. Dr Jebb called upon me, and earnestly exhorted me to attention in my diet as the preventive of disease, - to the skill of a most able physician added all the affection of a friend. – Rara avis. – My wife dined and drank tea at Mrs Serjeant's.<sup>26</sup> Composed two prayers.

Wednesday, January 15: Called on Dr Jebb, being my first going abroad again. Received letters from Mr Emeris<sup>27</sup> Mr Bland and Mr Allin and regulated some papers.

Thursday, January 16: Walked with Mr Lindsey to the Library in Red Cross Street and afterwards did some business at various shops. Calling at Mr Lindsey's met Mr Evanson.<sup>28</sup> Mrs Grignion<sup>29</sup> called at our house, and from some circumstances determined us to give the preference to her school above others. Writ letters to Mr Emeris and [Mr] Allin.

---

<sup>26</sup> Probably Rosamund Sargent, née Chambers, sister of William Chambers, Rector of Achurch. She married John Sargent of Halsted Place in Kent. See G M Ditchfield, ‘The Revd. William Chambers, D.D.’ *Enlightenment and Dissent*, 4 (1985), 3-12.

<sup>27</sup> Rev. John Emeris, Master of the Grammar School at Lowth, Lincolnshire.

<sup>28</sup> Edward Evanson (1731-1805). In 1769 became Vicar of Tewkesbury, but in 1778 resigned his preferments on doctrinal grounds. His publications include *The doctrine of the Trinity and the incarnation of God examined* (1772), *Reflections upon the state of religion in Christendom* (1802) and *The dissonance of the four generally received Evangelists* (1802).

<sup>29</sup> Mrs Grignion kept a school at Whitelands, Chelsea where Fanny Disney was sent when she was seven. John Disney acknowledges the help of a benefactress in defraying the expenses of keeping her there.

*John Disney's Diary*

Friday, January 17: Attended the putting up of bookcase. And placed the remainder of my books therein. Read Dr Priestley's<sup>30</sup> sermon on the constitution of a Christian Church.<sup>31</sup> Received letters from Mr Chambers and Mr Brand-Hollis.<sup>32</sup>

Saturday, January 18: Walked into the City, called on Mr Kettle and bought stove grates. Read Payley's<sup>33</sup> Ordination Sermon,<sup>34</sup> – a most excellent one indeed and well calculated to do much good.

---

<sup>30</sup> Joseph Priestley (1733-1804). During the period covered by the diary he was Minister at The New Meeting, Birmingham.

<sup>31</sup> Joseph Priestley, *The proper constitution of a Christian church, considered in a sermon, preached at the New Meeting in Birmingham, Nov. 3, 1782. To which is prefixed a prefatory discourse, relating to the present state of those who are called Rational Dissenters.* (Birmingham 1782).

<sup>32</sup> Thomas Brand-Hollis (1719/20-1804). Thomas Brand was educated at the University of Glasgow where he came under the influence of Francis Hutcheson. In 1748 he went on the Grand Tour with his friend and subsequent benefactor, Thomas Hollis. In 1754 he became a Governor of Guy's Hospital, and in 1755 a Governor of St Thomas's Hospital. In 1756 he was elected FRS and in 1757 FSA. In 1774 on the death of Thomas Hollis he inherited a large portion of his fortune and took the name of his benefactor. In 1776 he was found guilty of bribery and corruption during the parliamentary election at Bindon in 1774 and was sentenced to six month's imprisonment and ordered to pay a fine of a thousand marks. In 1780 he became a member of the Society for Constitutional Information. He first met J D when the latter came to Essex Street. Of his religious views J D wrote in his memoir of him, 'Mr Brand-Hollis had been educated in the principles of a protestant dissenter from the established church, chiefly with reference to the power of the civil magistrate on matters of religion and to the government of the Church. But from his subsequent reading and reflection he became a firm believer in the unity and the supremacy of the one God and father of all; and in the divine mission of Christ as the messenger and prophet of God; and he was, agreeably to such his faith, not only a member of the chapel in Essex street, London, but a liberal benefactor to it.' See John Disney, *Memoirs of Thomas Brand-Hollis, Esq.* (London, 1808), 36.

<sup>33</sup> William Paley (1743-1805). In 1759 he entered Christ's College, Cambridge and in 1766 became a Fellow of the College. His preferments included Rector of Great Musgrave (1775), Vicar of Dalston (1776), a

*John Disney's Diary*

Sunday, January 19: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, and myself in the afternoon, – afterwards my wife and self drank tea at Mr Lindsey's with Messrs. Shore and Leake.<sup>35</sup> Received letter from Mr Morland.

Monday, January 20: Transacted some business at shops and called on Mr Cadell and Dr Jebb. Parlor stove fixed this day. My wife and myself and Mr and Mrs Lindsey dined and drank tea at Mr Brown's. Writ letter to Mr Skinner<sup>36</sup> and Mr Chambers.

Tuesday, January 21: Transacted some business at shops. – and received letter from Mr Allin.

Wednesday, January 22: Called on Dr Jebb. – at Payne's Booksellers, – and Mr Lindsey's Brother and sister Disney ffytche<sup>37</sup> called upon us. – My brother called also in the evening and sat a couple of hours with us. Received letter from Miss Ward.<sup>38</sup>

---

Prebendary at Carlisle (1780) and Archdeacon there (1782). In 1785 he also became Chancellor of the diocese. His publications include *The principles of moral and political philosophy* (1785), which, as the diary shows, J D read before it was published.

<sup>34</sup> See 'Advice addressed to the young clergy of the diocese of Carlisle, in a sermon preached at a General Ordination holden at Rose Castle, on Sunday, July 29, 1781' contained in *The works of William Paley, D.D.*, ed. James Paxton 5 vols. London, 1845), V, 323-333. To earn the respect of their congregations, Paley commends to ordinands the virtues of frugality, sobriety, and habits of retirement, reserve and seriousness in deportment. In warning against dissoluteness, Paley says, 'In my judgement the crying sin and calamity of this country at present is licentiousness in the intercourse of the sexes.'

<sup>35</sup> Possibly Robert Martin Leake, Master of the Report Office in the Court of Chancery. An ardent and generous supporter of the chapel at Essex Street. See Belsham, *Memoirs of Lindsey*, 122.

<sup>36</sup> Rev. Richard Skinner, Rector of Bassingham, Lincs. See SJ.

<sup>37</sup> Lewis Disney (1738-1822) was the eldest son of John and Frances Disney and J D's eldest brother. On his marriage in 1775 to Elizabeth, the only daughter of William Ffytche, the Governor of Bengal, he inherited Flintham Hall from his grandmother and was patron to the living of Woodham Walter (see n. 80 below).

<sup>38</sup> Miss Ward, of South Scarle, Notts. See SJ.

*John Disney's Diary*

Thursday, January 23: Called on my Brother at his Lodgings, on Bishop of Carlisle, Lord Middleton,<sup>39</sup> Mr Dawson.<sup>40</sup> Dined at home alone, my wife dined at Mr Serjeant's along with Sister Lindsey. Read the service at the ordination of Rev. William Turner.<sup>41</sup> The charge by his excellent Father, a masterly performance.<sup>42</sup> Received letter from Mr Burne.<sup>43</sup>

Friday, January 24: Went with sister Lindsey, my wife and Fanny<sup>44</sup> to Chelsea, and admitted Fanny at Mrs Grignion's school there. Returned to dinner. Read Dr Payne's Answer to Abbe Raynal's Revolution of America, a valuable work by an able hand.<sup>45</sup>

Saturday, January 25: Engaged this day, chiefly in preparing for the duties of the following, and went not abroad, except for half an hour to Mr Lindsey's.

Sunday, January 26: Attended at chapel, Mr Lindsey officiating in the morning. In the afternoon I read and preached. My mind easy, and well disposed to piety and devotion. In the evening low, somewhat spent by the duty of the day. Dr Jebb called when we were at dinner.

Monday, January 27: Walked into the City, called in Mincing Lane, and did some business in my way thither and return. Mr Roebuck called in the afternoon. Received letter from Brother Disney ffytche. Writ letters.

---

<sup>39</sup> Henry Willoughby, fifth Baron Middleton (1726-1800). Married Dorothy Cartwright in 1756. he was elected FRS in 1787 and FSA in 1791.

<sup>40</sup> Possibly, Benjamin Dawson, LL.D. (1729-1814), Rector of Burgh, Suffolk.

<sup>41</sup> Rev. William Turner, Secundus, of Newcastle (1761-1859).

<sup>42</sup> Rev. William Turner of Wakefield (1714-94).

<sup>43</sup> Dr Burne, Navenby, Lincs. see SJ.

<sup>44</sup> Frances Mary (b. 1775). J D constantly refers to her as 'dear Fanny' or 'dear little Fanny'. She married Thomas Jervis (See n.76).

<sup>45</sup> Thomas Paine, *Letter to the Abbé Raynal, on the affairs of North America, in which the mistakes of the Abbé's account of the Revolution are corrected and cleared up* (1782).

*John Disney's Diary*

Tuesday, January 28: Called at Lord Effingham<sup>46</sup> and Dr Kippis. Dined and drank tea with my wife, Mr and Mrs Lindsey at Mr Serjeant's. Writ letters to Archdeacon Blackburne, Mr Burne, Brother Disney ffytche and sister Turnor.<sup>47</sup>

Wednesday, January 29: Read Dr Priestley Corruptions<sup>48</sup> Made several calls on Messrs. Dodson,<sup>49</sup> Shore, Hett<sup>50</sup> Hollis<sup>51</sup> Lee,<sup>52</sup> after

<sup>46</sup> Thomas Howard (1746/7-91) became the third Earl of Effingham in 1763. In 1765 he married Catherine Proctor, a grand-daughter of John Disney, J D's grandfather. He held the following offices: 1772 Deputy Earl Marshal, 1782-3 Treasurer of the Household, 1784-89 Master of the Mint, 1789-91 Governor of Jamaica.

<sup>47</sup> Mary, the eldest child of John and Frances Disney and J D's sister, referred to throughout the diary as 'Sister Turnor'. She married Edmund Turnor of Panton House, Kirton and Stoke Rochford, Lincs.

<sup>48</sup> Joseph Priestley, *A history of the corruptions of Christianity* (2 vols. Birmingham, 1782). This work was dedicated to Lindsey.

<sup>49</sup> Michael Dodson (1732-1799), lawyer, only son of Joseph Dodson, Dissenting minister at Marlborough, Wiltshire. Entered Middle Temple, 31 Aug. 1754. Practised for several years as a special pleader. Married Elizabeth Hawkes in 1778. In 1790 he published *A new translation of Isaiah*. J D wrote a preface to his *Life of Sir Michael Foster* which was published posthumously.

<sup>50</sup> John Hett, Master in the Court of Chancery. See SJ.

<sup>51</sup> Timothy Hollis FRS (1708-1790), first cousin, once removed of Thomas Hollis. Apparently he shared the religious and political views of his celebrated cousin. In his diary on 24 June 1767, Silas Neville wrote, 'Except in a few things of less consequence, Mr H[ollis] and I agree in opinion particularly in this fundamental one that no person is a true friend of Liberty who is not a Republican'. (See *The diary of Silas Neville*, ed. Basil Cozens-Hardy (London, 1950), 15). He lived, and entertained the 'Friends of liberty' at his house in Great Ormond Street. The notice of his death in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (LXI (1790) pt. 2 1143) describes him as a merchant.

<sup>52</sup> John Lee (1733-1793), lawyer. Appointed Recorder of Doncaster in 1769. MP for Clitheroe (1782-90), and for Higham Ferrers (1790-93). Solicitor-General from April to July in 1782 and from April to November in 1783. Attorney-General November to December 1783. A supporter of and generous benefactor to Lindsey's chapel in Essex Street. See G.M. Ditchfield, 'Two unpublished letters of Theophilus Lindsey', *T.U.H.S.* Vol. XX, No. 2 (April, 1992), 137-142.

*John Disney's Diary*

dinner went to Johnson with Fanny.<sup>53</sup> Writ to my Brother, Frederick Disney,<sup>54</sup> Mrs M. Bonsor; inclosing drafts for their half year's annuities, and to my Mother.

Thursday, January 30: Dined with my wife, Mr and Mrs Lindsey and Fanny at Mr Chambers's. I afterwards drank tea at Mr Amory's<sup>55</sup> and went with Dr Kippis to the Antiquarian Society but no meeting. He sat with me half an hour. Very indifferent all the day in my head. Writ to Mr Chambers, and received letter from him.

Friday, January 31: Went with my wife to Chelsea with Fanny where we left her at school with Mrs Grignon at White Lands. Thankful to God for the benefactress who assists us herein and all intermediate friends and in earnest hopes of our dear child's improvement in all useful and necessary acquirements. Received letter from Br Fr Bche(?).<sup>56</sup>

Saturday, February 1: Walked out with my wife in the morning. In the afternoon composed a prayer, and writ letters. Received letter from Mr R. Hutton<sup>57</sup> and E. Turnor at Bath and answered the former.

Sunday, February 2: Prayed and preached in the morning. Mr Lindsey officiated at the communion table and in the afternoon

---

<sup>53</sup> Joseph Johnson (1738-1809), bookseller. Joined John Payne in 1768. When their bookshop on Paternoster Row was utterly destroyed by fire in 1770 he re-opened at No 72 St Paul's Churchyard where he kept shop until 1809. He was imprisoned in 1797 for publishing Gilbert Wakefield.

<sup>54</sup> Frederick Disney (1741-1788) brother to J D. He was born on 12 July, 1741. In 1766 he was appointed Captain in the 21st Regiment of the Foot. Promoted Major in 1780. During the War of American Independence he saw service under Burgoyne and Carlton.

<sup>55</sup> Possibly Mr Amory, a banker, who lived in Clements Lane London. See SJ.

<sup>56</sup> Francis Blackburne, LL.B., Vicar of Brignal, Yorks. Eldest son of Archdeacon Blackburne.

<sup>57</sup> R. Hutton, of Carlton-upon-Trent. See Subscription List [hereafter 'SC'] in A.M. Cox, *Joseph a poem* (London, 1783).

*John Disney's Diary*

service. After tea my wife and self attended Mr Fawcet<sup>58</sup> in Old Jewry, returned dissatisfied, his language florid and accurately spoken, but there seemed more of the actor than the serious preacher. No portion of the Scripture read.

Monday, February 3: Read part of Dr Priestley's Corruptions at home. Received letters from Brother Frederick Disney and Mrs M. Bonsor.

Tuesday, February 4: Cousin Samuel Disney called in the morning, as did Mr Reynolds,<sup>59</sup> Mr Sargent, Mr and Mrs Barnard,<sup>60</sup> Miss S. Chambers.<sup>61</sup> Dined and drank tea with Mr Lindsey at Mr Hollis, Great Ormond Street.

Wednesday, February 5: Called on Bishop of Carlisle, and with my wife called at Lord Middleton's where we afterwards dined, having called on Ladies Buck<sup>62</sup> and Effingham,<sup>63</sup> and Dr Jebb.

---

<sup>58</sup> Joseph Fawcett (d.1804). In 1780 he became morning preacher at Walthamstow when Hugh Farmer retired. J D manifestly did not share the opinion of the anonymous writer to the *Monthly Repository*, XII (1817), 90, who wrote of Fawcett: 'The most distinguished character which the present generation of Dissenters has known was Mr. Fawcett, who was many years morning preacher to the Society at Walthamstow where he resided, and who delivered a Sunday evening lecturer during the winter season at the old Jewry. His eloquence was of a rare and striking kind. Not only Dissenters of all classes, but Churchmen of the highest rank, and some of the leading dramatic characters of the day were his hearers. Mrs Siddons and her brothers were frequent attenders at his evening services.'

<sup>59</sup> Richard Reynolds (1730-1814), See Introduction p. 34, and *Letters to William Frend from the Reynolds family of Little Paxton and John Hammond Fenstanton* (1793-1814), ed. Frida Knight (Cambridge, 1974).

<sup>60</sup> Possibly Thomas Bernard of Lincoln's Inn. See SJ.

<sup>61</sup> Miss Sophia Chambers, a sister of Rev. William Chambers, who lived at Morden, Surrey.

<sup>62</sup> Probably Mary, the eldest daughter of George Cartwright of Ossington (d. 1762), who married Sir Charles Buck. She was a sister to Dorothy, Lady Middleton.

<sup>63</sup> Catherine Proctor (1746-91) was the daughter of Metcalfe Proctor and Martha Disney who was the daughter of John Disney, J D's grandfather. She married the Earl of Effingham in 1765.

*John Disney's Diary*

Thursday, February 6: Mr Fisher<sup>64</sup> breakfasted with us. Mrs Chambers,<sup>65</sup> Sargent and Hinckley called upon us. I called on Mr Reade for an hour. Dr Kippis drank tea with me and introduced me to the Antiquarian Society:<sup>66</sup> went with him to the Royal Society and afterwards to the Club at the London Coffee House,<sup>67</sup> which was the first time after my election. The meeting large, and agreeable. Writ letters to Mr Tayleur<sup>68</sup> and G. Turnor.

Friday, February 7: Messrs. Lindsey and Walker<sup>69</sup> breakfasted with us. Mr Manning,<sup>70</sup> Mrs Rayner and Cousin Samuel Disney called upon us. Composed two prayers. Read also part of Priestley's Corruptions. Received letter from Archdeacon Blackburne.

Saturday, February 8: Called at Mr Brooksbanks<sup>71</sup> and on Mr Sargent's. Transcribed part of a MS. sermon. Mrs Hinckley and family drank tea with us. This the last Saturday, I shall chuse to sacrifice to company.

Sunday, February 9: Mr Lindsey and Mr Walker officiated in the morning. Mr Samuel Disney called upon us and dined, after our

---

<sup>64</sup> Rev. Fisher, Rector of Woodham Walter upon the nomination of the Solicitor-General, John Lee, after the failure of Lewis Disney ffytche's lawsuit against the Bishop of London. See entry for 23 July 1783.

<sup>65</sup> It is not easy to determine to whom this refers. There are several candidates: The Rev. Dr William Chambers was survived by his mother and his wife; it could be a relative of Rev. Andrew Chambers, Vicar of Swinderby, or it could be a relative of Christopher Chambers who resided in Mincing Lane.

<sup>66</sup> J D was elected a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries in 1776.

<sup>67</sup> The Club of Honest Whigs, see Introduction, p.30.

<sup>68</sup> Mr Tayleur of Shrewsbury (1713-96) a wealthy landowner and a Unitarian. See Introduction, p.35.

<sup>69</sup> George Walker (1734?-1807). Educated at Kendal, Edinburgh and Glasgow. In 1771 he was elected FRS and in 1772 he was appointed Tutor in mathematics at Warrington Academy. In 1774 he resigned his tutorship to become a Minister at Nottingham. In 1798 he was appointed Professor of Theology at Nottingham.

<sup>70</sup> William Manning, Rector of Diss, Norfolk.

<sup>71</sup> George Brooksbank, Bloomsbury, London. See SJ.

*John Disney's Diary*

dinner time, I officiated in the afternoon, and drank tea at home, employed in transcribing part of MS. sermon.

Monday, February 10: Went to Chelsea to see my dear little Fanny, for the first time after her going to school there, found her well and well situated, with her heart affectionately attached to her mother, myself and her brothers. Mr and Mrs Reade drank tea with us, as did my brother Disney ffytche who stayed the evening. Sat up late transcribing. Received letter from E. Cartw[right].<sup>72</sup>

Tuesday, February 11: Brother Disney ffytche and cousin Samuel Disney breakfasted with us. Several (?) calls upon us this morning. We dined and drank tea at Mr Sargent's.

Wednesday, February 12: Dr Jebb called and prescribed for John.<sup>73</sup> My wife and self with Mr and Mrs Lindsey dined and drank tea with Mrs Rayner. Transcribed part of a sermon.

Thursday, February 13: Attended the Monthly Exercise at Salter's Hall. (Dr Rees,<sup>74</sup> Preacher) - the duty well adapted to the occasion

---

<sup>72</sup> Edmund Cartwright (1743-1823), divine, classical scholar and inventor. Educated at Wakefield Grammar School and University College, Oxford. Elected Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. In 1779 he was presented to the living at Brampton, near Wakefield, and to the Rectory of Goadby Marwood. Awarded D.D. at Oxford in 1806. Now best remembered for his prowess as an inventor, particularly for his invention of the power-loom which he patented in 1806. See [Margaret Strickland], *A memoir... of Edmund Cartwright* (London, 1843).

<sup>73</sup> John Disney, LL.D., FRS, FSA, (1779-1857), lawyer. He was J D's elder son; married his cousin, Sophia Disney ffytche (1779-1802).

<sup>74</sup> Abraham Rees (1743-1825), son of Lewis Rees, Llanbrynmair and Esther Penry. Educated at Llanfyllin and Coward's Academy where he became tutor in mathematics and natural theology in 1762, a post which he retained until 1785. In 1775 he received the degree of D.D. from Edinburgh. From 1786 to 1796 he was tutor in Hebrew and Mathematics at New College, Hackney. In 1768 he became assistant to Henry Reed at St. Thomas's, Southwark, succeeding him as minister. From 1773 he shared a Sunday evening lecture at Salters' Hall and from 1783 to 1825 was minister at old Jewry. He edited *Chambers's Encyclopaedia* (1781-

*John Disney's Diary*

and highly praiseworthy. Messrs. E. Turnor and J. Brooke<sup>75</sup> drank tea with us. I afterwards went with them to the Antiquarian Society, and from there went with Dr Kippis to supper at Mr S. Heywood's, meeting also Messrs. Walker and Jarvis.<sup>76</sup>

Friday February 14: Called with my wife at Mr. Bernards, and thence went to Sir Ashton Lever's Museum in Leicester Fields,<sup>77</sup> and afterwards to Dr. Jebb's. Received letters from Mr. Seddon<sup>78</sup> and G. Turnor.

---

86) and then *The New Cyclopaedia* which appeared in forty five volumes from 1802-1820. He was elected FRS in 1786.

<sup>75</sup> John Charles Brooke (1748-1794), genealogist and topographer. He was appointed Rouge Croix pursuivant in the college of Heraldry in 1773 and promoted Somerset Herald in 1777. Elected FSA in 1775. In the field of topography Brooke inherited through his father extensive collections of manuscripts made by his great-uncle, the Rev. John Brooke, rector of High Hoyland in Yorkshire and made considerable additions to them. He contributed to *Archaeologia* and to the *Gentleman's Magazine*. On 3 February 1794 he was crushed to death trying to get into the pit at the Haymarket Theatre.

<sup>76</sup> Thomas Jervis (1748-1833). Unitarian minister. Born at Ipswich, the son of the Rev William Jervis (1725-1797) a Presbyterian Minister at Ipswich. He was educated at Wellclose Square Academy under Jennings and at Hoxton. In 1770 he became classical and mathematical tutor at Exeter Academy, and in 1772 he was appointed resident tutor at Bowood to Shelburne's two sons, a post which he retained until Shelburne's surviving son, Lord Wycombe, went up to Oxford in 1783. He was ordained in 1779 and in 1783 became Minister at St Thomas's, Southwark. In 1796 he succeeded Andrew Kippis as Minister at Princes Street, Westminster. He married Frances Mary Disney, J D's daughter.

<sup>77</sup> Sir Ashton Lever (1729-88) of Alkrington Hall near Manchester, an ardent collector of ethnographic and natural historical material, many from Captain Cooks' expeditions to the Pacific. His extensive collection was famous in his lifetime. Around 1773-1774 he moved it to London where he set up a museum at Leicester House, Leicester Square. Dubbed the 'Holophusikon', it was open to the public daily, admittance varied from 5s. 3d. to half a crown. However, Lever overextended himself. By the time Disney visited his museum he was already in severe financial straits and his collection would eventually be dispersed, *ODNB*.

<sup>78</sup> Rev. Thomas Seddon, B.A., Vicar of Norton Disney, Lincs. See SJ.

*John Disney's Diary*

Saturday, February 15: At home the whole day. Transcribed part of sermon and writ two prayers. Writ letters to Mr Chambers and Seddon, and Brother Disney ffytche. Writ also to my dear Fanny at Chelsea.

Sunday, February 16: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, and myself in the afternoon. The afternoon and evening in my study, though low and faint.

Monday, February 17: Dr Jebb and Mr Lindsey called. Called on Messrs. North,<sup>79</sup> Brooksbank, Leake, Dawson. Received letter from Mr Chambers. Writ to Mr Edwards.<sup>80</sup> Transcribed part of sermon.

Tuesday, February 18: In the morning writ to Mr Nevile. Transcribed part of sermon. Mr B. Hollis called. My wife, self, Mr and Mrs Lindsey dined and drank tea at Mr Sargent's. Received a packet of letters from Brother Disney ffytche concerning the Bishop of London.<sup>81</sup>

Wednesday, February 19: Walked with my wife to Mr Chambers's in Mincing Lane, and returned to dinner: in afternoon called at Dr Jebb's when he was engaged. Received letter from Brother Disney ffytche. Transcribed part of sermon.

Thursday, February 20: Called on Mr Edmund Turnor and Mr Brand Hollis. Brother Disney ffytche<sup>82</sup> drank tea with us. Went to the Antiquarian Society and from thence to the Club on Ludgate Hill. The day wholly occupied in matters foreign to study.

---

<sup>79</sup> Mr North, Fleet Street, London. See SJ.

<sup>80</sup> Possibly Rev. John Edwards, Rolleston, Notts. See SC.

<sup>81</sup> The Bishop of London at the time when Lewis Disney ffytche was engaged in a law suit with him was Robert Lowth (1710-1787). Before he became Bishop of London in 1777 he had been Bishop of St. David's and Bishop of Oxford.

<sup>82</sup> For an account of Lewis Disney ffytche's action against the Bishop of London, see Introduction, pp.10-11.

*John Disney's Diary*

Friday, February 21: Brother Disney ffytche and Dr Towers<sup>83</sup> met at my house concerning the dispute with the Bishop of London. The former dined with us, afterwards my wife and self drank tea at Mr Reade's. Received letter from Mr Chambers with a bill inclosed. Answered it and writ also to Mr Bland.

Saturday, February 22: Mr T. Burne called upon me. Looked over a sermon and composed two prayers. Read part of Priestley's Corruptions.

Sunday, February 23: Mr Fillingham breakfasted with us. Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon, when we drank tea at his house. In evening transcribed part of sermon.

Monday, February 24: Writ letters to Mr Charlesworth<sup>84</sup> and Mr Dealtry. Walked into the City, purchased two Exchequer Bills. Called at Mr Vaughan's<sup>85</sup> and Mr Chambers's. We dined at Mr Sargent's, my wife staying [to] tea. I returned home early.

Tuesday, February 25: A great fall of snow, the first this winter. Confined to the house. My eyes so indifferent as to make it

---

<sup>83</sup> Joseph Towers (1737-1799), printer, biographer, political pamphleteer and dissenting minister. In 1764 he came to London as a journeyman printer and in 1769 opened a bookseller's shop in Fore Street. In 1774 he was ordained a dissenting minister, and in 1778 became a co-pastor with Richard Price at Newington Green and morning preacher there, an appointment which he held until his death in 1799. In 1779 he was awarded an honorary LL.D. at Edinburgh University. He was a prominent member of the Society for Constitutional Information and wrote extensively on political topics, including a celebrated pamphlet *Observations on the rights and duty of Juries in trials for libels* (1784) and he co-operated with Andrew Kippis in co-editing *Biographica Britannica*. See F K Donnelly, 'Joseph Towers and the collapse of Rational Dissent', *Enlightenment and Dissent*, 6 (1987), 31-39.

<sup>84</sup> Rev. John Charlesworth, Ossington, Notts.

<sup>85</sup> Probably William Vaughan (1752-1850), a son of Samuel Vaughan, Sen. (1720-1802). He was a merchant at Mincing Lane and a writer on navigation and docks. See *A catalogue of portraits ... in the possession of the American Philosophical Society* (Philadelphia, 1861), 98.

*John Disney's Diary*

necessary to bleed with leeches. Mr Edmund Turnor drank coffee with us.

Wednesday, February 26: Called at Lord Effingham's and at Mr Robertson. Dined and drank tea with my wife, Mr and Mrs Lindsey and Mrs Priestley<sup>86</sup> at Mrs Rayner's. Read part of Priestley's Corruptions.

Thursday, February 27: Walked with my wife to Chelsea to see our dear Fanny, – found her well, and in the possession of the most amiable, promising dispositions. May Almighty God continue them to her, and her to us! Returned in part in a coach. Drank tea at Mrs Hinckley's, after which I went to the Antiquarian Society. Received letter from Mr Chambers.

Friday, February 28: This morning left a woodcock at Mr Lindsey's, and another and a snipe at Mrs Rayner's. Called on Mr B. Hollis and Sister Turnor. Received letter from my Mother, and paid (?) for her her bill to Mr North.

Saturday, March 1: Walked to Johnson's. Compos[ed] to two prayers, and looked over sermon. Transacted other [matters] in my study.

Sunday, March 2: officiated and preached in the morning at Essex Street Chapel. Mr Lindsey administered the communion. Myself grievously afflicted with the headach but, by God's blessing satisfied the congregation as I afterwards learned, which I despaired of, but for which I am thankful. Mr Lindsey officiated in the afternoon. Transcribed part of a sermon. Writ letters to Mr Chambers and Mr Pocklington.<sup>87</sup> Mr Ward of S[outh] Scarle<sup>88</sup> died this evening.

---

<sup>86</sup> Mary Priestley (1745?-1796) was the daughter of Isaac Wilkinson, an ironmaster. Joseph Priestley and Mary were married at Wrexham on 23 June 1762.

<sup>87</sup> John Pocklington, Carlton-upon-Trent. See SC and SJ.

<sup>88</sup> Edward Ward, of South Scarle, nr. Newark, Notts. Died on 9 March 1783. See *Gentleman's Magazine*, LIII (1783) pt.1, 271.

*John Disney's Diary*

Monday, March 3: Transcribed part of sermon. Sister Turnor called in the morning and my wife and self dined and drank tea at her house.

Tuesday, March 4: Went to a poor distressed woman in St. Giles's for Mrs Rayner, where I saw an excess of wretchedness and misery. My wife, and self dined and drank tea with Mr and Mrs Lindsey at Mr Chambers's. Read Gentleman's Magazine and Monthly Review.

Wednesday, March 5: Mr Chambers called. I walked to Chelsea and called on Fanny, tho' a very snowy morning and returned home to dinner. Transcribed part of a sermon.

Thursday, March 6: Received letter from Miss F. Cartwright<sup>89</sup> opening a sad prospect of the affairs of the family. Attended the Antiquarian Society and afterwards went to the Club at the London Coffee House. This day composed two prayers, called on Mr Law.

Friday, March 7: Transcribed prayers. Walked in Inner Temple Garden. Received letters from Mr Skinner and Mr Chambers, which brought the account of the death of Mr Ward on the 2nd inst. Answered them and writ also to Mrs Ward.

Saturday, March 8: Writ letter to Archdeacon Blackburne. Transcribed part of sermon. My wife and self drank tea with Mrs Cadell<sup>90</sup> and went with her to Drury Lane Play House to See Mrs Siddons<sup>91</sup> in Jane Shore, in which she was Nature all over.

Sunday, March 9: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning. Mr H. Dealtry called upon me, bringing me a letter from his brother. In

---

<sup>89</sup> Miss Frances Dorothy Cartwright, daughter of Edmund Cartwright, and editor of *The life and correspondence of Major Cartwright*, 2 vols. (London, 1826). See *A memoir of the life, writings and mechanical inventions of Edmund Cartwright ...* (London, 1843), 238n.

<sup>90</sup> Mrs Cadell was the daughter of Thomas Jones of the Strand. She married Thomas Cadell, the printer, in 1769. She died on 31 December 1785.

<sup>91</sup> Mrs Sarah Siddons, née Kemble (1755-1831), the celebrated actress. The part Disney refers to is that of the heroine in Rowe's *Jane Shore*.

*John Disney's Diary*

the afternoon I officiated at chapel and was, I thank God, in possession of myself, which never fails to give the highest satisfaction to my own mind. Mr Reade, Mr Dealtry, and Mr Toulmin Jun.<sup>92</sup> drank tea with us.

Monday, March 10: Writ letter to Miss F. Cartwright. Called at Lord Effingham's, Dr Kippis, Dr Jebbs (who was with me also earlier), Mrs Turnor's. My wife and self dined and drank tea with Mrs Lee.<sup>93</sup> In evening transcribed part of sermon.

Tuesday, March 11: Writ letters to Mrs Bland and John Huddleston. Mr G. Cartwright and Dr Ramsden called. Walked to some shops. My wife, self, Mr and Mrs Lindsey dined and drank tea at Mr Sargent's, meeting Mr Anstey<sup>94</sup> and sons. Writ letter to Dealtry.

Wednesday, March 12: My Brother Disney ffytche and H. Roebuck called in the morning. Walked into the City, afterwards called at my Sister Turnor's, upon Lord Middleton and at Sir J. Thorold's.<sup>95</sup> Dined and drank tea with my wife and Mr and Mrs Lindsey at Mrs Rayner's. Writ letter to Fanny and composed a prayer.

Thursday, March 13: Attended at the Monthly Exercise at the Old Jewry; Mr Taylor prayed and Mr Jones preached on Habakkukk iii. 2.<sup>96</sup> Mrs Reynolds,<sup>97</sup> my Brother Disney ffytche and Sister Turnor and M.T. called on us. This day my dear John broke out of the

---

<sup>92</sup> Harry Toulmin, son of Dr Joshua Toulmin (see n. 17). He was minister at Moniton in 1786 and at Chowbent in 1788. He emigrated to America in 1793. See Lindsey, *Letters*, 121.

<sup>93</sup> Mrs Mary Lee, daughter of Thomas Hutchinson, Antiquarian of County Durham. See G M Ditchfield, 'Two unpublished letters of Theophilus Lindsey', 137-142.

<sup>94</sup> Possibly Arthur Anstey, Lincoln's Inn. See SJ.

<sup>95</sup> Sir John Thorold (1734-1815) succeeded his father as 9<sup>th</sup> Baronet in June 1777. M.P. for Lincolnshire (1778-1796).

<sup>96</sup> 'O Lord, I have heard thy speech, and was afraid: revive thy work in the midst of the years, in the midst of the years make known; in wrath remember mercy.'

<sup>97</sup> Mary Reynolds (d.1803) was the wife of Richard Reynolds of Paxton in Huntingdonshire.

*John Disney's Diary*

measles, having been indifferent some days. In the evening I called on Dr Jebb and afterwards transcribed two prayers. Read also this day a pamphlet entitled Sentiments against my Pamphlet Reasons for resigning.<sup>98</sup>

Friday, March 14: Transcribed part of sermon. Mrs Dalton, Mr and Mrs Sargent called. Dr Jebb visited John. Received letters from Archdeacon Blackburne and C. Cartwright<sup>99</sup> answered both and writ letter to Fanny and walked out. Lady Effingham called in the afternoon. Mr Fillingham drank tea with us. Transcribed part of sermon in the evening.

Saturday, March 15: Dr Jebb visited John. Transcribed part of sermon. Finished reading Taylor's Further thoughts.<sup>100</sup> Writ short letter to Mr Chambers. Received letter from Mrs Grignon (writ for Fanny).

Sunday, March 16: Mr Lindsey officiated in the forenoon and myself in the afternoon. Dr Jebb visited John in the morning. My

---

<sup>98</sup> John Disney, *Reasons for resigning the Rectory of Panton and Vicarage at Swinderby in Lincolnshire, and quitting the Church of England* (London, 1782).

<sup>99</sup> George Cartwright (1739-1819) son of William Cartwright of Marnham and Anne (daughter of George Cartwright of Ossington), see Introduction, pp. 2 & 9.

<sup>100</sup> Henry Taylor, *Further thoughts on the ...Grand Apostacy*, (1783). Henry Taylor (1711-85). Educated at Hackney and Queen's College, Cambridge. Ordained priest by Benjamin Hoadly in 1735, becoming Rector of Crawley in 1755. In theology he was heavily influenced by Samuel Clarke and inclined towards Arianism. He was one of the Anglican clergy who supported the petition for relief from Subscription. *Further thoughts* was a sequel to *Thoughts on the nature of the Grand Apostacy with reflections on the fifteenth chapter of Mr Gibbon's History* which was published in 1781. In *Memoirs of my life*, Gibbon wrote: 'The stupendous title *Thoughts on the causes of the Grand Apostacy* at first agitated my nerves till I discovered that it was the apostacy of the whole Church, since the Council of Nice from Mr Taylor's private Religion. His book is a strange mixture of *high* enthusiasm and *low* buffoonery, and the *Millennium* is a fundamental article of his creed.' See Georges Bonnard's edition (New York, 1969), 171.

*John Disney's Diary*

mind this day much given to the duties of the day.

Monday, March 17: Called on Dr Calder<sup>101</sup> and afterwards walked with my wife in Inner Temple Garden. Received letters from Mr Emeris, Bland and Charles Cartwright. In afternoon went into the City on the business of the last.

Tuesday, March 18: At home the whole day. Transcribed part of sermon. Writ letter to Mr Charles Cartwright and received letter from A. Chambers. Composed also a prayer.

Wednesday, March 19: Called on Mr Lindsey, Dodson, Shore, Hollis and Bernard.<sup>102</sup> After dinner walked to Mr North's and Johnson's. Transcribed part of sermon. [Mr] Turnor [and I] called. Read Payley's sermon<sup>103</sup> at Bishop John Law's Consecration.

Thursday, March 20: Walked with Mr Shore to Hyde Park Corner and called on Mrs Jebb. Read Bishop Watson's<sup>104</sup> letter to Arch-

---

<sup>101</sup> John Calder (1733-1815) Graduated at Marischal College, Aberdeen in 1750. Sometime Librarian at Dr Williams's Library. In 1770 he succeeded Richard Price as afternoon preacher at Poor Jewry Lane. In 1774 he retired from the ministry and devoted himself to literary pursuits which included editorial work on the *Cyclopaedia*. He was a member of the chapel in Essex Street.

<sup>102</sup> Possibly Thomas Bernard, of Lincoln's Inn. See SJ.

<sup>103</sup> See *A distinction of orders in the church defended upon principles of public utility, in a sermon preached in the Castle Chapel, Dublin at the consecration of John Law, D.D., Lord Bishop of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh Sept 21, 1782* (London, 1782). This sermon is contained in the *Works of William Paley*, D.D., ed. James Paxton (5 vols., London, 1845), V, 334-344. John Law (1745-1810), eldest son of Edmund Law, Bishop of Carlisle. Educated at Christ's College, Cambridge. In 1773 he became a Prebendary, and in 1777 Archdeacon of Carlisle. Bishop of Clonfert (1782), of Killala (1787) and of Elphin (1795).

<sup>104</sup> Richard Watson (1737-1816). Educated at Trinity College, Cambridge where he became a Fellow in 1760. Elected Professor of Chemistry at Cambridge in 1764 and Professor of Divinity in 1771. Elected FRS in 1769. In 1779 he became Archdeacon of Ely, and in 1782 Bishop of Llandaff. His advocacy of the redistribution of church revenues in *A letter*

*John Disney's Diary*

bishop of Canterbury, a sensible, manly and honest letter promising much good. Dined at Mr Sargent's, went to the Antiquarian society, introducing Mr Shore, afterwards went to the Club at London Coffee House.

Friday, March 21: Called at Mrs Reynold's at the Charterhouse with my wife and also at Mrs Brown's. I dined and drank tea at Mr Dodson, meeting there Messrs. Lindsey, Wren,<sup>105</sup> Jefferies<sup>106</sup> and Towers. Received letters from Archdeacon Blackburne, and Charlesworth.

Saturday, March 22: At home in the day but extremely low in spirits. Prepared for the duties of the following day. Algernon<sup>107</sup> sickened of the measles, and this day John was bled with leaches on his temples to relieve his eyes. Dr Jebb calling in the morning. Mrs Lindsey drank tea with us.

Sunday, March 23: Officiated in the morning. Mr Lindsey in the afternoon. My mind much engaged in the duties of the day. Drank tea with Mr Lindsey. Walked with Mrs Lindsey to Old Jewry to hear Mr Fassit<sup>108</sup> whose matters and manner all calculated more to entertain than to edify.

Monday, March 24: Called at Lord Effingham's, Dr Stinton, Mr B. Hollis and Mr Turnor's and Dr Jebb. My Brother Disney ffytche called in the morning. Writ letters to Mrs Bland and Mr Chambers.

---

*to the Archbishop of Canterbury* is said to have precluded all further preferment.

<sup>105</sup> Thomas Wren (1725-87). Minister of a Dissenting congregation at Portsmouth. Born at Grange, near Keswick. Educated at Wellclose Square under David Jennings and Samuel Morton Savage. Received the degree of D.D. at Princeton in recognition of his services to American prisoners of war. See *Gent Mag.*, LVII (1787), 1 pt. 2, 1026-27.

<sup>106</sup> Joseph Jefferies (1726-1784) L.I.D. Minister to the Baptists at Bury Street, St Mary Axe. He became Professor of Civil Law at Gresham College in 1767.

<sup>107</sup> Algernon Disney (b. 1780) had a career in the Army.

<sup>108</sup> i.e Joseph Fawcett. See n. 58.

*John Disney's Diary*

Tuesday, March 25: Called on Mr Sleigh on Mr Blackburne's business and afterwards writ letter to him. Dined at Mr Hollis's, Great Ormond Street. Mrs T. sat an hour with us in the evening. Received letter from J. Huddlestone.

Wednesday March 26: Indifferent in the day. Composed a prayer. Brother Frederick Disney called on us. Dined and drank tea at Mrs Rayner's, my wife staying home with the children in the measles. Called on Dr Jebb in the evening who went this day to Chelsea to see Fanny, of whose health he made a good report. Read Graham's<sup>109</sup> sermon on repentance.

Thursday, March 27: Officiated at the funeral of a poor child in Bunhill Fields,<sup>110</sup> called on Mrs Chambers and Mrs Hinckley. Received letter from Mr Burne. Went to the London Coffee House in the afternoon to look for an advertisement. Attended the Antiquarian Society. Transcribed two prayers, and adjusted several papers.

Friday, March 28: Called on Brother Frederick Disney, Mrs T., Mrs Dalton<sup>111</sup> and Buckley, Bishops of Carlisle and Clonforth [i.e. Clonfert]. Walked on to Chelsea to enquire by a note after my dear Fanny. Called on Dr Jebb on my return. Writ to Mr Charlesworth, adjusted several little things among my papers in the evening.

Saturday, March 29: In the house this day. Mr Edmund Turnor called in the morning. Transcribed part of a sermon. Writ letter to my Mother. Sister Turnor had tea with us.

---

<sup>109</sup> William Graham, *Repentance the only condition of a final acceptance, a sermon [On Matt. iv.17]*. William Graham, M.A. (d.1782) was a Minister at Halifax. He was a friend and a benefactor to Joseph Priestley. See J T Rutt ed, *The theological and miscellaneous works of Joseph Priestley, LL.D., F.R.S* (25 vols., London 1817-1835), III, 199; and *Gentleman's Magazine*, LII 1782, 357.

<sup>110</sup> Bunhill Fields, the last resting place of several prominent eighteenth century Dissenters. See the *Official Guide to Bunhill Fields* (Corporation of London, 1991).

<sup>111</sup> Possibly Thomas Dalton, Vicar of Carlsbrook, Isle of Wight.

*John Disney's Diary*

Sunday, March 30: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, myself in the afternoon, possessed myself more in the prayers than in preaching. I pray God, ever to give me serious and devout affections during all the services of public worship. My wife and self drank tea with Mr and Mrs Lindsey. Writ letters to my Mother and Mr Burne.

Monday, March 31: Called on Brother Frederick Disney and Sister Turnor, the former returned home with me for half an hour. Lord and Lady Middleton,<sup>112</sup> sat half an hour with us. Writ letters to Mr Chambers, and Mr Bland. My wife and self dined and drank tea at Mr Sargent's.

Tuesday, April 1: Went to Sackville Street at the desire of my Sister Turnor on some business, herself having no other than her helpless - about her. My wife and self dined and drank tea with Mrs Reynolds (Mr and Mrs Lindsey and Dr Price<sup>113</sup> were there also).

Wednesday, April 2: Called on Mr Dealtry, Brother Disney ffytche and Dr Jebb. Afterwards transacted some business at the Bank. And called on Mr Kettle, Reade and dined and drank tea with my wife, Mr and Mrs Lindsey at Mr Chambers's. Read Considerations on the Peace.<sup>114</sup> Was let blood by leaches for the pain in my head. Received letter from Archdeacon Blackburne.

Thursday, April 3: Brother Disney ffytche called this morning. Confined to the house all day, by head ach and lowness of spirits. Writ letter to Archdeacon Blackburne and transcribed part of a sermon. Composed two prayers.

---

<sup>112</sup> Dorothy, Lady Middleton (1732-1808), was the daughter of George Cartwright of Ossington, Notts. She married Henry Willoughby, Lord Middleton in 1756.

<sup>113</sup> Richard Price (1723-91), Minister at Newington Green and Gravel Pit, Hackney. Philosopher, theologian, mathematician and political pamphleteer.

<sup>114</sup> Andrew Kippis, *Considerations on the provisional treaty with America, and the preliminary articles of peace with France and Spain* (1783).

*John Disney's Diary*

Friday, April 4: At home the forenoon, when Miss T. called, except walking in the Inner Temple Garden with my little boys. Mrs Reade, Mr Man[n]ing, Mr T. Burne drank tea with us. Transcribed prayers and read Monthly Review and Gentleman's Magazine.

Saturday, April 5: My head continuing indifferent. I lost 10 ozs of blood by cupping. Transcribed part of a sermon. Received letter from Mr Chambers.

Sunday, April 6: Officiated in the morning at the Chapel, Mr Lindsey administering the Lord's supper. My mind, I thank God, much engaged in his service, and as I afterwards found, my manner and approved. Attended chapel in afternoon, Mr Lindsey officiating. Transcribed part of a sermon. Mr Reade sat an hour with me in the evening.

Monday, April 7: Walked with Mr Shore to see my dear Fanny at Whitelands, but staying in our way thither in Covent Garden, it being Mr Fox's re-election.<sup>115</sup> I had my pocket picked of my purse with 4.5.0.

Tuesday, April 8: Walked into the City and transacted some business with Mr Brooksbank. My wife and self dined and drank tea at Mr Sargent's.

Wednesday, April 9: Transcribed part of sermon. Called on Mr Jones, Shore and Mrs Turnor. My wife and self dined and drank tea with Mrs Rayner. Received letters from my Mother and from Anonymous.

Thursday April 10: Went to the monthly lecture at the Meeting in Carter Lane, when Dr Kippis preached an excellent sermon from Lamentations 4:1<sup>116</sup> exhorting to a revival of the religious spirit.

---

<sup>115</sup> Charles James Fox stood for re-election after taking office. See Namier and Brooke, 1, 335.

<sup>116</sup> 'How is the gold become dim! How is the most fine gold changed! The stones of the sanctuary are poured out in the top of every street.'

*John Disney's Diary*

Composed a prayer, writ to my Mother. In evening attended Antiquarian Society.

Friday, April 11: Sisters T. and S. called. I went with Messrs. Lindsey and Kettle to Greenwich and dined and drank tea with Master Hett. In the evening transcribed part of sermon. The visit to Greenwich most agreeable on every account.

Saturday, April 12: Engaged in my study this day except walking with my Boys for half an hour in the Temple Garden. Writ letter to Mr Chambers, and transcribed part of sermon. Composed and transcribed a prayer. Mr Dalton called in the morning.

Sunday, April 13: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon. My mind serious and occupied in the service, but my head aching continually. Advised with Dr Jebb. Mr and Mrs North and Mr and Mrs Cadell and Mr Robinson drank tea with us. Sent a parcel of little things to my Mother.

Monday, April 14: Myself indifferent the whole day, but began with Dr Jebb's prescription. Transcribed part of sermon, composed two prayers, and walked with my wife and children into Inner Temple Gardens. Writ letters to Mr Chambers and Mr Lock.<sup>117</sup> Received letter from Archdeacon Blackburne.

Tuesday, April 15: This day under the operation of Rhubarb, the forenoon engaged in transcribing part of sermon. Dined and drank tea with my wife and L(?) at Mr Chambers and in the evening returned to my transcripts.

Wednesday, April 16: Rode with Mr Lee (Solicitor-General) to Fulham, Putney, Roehampton, Richmond, Kew and Acton. Returned from a most delightful ride; dined late at home thoroughly fatigued.

Thursday, April 17: Walked with my wife and John and Algernon to Sackville Street and went with my Sister Turnor to Chelsea to

---

<sup>117</sup> Rev. Robert Lock, Vicar of Farndon, Notts.

*John Disney's Diary*

bring home Fanny. I dined with Mr Kemble.<sup>118</sup> My wife and children dined in Sackville Street. This day the account received of the death of Cecil Turnor, a fine and promising youth.

Friday, April 18: Officiated in the morning at the Chapel being Good Friday, much interest[ed] and my mind rightly disposed. Dined with my wife and family at Mr Sargent's. I drank tea at my sister Turnor's. Received letters from my Mother, Mr Tonge<sup>119</sup> answering the latter.

Saturday, April 19: Composed and transcribed two prayers. Walked in the Temple Gardens with my three children. Writ letters to Mr Emeris, sending him also Payley's sermon. Dined and drank tea at my Sister Turnor's. Went with Edmund Turnor to Sheridan's lecture on Elocution,<sup>120</sup> but little to be learnt there.

Sunday, April 20: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon; impressed with much seriousness but much cast down by head ach. Mr and Mrs Brown drank tea with us.

Monday, April 21: My wife and self and three children at Mrs Hinckley's in the morning to see Lord Mayor [Show]. In the afternoon we all drank tea at Mr Brown's. Received letters from Mr Field and John Huddlestone. Answered the former and transcribed part of sermon.

Tuesday, April 22: Made several morning calls. Transcribed part of sermon. Mrs Lindsey dined and drank tea with us. Received letter from Mr Edwards. Writ to Brother Disney ffytche.

---

<sup>118</sup> Francis Kemble, Swithin's Lane, Middlesex. See SJ.

<sup>119</sup> Rev. Joseph Tongue, Morton, Lincolnshire.

<sup>120</sup> Richard Brinsley Sheridan (1751-1816), actor, politician and orator. After a highly successful career on the stage, both as an actor and author he entered Parliament in 1780 and won fame as the manager of the impeachment of Warren Hastings.

*John Disney's Diary*

Wednesday, April 23: Called on Mr Cadell, Lord Surry,<sup>121</sup> Dr Jebb, Dr Kippis, Lord Effingham, Dr Stinton, Sister Turnor. Dined and drank tea at Mrs Rayner's with my wife, and Fanny, Mr and Mrs Lindsey and Dr Priestley. Mr B. Hollis sat an hour with me in the evening. I transcribed part of sermon. Mrs R[ayner] gave Fanny a beautiful piece of silk for a frock or gown. May we all deserve her great and unexampled kindnesses.

Thursday, April 24: Went with my wife and three children to Chelsea in Mrs Rayner's coach, and left Fanny at Mrs Grignion's (after her Easter Holidays). Dined and drank tea with Mr Lindsey at Mr Adams,<sup>122</sup> calling at Mr Chambers's in the forenoon.

Friday, April 25: At home the whole day. Composed and transcribed two prayers. Transcribed part of sermon. Sister Turnor and Mr J.Brough call upon us.

Saturday, April 26: Called at Dr Jebb's, Dr Stinton's and Lord Effingham's. Walked in Middle Temple Garden with John and Algernon. Transcribed part of sermon. Received letter from Mr Bland, prepared service for following day.

Sunday, April 27: Mr Lindsey and Dr Priestley officiated in the morning, myself in the afternoon, low in spirits. My wife and self drank tea at Mr Lindsey's. Transcribed part of sermon.

Monday, April 28: My wife and self called at Mr Peart's. Mr Lee's, Mr Sargent's, Lord Effingham's, and Dr Jebb and I called at Dr Stinton's. We also went to the Exhibition at the Royal Academy. Transcribed a sermon. Received letters from Fanny and Mr Emeris.

Tuesday, April 29: Extremely low the whole day, notwithstanding which I transcribed a sermon and my wife and self dined and drank tea at Mr Chambers's.

---

<sup>121</sup> Charles Howard (1746-1815) who before his father's death was styled Lord Surrey was elected FRS in 1767 and FSA in 1779. He was M.P. for Carlisle from 1780 to 1786 when he became Earl of Surrey and Duke of Norfolk.

<sup>122</sup> Possibly Daniel Adams, Tavistock Street, London.

*John Disney's Diary*

Wednesday, April 30: Called on Mr Dodson, Shore, Leake and Dawson. In afternoon walked with my wife and boys in Inner Temple Gardens. Transcribed a sermon.

Thursday, May 1: Transcribed part of a sermon. Dined and drank tea with Mr Hollis. Attended the Antiquarian Society, taking Mr Shore with me and afterwards went to the Club.

Friday, May 2: Transcribed part of sermon and writ letter to Mrs Stinton. Dined and drank tea with Dr Kippis (Dr Lindsey and Dr P. there). In evening composed two prayers and transcribed part of sermon.

Saturday, May 3: In my study the whole day. Transcribed a sermon and two prayers and prepared the service for following day.

Sunday, May 4: Officiated in the morning and Mr Lindsey in the afternoon. In the afternoon and evening I read Payley's Principles of Morals and Politics (not yet published),<sup>123</sup> a most excellent work. Brother Disney ffytche called and sat an hour in the evening.

Monday, May 5: Walked into the City with my wife, called at Mr Reade's. Transcribed part of sermon.

Tuesday, May 6: Transcribed part of sermon. My wife and self dined and drank tea at Mr Vaughan's.

Wednesday, May 7: Called at Dr Jebb's, Lord Effingham's, sister Turnor. Dined and drank tea with my wife at Mrs Rayner's. – Mr Lindsey, Dr Price, Priestley there.

Thursday, May 8: Mr B. Hollis and Mr Reade called. Attended the House of Lords to hear the arguments in writ of error brought by Bishop of London against Disney ffytche. Afterwards dined with my Brother at a tavern. Transcribed part of sermon. My wife dining at Mr Sargent's.

---

<sup>123</sup> William Paley, *The principles of moral and political philosophy*. This work was not published until 1785.

*John Disney's Diary*

Friday, May 9: Went with my wife, sister Lindsey, John and Algernon to Chelsea to see Fanny on hearing of her not being well and bringing her home in a coach. I dined and drank tea at Mr Cadell's (my wife attending on our dear Fanny). Brother Disney ffytche sat an hour in the evening. Composed two prayers.

Saturday May 10: My dear Fanny very indifferent this day. Dr Jebb attended her. Received letter from Mr Lock by Mr Charlesworth. Called at Mr West's,<sup>124</sup> and Mr Brooksbank's. Transcribed part of sermon and two prayers. Writ letter to Archdeacon Blackburne.

Sunday May 11: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, and myself in the afternoon. My mind serious and devout, Lady Effingham and Mrs B. Charlesworth called after Chapel, as did Mr. Dealtry. Transcribed part of sermon.

Monday, May 12: Transcribed part of sermon. Received letter from Mr Chambers. Drank tea at Miss Chambers's. Sister L[indsey] and Sister T[urnor] sat an hour in the evening.

Tuesday, May 13: Transcribed part of sermon. Mr T. Hollis called.

Wednesday, May 14: Received letter from my Mother by Mrs M. Chambers<sup>125</sup> and walked with her to Sister Turnor's. Called on Mrs S[amuel] D[isney] and Mr B. Hollis. Received letter from Mr Burne.

Thursday, May 15: Walked in the Temple Gardens with my boys and Mrs M.[Chambers]. Dined at Mr Sargent's. My wife attending upon Fanny (M. Chambers dined with her) who was better this day than any time since the commencement of her illness. Dr Jebb attending every day. Most thankful to God for the prospect of her recovery.

---

<sup>124</sup> Possibly James West, Chancery Lane, London. See SJ.

<sup>125</sup> Possibly Mrs M Chambers, wife or relative of Rev. Andrew Chambers, J D's successor at Swinderby.

*John Disney's Diary*

Friday, May 16: Mrs Samuel Disney breakfasted. She, my wife and self called at Lady Effingham's. Received letter from Chambers and Mr Bland. Answered them and writ letters to my mother and Mr. Burne. Composed two prayers.

Saturday May 17: Transcribed two prayers. Looked over part of the proof of Priestley's Appeal<sup>126</sup> and a sheet of Gough's Camden.<sup>127</sup> Mr Charlesworth, Mrs B.C. and Captain Eyre drank tea with us. Mr. Chambers dined with us.

Sunday, May 18: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, and myself in the afternoon. In the evening looked over a couple of sheets of Gough's Camden.

Monday, May 19: Looked over some sheets of Mr. Gough's additions to Camden. Called on Mr Brooksbank and Hollis. Went into the City. Read a pamphlet written against my Reasons<sup>128</sup> entitled Socinian integrity examined<sup>129</sup> - trifling in matter, tho written with spirit, and some effort at humour. Received letter [from] Arch-deacon Blackburne. Prepared some corrections for Mr Gough. Mrs M. Chambers dined with us.

---

<sup>126</sup> Joseph Priestley *An appeal to the serious and candid professors of Christianity*. An edition of this work appeared in 1783. Earlier editions appeared in Leeds in 1770 and in London in 1771, 1772 and 1775 (Robert E Crook, *A bibliography of Joseph Priestley* (London, 1966), 5 and 6.

<sup>127</sup> Richard Gough (1735-1809), antiquary. Educated privately and at Corpus Christi, Cambridge. After leaving the University he travelled the length and breadth of England collecting information for an extended version of Camden's *Britannia*. He was elected FSA in 1767, becoming Director of the Society from 1771 to 1797. J D was associated with Gough both through his membership of the Society of Antiquaries and through John Nichols, the printer, who was a close friend of Gough's.

<sup>128</sup> The first edition of J D's pamphlet appeared in 1782, the second in 1783.

<sup>129</sup> *Socinian integrity examined. In reply to a pamphlet entitled, Reasons for resigning the rectory of Panton and the vicarage of Swinderby in Lincolnshire, and quitting the Church of England. By A country curate.* (London, 1783). The titlepage cites Daniel v.27. 'TEKEL: Thou art weighed in the balance, and found wanting.'

*John Disney's Diary*

Tuesday, May 20: Adjusted some papers and books. The whole day at home.

Wednesday, May 21: Called on Mr Brooke. My wife and self dined and drank tea at Mrs Rayner's.

Thursday, May 22: At home engaged in making an index to Mr Lindsey's Historical View<sup>130</sup> except walking for an hour in the Temple Garden. Mrs Kirwan sat an hour in the afternoon.

Friday, May 23: My wife and self called on Mr Sargents', Mrs Samuel Disney and Dr Jebb. In the afternoon I went to Rivington's, the printer, about Mr Lindsey's Work and in the evening composed a prayer and continued to make out an index, &c. for Mr Lindsey.

Saturday, May 24: At home the whole day, preparing for the duties of the following day, settling accounts. Received letter from Mr Bland.

Sunday, May 24: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, and myself in the afternoon. In evening read Priestley's Institutes<sup>131</sup>. Writ letters to Messrs. Bland and R. Hutton.

Monday, May 26: Walked with Fanny into Smithfield and St. Paul's Churchyard. Afterwards we went to the House of Lords to hear the judges give their opinions in the case between the Bishop of London and my brother. Dined with my brother at a tavern, and he afterwards drank tea with me.

Tuesday, May 27: My wife and self went to Sackville Street and from thence to Camden House. Returned to dinner and tea at Sister Turnor's. M. Chambers sat the day with my children.

---

<sup>130</sup> Theophilus Lindsey, *An historical view of the state of the Unitarian doctrine and worship from the Reformation to our own times; with some account of the obstructions it has met with at different periods* (London, 1783).

<sup>131</sup> Joseph Priestley, *Institutes of natural and revealed religion* (London, 1772).

*John Disney's Diary*

Wednesday, May 28: Attended in the House of Lords on the cause between Bishop of London and my Brother. Some of the judges gave their opinions. My Brother and Mr Reade drank tea with us.

Thursday, May 29: Went with Mr Lindsey to Islington, dined and drank tea with Mr Jellico.<sup>132</sup> I supped at the Club. Received letter from Mr Neville. Mrs Lindsey dined with my wife. This day John completed four years and I pray God to bless him.

Friday, May 30: Went with my wife, Fanny, John and Algernon and Mrs M. Chambers to Chelsea, and left Fanny at Whitelands, recovered entirely I trust. Afterwards I went into the House of Lords, heard the debates on my Brother's cause, when 14 Bishops divided against law and justice. Dined at Crown and Anchor with Disney ffytche.

Saturday, May 31: Went to Westminster Hall to offer the living of Woodham Walter to Mr Lee (the Solicitor General) for his friend Mr Fisher. My Brother having obliged me therewith. Writ letter to Mr C. Neale. In afternoon Brother Disney ffytche drank tea with us. Writ letters and prepared in the evening for the duties of the following day.

Sunday, June 1: I officiated in the morning, Mr Lindsey in the afternoon. My Brother and his two little girls called before chapel. Sister Turnor also called before dinner. J. Huddlestone dined with us. My dear Algernon this day completed three years. I pray God to bless him. Writ to my Mother and Mr Chambers.

Monday, June 2: Mrs Grignon brought Fanny to sit an hour with us, when she was visibly better than she had been. My wife and self went to Sackville Street and Kensington Gardens (I called on

---

<sup>132</sup> Adam Jellicoe (d. 1789) First Clerk in the Office of Paymaster to the Treasurer of the Navy (see *Journals of the House of Commons*, XMVIII, 717). He lived at Highbury Place, Islington, and became a member of New College Committee. He was a close friend of Richard Price, see 'Richard Price's Journal', *The National Library of Wales Journal*. vol.XXI, no. 4 (Winter, 1980), 266-414.

*John Disney's Diary*

Mr Manning). Afterwards we dined and drank tea at Sister Turnor's. Received letter from Mr Chambers.

Tuesday, June 3: Dr Jebb and Mr Adair (late Jones) called upon me. Transcribed index, etc. for Mr Lindsey. In evening walked to Johnson's.

Wednesday, June 4: Called on Solicitor General, Mr Wilson<sup>133</sup> and Mr Shore, Sister Turnor meeting Colonel Durore. Dined with my wife at Mrs Rayner's. Called on my Sister in the evening. Received letter from Dealtry.

Thursday, June 5: Called on Solicitor General, Dr Towers, Mr Adams – and E1sley<sup>134</sup> in Hoxton Square, – and at the Bank. Dined and drank tea with my wife at Mr Sargent's.

Friday, June 6: Breakfasted with Colonel Durore and concluded with his father, the business of a proposal made by the son to F[anny] T[urnor].<sup>135</sup> Called at Sister Turnor's. Dined and drank tea with my wife at Miss Chambers's in Mincing Lane.

Saturday, June 7: In my study the whole day. Composed and transcribed two prayers and prepared other matters for the following day.

Sunday, June 8: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, and myself in the afternoon. My wife very indifferent and obliged to go out of chapel in the morning.

Monday, June 9: Called with my wife at Dr Jebb's and Lady Effingham's and dined and drank tea at Sister Turnor's. Went with them to Whitelands, called on Fanny, and afterwards walked in Kensington Gardens. Received letter from my Mother and Brother Disney ffytche.

---

<sup>133</sup> Possibly Mr Wilson, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden.

<sup>134</sup> Rev. Heneage E1sley. Rector of St. Bennet, Gracechurch Street, London.

<sup>135</sup> Probably either Elizabeth Frances or Frances Turnor, see n. 19 above.

*John Disney's Diary*

Tuesday, June 10: Answered Brother Disney ffytche. Writ to Archdeacon Blackburne and Mr Chambers. My wife very ill this morning. Dr Jebb saw her twice in the course of the day. I called on Mr Kirwan and Mr Brooksbank in the morning. Read Kippis's Life of Sir John Pringle.<sup>136</sup>

Wednesday, June 11: Mr Emeris breakfasted with us. Called on Mr Lee and Mr Brooksbank. Dined and drank tea at the anniversary Club Dinner at Hackney.<sup>137</sup> My wife very indifferent on my return.

Thursday, June 12: At home all the forenoon, my wife much better, this day attended twice by Dr Jebb. Received letters from Brother Disney ffytche, Bland, Seddon and Mrs Hutton. Mr Emeris drank tea with me, walked out with him for an hour in the evening.

Friday, June 13: At home. This day my wife very ill, in the evening had some dangerous symptoms. Mr Emeris sat a while with me this day, as did my Sister Turnor and Brother Disney ffytche.

Saturday, June 14: My wife somewhat better, after a good night, but Dr Saunders<sup>138</sup> was called in, this day at Dr Jebb's insistence. Brother Disney ffytche called twice.

Sunday, June 15: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, when I absented from Chapel on my wife's account who continued very indifferent. Drs Jebb and Saunders again attending. In the afternoon I officiated. Brother Disney ffytche sat an hour with me in the evening and Mr Emeris also called for half an hour.

---

<sup>136</sup> Andrew Kippis, *Six discourses, delivered by Sir John Pringle, Bart., when President of the Royal Society, on occasion of six annual assignments of Sir Godfrey Copley's Medal. To which is prefixed the life of the author* (1783).

<sup>137</sup> Since the only club, as distinct from a society that Disney refers to as one to which he belongs is the 'Honest Whigs' this, presumably is a reference to that Club, though I have not been able to find any independent evidence to support this conjecture, nor any evidence as to the precise date on which this club was founded.

<sup>138</sup> William Saunders, FRS, FSA, studied medicine at Edinburgh under Cullen M.D., LRCP, 1769, MRCP, 1770.

*John Disney's Diary*

Monday, June 16: Drs. Jebb and Saunders again attended; my wife better today. Writ to Cousin Samuel Disney and Fanny and received letter from Archdeacon Blackburne, Mr Burne and Chambers. Walked to Johnsons's in the afternoon.

Tuesday, June 17: I called on my Brother Disney ffytche and at Mr Lee's. Drs. Jebb and Saunders again attended together. My wife, I trust, in the way to recover. Bark being given this day. Mr Lee, Brooke, Leake called; also my Brother in the evening. Walked with my boys to Johnson's. Writ letter to Archdeacon Blackburne. Sister Lindsey dined and drank tea with me.

Wednesday, June 18: Dr Jebb attended my wife twice this day, the bark continued to be taken, and she remained as well as was to be expected. Sister Lindsey dined and drank tea with me. Mr Lindsey drank tea also. Mr Wyvill<sup>139</sup> called.

Thursday, June 19: My wife much better. In the afternoon walked with my boys in Lincoln's Inn Gardens and in the evening called on Mr Fisher at the Solicitor General's. Dr Jebb attended my wife.

Friday, June 20: My wife continued free from fever, Dr Jebb, nevertheless assiduously attending. I went to Chelsea to see Fanny and returned to dinner. Mrs M. Chambers dined with me and Sister Lindsey drank tea with me.

Saturday, June 21: At home the whole day. Dr Jebb attended my wife, who was recovering greatly. Sister Turnor and Dains(?) called in the morning. Transcribed two prayers, prepared service for the next day. Adjusted several small matters.

---

<sup>139</sup> Christopher Wyvill (1740-1822), an Anglican clergyman and wealthy landowner who lived at Burton Constable, North Riding. He was an absentee vicar of Black Notley in Essex. In 1779 he became Secretary of the Yorkshire Association for economic and parliamentary reform. Although he was sympathetic to Unitarians, he did not leave Anglican orders on that account.

*John Disney's Diary*

Sunday, June 22: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon. I was extremely low the whole day. Dr Jebb called this day.

Monday June 23: Dined with Sister Turnor, called on Mrs Jebb.<sup>140</sup> Writ to Fanny, Cousin Samuel Disney and to Riffington. Dr Jebb visited my wife, who continued much the same as the day before, tho' somewhat lower than before.

Tuesday, June 24: Writ letters to Archdeacon Blackburne, Mr Chambers and Mr Bland. Finished the life of Firmin,<sup>141</sup> who appears to me to be more of a Sabellian than a Socinian, or Unitarian. Set some books in order in my study.

Wednesday, June 25: Mr Fisher (now) Rector of Woodham Walter, and Dr Ramsden called. Dr Jebb also visited my wife. I called on Mrs Brown and Mrs Reynolds. Fanny came home from school being brought by Mrs Cadell, and I think much improved in every respect. In the afternoon I walked in Inner Temple Garden with my three dear children.

---

<sup>140</sup> Ann Jebb, née Torkington, daughter of James Torkington, Rector of Little Stukely, Huntingdonshire, and of Lady Dorothy Sherard, daughter of Philip, the second Earl of Harborough (see J D's 'Memoirs' in *The works ... of John Jebb* (London, 1788), p. 11). F D Cartwright writes. 'For the relict of Dr John Jebb, a lady of extraordinary talents and energy of mind, who survived her excellent husband many years, Major Cartwright also entertained the highest esteem and regard.' See F D Cartwright ed., *The life and correspondence of Major Cartwright* (2 vols. London, 1826, reprint New York, 1969), vol. 1, 167.

<sup>141</sup> [Anon.] *Life of Mr Thomas Firmin, late citizen of London ... together with an account of his religion and of the present state of the Unitarian controversy* (London, 1698). Thomas Firmin (1643-97) was a celebrated philanthropist. Sabellius is thought to have been a theologian of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century and of Roman origin. The doctrine to which he has given his name was a form of Monarchianism. The latter school, of which there are various forms, tried to reconcile the Unity of the Godhead with the divinity of Christ. The Sabellian version maintains that the Deity is made manifest in the Son, and as such suffers with Christ on the Cross. Disney seems to have assumed that Firmin was nearer to that doctrine than he was to the Socinian doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ.

*John Disney's Diary*

Tuesday, June 26: Aired out with my wife (for the first time after her illness), to Newington Butts with Fanny, John and Algernon. Afterwards I dined and drank tea at Mr Towgood's<sup>142</sup> at Hackney. Received letter from Samuel Disney.

Friday, June 27: Aired out with my wife and the three children to Clapham, when I called on Messrs. Flower<sup>143</sup> and Crompton. Composed two prayers.

Saturday, June 28: Called on Messrs. Brooke, Chambers, Bernard, Fisher, Mrs Vaughan. Writ to Mr Chambers and Brother Disney ffytche. Dr E. Turnor drank tea with me.

Sunday, June 29: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon and drank tea with Mrs Lindsey. Received a present from Mrs Rayner inclosed in a note, yet more valuable, bespeaking a truly great mind. Dr Jebb also visited my wife.

Monday, June 30: Went with my wife and Fanny in a chaise to Halstead, on a visit for a few days to my cousin Samuel Disney and reached there in the evening.

Tuesday, July 1: At Halstead; company dining at cousin Samuel Disney's.

Wednesday, July 2: My wife, Fanny and self, with Mr and Mrs Samuel Disney, dined at Mr Oneley's at Stinstead. Returned to Halstead in the evening. Received letters from Sister Disney and brother Disney ffytche

Thursday, July 3: At Halstead. Mr Oneley dined there also. Received letters from Sister Lindsey, Archdeacon Blackburne, Miss Turnor.

---

<sup>142</sup> Matthew Towgood (1732-91), son of Micaiah Towgood (1700-1792). Minister at Bridgwater from 1747 (apparently at a very early age), until 1755. Then became a merchant, and, later, a banker at London. He was a member of the New College Committee (*DNB*).

<sup>143</sup> Possibly Benjamin Flower (1755-1829). Unitarian and publisher of the *Cambridge Intelligencer*. See G M Ditchfield, 'Lindsey-Wyvill Correspondence', *T.U.H.S.*, vol. XX, no 3 (April, 1993), 166.

*John Disney's Diary*

Friday, July 4: At Halstead.

Saturday, July 5: Returned from Halstead with my wife and Fanny in a chaise, reaching Essex Street by half after one o'clock. Afterwards went with Mr Lindsey to Newington Green to dinner with Dr Price.

Sunday, July 6: I officiated in the morning, Mr Lindsey at the Lord's Supper and in the afternoon. Transcribed some prayers.

Monday, July 7: Mr and Mrs Lindsey went on their Yorkshire journey. I writ letters to Mr Chambers, Bland, Hutton and Cousin Samuel Disney. Walked out in the forenoon, and afterwards in the evening with Fanny into Piccadilly.

Tuesday, July 8: In the morning left some money at Gosling's for the first time. Called on Nichols,<sup>144</sup> Mrs Lee, Mr Maty.<sup>145</sup> Mr Shore drank tea with me and we walked afterwards to Knightsbridge to call on Mr Wyvill, and to Whitelands. Writ to my Brother Disney ffytche and short note to Cousin Samuel Disney.

Wednesday, July 9: Dr Jebb and Dr Towers called in the morning. Called on Mr Nichols. Mrs Chambers dined with us. I drank tea with Mr Adams, called at Mr Bullock's on my Brother's business.

Thursday, July 10: Sorted several pamphlets and transcribed some papers. I dined at Mr Chambers's (with Messrs. Sargent and Rollest<sup>146</sup>). Drank tea at the London Coffee House. Prepared some [matters] for Sunday's duty. This day Margaret Chambers

---

<sup>144</sup> John Nichols (1745-1826) became a printer with William Bowyer, jun. in 1766 and sole proprietor of the business on the latter's death. He was associated with the *Gentleman's Magazine* from 1778, becoming manager in 1792. See Maxted, *The London book trade, 1775-1800* (London, 1977).

<sup>145</sup> Paul Henry Maty (1745-87), Educated at Westminster and Cambridge. In 1767 he became Assistant Librarian and in 1782 Under-Librarian at the British Museum. From 1776 to 1784 he was the foreign secretary at the Royal Society.

<sup>146</sup> Lancelot Rolleston, Watnall, Notts. See SJ.

*John Disney's Diary*

left London. The barometer said to be 85. The hottest day I ever remember.

Friday, July 11: Continued to regulate and class several pamphlets and in the afternoon walked with Fanny and drank tea at Dr Jebb's. Received letter from Mr J. Pocklington.

Saturday, July 12: Sat three hours in the morning in Mr Lindsey's study. In the evening walked with my wife and children in Inner Temple Gardens. Writ letters to Mr Lindsey and Mr J. Pocklington.

Sunday, July 13: Officiated morning and evening at Chapel. My mind much disposed to my duty. In the afternoon I drank tea with Mr Hood.<sup>147</sup>

Monday, July 14: Walked out the whole morning with Fanny, calling in Mincing Lane and doing several errands. Dr Towers drank tea with me, when I gave him some papers in my brother's business.<sup>148</sup> Received letters from Mr Lindsey (at Norton place) and Cousin Samuel Disney.

Tuesday, July 15: Writ letters to Mr Lindsey and Archdeacon Blackburne. Composed a prayer. In the afternoon called on Dr Harwood,<sup>149</sup> a miserable object, – the natural consequence of his profligacy; – how much to be lamented that his learning and knowledge produced no better fruit. I gave him a trifle.

---

<sup>147</sup> Possibly William Hood, Chancery Lane, London. See SJ.

<sup>148</sup> Presumably the law suit with the Bishop of London.

<sup>149</sup> Edward Harwood (1729-94). Trained for the ministry at Wellclose Square, London. On 1754 he moved to Congleton where he founded a grammar school, and where he became friendly with Joseph Priestley. He lived in Bristol from 1765 to 1772 and then moved to London. He was a prolific author on classical and theological topics. He was awarded the degree of D.D. at Edinburgh in 1782. On May 15, 1782 he suffered an attack of paralysis. It is not clear why J D should have been, as from his note he seems to have been, so unsympathetic, although his attitude may have been coloured by charges of immorality made against him during his Bristol ministry.

*John Disney's Diary*

Wednesday, July 16: Transcribed the letter on the monopoly of the East India Company. In the afternoon walked into the City. Dr Ramsden called in the evening.

Thursday, July 17: Mr Wren of Portsmouth called and breakfasted with me. My wife and Fanny went to Morden, myself seeing them to the Inn, from whence they set out. In the afternoon walked in Temple Gardens with my boys. Mr Kettle called in the evening.

Friday, July 18: Writ letters to Mrs Hutton, Mr Seddon, and Mr Bland, received from Mr Lindsey, Brother Disney ffytche and Mrs R. Hutton, answered the last. In the afternoon walked in Temple Gardens with my boys, composed part of a sermon. Prepared service for Sunday, writ letters to Archdeacon Blackburne, and Mr Lindsey. Mr Chambers sat half an hour.

Saturday, July 19: Called upon Nichols, Johnson. Writ letter to Brother Disney ffytche, inclosing part of a proof sheet of next month's Gentleman's Magazine. Received letter from my dear wife at Morden. In the afternoon walked with my little boys to the Obelisk in St. George's Fields.

Sunday, July 20: Officiated morning and evening. Mrs Rayner attended. Mr Kettle drank tea with me and afterwards walked with me and my boys in Inner Temple Garden.

Monday, July 21: Rode to Morden on Mr Chambers's horse to breakfast, and stayed dinner, seeing my wife and Fanny there well, under that friendly roof. Returned home in the evening.

Tuesday, July 22: Walked into the City on business, calling on Mr Chambers, and on Mr Burne in the Borough. Dined and drank tea at the Solicitor General's, meeting Mr Villiers and Sergeant Walker. Walked in Temple Gardens, and sat the evening with Mr Pearson.<sup>150</sup>

---

<sup>150</sup> Possibly Michael Pearson (1730-1806), physician. He lived in Spital Square. Member of the Society for Constitutional Information. See *Mon. Rep.*, vol. 1 (1808), 492.

*John Disney's Diary*

Wednesday, July 23: Walked in the gardens with my boys. My wife and Fanny returned from Morden in forenoon. In the evening walked with Fanny in Temple Gardens. Received letters from Mr Lindsey and Miss M. Turnor, answered the former.

Thursday, July 24: Walked with Fanny to Dr Jebb's and Westminster Abbey. Mrs Grignion called and dined with us. In the afternoon my wife, self and children went by water to Chelsea landing Mrs Grignion there.

Friday, July 25: Regulated my new bound Tracts in the Clerical Petition Controversy. Received letters from Archdeacon Blackburne, Brother Disney ffytche and J. Huddlestone. Mr Dealtry dined and drank tea with us. In evening with my wife and family we walked in Temple Gardens.

Saturday, July 26: Called on Messrs. Sleigh, West, Dodson, Leake and Dawson. Dined and drank tea at Mr Solicitor General's (meeting Sir Thomas Davenport<sup>151</sup> and Mr Bearcroft). In evening walked in Temple Gardens with Fanny.

Sunday, July 27: Officiated both parts of the day. At home all the afternoon and evening writ letters to my Mother, Archdeacon Blackburne, Mr Burne, Mrs M. Bonsor, Brother Frederick Disney, to be sent on the 29th.

Monday, July 28: Mr Christie of Montrose<sup>152</sup> and Mr Johnson called upon me this morning. I walked out for an hour. In the afternoon my wife, self, Fanny and the two boys went to Chelsea and drank tea with Mrs Grignion. Left Fanny there being the opening of the school after the holidays.

---

<sup>151</sup> Sir Thomas Davenport (1734-86), M.P. for Newton 1780-86. Solicitor-General to the Queen, 1781-82. Knighted in 1783.

<sup>152</sup> William Christie (1748-1823), the son of Thomas Christie, a merchant and the Provost of Montrose. He became a Unitarian early in life and suffered much persecution thereby. In 1781 he opened a Unitarian Church in Montrose and in 1784 published *Discourses on the Divine Unity*. In 1794 he moved to a Unitarian congregation in Glasgow, but he did not stay there long. He emigrated to America in the following year.

*John Disney's Diary*

Tuesday, July 29: Composed and transcribed three prayers. Received letters from Sister Lindsey and Mr Bland. Writ letters to Mrs Rayner and Mr Lindsey. My wife, self and boys drank tea at Dr Ramsden's at Charterhouse.

Wednesday, July 30: Mr Christie of Montrose called upon me, who afterwards dined and drank tea with me; walked with him into the city in the forenoon, and to Dr Jebb's in the afternoon, concerning a letter received by Mr C. from Mr Palmer of Queen's College Cambridge,<sup>153</sup> concerning his painful situation in the Church of England.

Thursday, July 31: Called at Mr Lee's. Read Call to the Jews.<sup>154</sup> Mr Fillingham sat an hour with me in the afternoon. Afterwards I walked in Temple Garden with my wife and boys.

Friday, August 1: Indifferent this morning from a wakeful night preceding. Went with my boys into the Temple Garden in the afternoon. Received letters from Mr Chambers and Mrs Hutton.

Saturday, August 2: Composed part of sermon. Mrs Lee and Brother and Sister Disney ffytche called this morning, myself under much surprise, but not to be here explained. Received letters from my Mother, Brother Frederick Disney, Mr Lindsey and Mrs M.

---

<sup>153</sup> Thomas Fysshe Palmer (1747-1802). Educated at Eton and Queen's College, Cambridge. Was made a Fellow at Queen's in 1781 but experienced difficulties there because, largely under the influence of Priestley, he had become Unitarian in his views. He became an assistant to Christie at Montrose from November 1783 to May 1785. He founded the Unitarian chapel at Dundee in 1785. His radical views and associations brought him into conflict with the authorities, and on 12 September 1793 he was tried and found guilty on a charge of treason and was sentenced to transportation for seven years. He was sent to Botany Bay and served the whole of his sentence in Australia. He died on the island of Cugnan in 1802 while he was attempting to make his way home.

<sup>154</sup> *Call to the Jews*, by a friend to the Jews, published by Joseph Johnson. Not identified in Halkett and Laing, but presumably a new edition of *A call to the Jews : by Daniel Thangam Alexander, an eminent Jew, ... setting forth, in what surprising manner he was converted to Christianity* (London; M. Mechell, 1770?).

*John Disney's Diary*

Bonsor. In afternoon in Temple Garden for two hours. Prepared in evening for the duty of next day.

Sunday, August 3: Officiated morning and afternoon, and administered the Lord's supper in the morning. Mrs Rayner attended this day. In the evening oppressed by cold and a sore throat, in addition to other uneasinesses.

Monday, August 4: Went with my Brother Disney ffytche into the city, called on Dr Towers and Mr Chambers and afterwards my wife and self and two boys dined with him and Sister Disney ffytche in Hertford Street. Aired with them to Chelsea when we called on Fanny and to Camden House, where two of their [dams] were. Returned home in the evening.

Tuesday, August 5: The preceding evening having had much fever, anda sore throat, my wife went to Dr Jebb who was himself ill in bed, and thence to Dr Saunders, who kindly came to my assistance and prescribed accordingly and successfully. I was in bed very nearly the whole day.

Wednesday, August 6: Mr Brooke called this morning and sat half an hour. Myself greatly better, and in a fair way to be well in a few days. Mr Adams drank tea with us.

Thursday, August 7: Dr Saunders called this morning as did Mr Sargent and Disney ffytche. Mr [Mrs] and Sister Lindsey returned home this morning, well - to my great joy and satisfaction and for which I am truly thankful. They and Mrs Lee, Mr Chambers and Mr Black drank tea with us. Dr Ramsden called. This day my dear dear Fanny completed 8 years of age. May God Almighty preserve and bless her.

Friday, August 8: Myself very low in the morning [particularly]. Dr and Mrs Jebb, the former kindly prescribing - may his valuable life be preserved. Called at Mr Lindsey's. In the evening engaged in my study.

*John Disney's Diary*

Saturday, August 9: Composed part of sermon. In afternoon went into the garden with my boys. Sat half an hour with Mr Lindsey's. In evening prepared for the next day.

Sunday, August 10: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, myself in the afternoon. Dr Jebb most kindly called in the evening and prescribed for my wife, he being to go to Brighthelmstone<sup>155</sup> the next day.

Monday, August 11: Went after an early dinner with Mr and Mrs Lindsey to Mrs Rayner's at Sunbury.

Tuesday, August 12: Visited Hampton Court with Mrs Rayner and Mr and Mrs Lindsey. Returned to Sunbury to dinner.

Wednesday, August 13: Aired out to the neighbouring villages of Sunbury with Mrs Rayner and Mr and Mrs Lindsey.

Thursday, August 14: Went with Mrs Rayner and Mr and Mrs Lindsey to Runningmede and to see Cooper's Hill.

Friday, August 15: Walked with Mr Lindsey from Sunbury to Hanworth and back again to dinner, in the afternoon returned with him and Mrs Lindsey to town in Mrs Rayner's coach. Mr Chambers called. Lady Effingham supped with us and her Lord called in for half an hour. Found at home letters from Samuel Disney, Archdeacon Blackburne, Mr Chambers, Miss Turnor. Answered Samuel Disney.

Saturday, August 16: Writ letters to Mr Emeris, Dr Jebb, Miss T.; called on Nichols and on Johnson in Maiden Lane with a list of 3 [his] subscribers to Joseph, by his sister.<sup>156</sup>

Sunday, August 17: Mr Lindsey officiated in morning and myself in afternoon. Low and oppressed this day, but writ letters to my Mother, Mr Burne, Chambers and Riffington.

---

<sup>155</sup> i.e. Brighton

<sup>156</sup> A.M. Cox. *Joseph a poem.*

*John Disney's Diary*

Monday, August 18: Transcribed my prefatory account of Dr Robertson<sup>157</sup> for Gentleman's Magazine and left the whole with Nichols. Received letters from Edmund Turnor at Rouen and Miss T.

Tuesday, August 19: Went with Mr and Mrs Lindsey, my wife and boys to Morden and spent the day there,<sup>158</sup> an agreeable day in all respects, and in the society of most valued friends. Received letter from Dr Jebb at Brighton.

Wednesday, August 20: Called with my wife on Mrs Hodges. In the afternoon I drank tea at Mr Chambers's.

Thursday, August 21: Mr and Mrs Lindsey went this day to Mr Sargent's at Halstead. I looked after some workmen on the roof at Essex House. Mr Chambers drank tea with us. Mr E. Robertson called on us this evening.

Friday, August 22: Mr and Mrs Hodges called this morning. Composed and transcribed two prayers, made some corrections to Additions to Camden in Notts. – In afternoon my wife, self and boys drank tea with Mrs Grignon at Chelsea. Received letters from Mr Chambers and Miss Turnor.

---

<sup>157</sup> William Robertson (1705-83). Dissenting minister and Master of the Grammar School at Wolverhampton. Educated at Dublin under Frances Hutcheson, before the latter moved to Glasgow, and at Glasgow University. In 1728 he married Elizabeth Baxter who bore him twenty one children, all of whom he survived. In 1729 he was presented to the Rectory of Rathvilly in the county of Carlow and to the Rectory of Kilravels in the County of Wicklow. In 1767 he was awarded the degree of D.D. at Glasgow and in the following year became Master of the Grammar School at Wolverhampton. In 1772 he was elected to the Committee for conducting the Feathers Tavern Petition. He died on 20 May 1783.

<sup>158</sup> The family home of the Chambers at Morden in Surrey, where two sisters of the Rev. William Chambers (who died in 1777) lived and from time to time entertained the Lindsey and Disney families. See G.M. Ditchfield, 'The Lindsey-Wyvill correspondence', 171.

*John Disney's Diary*

Saturday, August 23: Went to the Bank. Afterwards engaged in my study. Lady Effingham dined with us, and in the afternoon walked with her to some shops. In the evening Mr Fothergill called - the first interview - writ letter to Miss T.

Sunday, August 24: Officiated morning and evening (Mr and Mrs Lindsey being at Halstead). Mrs Rayner in town.

Monday, August 25: Travelled with my wife, John and Algernon in post chaises to Bourn 95 miles, and slept there.

Tuesday, August 26: Proceeded on our journey from Bourn to Lincoln (38 miles) by the way of Navenby where we dined with Mr Burne.

Wednesday, August 27: At Lincoln.

Thursday, August 28: At Lincoln.

Friday, August 29: At Lincoln.

Saturday, August 30: At Lincoln.

Sunday August 31: At Lincoln.

Monday, September 1: We left Lincoln and went to Mr Chambers's at Swinderby to dinner, meeting there Messrs. Skinner, Seddon, Pocklington and Simpson.<sup>159</sup>

Tuesday, September 2: At Swinderby. Mr Charlesworth, Mrs and Miss Ward dining there. Received letter from Archdeacon Blackburne. Mr Bland came to Algernon, he being somewhat feverish.

Wednesday, September 3: Breakfasted with Mr Bland and dined at the Book Club meeting Messrs. Edwards, Chambers, Skinner, Seddon, Oliver,<sup>160</sup> R. Hall, Buck, Dr Rastall,<sup>161</sup> R. Pocklington, J.

---

<sup>159</sup> Rev. Simpson, South Scarle, Notts. See SC.

<sup>160</sup> Rev. Oliver, Holme, Notts.

<sup>161</sup> Either Rev. William Rastall, Rector of Thorpe, Notts. Or Rev Dr Rastall, Muskhamp, Notts. or Rev. Rastall, Newark. Notts. See SJ.

*John Disney's Diary*

Pocklington. Received letters from Mr and Mrs Lindsey. Returned to Swinderby in the evening.

Thursday, September 4: We went to Mr Seddon's at Carlton to dinner, meeting there Mr and Mrs Chambers and Mr Skinner.

Friday, September 5: At Mr Seddon's, but drank tea at Mr Hallilay.

Saturday, September 6: Went to Mr Skinners' at Bassingham to dinner, meeting there Mr and Mrs Chambers, Mr and Mrs Seddon and Mr and Mrs Hallilay.

Sunday, September 7: My wife and boys continued today at Bassingham, while I rode to Navenby to dinner and to stay the evening with Mr Burne. Writ letters to Mr Lindsey and to my dear Fanny.

Monday, September 8: Returned from Navenby with Mr Burne to dinner with Mr Skinner, and in the afternoon my wife, self and boys returned to Mr Chambers's at Swinderby.

Tuesday, September 9: Received letters from Mr Lindsey, Mrs Grignion and in the afternoon I rode to Lincoln, leaving my family at Swinderby.

Wednesday, September 10: My wife and boys moved to Mrs Ward's at Scarle. Myself at Lincoln this day.

Thursday, September 11: Rode from Lincoln to Mr Neville's at Thorney<sup>162</sup> to dinner, and in the afternoon to S. Scarle, meeting my family and Mr and Mrs Chambers there.

Friday, September 12: My wife, self and boys went to Ossington to Mr Charlesworth's to dinner meeting Mr and Mrs Hutton, Mr R.H., Mr Thomas Sutton<sup>163</sup> there.

---

<sup>162</sup> Possibly George Neville, Thorney, Notts. See SC and SJ.

<sup>163</sup> Thomas Sutton. See Cartwright ed., *The life and correspondence of Major Cartwright*, vol. 1, 144.

*John Disney's Diary*

Saturday, September 13: At Ossington, received letter from Mr Lindsey.

Sunday, September 14: After breakfast my wife rode to Mr Hutton's at Carlton, myself and little boys walking thither to dinner and slept the evening at the Inn.

Monday, September 15: Stayed dinner at Mr Hutton's, the Charlesworth family and Mr T. Sutton there. In the evening we went to Mr Bland's at Newark.

Tuesday, September 16: My wife, self and boys (after breakfast at Mr Bland's) went in a chaise to call on Mrs Carpenter and Mr Pocklington at Winthorpe and afterwards to Mr Edwards at Rolleston to dinner and tea and returned in the evening to Mr Bland's.

Wednesday, September 17: At Mr Bland's, except myself dining at the Kingston's Arms with Messrs. Chambers, Edwards and Seddon. Having in the morning called upon Mrs Rastall and Mr Lock.

Thursday, September 18: We left Mr Bland's in the morning and proceeded on our return to town, dined and slept at Alconbury Hill (54 miles).

Friday, September 19: Travelled from Alconbury Hill (by Caxton) 64 miles. Reached home between 5 and 6 o'clock, all well and thankful for a safe and agreeable journey and for the friends who helped us forward. Mr Lindsey sat an hour with us.

Saturday, September 20: Mr Fothergill called upon me. I marketed, called on Mr North, Nichols, Johnson, and writ letters to my Mother, Samuel Disney, Archdeacon Blackburne, and Mr Turnor. In evening prepared for the duties of the next day, drew out rules for intended Society (at the instance of Dr Jebb) for

*John Disney's Diary*

promoting scriptural knowledge.<sup>164</sup>

Sunday, September 21: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon. Mrs Rayner in town. I drank tea at Mr Lindsey's and in the evening transcribed the Rules which I had written on the preceding day, and which had in the morning been approved by Mr Lindsey, Dr Jebb, and Mr Warburton.

Monday, September 22: Called with my wife on Mr North, and afterwards went to see our dear Fanny at Chelsea, whom we found well, happy and promising. Writ letters to Messrs. Chambers and Bland.

Tuesday, September 23: Called on Dr and Mrs Jebb. Transcribed part of sermon. Received 50 copies of the engraved plate of Dr Robertson's portrait from Mr Nichols, for Mr Lindsey and myself. Read the account of Dean Shipley's intended trial in Denbighshire<sup>165</sup> and sent the same in a cover to Mr Bland at Newark.

Wednesday, September 24: Called upon Mr Hughes, Mr Hollis, Johnson, Kettle, Brooksbank and Chambers. Received letter from Mrs Samuel Disney.<sup>166</sup> My wife, self and boys drank tea at Mr Pearson's.

---

<sup>164</sup> For the membership of this Society see Introduction, pp.29-30, and for a summary of the aims and intentions of the Society, see Belsham, *Memoirs of Lindsey*, 177.

<sup>165</sup> William Davies Shipley (1745-1826), was the son of Jonathan Shipley, Bishop of St Asaph. He became Dean of St Asaph in 1774. His publication of Sir William Jones's pamphlet *The principles of government, in a dialogue between a scholar and a peasant* led to his being charged with a seditious libel. The ensuing case, *Rex v. Shipley* became celebrated not least because the judge instructed the jury to confine their attention to the question whether what was alleged to be a libel had been published and to leave the question whether the publication constituted a libel to the Court. See W.S. Holdsworth, *A history of English law* (London, 1938), X, 672ff.

<sup>166</sup> Ann, the daughter of Christopher Wilson, who became Bishop of Bristol, was the wife of Samuel Disney, cousin to J D.

*John Disney's Diary*

Thursday, September 25: Called on Nicholls with corrections of account of Dr Robertson, executed Mrs Samuel Disney's commissions and writ to her. Received letters from Sister Turnor, Fanny T., and Edmund Turnor. Answered two former and writ also to Miss Molly T. and to Lady Effingham. Transcribed part of sermon.

Friday, September 26: Transcribed part of sermon. Received letters from Miss Turnor, Mr R. Hutton, Mr Christie. Writ to my Mother and to William Carryer. Made up some packets for Lincoln, Ossington and Halstead. Walked out with Algernon in the forenoon.

Saturday, September 27: In study the whole day, transcribed sermon, preparing for the duty on following day. Writ letter to Mr Charlesworth.

Sunday, September 28: This day being the anniversary of my birthday, I pray God to bless my future life in usefulness in his truth, and in the happiness of my family. Mr Lindsey officiated in the forenoon, myself in the afternoon. Transcribed part of sermon.

Monday, September 29: Called on Mr Fothergill on Miss T.'s business but did not find him at home. In the afternoon drank tea at Mr Lindsey's, meeting there also Dr Jebb, Messrs. Warburton and Kettle, when we instituted A Society for promoting the Knowledge of the Scriptures and agreed to Resolutions and Rules.

Tuesday, September 30: Transcribed the Resolutions and Rules of our Society for the Press and set[t]led with the Printer. Walked into the City.

Wednesday, October 1: Walked with my boys to Mr Johnson's and to the Herald's College. Mr Fothergill called this morning. Writ to Miss T. – Mr Brooke called in the afternoon. – Arranged several tracts this day, in part towards my Scheme of the Testimony of the Scriptures to the Divine Unity.<sup>167</sup>

---

<sup>167</sup> In 1805 J D published *Six tracts on the worship of one God by the Rev. Dr Disney and others.*

*John Disney's Diary*

Thursday, October 2: Walked out with my boys. Writ letters to Mr S. Disney, to Mr Charlesworth, and to my Sister Turnor (inclosing an anonymous letter received concerning Mr F). In the evening took a proof of the Resolutions and Rules of the new Society to Dr Jebb. Transcribed part of sermon.

Friday, October 3: Went to Chelsea to see my dear Fanny (taking with me her doll J) and walked home. Received letters from my Mother, Lord Middleton, Archdeacon Blackburne and Mr Chambers. Revised the Printer's second proof of Rules. etc. Read Fownes's sermon at Mr Orton's funeral<sup>168</sup> and Monthly Review. Mr Neville and his son, Christopher, called in the evening, the son to be placed in the Navy, and a promising youth.

Saturday, October 4: Dr Jebb called. Went in to the City to receive Lord M[iddleton]'s bond, and bought 1,000 in India Bonds. Writ letters to Dr White,<sup>169</sup> Mr. Chambers, Mr Edwards, Charlesworth, and Bland, concerning our Society. Adjusted my accounts. Prepared for the duty of the next day.

Sunday, October 5: I officiated in the morning at Chapel (Mr Neville there) and Mr Lindsey in the afternoon. Mr B. Hollis called in the evening. Writ letters to Mr Christie, Dealtry and Clarkson.<sup>170</sup>

Monday, October 6: Went with my wife and my boys to Mr. North's to see the Peace proclaimed.<sup>171</sup> Dr Towers drank tea with

---

<sup>168</sup> Joseph Fownes, *The glory of the Gospel and the excellence and honour of the ministration of it, a sermon on Tim.i.11,12 preached on the occasion of the death of the late Rev. Job Orton* (Shrewsbury, 1783). Job Orton (1717-83). Educated at Shrewsbury Grammar School and Doddridge's Academy at Northampton where he became an assistant tutor in 1739. From 1751 to 1765 he was Minister at High Street Chapel, Shrewsbury. He died on 19 July 1783.

<sup>169</sup> Possibly Dr Snowden White, Nottingham. See SJ. Dr Nathaniel White had died earlier in the year.

<sup>170</sup> Possibly Anthony Clarkson, Rector of Lanwith, Derbyshire. see SJ.

<sup>171</sup> The definitive Treaty of Peace between the United States of America and Great Britain was signed at Paris on 3 September 1783.

*John Disney's Diary*

us. Dr Jebb called. Writ letters to Cousin Samuel Disney and to Mr Emeris.

Tuesday, October 7: Walked in to the City (with John Disney), called on Mr Hood and Mrs Brown and at the Chapter House of St. Paul's for Mrs Rayner. At home in the afternoon.

Wednesday, October 8: Called on Dr Garthshore,<sup>172</sup> and Dr Jebb and Mr Kirwan; received letters from Sister Turnor, Miss T., and Fanny T. Transcribed part of sermon.

Thursday, October 9: Writ letters to Sister Turnor and to Miss F.T. Went in the stage to Chelsea to see my dear Fanny who had an inflammation on one of her eyes, applied leeches to the temple and I hope with success, walked home. Applied to the arrangement of texts for my Testimony of the Scriptures till very late.

Friday, October 10: Attended the Dean and Chapter of St Paul's, at their chapter, on the part of Mrs Rayner concerning her renewal of Sunbury, and with success. Prosecuted my yesterday's work. Mr Tayleur sent this day 100 pounds to our new Society, and subscribed 5 guineas annually. Mrs Rayner had given 20 pounds. Both from great and good motives.

Saturday, October 11: Employed at home this day in preparing for Sunday's duty and arranging the text of the Testimony. Received letters from Cousin Samuel Disney and Lady Effingham. Writ to Mrs Rayner and Lady Effingham.

Sunday, October 12: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, and myself in the afternoon. In the evening I went to Mr Fasset's<sup>173</sup> lecture.

Monday, October 13: Went in the stage to Whitelands, and finding my dear Fanny's eye very bad and unrelieved by the leech, brought

---

<sup>172</sup> Maxwell Garthshore (1732-1812), physician. In 1764 after practising in Ippingham for eight years he settled in London where he acquired a large practice as an *accoucheur*. In the same year he graduated M.D. at Edinburgh (*DNB*).

<sup>173</sup> Another spelling of Fawcett, see n.58.

*John Disney's Diary*

her home in the coach. In the afternoon went with my wife and her to Dr Jebb, and afterwards to Mr Sharpe,<sup>174</sup> who gave directions for her. I pray God she may soon be restored. I received letters from Mr Dealtry, Bland, Edwards and Emeris.

Tuesday, October 14: Made many entries in my interleaved New Testament. Dr Jebb and Mr Sharpe call to see Fanny's eye. Went into the City taking Algernon with me. In the afternoon continued my entries as in the morning. Writ to cousin Samuel Disney and a long letter to my Mother.

Wednesday, October 15: Continued my arrangement for the Testimony. Mr Sharpe called on Fanny. Received letter from Brother Disney ffytche and answered it, also received letter from Sister Turnor. Dined at Mr Chambers's in Mincing Lane. Read part of new Annual Register.

Thursday, October 16: Writ letters to Edmund Turnor and Mr Chambers. Received letter from Mr Charlesworth and answered it. Walked in Temple Gardens with my wife.

Friday, October 17: At home the whole day. Received short note from Archdeacon Blackburne. Mrs Lindsey and Mrs Jebb drank tea with us.

Saturday, October 18: Writ letter to Archdeacon Blackburne. Transcribed part of sermon and prepared for succeeding day's duty. Dr Kippis called.

Sunday, October 19: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the evening. Afterwards my wife and self drank tea at Essex House. Mr Lindsey, Mr Kettle and myself went to the Old Jewry to hear Mr Fassets - much dissatisfied.

Monday, October 20: Called on Mr Dodson, Mrs Reynolds, Dr Ramsden, Dr Towers, Mrs Adams and Mr West, &c. Received letters from Mr Seddon, Mr Christie, Mr Clarkson and Mr Robert Leake. In the afternoon and evening attended at Essex House the

---

<sup>174</sup> Mr William Sharpe. A Royal Surgeon.

*John Disney's Diary*

meeting of our Society, detained there till late, in correcting the intended Rules, &c.

Tuesday, October 21: Made the entries in the Society's Books and corrected two copies of the Rules for the Printer. My wife and Fanny and self dined and drank tea at Mrs Rayner's (with Mr and Mrs Lindsey) when MrsRayner gave my wife a dove colored silk gown.

Wednesday, October 22: Corrected part of Mr Hopkin's Attempts.<sup>175</sup> Walked out with my wife and sat for my shade<sup>176</sup> at full length (for ).<sup>177</sup> Writ letters to Mr Seddon, Mr Bland, Major Cartwright,<sup>178</sup> Mr Edwards, Mr Charlesworth and Mr Clarkson and Brother Disney ffytche. Received letter from Samuel Disney.

---

<sup>175</sup> [William Hopkins] *An attempt to restore scripture forms of worship, or a friendly dialogue* (London, 1765). William Hopkins (1706-1786), priest, schoolmaster and theologian. Born at Monmouth, educated at Monmouth Grammar School and All Souls, Oxford. In 1731 he became Vicar of Bolney and assistant master at Cuckfield Grammar school (where he was elected master in 1756). In 1753 he published anonymously *An appeal to the common sense of all Christian people .... more particularly the members of the Church of England, with regard to an important point of faith and practice imposed upon their consciences by Church authority*. He was an ardent supporter of the petition for relief from subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. In theology he was an Arian (*Mon. Rep.* I (1806) 337-38 and (*DNB*). For Lindsey's commendation of *An appeal* see *The apology of Theophilus Lindsey, M.A. on resigning the vicarage of Catterick, Yorkshire* (London, 1774), 199.

<sup>176</sup> i.e. a silhouette. *S.O.E.D.*

<sup>177</sup> Disney leave this blank.

<sup>178</sup> John Cartwright (1740-1824). Entered the Navy in 1759, but promotion came to an end when he refused to fight against the American rebels. He became a major in the Nottinghamshire militia in 1775. He wrote pamphlets in defence of the American rebels and to promote parliamentary reform, advocating annual parliaments and universal suffrage. His lasting contribution to political philosophy was his advocacy of the principle that political rights are grounded not in property but in the person. His publications include *American independence* (1774) and *Take your choice* (1776). In 1780 he founded the Society for Constitutional Information.

*John Disney's Diary*

Thursday, October 23: My wife sat (at home) for her shade. Mr S. Smith called. Walked with Fanny to Johnson's &c. Received letter from Mr Chambers and writ to my Mother, sending her also a Wiltshire cheese, an eye cup and half an hundred of pens. In evening went to Peele's Coffee House.

Friday, October 24: Transcribed part of sermon. Called on Messrs. R<sup>179</sup> and S. Smith. Mr Sharpe visited Fanny whose right eye begand (sic) to be inflamed. Prepared my MSS. for Sunday.

Saturday, October 25: At home the whole day. Captain Hare<sup>180</sup> dined and drank tea with us. Revised a corrected proof of our amended Rules for our Society.

Sunday, October 26: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, and myself in the afternoon. Transcribed part of sermon but low and indisposed the whole day.

Monday, October 27: Called on Mrs Cadell and Mrs Jebb and Dr Kippis. Received letters from my Mother, Sister Turnor, Edmund Turnor, Miss T. and Fanny T. Writ out my idea of a circular letter from our new society and transcribed part of sermon.

Tuesday, October 28: Received 39 copies of Mrs Cox' History of Joseph,<sup>181</sup> subscribed for by my friends. Mr Sharpe, Dr Jebb and Mr Lindsey called. Transcribed part of sermon. Altered, enlarged and transcribed an intended circular letter for our Society. At home the whole day.

Wednesday, October 29: Called on Mrs Jebb. Miss Harrison came to us at dinner time and stayed the night. Mr and Mrs Lindsey and Mr C. Chambers supped with us. Received letter from Archdeacon Blackburne.

Thursday, October 30: Received letters from Sister Turnor and Edmund Turnor. Received copy of intended settlement in marriage

---

<sup>179</sup> Possibly Mr Robert Smith, MP for Hampstead.

<sup>180</sup> Captain Hare, Lincoln. See SJ.

<sup>181</sup> Mrs A.M. Cox, the authoress of *Joseph a poem*.

*John Disney's Diary*

of Mr Smith and Miss T. Writ to Edmund Turnor and called on Bullock and Lawton, Mr Smith and Brooksbank. Dined with the London Coffee House Club at the Half Moon. Received letters from Brother Disney ffytche and Sister Turnor and Charlesworth. Writ to my Mother and Sister Turnor.

Friday, October 31: At home the whole day, oppressed, as I had been for many days with a violent head ach. Transcribed part of sermon.

Saturday, November 1: At home all this day. Prepared for the following day. Transcribed part of sermon. Writ letters to Mr Chambers, Sister Turnor, Charlesworth and Mr Charles Neale. Fanny very indifferent this day, with the first attack of fever.

Sunday, November 2: Officiated in the morning and assisted at the Comm[union Table]. Mr Lindsey officiated in afternoon. Transcribed part of sermon. Brother Disney ffytche drank tea with us.

Monday, November 3: My Brother Disney ffytche and Dr Towers met at my House. Dr Jebb and Mr Sharpe called. In the afternoon attended our new Society. Received letters from my Mother and Mr Chambers. Answered the former.

Tuesday, November 4: Transcribed the Rules of our Society into the proper book. Called at the Printer's, at Mr Oldham<sup>182</sup> and Mr Chambers. Mr R. Smith and Mr West called upon me. In the afternoon my wife, Fanny, the boys and self drank tea at Mr North's.

Wednesday, November 5: Mr Kirby called. My wife let blood. Went to see the dreadful fire in Bartholomew Close - a most awful scene. Dined with my wife, Fanny and Mr and Mrs Lindsey at Mrs Rayner's.

Thursday, November 6: At home the whole day. Dr Jebb called. Transcribed a sermon.

---

<sup>182</sup> Mr Oldham. Lombard St., London. See SJ.

*John Disney's Diary*

Friday, November 7: Called on Mr Hollis, Mr Kirby, Mr Hughes, Mrs Jebb, Dr Cadell. Received letters from my Mother, Sister Turnor, Samuel Disney and Charlesworth. Answered my Mother. Mr and Mrs West and children drank tea with us.

Saturday, November 8: Prepared my papers for the following day. Transcribed part of sermon. Mr Shore called upon me. Received letter from Mr C. Neale with a draft inclosed, answered the letter. Walked with my boys into Aldermanbury. In the evening called on Mr Wilson.<sup>183</sup>

Sunday, November 9: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon, seriously affected. Drank tea at Mr Lindsey's in the evening. Concluded my part of 'The Sketch of the Plan of the Society'.

Monday, November 10: Called on Mr Dodson and on Mr Bullock, &c. My wife, self and children dined with Mr West's, being there to see the Lord Mayor's Shew. And I spent there an agreeable day. Drank tea at Mr Lindsey's and attending a Committee of our Society.

Tuesday, November 11: My wife, self and 3 children went to Dr Jebb's to see the King go to the House, returned home before 3 o'clock. Myself, Mr Lindsey dined and drank tea with Mr Hollis.

Wednesday, November 12: Called upon Mrs Kippis and Mrs Jebb and went (with Algernon) into the Exchequer Chambers at Westminster, the Sheriffs being this day appointed. Transcribed sermon.

Thursday, November 13: Walked with John to Whitechapel to meet Cousin Samuel Disney. Returned to dinner. In the evening supped at London Coffee House when Messrs. Adams<sup>184</sup> and Jay<sup>185</sup> were there. Writ to Frank B.

---

<sup>183</sup> Mr Wilson, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London.

<sup>184</sup> John Adams (1735-1826) arrived in London from France in October 1783 and stayed until the beginning of January 1784. According to his diary on 27 October he went to see Mr Jay 'who is lodged with Mr

*John Disney's Diary*

Friday, November 14: At home this morning till near two. Walked with my children in Temple Gardens. Received letter from Mr Simpson. Composed two prayers and revised two sermons.

Saturday, November 15: Made some morning calls. Read a little pamphlet entitled Attempt to explain certain passages of Scripture<sup>186</sup> and Mr Alexander's Preface to his Commentaries.<sup>187</sup> Corrected proof of Sketch of our Society's Plan. Mr Fothergill called.

---

Bingham in Harley Street', and from there, presumably, they both went to the Club (See *The diary and autobiography of John Adams*, ed. L.H. Butterfield (Cambridge, Mass.1961). Doubtless Adams and Jay would have heard of 'The Honest Whigs' from Benjamin Franklin who had attended their meetings frequently during his stay on London. Several members of the Club had been sympathetic to the aims and the purposes of the American rebels and it is altogether understandable that Adams should have attended a meeting of the Club when the opportunity arose.

<sup>185</sup> John Jay (1745-1820) was President of Congress in 1771 and Minister to Spain from 1779.

<sup>186</sup> Philalethes (pseud.) *An attempt to explain certain passages of scripture generally misunderstood* (London, printed by J. Nichols and sold by C. Dilly). A reviewer in the *Gentleman's Magazine* writes: 'This writer treading in the steps of Dr John Taylor of Norwich whom he styles 'illustrious' and Mr M ---- n calls 'd.iable' (so Doctors differ), endeavours to put what is called a rational sense on such figurative passages as 'dead in sin'; 'born again', 'putting off the old man', which when understood literally, he says, are productive of various absurdities, and on several other passages of scripture he puts a construction, or translates them so as to adapt them to the Unitarian system (as it is called), for which this author seems a zealous advocate.' *Gentleman's Magazine*, LIII (1783). (Information supplied by P A L Jones).

<sup>187</sup> Possibly Levy Alexander, *The Holy Bible in Hebrew and English : the Hebrew conformable to the accurate text of Everardo van der Hooght, printed at Amsterdam in 1705, and the Authorized English translation on the opposite page ; illustrated with the opinions and observations of the most esteemed and enlightened Jewish authors... together with annotations and commentaries, wherever the English translation deviates from the genuine sense of the Hebrew expressions* (London, n.d.)

*John Disney's Diary*

Sunday, November 16: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, myself in the evening. Read part of Alexander's 'Preliminary Discourse'. Corrected proof of Sketch.

Monday, November 17: Went with my wife to bespeak a watch of Dutton, and with Fanny to Mr Sharpe's, where she had a issue cut and bore the operation heroically.<sup>188</sup> Made some morning visits. My wife and self (with Mr and Mrs Lindsey) dined and drank tea with Mr Hett. Received letters from Sister Turnor and Brother Disney ffytche. Revised the second Proof of Society's Plan. The ninth anniversary of my Wedding Day, – May it continue happy, to our mutual comfort.

Tuesday, November 18: Mr Lindsey, Mr Shore and Dr Jebb called upon me. Fanny walked with me into the city. Sold 9 India Bonds and paid £1200 into Lee and Aytons for Mr T.'s use. Called at Mr Sharpe's. Writ to Sister Turnor inclosing the receipt for £1200 and blank bond. Received letters from Sister Turnor and Miss M.T. Answered the latter.

Wednesday, November 19: Called on Mr Bullock, Mr Chambers and Mr R. Smith. Bought £100 in 3 per cent Consols with my children's money at 58.12.5 and for their use. Writ letters to Sister Turnor, Archdeacon Blackburne, Mr Emeris, Mr Hopkins, Mr Christie. My wife and self dined and drank tea with Mrs Rayner. In the evening made up many packets of the Sketch of our Society's Plan.

Thursday, November 20: Called on Mr Shore, Dr Jebb and Bishop of Carlisle. Received letter from Lady Effingham and answered it. My wife and self dined and drank tea with Mrs Reynolds. Brother Disney ffytche called in the morning.

---

<sup>188</sup> 'Issue (S.) in *Physick*, is a small artificial incision or aperture made in the fleshy part of the body, in order to draw or drain off some superfluous humours which afflict it'. Thomas Dyche and William Pardon, *A new general English dictionary* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn., London, 1740).

*John Disney's Diary*

Friday, November 21: Dr Jebb called. Went to the Printer's to correct some mistake, and into the City. Received letter from Sister Turnor.

Saturday, November 22: Mrs Rayner called this morning, walked with Fanny to Mr Sharpe to dress her issue, – and shewed also a printing press. Writ letters to Mr Chambers and Mr Brand Hollis. Composed a sermon on Matthew 16.13.<sup>189</sup> Read part of the History of Sandforth and Merton.<sup>190</sup>

Sunday, November 23: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the evening. In evening read Dr Priestley's Letters to Dr Horsley.<sup>191</sup>

Monday, November 24: Went with my wife and boys to accompany Fanny (in Mrs R.'s coach) to Chelsea after six weeks absence, on account of the disorder in her eyes. Afterwards called at Mr West's. Received letters from Sister Turnor and Mr Bland, answered the latter, and writ short notes to Mr Chambers and Edwards.

Tuesday, November 25: Dr Jebb called in the morning. Called on Dr Kippis and Mrs Jebb (taking my boys with me). Received letter from Lady Effingham. Writ letters to my Mother, Mr Burne and Sister Turnor. Adjusted some accounts.

Wednesday, November 26: Called on Mrs Brown, Mr Leake and Dr Ramsden. Received letters from Mr Chambers and Mr Huddlestone. Answered the former and writ to Mr Simpson and Mrs Hutton.

Thursday, November 27: At home the forenoon. Mr B. Hollis called and desired me to be one of his executors. Dr Jebb called.

---

<sup>189</sup> ‘When Jesus came into the coast of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?’

<sup>190</sup> Thomas Day (1748-1789), author of *The history of Sandford and Merton*, a three volume work, the first volume of which appeared in 1783.

<sup>191</sup> Joseph Priestley, *Letters to Dr Horsley* (Birmingham 1782).

*John Disney's Diary*

Received letters from Miss T. and Miss M.T. Transcribed part of a sermon. Attended Antiquarian Society and our Club.

Friday, November 28: Walked with my little boys to Whitelands to see Fanny: when in St. James's Park they saw there the King, – made their best compliments and received most gracious notice in return: – the children performed their walk thither and back without fatigue. Composed a prayer, finished transcribing a sermon. Writ to my Mother.

Saturday, November 29: Prepared for the next day's duty. Walked with my boys in Temple Garden. Cousin Samuel Disney sat half an hour with me. Received letter from Mr Emeris. Drank tea with Mr Dodson.

Sunday, November 30: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon. In the evening with my family.

Monday, December 1: Walked to Johnson's. Received letters from Lady Effingham and Mr Burne. Attended the meeting of our Society at Essex House. Received letter from Mr Hopkins and his preface to his intended translation of Exodus.<sup>192</sup>

Tuesday, December 2: Indifferent today. Writ letters to Mr Hopkins and Dr Wren, and some others by penny post. Read Magazine and Reviews. Adjusted the Society's papers, &c.

Wednesday, December 3: Transcribed part of sermon. Dined with my wife at Mrs Rayner's.

Thursday, December 4: Transcribed part of sermon. Mr Samuel Disney called upon us. Received letter from Edmund Turnor and writings. Answered the letter. Bottled raisin wine. In afternoon, my

---

<sup>192</sup> [William Hopkins] *Exodus. A corrected translation with notes.* By W H (London, 1784) The reviewer in Horne's 'Biblical bibliography' wrote: 'The author's heterodoxy is offensively avowed both in the preface and the notes'. Cited in S. Austin Allibone, *A critical dictionary of English literature and British and American authors* (3 vols, J B Lipincott & Co, Philadelphia, 1859-71), 1, 836.

*John Disney's Diary*

wife and self drank tea with Mrs Grignon going there with Mr Cadell.

Friday, December 5: Called at Mr Brown's, Mr Johnson's, and Mr Kettle's. Received letters from Sister Turnor and Mrs Hall.<sup>193</sup> Transcribed part of a sermon. Mr C. Chambers and Mr Kettle called in the evening.

Saturday, December 6: In my study the whole day, transcribing part of a sermon and prayer. Prepared for the succeeding day. Writ letters to Sister Turnor, Mr Burne, Mr Dunkley and to Mr Samuel Disney at Barnes.

Sunday, December 7: Officiated in the morning, Mr Lindsey in the evening. Composed a great part of a sermon.

Monday, December 8: Called on Mr R. Smith, Mr Chambers, &c. Writ to Mr Chambers. Continued the sermon begun the preceding day.

Tuesday, December 9: Called on Mr Shore, Mr Abel Smith,<sup>194</sup> Dr Jebb, Dr Kippis. In the afternoon at the Coffee House. Mr Kirby, Jun. drank tea with us.

Wednesday, December 10: Mr A. Smith, Dr Ramsden, Dr Orme<sup>195</sup> called. At home the forenoon, transcribing the Friendly

---

<sup>193</sup> Sarah Hall was a daughter of Archdeacon Blackburne and sister to J D's wife, Jane. She married John Hall, curate of Gilleng in Yorkshire who became Rector of Chew Magna (on the presentation of Theophilus Lindsey) in June 1787. See *Gentleman's Magazine* LVII (1787), pt.2, 646.

<sup>194</sup> Abel Smith (1717-1788), merchant, banker, politician. His grandfather, Thomas Smith, started a banking enterprise in Nottingham which was extended by his son, also named Abel Smith. The latter's son, Abel Smith II, took over the management of the bank when his father died in 1757. He became MP for Aldborough (1774-78), for St Ives (1780-84), and for St Germans (1784-88), (*DNB*).

<sup>195</sup> David Orme (1727-1812) M.D. (Edinburgh, 1748).

*John Disney's Diary*

Dialogue.<sup>196</sup> In afternoon left a paper signed Theophilus by Mr H. on necessity for Gentleman's Magazine.<sup>197</sup> Called on Mr Chambers.

Thursday, December 11: Engaged in transcribing Friendly Dialogue. Walked with my boys to Cloisters in Smithfield to be measured for new cloths to be given them by their Aunt Lindsey for a New Year's gift.

Friday, December 12: Mr and Mrs Samuel Disney called upon us, as did Mr B. Hollis. Mr Samuel Disney sat for his shade for me. Received letters from Mr Christie and Mr Chambers. Finished transcribing the friendly Dialogue. Revised proof of a paper in Gentleman's Magazine on East India Company and first half of the sheet of the Commentaries.<sup>198</sup> Miss Harrison came to our house.<sup>199</sup>

Saturday, December 13: Engaged in my study in the morning. Called on Mrs Jebb and drank tea with Mr Abel Smith. Miss H.

Sunday, December 14: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, and myself in the afternoon, when my wife and self dined at Mr Lindsey's. Miss H.

Monday, December 15: Walked into the City. Received letter from my Mother. Writ to Mrs Grignon and niece Smith.<sup>200</sup> Miss H.

---

<sup>196</sup> Disney *A friendly dialogue between a common Unitarian Christian and an Athanasian* (London. 1784).

<sup>197</sup> This paper does not seem to have been published in the *Gentleman's Magazine*.

<sup>198</sup> Two volumes of *Commentaries and Essays* were published by the Society for Promoting the Knowledge of the Scriptures. They contained articles on Dodson, Jebb, Lindsey, Garnham, Tyrwhitt and Henry Hore of Leskiard. See Rutt ed., *Works of Priestley*, VII, 443 and *Gentleman's Magazine* LIV (1784), pt.2, 762.

<sup>199</sup> Probably Miss Catherine Harrison, the daughter of Rev. Harrison, Lindsey's predecessor at Catterick, and, later the wife of Newcombe Cappe.

<sup>200</sup> See entry for 30 October 1783 where J D refers to negotiations concerning a marriage settlement between a daughter of Sister Turnor and Mr Samuel Smith of Hertfordshire. Presumably the marriage had taken place by this time.

*John Disney's Diary*

Tuesday, December 16: At home. Transcribed part of sermon. Mr Shore drank tea with us. Miss H.

Wednesday, December 17: Called on Mr Hollis, Sargent, and dined and drank tea at Mrs Rayner's. Received letters from Archdeacon Blackburne, and John Huddlestane, and from Mr Hopkins together with his M.S. translation of Exodus, and answered his letter. Miss H.

Thursday, December 18: Called on Mrs Jebb, walked to Chelsea, returned home in a coach, bringing Miss Cadell and Fanny home for the holidays. Dined and drank tea at Mr Dodson's. Went to the Antiquarian Society. Brother Disney ffytche called and drank tea with my wife. Miss H.

Friday, December 19: Walked with my boys in the Temple Garden. Prepared my papers for Sunday. Read part of Hopkins's M.S. translation of Exodus.

Saturday, December 20: Walked in the Temple Garden with my three children. Mr E. Turnor called and afterwards dined with us. Received letter from Dr Wren. Writ to Mr Charlesworth, revised proofs of part of Friendly Dialogue and an half sheet of the Society's Commentaries.

Sunday, December 21: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon. Mr Johnson drank tea with us, set[t]led with him concerning Mr Hopkins's Exodus. Composed a prayer for Xmas day. Miss H.

Monday, December 22: Called (with Edmund Turnor) on Mr Smith, Mr R. Smith and Dr Jebb. In afternoon called on Mr Oldham, and drank tea with Mr Chambers. Composed two prayers. Miss H.

Tuesday, December 23: Attended Miss H. to her friend's with whom she was to travel, leaving us this day. Writ letter to Mr Hopkins. Received letter from Mrs Smith. Mrs Grignion dined and drank tea with us.

*John Disney's Diary*

Wednesday, December 24: Transcribed two prayers for Xmas day. Walked in King's Bench Walks with my three children. Corrected 3rd or last half sheet of Friendly Dialogue. Composed and transcribed part of a sermon. Prepared service for next day.

Thursday, December 25, Xmas day: Officiated in the morning at Essex House Chapel, seriously affected. Dined and drank tea at Mr Lee's. Transcribed part of sermon.

Friday, December 26: Walked in King's Bench Walks with my children and Mr Edmund Turnor. Composed prayer and prepared my papers for Sunday.

Saturday, December 27: Transcribed some papers. Walked out with my children. Dined and drank tea with Mr Bernard. Fanny dined at Mr Sargent's.

Sunday, December 28: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon. In evening transcribed part of sermon.

Monday, December 29: Walked out with my three children. Transcribed part of sermon. Received letter from Mr Hopkins. Drank tea with Mr Pearson. Transcribed in the evening.

Tuesday, December 30: Called on Mr Kettle, Adams, Brooke, and dined and drank tea with Fanny at Mr Chambers's, my wife staying at home. In evening transcribed part of sermon.

Wednesday, December 31: Dined and drank tea at Mrs Rayner's with my wife and Fanny, which concluded the year with the same excellent much valued friend with whom we began it. Received letter from Mr Chambers.

**1784**

Thursday, January 1: Engaged in my study in the morning. My three dear children dined and supped at Mr Brown's. I drank tea at Mr Sargent's in the afternoon and called upon my babes in evening and brought them home. Received letters from Lady Effingham and Mr J. Pocklington. Answered the latter and writ to Mr

*John Disney's Diary*

Chambers. May myself and mine recommend ourselves to the Blessing of Almighty God in the whole course of the coming year.

Friday, January 2: At home the whole day. Transcribed a sermon. Reviewed some accounts. Received letter from Archdeacon Blackburne. Writ to Samuel Disney.

Saturday, January 3: At home the whole day. Composed and transcribed a prayer, and prepared the service for the next day. Transcribed part of a sermon. Received letter for M. and F. Turnor.

Sunday, January 4: Officiated in the morning and Mr Lindsey in the afternoon. Transcribed part of sermon. Writ letters to Mr Chambers and Mr R. Hutton, William Atkin and John Webster.

Monday, January 5: Called on Mr B. Hollis and the Bishop of Carlisle. In afternoon attended our Society at Essex House. Regulated their papers in the evening.

Tuesday, January 6: Transcribed part of sermon. Took part of Mr Hopkins's translation of Exodus to Mr Johnson. Myself and Fanny dined at Mr Sargent's.

Wednesday, January 7: Walked with my children in Lincoln's Inn Gardens. Transcribed part of sermon. Writ to Mr Hopkins inclosing a copy of the Friendly Dialogue. Called on Mr Pearson.

Thursday, January 8: Called on Mrs West, Dr Ramsden and Mr Hood, Mrs Lee, Mr Bernard. Received letter from Cousin Samuel Disney and Mr R. Pocklington. Attended the Antiquarian Society and afterwards the Club at the London Coffee House.

Friday, January 9: Called on Mrs Rayner, taking with me the Friendly Dialogue. Called on Mr Dodson. Dined and drank tea with Mr B. Hollis.

Saturday, January 10: At home the whole day, composed a prayer and prepared service for the next day. Writ letters to my Mother, Brother Frederick Disney, Misses M. and F. Turnor, Mr Chambers, Mr Simpson, Mr Tayleur, Lady Effingham, Mr Emeris, Cousin Samuel Disney.

*John Disney's Diary*

Sunday, January 11: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon. Transcribed part of sermon.

Monday, January 12: Walked with my 3 children to Dr Jebb's, calling also at Mr Cadells, and part of the way with Mr Edmund Turnor. Received letter from my Brother and answered it. Transcribed part of a sermon. Mr North called in the morning.

Tuesday, January 13: Negotiated the sum of £1,250 for Cousin Samuel Disney. Writ to him and to a Mr Hebden of Leeds, inclosing the receipts. Called on Mr Kettle and Mrs Hinkley. Mr Edmund Turnor called for an hour at dinner time. Transcribed part of a sermon.

Wednesday, January 14: Called on Mrs Jebb and Mr A. Smith. Myself and Fanny dined and drank tea at Mrs Rayner's. My wife received a letter from her father, upon which I forbear to set down my opinion. Transcribed part of sermon. Mr Edmund Turnor called in the evening.

Thursday, January 15: Mr B. Hollis and Mr Edmund Turnor called. Received letter from Mr Burne. Called on Mrs West and Mr Barbould.<sup>201</sup> Dined at Mr Chambers's. Called at Mr Pearson's.

Friday, January 16: Called on Mr T. Hollis, Mr Lee. Dined at Mr Sargent's. Transcribed part of sermon, received letter from R. Pocklington. Composed a prayer.

Saturday, January 17: Walked out with my children. Writ letters to Mr J. Pocklington, Mr Pocklington, Mr Burne, Mr Bland, and Mr

---

<sup>201</sup> Rev. Rochemont Barbauld (1749-1808), Dissenting minister. Educated at Warrington Academy under Aikin, though intended for the Anglican Church, he decided to become a Dissenter and served as minister to congregations at Highgate, Diss, Hampstead and, finally, at Stoke Newington. He accepted the Arian doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ, but did not think that that debarred him from being a Unitarian and he also accepted the doctrine of universal salvation and the ultimate perfectibility of all mankind. In 1774 he married Anna Laetitia Aikin (1743-1825), the eldest daughter of Dr John Aikin who was a tutor at Warrington Academy. See *Mon. Rep.*, III (1808), 706-709.

*John Disney's Diary*

Chambers. Transcribed part of sermon, prepared for service of next day.

Sunday, January 18: Rose at 6 o'clock and went to Dr Orme's, Bishopgate Street, my wife having symptoms of labor, and at about 8 o'clock was happily delivered of a fine little girl (Elizabeth). May Almighty God, bless them both to our common comfort and happiness. Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon. Writ letters to my Mother, Brother Disney ffytche, Sister Turnor, Mrs Smith, Samuel Disney, Frank B[lackburne], Dr B<sup>202</sup> Mr Bland, Mr Chambers, Lady Effingham, Mr Burne and Mrs Kirby.

Monday, January 19: Mr Lindsey, Dr Orme, Dr Jebb called. Went with my three children to Mrs Hinckley's. Mr Pearson dined with me. Drank tea at Mrs Hinckley's.

Tuesday, January 20: Called on Mr B. Hollis. Sat half an hour with the Bishop of Carlisle. Writ to Mrs Blackburne. Mr Burne and Mr Christie. Mr Edmund Turnor supped with me.

Wednesday, January 21: At home the whole day. Transcribed part of sermon. Fanny dined at Mr Lee's.

Thursday, January 22: Transcribed part of sermon. Received letters from Brother Disney ffytche and Cousin Samuel Disney. Mr Edmund Turnor called in afternoon, went with him to the Antiquarian Society. Received letter from Mr Tayleur.

Friday, January 23: Called with Fanny on Mr North, West, Johnson, Mrs Reynolds, Brown, Sargent, Kirkby and Heywood. Received letters from Mrs Smith and Mr Chambers. Writ to Mr Tayleur. Mr B. Hollis called. Composed a prayer.

---

<sup>202</sup> Since J D was, most probably, advising relatives and friends of the new infant in the family this was, possibly, Dr William Blackburne, his wife's brother, who was a physician.

*John Disney's Diary*

Saturday, January 24: Transcribed part of sermon. Walked with my boys to Mrs Jebb's and Dr Kippis. Prepared the service for the following day. Corrected first proof sheet of Hopkins's Exodus.

Sunday, January 25: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, myself in the afternoon, myself and Fanny drank tea with him. In evening transcribed part of sermon.

Monday, January 26: Called at Hugh's the Printers &c. Went with my dear Fanny and two boys (with Mrs Pearson) in Mrs Rayner's coach to Whitelands, left Fanny there, being the first day of opening the school. Received letters from Archdeacon Blackburne and Sister Turnor. Transcribed part of sermon.

Tuesday, January 27: Called on Mr Chambers. Received letter from Mr Hopkins. Writ to Archdeacon Blackburne. Transcribed part of sermon, &c &c. Mr Edmund Turnor drank tea with me, being to return to Panton the next day.

Wednesday, January 28: Called on Mrs Jebb, Mr R. Smith, Mr A. Smith. Bishop of Carlisle, Mr B. Hollis. Dined and drank tea with Mrs Rayner.

Thursday, January 29: Called (with my two boys) on Mr Dodson, Lee, Vaughan. Transcribed part of sermon. Composed a prayer. Altered some of Watts's Divine Songs.<sup>203</sup> Mr Kemble called in the morning.

Friday, January 30: Went to Westminster Abbey and heard Bishop Watson preach, – an excellent sermon, and his prayers and doxology, perfectly Unitarian. – Received letters from Mr Hopkins and Mr Chambers. Corrected sheet C of Exodus &c..

Saturday, January 31: Called with my two boys, on Mr T. Hollis and Mrs Sargent. Adjusted many papers. Transcribed a prayer and composed a great part of a sermon.

---

<sup>203</sup> Isaac Watts, *Divine songs attempted in easy language for the use of children* (London, 1715).

*John Disney's Diary*

Sunday, February 1: Officiated in the morning, Mr Lindsey at the Communion Table, Mr Lindsey officiated in the afternoon. Concluded the completion of a sermon begun the preceding evening.

Monday, February 2: Called on Bishop of Carlisle, Mr York, Mr Wyvill. Went with my boys to Mr West's in the afternoon and from thence to the Society's at Essex House. – brought my boys home; – received letter from Mrs M Bonsor.

Tuesday, February 3: Went with Mrs Rayner to the Bank, when she transferred £500 stock into my name designed for the future use of my dear little infant daughter Elizabeth Collyer Disney.<sup>204</sup> An Act great in itself, and made still greater by the manner of doing it, and which I knew not of till she gave directions for the transfer to be made out. Thanks be to God for such a friend. Mrs Rayner afterwards visited my wife and daughter. I called at Mr Chambers's and dined and drank tea at Mr William Vaughan's.

Wednesday, February 4: Mr A. Smith and Major Cartwright called in the morning. Dined with Mr Pearson, drank tea with my boys at Mr Dodson. Received letters from Archdeacon Blackburne and Wm Atkin, answered the latter. Writ to Fanny and to my Mother and Mr E. Cartwright.

Thursday, February 5: Walked out in the forenoon on business near home. Writ to Archdeacon Blackburne. Dined and drank tea with Mr Hood. Went to Antiquarian Society, and afterwards to the Club at London Coffee House.

Friday, February 6: Walked into the City. Received letters from Mr Bland and Mr F. Blackburne. In my study the afternoon, and evening correcting a proof sheet of Exodus, composing a prayer, transcribing a theological paper. Writ to nephew Edmund Turnor.

---

<sup>204</sup> Collyer was Mrs Rayner's maiden name.

*John Disney's Diary*

Saturday, February 7: In my study the whole day, transcribed and revised a paper intended for our Society, 1 Tim. iii.16.<sup>205</sup> Transcribed prayer and regulated the service for next day. Corrected the title and preface to Exodus. Lord and Lady Effingham called in the morning.

Sunday, February 8: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning, and myself in the afternoon. My wife dined for the first time downstairs. Transcribed part of sermon.

Monday, February 9: Writ letters to Mr Chambers, Mr Seddon, Mrs R. Hutton, Mr Bland and to Poole of North Scarle. Walked into the City. Received letter from Mr Burne. Finished transcribing a sermon.

Tuesday, February 10: Called on Mr R. Smith, Jebb, Kippis, at Westminster Meeting. Walked in Westminster Hall. Received letter from Mr Nevile and one from my dear Fanny to her little sister.

Wednesday, February 11: Called on Mr S. Carpenter. Dined and drank tea at Mrs Rayner's. Received letter from Archdeacon Blackburne. Corrected a proof sheet of Exodus.

Thursday, February 12: Called upon Mr Vaughan, Mr Hett, Mr North and Mr West. Attended Antiquarian Society in the evening, and afterwards, corrected sheet of Exodus.

Friday, February 13: In my study the whole day. Corrected a sheet of Exodus. Composed a prayer and a paper on right of private judgement, followed by authorities.<sup>206</sup> Received letters from my Mother, Fanny Turnor, Edmund Turnor, Mr R. Hutton and

---

<sup>205</sup> ‘And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.’

<sup>206</sup> The right of private judgement; it does not appear that J D published a paper under this title. But he did, in a defence of toleration and religious liberty, support the rights of private judgement in religious matters in *Remarks on the Bishop of Lincoln's charge* (Bath, 1812).

*John Disney's Diary*

Charlesworth. Answered Edmund Turnor and R. Hutton. Mr West and Mr S. Shore called in the morning.

Saturday, February 14: Continued my paper on private judgement and prepared papers for the following day. Walked with my boys to Whitelands and returned with them and Fanny in a coach.

Sunday, February 15: This morning my dear wife returned. Thanks to God for her delivery and recovery from childbirth, and our dear little infant was christened (by Mr Lindsey) by the name of Elizabeth Collyer (the maiden name of our great and excellent friend, Mrs Rayner). I officiated in the afternoon, and Brother Disney ffytche drank tea with us.

Monday, February 16: Called upon Mr A. Smith, Dr Jebb, Mr Lee. My wife took our dear Fanny to Chelsea. I dined and drank tea with Mr Chambers's. Brother Disney ffytche drank tea with my wife, and sat part of the evening.

Tuesday February 17: Dined and drank tea at Mr Kemble's, and afterwards supped at the Club at London Coffee House. Received letter from Mr Emeris.

Wednesday, February 18: Mr T. Todd breakfasted with us. Brother Disney ffytche called upon me. Made several extracts on the subject of private judgement. Received letter from J. Huddlestane. Writ letter to Disney ffytche and Edmund Turnor. In my study the whole day. Mr Lindsey and Mr Dalton called. Corrected proof sheet of Exodus.

Thursday, February 19: Walked to Peckham Rye with Mr Shore and made a second breakfast at Lady Effingham's. Returned home before dinner (9 miles). Looked over the first proof sheet of Hymns,<sup>207</sup> corrected a sheet of Exodus, and made additions to my papers on right of private judgement.

---

<sup>207</sup> Isaac Watts, *Hymns*, first published in 1707. Alternatively, *Hymns, to the Supreme Being, in imitation of the Eastern songs*, issued anonymously in 1780 by Edward King (see n. 197 below). Another possibility is John Fawcett, *Hymns: adapted to the circumstances of public worship and*

*John Disney's Diary*

Friday, February 20: Called on Mr Heywood, Mr Sargent, Dr Jebb. Received letter from Mr Chambers. Writ letters to my Mother, Archdeacon Blackburne, Frank Blackburne and Mr Chambers.

Saturday, February 21: Mr Kirkby and B. Hollis called. I called on Mrs Hinckley and others. Composed a prayer, transcribed, made some extracts for paper on private judgement, corrected a sheet of Exodus, prepared service for the next day.

Sunday, February 22: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon. Enlarged and transcribed part of a sermon.

Monday, February 23: Called on Dr Ramsden, and registered the birth of my infant daughter, E.C.D.,<sup>208</sup> in the Library Red Cross Street.<sup>209</sup> Writ to Brother Disney ffytche.

Tuesday, February 24: Went to Chelsea in the stage to see Fanny and walked back. Dined and drank tea with Mr Hollis.

Wednesday, February 25: Called at Mr West's and Mr B. Hollis. My wife and self dined and drank tea at Mrs Rayner's. Received letter from Mr Lindsey and answered immediately. Edmund Turnor called in the evening and brought a letter from my Mother. Received one from Archdeacon Blackburne. Corrected a sheet of Exodus.

Thursday, February 26: At home this day, when Mr Edmund Turnor drank tea with me, and until I went with him to the Antiquarian Society (where Mr King sat as President for the first time).<sup>210</sup>

---

*private devotion*, (Leeds, 1782). John Fawcett (1740-1817) was the brother of Joseph Fawcett, the popular preacher. I owe the latter suggestion to Martin Fitzpatrick.

<sup>208</sup> i.e. Elizabeth Collyer Disney.

<sup>209</sup> Red Cross Street. The site of Dr Williams's Library at that time.

<sup>210</sup> Edward King, FRS, FSA. (1735?-1807), lawyer, antiquary. Educated at Clare College, Cambridge. Entered Lincoln's Inn and, in 1763, was called to the bar. Elected FRS in 1767 and FSA in 1770. In February 1784, he was elected President of the Society of Antiquaries, but his tenure of the office was engulfed by controversy. He was elected to the

*John Disney's Diary*

Friday, February 27: Attended the auction of Dr Donne's books.<sup>211</sup> In the afternoon engaged in my study. Received letter from Samuel Disney.

Saturday, February 28: Attended the auction of books. Went to Mr Dealy's lodgings in the Strand, with my wife and boys, to see Mr Pitt pass into the City. In afternoon engaged in my study.

Sunday, February 29: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon. Very indifferent the whole day, nevertheless transcribed a sermon.

Monday, March 1: Called on Mr York and Mr Wyvill. Attended an auction of books. Received letter from Archdeacon Blackburne. In afternoon attended the Society. Entered the proceedings of the Society in their book.

Tuesday, March 2: My wife and self dined and drank tea at Mr Brown's. Writ letters to Archdeacon Blackburne, Samuel Disney and Mr Emeris. Corrected sheet of Exodus.

---

office on the understanding that he would relinquish it to Lord de Ferrars on the following April, but he refused to abide by this undertaking and sought re-election. When his candidature was rejected he resigned in high dudgeon (*DNB*).

<sup>211</sup> William Stafford Done, D.D., Archdeacon of Bedford and Prebendary at Lincoln Cathedral. Dr Done's library was sold at Leigh and Sotheby, York Street, Covent Garden. The auction started on 27 February 1784 and lasted for ten days. J D's purchases were as follows: on 27 February, Bell's *Divine mission of John the Baptist* (1761); Lardner's *Credibility of the Gospel*, 18 vols, (the 7<sup>th</sup> volume of the second part was missing); *Sermons* by Blackburne (1775); Warburton's *Sermons* in 3 vols (1753); Tillotson's *Works* in 3 vols (1717); Clarke's *Works* in 4 vols. (1738); Sir Thomas Browne's *Works* (1666); and Disney's [i.e. J D's grandfather] *Laws against immorality and profaneness* (172-). On 28 February, J D bought Foster's *Examination of Gibson's Codex* together with Whiston, Sykes, etc on *Phlegon*; and Locke's *Works* (1777). See *A catalogue of the genuine and valuable library of the Reverend William Stafford Done, D.D., Archdeacon of Bedford and Prebend of the Cathedral Church of Lincoln BL. S.C.S.21 (4)*. For the information in this note I am indebted to John Stephens.

*John Disney's Diary*

Wednesday, March 3: Called on Edmund Turnor, Mr A. Smith and Dr Jebb. Regulated Dr Sykes's tracts,<sup>212</sup> as far as my collection would admit.

Thursday, March 4: Mr Fillingham and Mr Dodson called, went to the Antiquarian Library. Dined with my wife at Mr Sargent's. Attended the Antiquarian Society in the evening. Writ to my Mother.

Friday, March 5: Mr Cappe<sup>213</sup> called. Called on Mrs Lee. Dined and drank tea at Mr Chambers's Mincing Lane. Received letter from Samuel Disney. Sent my Mother Carr's sermons,<sup>214</sup> a box of snuff, and box of wafers.

Saturday, March 6: Transcribed part of sermon, prepared papers for succeeding day. Writ letters to Samuel Disney and the Minister for Cottered Herts<sup>215</sup> concerning Dr Sykes. Received letter from Dr Leechman.<sup>216</sup> In afternoon walked out for an hour.

---

<sup>212</sup> Arthur Ashley Sykes (1684-1756), Rector of Rayleigh in Essex and Dean of St Burien in Cornwall, a prolific writer in Latitudinarian causes. J D published *Memoirs of the life and writings of Arthur Ashley Sykes* in 1785. J D's interest in Sykes is strong evidence of his debt to the interpretations and perspectives adopted by Samuel Clarke and Benjamin Hoadly. See *The dictionary of Eighteenth-century British philosophy* (2 vols., Bristol, 1999).

<sup>213</sup> Newcombe Cappe (1733-1800), Minister of St Saviourgate, York. He married Catherine Harrison, daughter of Lindsey's predecessor at Catterick (*Lindsey Letters*, 23).

<sup>214</sup> Presumably Rev. George Carr (1705-1776) of the English Episcopal Church in Edinburgh. His sermons were first published in 1746. Several new editions were published towards the end of the eighteenth century. A fourth edition was published in 1782 by J D's friend Thomas Cadell.

<sup>215</sup> The Rector of Cottered St. Mary in Herts at this time was the Rev. Anthony Trollope (d. 1806), (*DNB*).

<sup>216</sup> William Leechman (1706-1785). Educated at Edinburgh University In 1744 he was appointed Professor of Divinity at Glasgow and continued the practice introduced by Hutcheson of lecturing in English. In 1757 he became Moderator of the General Assembly and in 1761 Principal of Glasgow University.

*John Disney's Diary*

Sunday, March 7: Officiated in the morning and assisted at the Communion Table. Lady Effingham called at noon, as did Lord Middleton after dinner. Mr Lindsey officiated in the afternoon. Looked over proof sheet of Hymns. Writ to Dr Leechman.

Monday, March 8: Walked into the City, called on Mr Kettle and Mr Brooksbank. Transcribed a sermon. Received letter from Mr Chambers.

March 9: Called on Mr Dodson. Transcribed a sermon. Misses Robinsons drank tea with us.

Wednesday, March 10: After a night of great anxiety, on account of our dear little infant Elizabeth Collyer she died this morning at about half after ten o'clock of convulsions in her bowels, aged 7 weeks and 3 days. We had no appraisal of her danger till late the preceding evening. May Almighty God make this Affliction subservient to our improvement and advancement in his favor.

Thursday, March 11: At home all day except going to Dr Jebb in the afternoon to advise with him on my little John being feverish and indisposed. Writ letters this and the preceding day to Mr Bland, Mr Chambers, my Mother, Archdeacon Blackburne, Sister Turnor, Samuel Disney, niece Smith,<sup>217</sup> my Brother [Disney ffytche], and on both days to my dear little Fanny. Mrs Hinckley called.

Friday, March 12: At home all the day. Transcribed part of a sermon. Miss S. Chambers called and sat some time with my wife. Received letter from F. Blackburne. Writ letter to Mrs Rayner.

Saturday, March 13: This morning Nanny Borrodale and Mr Hodgson set out in a chaise with the corpse of poor little Betsy to be buried at Swinderby, the next evening. Transcribed a sermon.

Sunday, March 14: Mr Lindsey officiated both parts of the day, myself staying at home the whole day. Transcribed a sermon. Mrs

---

<sup>217</sup> Niece Smith, née Elizabeth Frances Turnor

*John Disney's Diary*

Rayner, Mrs North and Mrs West called. My dear little infant was this evening buried at Swinderby.

Monday, March 15: Walked in to the City, called on Mr Brooksbank and Mr Brooke. Transcribed a sermon. Received letters from my Mother and Sister Turnor. Writ letters to Mr Bland, Mr R. Hutton and Mr Seddon.

Tuesday, March 16: Walked into the City. Received letters from niece Smith and Mr Chambers. Mr Kettle called. Drank tea and supped at the London Coffee House.

Wednesday, March 17: Called (with Mr Shore) on Mr B. Hollis. Received letters from Mr Trollope and Archdeacon Blackburne. Answered the former, and writ to Mrs Smith. Transcribed part of sermon.

Thursday, March 18: Called on Edmund Turnor, Lord Middleton, Mr Yorke, Mr Wyvill. Dined and drank tea with Mrs Rayner. Attended Antiquarian Society. Received letter from Samuel Disney. Corrected sheet of Exodus. Writ letter to [Mrs] Blackburne.

Friday, March 19: Edmund Turnor called in the morning. Called on Mrs Brown, Mr Hollis and Mrs Sargent. Writ letter [to] Mrs Smith. Transcribed part of sermon.

Saturday March 20: Edmund Turnor breakfasted with me. Revised 3 half sheets of Commentaries. Mr Wyvill and Mr Nevile called. Received letter from Mr Burne. Writ to Archdeacon Blackburne and Frank Blackburne. Prepared papers for the succeeding day.

Sunday, March 21: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon, but my mind heavy and not sufficiently earnest. My wife and self drank tea at Mr Lindsey's.

Monday, March 22: Called on Mr North, Mrs Cadell, Mr Nevile, Shore, A. Smith, Dr Jebb. Dined and drank tea with Mr Hollis. In the evening sat an hour with Edmund Turnor in Sackville Street. On my return home much indisposed and seized with shiverings.

*John Disney's Diary*

Tuesday, March 23: Confined to my bed and attended by Dr Jebb. Edmund Turnor sat a while with me.

Wednesday, March 24: Confined to my chamber. Received letters from Mr Skinner, Mr Bland, Mr Emeris and Edmund Turnor.

Thursday, March 25: Confined to my chamber. Mr Shore drank tea with me. Edmund Turnor.

Friday, March 26: Confined to my chamber. Mr Nevile called. Received letters from Archdeacon Blackburne, Mr Chambers and Mr Seddon and Mr Brooksby and answered the latter.

Saturday, March 27: Continued confined to my chamber, but greatly better than heretofore. Dr Jebb attended me twice every day and I am truly thankful to God for the prospect of my recovery.

Sunday, March 28: In my chamber, and Mr Lindsey officiated both parts of the day.

Monday, March 29: In my chamber. Received letter from Mr R. Hutton and answered it. Writ also to Mr Chambers.

Tuesday, March 30: In my chamber. Mr Edmund Turnor called in the afternoon as did Mr Nevile who drank tea with me.

Wednesday, March 31: In my chamber. Received letter from my Mother. Writ letter to Mr Hopkins.

Thursday, April 1: Came down stairs to my study for the first time. Dr Calder called. Aired with my wife, along with Mrs Cadell to Chelsea to see Fanny. Mr Nevile drank wine and tea with me in the afternoon. Transcribed part of sermon. Received letter from Charlesworth, inclosing draft for 15 guineas to be distributed. Received letter from my Mother.

Friday, April 2: Mr Dodson, Mr Cappe, and Mr Christie jun.<sup>218</sup> called. Went with my wife to Mr Sharpe's, called at Johnson's &c.

---

<sup>218</sup> Thomas Christie (1761-96), writer and merchant. Founder of *The Analytic Review* he wrote extensively on a range of topics and was an

*John Disney's Diary*

in my return, transcribed part of sermon. Received letters from Mr Christie and Mr Palmer. Composed a prayer.

Saturday, April 3: At home the whole day. Writ letters to my Mother, Sister Turnor, Messrs. Seddon and Charlesworth. Transcribed part of sermon, prepared my papers for the succeeding day.

Sunday, April 4: Officiated in the morning and assisted at the Communion Table. Mr Lindsey officiated in the afternoon. Mr and Mrs Pearson drank tea with us.

Monday, April 5: Called on Dr Jebb. Mr Nevile called. Mr Dealtry of Helmsley dined with me. Attended the Society at Mr Lindsey's. Made up the packets of the Commentaries for the members, and the Society's resolutions. Received letter from Archdeacon Blackburne.

Tuesday, April 6: Went into the City with my wife, called on Mrs Chambers, and did several errands. Dined and drank tea at Mr Dodson's, but indifferent this day.

Wednesday, April 7: Mr Dealtry and Mr B. Hollis called. Called on Mrs West. My wife and self dined and drank tea at Mrs Rayner's. Received letters from my Mother, and Mrs Hopkins, but indifferent this day.

Thursday, April 7: Called on Edmund Turnor and Bishop of Carlisle. Went to Whitelands with my boys and brought my dear Fanny home for the Easter holidays, when her ankle was sadly strained and swelled, and my wife took her with her to Mr Sharpe's. Brother Frederick Disney called in the evening. Writ letters to Archdeacon Blackburne and Cousin Samuel Disney.

---

enthusiastic supporter of the French Revolution. His business interests took him to Surinam where he died in 1796. See *The correspondence of Richard Price*, III, 278 et seq.

*John Disney's Diary*

Friday, April 9: Being Good Friday I officiated in the morning. In the afternoon my wife, self and three children drank tea at Mr Kirkby's. Received letter from Samuel Disney.

Saturday, April 10: Called on Mrs Lee, Mr Dodson, Mr Cappe. Received letters from Sister Turnor with a box of progg<sup>219</sup>, from Mrs Ridghill<sup>220</sup> and Mr Leechman. Answered Mrs R. to Mr Hutton. My wife and self dined at Mr Sargent's. I drank tea at home. Transcribed part of sermon.

Sunday, April 11: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon. Much fatigued.

Monday, April 12: Transcribed part of sermon. Walked out with J[ohn] D[isney]. Mr Dealtry supped with me.

Tuesday, April 13: Called on Brother Frederick Disney and on G[eorge] C[artwright]. My wife took Fanny to Mr Sharpe's who declared the necessity of her leaving school and going into the country. I drank tea and supped at the Club, but grievously afflicted on account of my dear child.

Wednesday, April 14: Called with my wife at Mr A. Smith, Edmund Turnor and Lord Middleton's. Afterwards we dined and drank tea at Mr Chambers's. Mr and Mrs Lindsey sat an hour with us in the evening and Edmund Turnor supped with us. Received letter from Samuel Disney.

Thursday, April 15: At home the forenoon. Mr Edmund Turnor and Mr Ord<sup>221</sup> called to see the monument for Norton Disney Church. Mr Hood called. My wife and self dined and drank tea with Mrs Reynolds.

---

<sup>219</sup> 'Prog: Food, victuals, provender', *S.O.E.D.*

<sup>220</sup> Mrs Ridghill, Wellbourn, Lincs. See SC.

<sup>221</sup> Possibly Thomas Orde (later Orde-Powlett (1746-1807). MP for Aylesbury (1780-84) and for Harwich (1784-96). In July 1782 he was appointed Secretary to the Treasury in Shelburne's ministry. Subsequently he became Lord Bolton.

*John Disney's Diary*

Friday, April 16: Called on Mr Smith, Dr Jebb. Returned by Newington. Mrs S. Smith called. Edmund Turnor drank tea with us. Received letters from Archdeacon Blackburne and Brother Disney ffytche.

Saturday, April 17: Mr Dealtry, Lord and Lady Middleton, and Dr Priestley called in the morning. After dinner went with my wife and Mr Pearson by Newington Butts and Lambeth to look for a house, but unsuccessful.

Sunday, April 18: Mr Lindsey read prayers and Dr P. preached this morning and I officiated in the afternoon. Mrs Rayner and Mr and Mrs North called on Fanny and Mr West drank tea with us. I afterwards called on my Brother Frederick Disney.

Monday, April 19: Went with my wife and children in the morning to Newington Green, to look at a house there, and called on Dr Price. And in the afternoon we went to Clapham and Stockwell on the same errand. Received letter from Mr Hall and answered it.

Tuesday, April 20: Went with my wife and children to Chelsea to look after a house there. I dined and drank tea at Mr W. Vaughan's. Received letters from Brother Disney ffytche and Cousin Samuel Disney. Writ letter to Archdeacon Blackburne.

Wednesday, April 21: Called upon my Brother Frederick Disney. Went to view the house in Sloan Street, Chelsea (with Mr Griffiths) and articed for it with Mr Holland. Dined and drank tea with Mrs Rayner, my wife at home attending on poor Fanny. Mr Kettle called afterwards and Mr W. Dealtry. Received letter from Edmund Turnor.

Thursday, April 22: Called on Mr Kettle, Rolleston, Smith and Chambers. Dined with Mr Jeffries<sup>222</sup> at St Thomas's Hospital. Received letter from Charlesworth.

---

<sup>222</sup> Edward Jeffries, a London factor and treasurer of St. Thomas's hospital. A prominent Presbyterian, he was chairman of the Protestant Deputies from 1785 to 1801, and chairman of the Committee formed for obtaining the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts (1786-1790). See

*John Disney's Diary*

Friday, April 23: Mr Shore and Mr S. Smith called. Mr Kettle looked at my house in Essex Street. I attended the anniversary of the Antiquarian Society and dined with them. Received letters from Mr Chambers, Mr R. Hutton and Mr Joseph Tonge. Supped at Mr S. Heywood's.

Saturday, April 24: Brother Disney ffytche called. Writ letters to my Mother, Mrs Chambers, Mr R. Hutton, Mr Bland, Mr Joseph Tonge, Mr Edmund Turnor, and Cousin Samuel Disney. Called on Brother Frederick Disney, and Dr Jebb.

Sunday, April 25: I read prayers in the morning and Dr P[riestley] preached. Mr Lindsey officiated. Drank tea with Mr Lindsey. Mr W. Dealtry sat the evening with us.

Monday, April 26: Went to Sloane Street, Chelsea with my wife and Mr Dealtry, to look after the house there, called on Mr B. Hollis. Dealtry dined and drank tea with me. In the evening called on Sister Turnor, on her coming to town this day.

Tuesday, April 27: Called at Mr Sargent's &c. Transcribed part of sermon. Dr Ramsden and Mr Onley called. Supped at the Club at London Coffee House.

Wednesday, April 28: Corrected the two last sheets and half of Exodus. Transcribed part of sermon - at home the whole day.

Thursday, April 29: Called on Dr Jebb. Dined and drank tea with Dr Kippis and went with Mr W. Dealtry to the Antiquarian and Royal Societies. Received letter from my Mother.

Friday, April 30: My wife and self called on Mrs S. Carpenter, Sist. Turnor, Mr B. Hollis, Dr Jebb and Mr Smith's. Received Mr Howard's third edition of his State of Prisons,<sup>223</sup> a present from the author. Received letter from Archdeacon Blackburne.

---

Thomas W Davis ed., *Committees for repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts*, London Record Society, 1978, esp. x.

<sup>223</sup> John Howard (1726-1789), the prison reformer. His *The state of the prisons in England and Wales* was first published in 1777.

*John Disney's Diary*

Saturday, May 1: Called at Mr Bullocks and Smiths. Dined at Mr Dodson's. Writ to Archdeacon Blackburne. Sister Turnor called. Writ also to my Mother. Transcribed prayer and prepared service for the following day.

Sunday, May 2: Officiated in the morning, Mr Lindsey at the Communion Table and in the afternoon. Transcribed part of sermon. Writ letters to Mr Skinner and Mr Chambers.

Monday, May 3: Called on Dr Jebb and Mr Dodson, leaving my two boys to dinner there. Drank tea with Mr Dodson. Attended the Society at Essex House. Received letters from my Mother and a singular instance of munificence from Mr Tayleur of Shrewsbury.

Tuesday, May 4: Went into the city, got a circular letter from the Society printed. Mr and Mrs and Miss Kirby drank tea with us. Writ to my Mother.

Wednesday, May 5: Called in Sackville Street. Dined and drank tea with Mrs Rayner, my wife staying at home with Fanny. Received letter from Archdeacon Blackburne.

Thursday, May 6: Called on Dr Jebb. Mr Dalton drank tea with us and went to Antiquarian Society whom I presented with my grandfather's View of Ancient Laws<sup>224</sup> and three quarto vols. of M.S. Collections. Writ to Dr Leechman and cousin Samuel Disney.

Friday, May 7: Called with my wife on Mrs Stinton and Mrs Grignion, and at the house in Sloane Street. In afternoon went with her to the Exhibition of Pictures. Sister Turnor and Brother Frederick Disney called in the evening. Writ to Mrs Burne.

Saturday, May 8: At home the whole day. Mr Sharpe opened my dear Fanny's ankle by a caustic. Received letter from Mr Bland. Mrs Hutton drank tea with us.

---

<sup>224</sup> John Disney (1677-1730), J D's grandfather, was Vicar of St Mary's, Nottingham. His *Essay on the execution of the laws against immorality and profaneness* was published in 1708.

*John Disney's Diary*

Sunday, May 9: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon.

Monday, May 10: Called on Dr Jebb. Transcribed part of sermon. Mr B. Hollis and Mr Onley called.

Tuesday, May 11: Was sent for by Mr West and attended him three several times in the course of the day and engaged to be one of his executors. Much afflicted for him and his family. Drank tea and supped at the Club.

Wednesday, May 12: Went into the City, calling on Mr West and Mr Chambers. Let the remainder of the lease on house in Essex Street to Mr Dayrell. Called on Mr Pearson, Sister Turnor. Drank tea with Mrs Rayner. Received letter from my Mother by M.C. and answered it.

Thursday, May 13 Called at Mr West's. Dined with my wife and Fanny at Mr chambers and afterwards went with him to the Antiquarian and Royal Societies – ill of the cold.

Friday, May 14: Went to Chelsea with J[ohn] D[isney].

Saturday, May 15: Called on Mr West, prepared for the succeeding day.

Sunday, May 16: Mr Lindsey officiated in the morning and myself in the afternoon. Mr Hutton and Major J. Cartwright at chapel. In the evening visited Mr West and churched Mrs West.

Monday, May 17: Called with my wife on Mr Wakefield.<sup>225</sup> Sister Turnor, Brother Frederick called on Mr B. Hollis. Received letter from Mr Bland. Called at Mr West's.

---

<sup>225</sup> Gilbert Wakefield (1756-1801) was a student at Jesus College, Cambridge from 1772 to 1776, becoming a Fellow there from 1776 to 1779. While at Cambridge he developed radical theological views, regretted his subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles and became a Unitarian. In his *Memoirs* which were published complete posthumously he refers to Disney as 'my valued friend' (J. T. Rutt and A. Wainewright eds., *Memoirs of the life of Gilbert Wakefield*, 2 vols. London, 1804, 1.71.)

## **CHARLES POLHILL AND THE CHRONICLE OF THE KINGDOM OF THE CASSITTERIDES**

*Sheldon Cohen*

The Declaration of Independence contains many time-honoured pronouncements. Among them, though perhaps less prominent than other parts of this document, was the signers' assertion that the Americans had not been 'wanting in attention to our British brethren.' The paragraph in which these words appear then cites ways that the colonists allegedly had communicated their sentiments to inhabitants of the Mother Country, but had soon concluded that Britons had 'been deaf to the voice of justice and consanguinity'. History, has shown that, in fact, many prominent members of Britain's established orders along with other notables did indeed dissent from their government's American policies – before and during the conflict that erupted in 1775. And historians themselves have depicted the lives, activities, and the writings displayed by a number of these individuals who opposed the statecraft that King George III and his ministers adopted for administering the North American colonies. Portrayals of these dissenters have included the likes of Edmund Burke, John Wilkes, Henry Conway, Richard Price, David Hartley, and Joseph Priestley. But there remain less conspicuous others who deserve inclusion in the list. Such is the case for one eighteenth century English country gentleman named Charles Polhill.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> George H Guttridge, *David Hartley M.P. an advocate of conciliation* (Berkley, CA, 1926); George H Guttridge, *English Whiggism and the American Revolution* (Berkeley, CA, 1966); John Sainsbury, *Disaffected patriots; London supporters of Revolutionary America, 1769-1782* (Kingston, Ont. 1987), xi-305; Jerome R Reich, *British friends of the American Revolution* (London, 1998), 1-186; Richard Price, *Two tracts on civil liberty, the war with America, and the debts and finances of the kingdom* (London, 1778); Charles R Ritcheson, *British Politics and the American Revolution* (Norman, OK, 1954); Roland Thomas, *Richard Price; philosopher and apostle of liberty* (London, 1924); D O Thomas, *Richard Price and America (1723-91)* (Aberystwyth, 1975); D O Thomas, *The honest mind: the thought and work of Richard Price* (Oxford, 1977); Peter D G Thomas, *John Wilkes: A Friend to Liberty* (Oxford, 1996); Stanley E Ayling,

*Sheldon Cohen*

Charles Polhill (1725-1805) was born at Sevenoaks in the historic English county of Kent. The Polhill family itself could be traced to the thirteenth century when the name appears in the Kent Assizes Roll for Detling in 1241. Subsequently, during the religious upheavals that wracked the nation following Henry VIII's break with Rome, the family ascended into England's landed gentry. Their considerable and expanding properties centered around an imposing residence called Chipstead Manor. And it was within these privileged circumstances that Charles was born on May 8, 1725, the only surviving son of David and Elizabeth (Barrett) Polhill.<sup>2</sup>

During his formative years and on to middle age, Charles received the advantages of training and preferment befitting the sons of affluent country squires. Like other such favored youths, he was provided a preferential education which apparently included at least one trip to the European continent. In 1754, upon the death of his father, he inherited the family estate at Sevenoaks. That same year, at age twenty-nine, Charles Polhill wed Tryphena, daughter of Sir John Shelly, 14th Baronet of Michelgrove. This match, however, lasted only until July 1756 when Tryphena died in childbirth.<sup>3</sup>

The remainder of Charles Polhill's career was centered primarily with supervising the Sevenoaks estate. He married a second time in 1766 to one Patricia Haswell who died in 1803, but who bore him one son, George, and a daughter, Patience – though only George survived his parents.<sup>4</sup> Polhill certainly found much to develop on his

---

*Edmund Burke: his life and opinions* (New York, 1988); Peter N Miller ed., *Political writings; Joseph Priestley* (New York, 1993).

<sup>2</sup> K G Bennett, 'The Kentish Polhills: An Account of an Old Kentish Family, with Some Notes of the Senior Line.' Typescript, Private Contribution for the Otford Historical Society (October 1958), Sevenoaks Public Library, Kent England, 279/1/1, 1-49; Sheldon S Cohen, 'Monuments to Greatness: George Dance, Charles Polhill and Benjamin West: Designs for a Memorial to George Washington,' *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 99 (1991), 191; William Berry, *County Genealogies: pedigrees of the families in the county of Kent...* (London, 1830), 334-35.

<sup>3</sup> Bennett, 'The Kentish Polhills', 35-48; Berry, *Pedigrees of the families*, 335.

<sup>4</sup> Bennett, 'The Kentish Polhills', 49-50; Berry, *Pedigrees of the families*, 335-36; [George Polhill's son, Charles, graduated from Oxford in 1823, see

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassitterides*

considerable properties which included valuable stone quarries as well as timberlands and rich sheep-grazing fields. Aside from these routine tasks managing his own lands, this rural patrician also achieved notoriety among the county residents by improving Kent's existing road system and building new thoroughfares. Reportedly, he labored in this capacity almost to the time of his passing in July 1805.<sup>5</sup>

The direct involvement of Charles Polhill in Britain's political affairs was limited, although as a Kent freeholder, he participated in county and local concerns, and in keeping with his superior status, he certainly carried weight in Parliamentary elections. It had been a different story for his father David, who had not only been a justice of the peace, but Keeper of Records for the Tower of London, and a Member of Parliament as well.<sup>6</sup> Charles himself reportedly once eyed a seat in the House of Commons, but his aspirations were dampened by the candidacies of men more prominent in the Kent aristocracy. Still, like almost all members of his favoured class, Polhill was affected by the policies of Parliament, and he kept a keen eye on their actions not only in domestic policies, but also in colonial administration. In the latter instance, evidence shows that he did not endorse the actions of George III and the plans of his ministers for America. There are no extant references to Polhill by leaders of the American Rebellion. But seven months after the Peace of Paris (September 1783), Benjamin Webb, a former London acquaintance of Benjamin Franklin, wrote to the American Peace Commissioner, citing Polhill's name as one of several assignees handling matters related to Webb's recent bankruptcy declaration in England.<sup>7</sup>

---

Joseph Foster, comp., *Alumni Oxoniensis, 1715-1886* (Oxford, 1887), III, 1126.]

<sup>5</sup> Edward Hasted, *The 1715-1786 History and Topographical Survey of Kent* (Canterbury, 1788), I, 316-64; Bennett, *The Kentish Polhills*, 49-51; Berry, *Pedigrees of the families*, 336.

<sup>6</sup> Bennett, 'The Kentish Polhills', 28-39; Hasted, *History of Kent*, I, 316-64; II, 236-40; Berry, *Pedigrees of the families*, 335-36.

<sup>7</sup> Bennett, 'The Kentish Polhills', 40-43; Charles Polhill, American Anecdotes before, during and after the Fatal War, ca. 1785-88, handwritten, U1007, 212/1, Sevenoaks Public Library, Kent. Benjamin Webb to Benjamin Franklin, Apr. 15, 1784, Ms. The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, Yale

*Sheldon Cohen*

Two pamphlets, attributed to Polhill, reflect his views regarding Imperial policies: *Reflections on a pamphlet entitled, A short history of opposition with some observations on the views of the minority; and reflections on the present state of affairs By a Country Gentleman* (London, 1779), and *Observations and reflections on an Act passed in the Year 1774 for the settlement of the Province of Quebec, intended to have then been printed for the electors of Great Britain, but now first published by A Country Gentleman* (London, 1782). (The first of these works was obviously delayed in its publication, and the second, which aside from its political views, also showed a distinct anti-Catholic bias).<sup>8</sup> In the political remarks within both writings, he was particularly critical of Britain's government for alleged shortsightedness in governing the American colonies. This was especially clear in his tract of 1779 when Polhill argues that the reversals the British were then suffering were due to the 'natural impracticability' of pre-Revolution governmental policies, rather than the planning of the war itself, and he concludes that pursuing the conflict further was 'fruitless and unprogressive'.<sup>9</sup>

One interesting sidelight that emerged from this Kent county squire's observations concerning the events of the American Revolution was a strong and long-standing admiration for George Washington. Such esteem had been earlier manifested by several of those in Charles Polhill's social circle during the War of Independence when, paradoxically, Washington had led the Continental Army against the Crown. But, ironically, the American general had then received a considerable amount of praise in the

---

University Library. Webb was listed in *Kent's London Directory* from 1771 through 1777 as a director of the London Assurance Company. See, William B Willcox, Dorothy W Bridgewater, et al., eds., *The papers of Benjamin Franklin* (New Haven, 1959-), 25: 353n.

<sup>8</sup> [Charles Polhill], *Reflections on a pamphlet entitled, A Short History of Opposition; with some observations on the views of the minority; and reflections on the present state of affairs. By a Country Gentleman* (London, 1779), 2-23; [Charles Polhill], *Observations and reflections on an act, passed in the year 1774 for the settlement of the Province of Quebec, intended to have been printed for the electors of Great Britain, but now first published by a Country Gentleman* (London, 1782), ix, 11-30.

<sup>9</sup> [Polhill], *Reflections on a pamphlet*, 11, 18-19.

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassitterides*

British press, and, as a member of Virginia's planter aristocracy, he offered a certain sense of commonality to many of England's country gentry.<sup>10</sup> And perhaps this adulation was best expressed in a eulogy composed for the much revered former general and first United States president following his death in December, 1799. An excerpt captures the tone of this worshipful opus: 'One of the most Perfect Characters, Merely Human, that ever trod the surface of this Globe'. Charles Polhill was simultaneously involved in a plan with two other Britons, George Dance and the expatriate artist, Benjamin West, in 1801 and 1802 to erect a memorial for the departed American leader in the fledgling new national capital. The Kentish gentleman even offered to send stones from his own quarries without charge to America to expedite such a project. Thomas Jefferson, however, was then the incumbent president, and his disparate political sentiments felt toward the former Federalist-oriented Chief Executive might well have squashed this British endeavour.<sup>11</sup>

Returning to the matter of Charles Polhill's dissenting wartime presentments, it was obvious to Britons by 1782, that the contest in America was lost. News of the British catastrophe at Yorktown (October, 1781) arrived in London by the end of the year, and early the following year, the pro-war North Ministry collapsed. The new government headed by Lord Rockingham and subsequently Lord Shelburne, installed in March 1782, proceeded almost immediately to open negotiations, and the following month, a peace envoy had met with Benjamin Franklin in Paris.<sup>12</sup> Diplomatic intrigues and

---

<sup>10</sup> Troy D Bickham, 'Sympathizing with Sedition? George Washington, the British Press, and British Attitudes during the War of American Independence', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 59 (2002), 101-22.

<sup>11</sup> Cohen, 'Monuments to Greatness', 191-203; Charles Polhill to [Benjamin West], 27 Mar. 1801, Polhill-Drabble Papers, U1007, 212/3, Sevenoaks Public Library, Kent.

<sup>12</sup> Ellen R Cohn, Jonathan Dull, Karin Duval, Kate M Ohno et al., eds., *The papers of Benjamin Franklin* (New Haven, 1959-), 36: 64n, 105n, 360n; Don Cook, *The long fuse: how England lost the American Colonies, 1760-1785* (New York, 1995), 348, 350-362; Richard B Morris, *The peacemakers; the great powers and American Independence* (New York, 1970), 216-18, 244-279; John R Alden, *A History of the American Revolution* (New York, 1969),

*Sheldon Cohen*

manoeuvrings occurred during the summer in the French capital, and were followed that November when Britain agreed to the ‘Preliminary Articles of Peace’, recognizing American Independence. With this, British confidence in the inviolability of their Empire had been shattered.<sup>13</sup>

Under such circumstances of disillusionment, many Britons – particularly members of the establishment – sought a certain reassessment along with a recapitulation of events that had led to this national calamity. And Charles Polhill was but one of many from these favored classes who expressed the mood of many of them. It was thus in early 1783 that he offered his sentiments in a fanciful, somewhat Swiftian allegorical forty page pamphlet carrying the unusual title, *The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassitterides, under the reign of the House of Lunen. A fragment. Translated from an ancient manuscript.* As before, his work was published anonymously, but evidence disclosing that it was the work of Polhill is found in his original handwritten version presently on deposit at the Sevenoaks Library in Kent. And further proof of the authorship is apparent in the fact that one copy of the work was sent to ‘The Reverend Dr. [Robert] Plumptre, Master of Queens [College Cambridge] from C. Polhill the author’.<sup>14</sup>

The five page ‘preface’ to the pamphlet provides an introduction to the major part of the tract. In it, Polhill concocts a bizarre story about an ancient manuscript that deals with a mythical kingdom of the Cassitterides [Tin men] ruled by the royal House of Lunen [half moon]. These were, of course, barely disguised allusions to Britain

---

477-482; Robert Middlekauff, *The glorious cause: the American Revolution, 1763-1789* (New York, 1982), 569-72.

<sup>13</sup> Morris, *The peacemakers*, chs. xiv-xvi, *passim*; Cook, *The long fuse*, 361-73; Middlekauff, *The glorious cause*, 521-26; Jonathan R Dull, *A diplomatic history of the American Revolution* (New Haven, 1989), 144-58.

<sup>14</sup> Linda Colley, *Britons: forging the nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven, 1972), 144-49; Ian R Christie, *Wars and Revolution, Britain 1760-1815* (Cambridge, MA, 1982), 138-62; Frederick P Lock, *Edmund Burke, Volume I, 1730-1784* (Oxford, 1998), 497-544; John W Derry, *Charles James Fox* (London, 1972), 154-90. Thomas R Adams, comp., *The American controversy; a bibliographical study of the British pamphlets about the American disputes 1764-1783* (Providence, RI, 1980), II, 894.

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassitterides*

and the House of Hanover. Then, the author notes that this seemingly powerful, flourishing, and expanding kingdom had unexpectedly experienced a dearth of difficulties emanating from a variety of causes. It was clearly an allusion to the current situation for Great Britain and the perils it faced by 1783. And in the conclusion of the preface, the author declares that the ‘Chronicle’ itself is replete with Scriptural adages perhaps with a couched implication that religion itself might serve as an example to all.<sup>15</sup>

Regarding the ‘Chronicles’ themselves, Polhill examines the events that had affected the Cassitterides during a little more than two decades of its history. Here, with his own nation in mind, he relates how the kingdom had won a lengthy war over their perennial enemies the Gauls [French] and the Iberians [Spanish], and it had emerged from the belligerency with a very advantageous settlement [Treaty of Paris, 1763] that had gained them extensive new territories as well as far greater commercial opportunities. Nevertheless, the narrative continues, accompanying their triumph were the Kingdom’s huge costs of fighting the war, and the Cassitterides had been faced with the problem of meeting these pressing expenses.<sup>16</sup> Related to this situation was the fact that the mythical kingdom also possessed thriving and expanding colonies abroad inhabited by peoples known as the ‘Amers.’ Consequently, it was only natural that the kingdom’s rulers would look to these prosperous colonies for financial assistance. The narrator then makes the erroneous assertion that the Amers ‘were not taxed at all’. [In fact, the English colonies in America had long been assessing internal taxes, although imposed by their own legislature.] The result of this presumption, reports the narrator, was that kingdom’s treasurer (a reference to George Grenville) turned to the Amers as a source of revenue and unwisely levied direct taxes upon them.<sup>17</sup>

The succeeding events of the Revolutionary period are next presented by the author, and again couched in allegorical fashion

---

<sup>15</sup> *The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassitterides under the reign of the House of Lunen ...* (London, 1783), iii-vii, 9-10. The manuscript of this work, in Charles Polhill’s handwriting, is found in the Polhill-Drabble Papers, U1007, Z12/2-3, Sevenoaks Public Library, Kent.

<sup>16</sup> *The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassitterides*, 10-11.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 11-14.

*Sheldon Cohen*

within a Scriptural mode. The author continues his recapitulation by stating that the taxes which were thoughtlessly assessed, despite the protests of the Amers, had led to a revolt on the part of these heretofore loyal subjects. And the ensuing conflict had witnessed the colonists forming alliances with the vengeful enemies of the Cassitterides (i.e., the Gauls and the Iberians), an alliance which the author warned could be inimical to the Amers in the future. Simultaneously, the revolt had affected the Cassitterides from within, as the kingdom's political factions, the 'Guillamites' [Whigs] and the 'Tors' [Tories] contested with each other to the detriment of the kingdom. All of these difficulties, claimed the memorialist, had brought unrest to other parts of the realm--a contemporary allusion to Scotland and Ireland. And these woes were heightened by the death of the kingdom's greatest statesman – a reference to William Pitt. But there was still some reason for optimism by the Cassitterides during their days of disillusionment, noted the author, and, switching to the present, he alludes to quite recent British victories achieved by Admiral Sir George Rodney in the West Indies and General Sir George Elliott at Gibraltar.<sup>18</sup>

The 'Chronicle' is replete with references to internal shortcomings which had led to misfortunes for the ancient 'Cassitterides', and which Polhill, by allusion, concluded had weakened his own native land: greed, haughtiness, shortsightedness, corruption, imprudence, political factionalism, and indolence. The immediate question facing the Cassitterides, as well as for the 1783 leaders of Britain, was whether their reversals would lead to a national renewal and regeneration<sup>19</sup>

How many of the Polhill jeremiads were actually sold or read in Great Britain remains unknown. A critique of the work in London's *Monthly Review or Literary Journal* dismissed it rather derisively: 'We have only to wish that the author had laboured for a better purpose, he might then, probably if successful, have reaped some advantage; at present he has laboured in vain.'<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, this intriguing work remains a very significant, albeit overlooked

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 14-40.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 13-14, 22-25, 35-37.

<sup>20</sup> *The Monthly Review or Literary Journal* (April, 1783), LXVIII, 373

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassitterides*

publication, from this period. It reveals, within the context of its symbolic words, an ingenious attempt by a member of Britain's establishment to both analyze and interpret the recent unnerving change of fortunes experienced by the nation and its Empire. *The Kingdom of the Cassitterides* thus offers readers a fresh window into a moment in a time long past, and it deserves this reprinting with pertinent annotations.

Sheldon S. Cohen  
History Department  
Loyola University Chicago

The  
CHRONICLE  
of the  
Kingdom of the Cassiterides,  
under the  
REIGN  
of the  
HOUSE of LUNEN.  
A FRAGMENT.

Translated from an ancient Manuscript.

L O N D O N.  
PRINTED for G. WILKIE,  
No. 71, St. Paul's Church Yard.  
MDCCLXXXIII.

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassitterides*

**PREFACE .**

These papers fell into my hands accidentally this summer, as executor to a gentleman in the west of England, who lived to a great age. The early part of his life he spent at the university, where he acquired a considerable degree of knowledge, after which he travelled over not only a great part of Europe, but also into Asia. And being a lover of antiquities, and well versed in the oriental languages, collected a number of manuscripts; and amongst the rest, that from whence this fragment of history was translated.

Amongst his papers I found the following account of the manner by which he obtained it.

The manuscript (says he) of which these papers are a translation, was given me by a Sheik, or chief, of one of the tribes of Arabs, with whom I was well acquainted, during my residence in Egypt.

This man coming to me one day,

'My friend (says he) here is a manuscript which fell into the hands of my ancestors many ages ago, on the sacking of a city in Abyssinia, by the Saracens, in the first century of our computation, but in the seventh according to yours. You will wonder how such a thing as this came to be saved amidst such a scene of desolation and plunder, but tradition informs us, that it happened to be deposited in a chest of silver, to which accident it owed its preservation.

It must be very ancient, for I never yet met with a person who understood the language in which it was wrote; to me it is of little use; to you who are a searcher after antiquities, it may be valuable.'

Saying this, he delivered it into my hands. On examination, I found it wrote [sic] in the ancient Syriac language, of which having some small degree of knowledge, and being also struck with some passages in the relation, I determined to attempt the translation of it. And with great difficulty, during my residence in the East, completed my design.

On my voyage back from Alexandria, landing at Naples, and purposing to pursue the rest of my journey home through Italy and France by land, I consigned the greatest part of my effects to the

[*Charles Polhill*]

care of a merchant in that city, to be sent after me to England by sea.

Accordingly, they were shipped on board a vessel bound to Plymouth, which meeting with a violent storm soon after she had passed the straits of Gibraltar, a great part of the lading was thrown overboard, and amongst the rest (to my irreparable loss) the chest in which this and some other manuscripts were contained. -- so far my late friend.

The history being curious, and affording me much entertainment in the perusal, I thought it might give some amusement, to a few lovers of antiquity at least; and at the same time, by carrying the thoughts of others back to so remote a period, might tend to divert their attention from contemplating the not very pleasing picture of our own times.

The title of the original was, The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassiterides, under the Reigns of the House of Lunen. I should add, that a great part of the original seems to have been lost (an accident which in the course of so many ages is very easy to be accounted for) as it begins in the twenty-first chapter of the Second Book, with the death of the second King of that race; and breaks off abruptly about the twenty-third year of his successor.

I must confess that the loss of the latter part of this history gave me a very sensible concern; for though it may to some readers appear ridiculous for a man to interest himself in the fate of a country so distant, and which flourished in ages so remote from ours; yet, I must own that my curiosity was excited to learn by what means a people so great and powerful as those are described to have been, and who through their own ignorance or pride, or through the weakness or wickedness of their rulers, or perhaps from a mixture of all, had involved themselves in such a labyrinth of difficulties, would extricate themselves therefrom.

And I was also desirous of knowing whether they afterwards sunk into total oblivion, or again raised themselves into some degree of consequence, amidst the surrounding nations. -- But these are circumstances of which we must be content to remain in entire ignorance.

The names being so very ancient, if not quite obsolete, I have been for some time exercising my imagination in endeavoring to

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassitterides*

find out the people of whom this history treats. But though we are not altogether unacquainted with the appellations of some of the countries here mentioned, yet I must confess with regard to the people themselves, as well as to the land in which the colonies were planted, after many fruitless efforts, I was at last obliged entirely to give up my pursuit.

The island of the Atlantides is too fabulous to build anything on such a foundation. The city of Carthage came next into my mind, as a state famous for its colonies; but it is well known that the fate of that empire was brought about, not by civil dissensions, but by the superior power of an irresistible enemy.

As few of the names of the tribes or nations, mentioned in this history, are to be met with even in the most ancient authors, it is evident that these events must have happened in the earliest ages of the world, probably before the foundation of the Roman empire.

But without puzzling myself or others about the Epocha of this history, I think I may venture to assert that it has two recommendations--the one, of its immense antiquity; the other, of the excellent lesson it holds forth to mankind.

I will just hint one observation more, which is, that from the affinity the style of this history bears to that of scripture, as well as from several other particulars, it seems to have been wrote by one of the Hebrew nation; not impossibly by a descendant from one of the ten tribes, who by some authors have been asserted to have been carried captives into that country.

I have nothing farther to add, but my wishes that the reader may meet with the same entertainment in the perusal, which it has afforded to his.

Most Humble Servant,  
The **EDITOR.**

[*Charles Polhill*]

THE  
CHRONICLES  
of the

KINGS of the CASSITERIDE .  
A FRAGMENT.

BOOK the SECOND  
CHAP. XXI.

And behold in those days it came to pass, that the house of Lunen reigned over the islands of the Cassiterides. And the second prince of that race died full of years and honors, and he left his dominions in a flourishing state; yea, so full of riches did he leave them, as no other prince had done aforetime; and he was gathered to his fathers, and his son's son reigned in his stead.<sup>1</sup>

And the nation traded to Lusitania, to the coasts of the great Hesperia, to Betica, to the land of gold and ivory, to the country of Seres, to the Pillars of Hercules; hundreds of leagues to the east thereof, and many hundreds to the west, and far also to the north; and their ships, laden with merchandise and riches from every quarter of the world, came into their ports with every wind that blew; and their merchants were the princes of the earth.<sup>2</sup>

And the colonies which this people had planted in the isles, and the land of Amer, had become great and flourishing, and the King was lord over them also, as well as over the Indies, and the isles of the Cassiterides; and his sway was great and powerful, and to his dominions there were scarcely any bounds.

And behold his generals, his armies, and his navies, had fought and gained great and wonderful victories over the Gauls and Iberians; and he was the most powerful of all the princes who had

---

<sup>1</sup> A reference to the death of King George II in 1760, and the accession of George III.

<sup>2</sup> References: Lusitania = Portugal; Hesperia = Western Hemisphere; 'land of gold and ivory' = Africa; Seres = China; Betica (Boetia) = Greece and the Near East.

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassiterides*

ever sat on the throne of those kingdoms. And at length, after many battles, a peace was concluded.<sup>3</sup> Howbeit, the people were not pleased with the peace; yet the peace brought a breathing time to the people, and gave rest and comfort to many nations, and left the dominions of the King great and flourishing.

Nevertheless the war had been long, and great treasures had been spent, and the people were burdened with taxes; but the trade and riches of the country had increased beyond measure.

But lo! the man who presided over the treasures of the country wanted wisdom, and he attended not to the increase of riches in the nation, but he communed with himself, and said: The children of this country are heavily taxed, and the children of Amer are not taxed at all; why should the people of this land be burdened, and the others go free? Let us tax the land of Amer, and ease the burden of the people at home.<sup>4</sup> But the treasurer erred and was deceived, for he wist not [was not] of the state of that country. For the land of Amer was of a vast extent; a land full of timber and iron, and the country abounded with corn, and herds, and flocks, and was plentifully stored with fish and fowl; it yielded also silk and cotton, and was a land flowing with honey, and with everything comfortable and convenient for the use of man. Her ships were numberless, and her trade extended to the north, and to the east, and far even unto the south.

Nevertheless, though the land was blessed with plenty, and the people thereof were industrious; yet they were a nation of husbandmen, mariners, and merchants; and they were destitute of men skilled in curious and cunning works, of workers on tin, and copper, and iron; of fine linen, silk, and embroidery; of inlayers in wood and precious stones, and of all manner of cunning works. And whatsoever things they wanted of this kind, lo! did they not seek it from their brethren? And the wealth of the children of Amer found its way to the country of the Cassiterides.

---

<sup>3</sup> References: Gauls = France; Iberians = Spain. The treaty referred to is the Treaty of Paris, February 1763.

<sup>4</sup> A reference to George Grenville (1712-1770), First Lord of the Treasury (Prime Minister) from 1763 to 1765, and author of the Stamp Act.

[*Charles Polhill*]

But the treasurer was blind, and saw not these things; and behold he went and laid the tax before the great council of the nation; and, lo! it was pleasant in their eyes, and it passed into a law.<sup>5</sup>

## CHAP. XXII

And when the children of Amer heard thereof they were amazed, and they complained and said: Are ye not masters of the produce of our land, whether corn, or timber, or iron; whatever we draw out of the sea, or gain by traffic, do not all the fruits of our labors rest with you, and what more would ye have of us? and we are taxed by the great council of your nation, and, lo! whom have we to plead in our behalf?

But the laws of the Cassiterides were not like the laws of the Medes and Persians, which change not; for behold, when the cry of the children of Amer came up, and reached the ears of the great council of the nation, they made the law void. And the children of Amer were content.<sup>6</sup>

And those who were wise amongst the people at home rejoiced also, and were right glad. For they said, will not this diversion between the countries end in a war? and will not our ancient enemies, the Gauls and Iberians, lay in wait, and take advantage thereof, to the utter ruin of us both?

And the people were happy for a season, howbeit these times lasted not long.

## CHAP. XXIII

For the people of the Cassiterides were grown rich, and to whatever they set their hands, lo! it prospered; and they were filled with plenty, and waxed fat, and forgot the Lord their God; and they followed not his laws, nor regarded his statutes: they worshipped Mammon and Ashtaroth,<sup>7</sup> and did they not raise altars to the

---

<sup>5</sup> An apparent reference to the Stamp Act of 1765.

<sup>6</sup> An apparent reference to the Stamp Act repeal, March, 1766.

<sup>7</sup> Ashtaroth (Ashtoreth). The Caananite deity, consort of Baal, and Goddess of Fertility. David Noel Friedman ed., *The Anchor Bible dictionary* (New York, 1992), I, 491-94.

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassitterides*

Goddess of Fortune, and sacrifice their children thereon? And the knowledge of their Creator was almost wholly rooted out of their hearts; and the Lord was wroth, and said: Have I not made these people a great nation, and crowned their undertakings with success? Have I not beat down their enemies under their feet? Have I not filled their barns with plenty, and their land with silver and gold?

And yet, have they not despised my oaths and rebelled against my laws? and are they not become a people altogether wicked and corrupt? And shall I not visit for these things? Yea in mercy will I visit them, lest a greater evil befall them.

And he suffered an evil spirit, a spirit of delusion, to go forth, and it seized on the multitude; and it spread wider and wider, and lo! at length it reached even unto the elders of the people, and a tax on the children of Amer was proposed a second time; and the people cried, and said, why should not the children of Amer be taxed? And the law passed.<sup>8</sup>

And when the children of Amer heard thereof, they were greatly astonished and confounded, and they clothed themselves with sackcloth and put ashes on their heads; and they came before the rulers of the people, and they petitioned as heretofore.

But the rulers of the people turned a deaf ear to their complaints, and they rejected their petitioners, yea with scorn did they reject them! and instead thereof, heavier and severer burdens were laid upon them.<sup>9</sup>

And behold now the hearts of the children of Amer sunk within them: and they gathered together and said, What do our brethren mean, or what would they have of us? They are become a people altogether unjust and oppressive; and lo! if we submit to their burdens will they not lay heavier on us? For verily, amongst them we have none to defend us; and we must either become their

---

<sup>8</sup> An apparent reference to the Townshend Duties of 1767 which were on tea, paint, paper, glass and lead.

<sup>9</sup> An apparent reference to the Tea (Regulating) Act of 1773, the Quebec Act, 1774, and the New England Restraining Act, 1775.

[Charles Polhill]

bondsmen, or defend ourselves; there is no other choice left for us.<sup>10</sup>

#### CHAP. XXIV

And they took courage, and armed themselves, and went and sought for succor and assistance amongst the enemies of the Cassiterides; and the Gauls remembered their ancient losses and defeats, and the many obstacles the people of those islands had thrown in the way of their proud and oppressive designs, and they were glad to behold this division amongst their enemies, and they rejoiced exceedingly; and the Princes of the land said to one another, now is the season arrived to pull down the power and insolence of these Islanders; have they not begun the business themselves? Is it not already half done to our hands? And shall we miss the opportunity of completing it? No! if we do, may we never again behold our revenge upon our enemies.

Let us clothe ourselves with dissimulation and craft; let us set up for the supporters of innocence; let us call ourselves the avengers of the oppressed; let us take the weaker part, till they have mutually wasted each other, and both together fall into the pit we have dug for them.

*And then who shall set bounds to our conquests? We will carry our victories to the very ends of the earth.* And they entered into a league with the children of Amer; and the foundation of the league was this: That the war should not cease, nor the sword be sheathed, till the children of Amer should be free from the dominion of their brethren.<sup>11</sup>

And this was the reward that the rulers of the Cassiterides met with, for all their hardheartedness and pride; for their enemies said, Lo! do not those people wish to oppress their brethren, and have they not demanded unreasonable things from them?

And shall we not defeat their designs? No: We will not lay down our arms; the trumpet shall sound, and the warlike instruments shall

---

<sup>10</sup> Probable reference to the First Continental Congress meeting in Philadelphia, September 1774.

<sup>11</sup> A reference to the Franco-American Treaties of 1778, and the French and American alliance against Great Britain.

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassiterides*

not cease, till the sons of Amer are as free as the children of the Cassiterides themselves.

And the Iberians entered into the league, and the war began, and the success thereof was various; for the Cassiterides were a great, powerful, and warlike nation: and though they had so many enemies to contend with, yet they behaved themselves manfully.

But the spirit of delusion still continued, for though the war was entered into in the fifteenth year of the reign of the King, yet it still raged in the twentieth; and there were other causes which contributed to the continuance of the war.<sup>12</sup>

**CHAP. XXV**

There were a race of people, the children of Caled, and their habitations were in the northernmost part of the island. And their forefathers had rebelled once, yea twice, against the forefathers of the King, without a cause; and had waged war against them, to deprive them of their crowns and dominions.<sup>13</sup>

But though their designs prospered to a season, yet in the end they were defeated with a great slaughter; yea, they were defeated by a prince of the house of Lunen: and he was a valiant man and a lover of his country. Their rebellion was crushed; their men were slain; and their leaders put to death. But yet they repented them not of the evil, but lay in wait for revenge.<sup>14</sup>

And there were some of the descendants and kindred of these people who found their way to the court of the Cassiterides; and they bent the knee, and flattered, and were full of craft and subtlety, and they found favor in the sight of the Great (for the sins of the people did they find favor) and they said to each other, Now is the

---

<sup>12</sup> A reference to the Treaty of Aranjuez (1779) under which Spain joined the alliance against Britain.

<sup>13</sup> A reference to Scotland and the Jacobite uprisings there in 1715-16 and 1745-46.

<sup>14</sup> A reference to William Augustus (1721-1765), a son of King George II, who became Duke of Cumberland, and who decisively defeated the rebel forces of the Young Pretender, Prince Charles, at the Battle of Culloden, April 15, 1746. Polhill speculates that Prince Charles still had some Highland supporters in Scotland despite his flight to France.

[Charles Polhill]

season arriving when we shall be avenged for our friends which were slain.<sup>15</sup>

This people have been too powerful and mighty for us in arms; but do they not lay open to our counsels? Let us give them insidious advice; let us go and persuade the rulers of the people to continue the war on the children of Amer.

Let us represent them as a stiff-necked and stubborn generation; yea, as enemies to the power of Kings.

Let us lay before the rulers the probability of success; let us dress up the delusion with all our art and cunning; let us tempt them with the prospect of more absolute sway! And should our counsels prevail, though peradventure we may not utterly ruin, and bring to destruction this people, whom we hate; yet shall we not pull down their pride, reduce them to poverty, and fill our habitations with their spoils and riches.

And accordingly they went and advised the rulers of the people (and it pleased the Lord, for the wickedness of the people, that their evil counsels should prevail) and the war continued, and raged more than ever.<sup>16</sup>

## CHAP. XXVI

And behold, the burdens of the people were not lessened; yea, they were greatly increased, and the workers in linen, and wool, and cotton; in tin, and iron; in silver and precious stones, found no one to purchase the labors of their hands. The loom stood still, the grindstone turned not, and the noise of the hammers ceased. The streets were empty, and the habitations of the people were shut up; for the merchants were ruined, and the trade of the country was

---

<sup>15</sup> A probable reference to the influence that Scotsmen such as John Stuart, Third Earl of Bute, were able to obtain during the latter years of the reign of George II; Sir John S Shaw, *The political history of eighteenth century Scotland* (New York, 1999), 72-78.

<sup>16</sup> Polhill's reference is apparently directed to Scots in Parliament such as Henry Dundas, Viscount Melville, who first supported the war in America, but in November, 1781, spoke against pursuing the conflict - a conflict which benefited Scottish trade with America. See Shaw, *Political history of Scotland*, 80, 98-9; Colley, *Britons*, 40-41.

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassiterides*

fled, for the ships and the mariners were all taken up in the war, and the handcraftsmen were become armed, saying--lest we perish; for we had better be killed than starve.

And the people wondered and were confounded, and said, Did we not enter into this war with the children of Amer to lessen our burdens, and behold, are they not increased two-fold? For our corn and our merchandise we find no vent -- our own people are reduced to poverty, and we have neither ships nor mariners to carry our merchandise abroad; and for all that we stand in need of from other countries, lo! doth not the price continually increase upon us?

And they were silent, and held their tongues; and they were filled with amazement and dismay: for they beheld evils pouring in upon them on every side, and they were greatly confounded. And they cast their eyes around, and lift up their voices again, and cried, Whence are we to look for help? and from what quarter are we to hope for deliverance? And the spirit of delusion began to cease.

And they gathered themselves together by hundreds and by thousands, and they petitioned the great council of the nation, and they implored them to lessen the number of the King's servants, and to manage the treasures of the kingdom.<sup>17</sup>

And the great council listened to them, and their friends began to prevail, and the people took heart and expected great things, but their expectations were vain, for lo! in the end, the great council did nothing, for the chief part of the council were bribed with silver and gold, and they said, We must not listen to the voice of the people, lest we cut off the sources of our wealth.

**CHAP. XXVII**

And the war continued and raged dreadfully, and the Cassiterides lost both territory and armies, and the people were grievously oppressed; till at length the power of the old council expired, and a

---

<sup>17</sup> Polhill's reference is to the adverse negative economic effects that the war in America had produced in England, particularly for members of the landed gentry like himself. See J Steven Watson, *The reign of George III, 1760-1815* (Oxford, 1960), 334-36. Another reference is to the reform movement of the Yorkshire Association in 1779. See Watson, *Reign of George III*, 227-55.

[Charles Polhill]

new one was called; and the people continued to meet, and to watch over the actions of the new council; and the leaders thereof began to open their eyes. And behold, the nation was divided into two sects; the one was called the Sect of the Guillamites, and the other of the Children of Tor; and between these two almost the whole land was divided. And the Children of Tor began to join themselves to the Guillamites, and there was but one voice to be heard amongst them; and that was, to pull down the evil counsellors, and to put an end to the war.<sup>18</sup>

And the great council passed a vote, that whoever proposed the continuance of the war he should be held as an enemy to his country. And a day was set apart to take under solemn consideration, the state of the country, for the people, yea some of the great men were grievously alarmed; yea, with reason were they terrified, for it appeared that the nation was on the very brink of destruction.

The loss of their traffick had been exceedingly great, but that was the least evil. Peace, on her olive wings, might again bring back their traffick and commerce. They had also lost territory and armies, but what was still a greater evil, and which they dreaded more than all, was, that they had borrowed vast treasures of all nations; yea, so immense were the sums which they had borrowed vast treasures of nations; yea, so immense were the sums which they had borrowed, that in the twenty-second year of the reign of the King, their debts amounted to thirty-six thousand and five hundred and sixteen talents\* of gold, and upwards; yea, to two hundred and seventeen millions, two hundred and fifty thousand shekels\*\* of gold. Their friends stood afar off, and their enemies increased, and behold they were in a dangerous and fearful plight.<sup>19</sup>

---

\* In English money a Hebrew talent is £.5475.

\*\* A shekel of gold is 18s.3d.

<sup>18</sup> A reference to the Tories and Whigs and the alliance of Charles James Fox, Lord Rockingham, Lord Shelburne, John Wilkes, Baron Ashburton, and others to bring down the North Ministry. See Watson, *Reign of George III*, 230-55.

<sup>19</sup> See G Barnett Smith, *History of the English Parliament* (London, 1892) II, 320-21; Colley, *Britons*, 148-49; Watson, *Reign of George III*,

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassiterides*

**CHAP. XXVIII**

And there was a man of the house of Nevac, a Guillamite, and he descended from the mountains of *Der*; and he stood forth in the great council, and he was a man of integrity and of great repute, and he laid before them the state of the country; and he proved that all the evils they suffered, and the dangers to which they were exposed, arose from the war against the children of Amer, and from the waste and bad management of the rulers.<sup>20</sup>

And the matter was long and vehemently debated, from noon until even midnight, for though the spirit of delusion had ceased, yet the spirit of Mammon still prevailed, and blinded the eyes, and took possession of the hearts of many; and in the issue the evil counsellors prevailed, to the great confusion and sorrow of the people did they prevail. And lo! after a few days was the subject again taken up, by one of the children of Tor, and he was of the house of Suor. And he opened his mouth, and said,

‘Am I not of the same sect with the man who presides over the treasures of the nation, and have not he and his followers found favor in my sight, and in the sight of many of my friends? And did we not expect great things from his hands? And have not our eyes been blinded, yea our understandings covered as with a veil? But now, lo! mine eyes are opened, and would that they were closed again; for what do I behold but the utter ruin of my country? yea, should the war on the children of Amer continue, the extinction of the very name of the Cassiterides!’,<sup>21</sup>

---

226-36. The British national debt had reached £16,700,000 by 1780. The vote referred to was an adopted motion in the House of Commons by General Henry Conway in February 1782. See Barnett Smith, *History of the English Parliament* (London, 1892) II, 320-21.

<sup>20</sup> Polhill is apparently referring to William Henry Cavendish (1738-1809), third Duke of Portland. See Henry M Spooner in *DNB* s.v. ‘Bentinck, William Henry Cavendish’. Note, Nevac = Caven[dish].

<sup>21</sup> ‘Suor’, ‘a possible reference to ‘Sur’, ‘an area around Mt. Carmel and the Phoenician coast. Friedman, *Anchor Bible dictionary*, vol. 6, 242. Polhill’s reference is apparently to John Robinson, secretary for the Treasury under Lord North. See William P Courtney in *DNB* s.v. ‘Robinson, John’.

[*Charles Polhill*]

And the matter was more vehemently debated than ever, and the council chamber was filled; for, lo! the sick, and the lame, and the ancient (bending under the weight of their years) were sought for, out of every corner of the kingdom, and brought up to give their voices on this great and solemn occasion.

And the people waited with extreme impatience; yea, with great anxiety and concern did they wait the determinations of the great council. And notwithstanding the children of Tor and the Guillamites were joined, and that the friends of the people strove hard, and did their utmost; yet the evil counsellors prevailed a second time, but they prevailed but by a few; and they and all men saw that their power was drawing towards an end, and they knew not which way to turn them. They feared to yield up their power, and to keep it they knew not how; for they beheld that the faces of all men were set against them, and they were in a great straught.<sup>22</sup>

## CHAP. XXIX

And behold there was a man, an Eborite, and he was descended from the Princes of the country, and his ancestors had been idolaters for many generations, but he became a proselyte to the true religion, and his family had enjoyed vast possessions, and they still had great ones remaining, and he was one of the great council of the nation, and he was a friend to the nation; and he said within himself,

'My possessions are large, my friends and kindred are numerous. But behold, my possessions, my friends and kindred, yea, even the land itself, is it not on the very brink of destruction, and shall I stir a finger in their behalf? Verily, I will do to the utmost of my power; I will bring the matter to an issue; I will lay the axe to the root of this great evil; I will move for the expulsion of these wicked counsellors, and, peradventure, I may prevail.'<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Polhill is apparently referring to the Parliamentary election in the autumn of 1780 in which the North Ministry won a narrow electoral victory. See, Leonard W Cowie, *Hanoverian England: 1714-1837* (London, 1967), 291-2.

<sup>23</sup> Polhill is apparently referring here to William Petty (1737-1805), Lord Shelburne. See George Fisher Russell Barker in *DNB* s.v. 'Petty William'.

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassitterides*

And he gave notice, and he set a day to utter the thoughts of his heart, even the\* twentieth day of the seventh month did he set; and when the day came, and the evil counsellors saw that the children of Tor and the Guillamites were joined, and that the faces of all men were set against them, their hearts failed them, and their knees smote together, and they spake by the mouth of one of their leaders, saying,

‘What do they desire, or what would you have of us? our power, lo! is it not at an end? only wait with patience, till it shall appear whom the King will appoint to minister in our places.’

And his saying pleased the great council, and they agreed thereto, and the evil counsellors walked out (on the twentieth day of the seventh month did they walk out) they and all their abettors, and their countenances were wan and ghastly, for they wot not what would follow.<sup>24</sup>

For they knew they had gathered great riches, at the expense of the people had they gathered them; and they knew that they had squandered the treasures, and wasted the strength of the nation. *This also they knew, that their deeds were evil, and they feared the recompense of their deeds.*

**CHAP. XXX**

And the great council separated for a little time, and the evil counsellors were removed, and another set of men were put in their places; and these men were of a race who delighted not in the war, yea, who had foretold from the beginning, all the evils it would bring upon the nation: And the hearts of the people were exceeding

---

\* The month of September was the first month in the Jewish Calender.

<sup>24</sup> ‘Eborite’, ‘A reference to the Ebionites, an early Christian sect that still observed certain forms of Judaism. Friedman, *Anchor Bible dictionary*, vol. 2, 260-62. Polhill is referring to the collapse of the North Ministry. See Ian R Christie, *The end of the North Ministry* (London, 1958), 299-369. The twentieth day refers to March 20, 1782 when Lord North resigned his powers.

[*Charles Polhill*]

glad, for they had confidence in those men, and they shouted for joy, and cried, May the King live for ever, who at length hath listened to the voice of his people. And the new counsellors devised, and made many excellent laws and statutes; and behold, all that they did, and the laws which they made, are they not to be found in the records of the kingdom? And they sought for peace from their enemies, and the affairs of the nation began to take another turn.<sup>25</sup>

And lo! there was a neighboring island, part of the dominions of the King; and the inhabitants thereof had been the greatest part of them idolaters for many ages: and in times past they had committed great cruelties on such of the Cassiterides as had settled amongst them; and they were fallen upon by a great leader of that nation (and he was a mighty man) and he defeated them; and he laid siege to their towns and fortresses, and he took them. And the inhabitants thereof he put to the edge of the sword; in revenge for the cruelties they had committed on his countrymen, did he flay them; and he left them in subjugation like as a conquered nation.<sup>26</sup>

Howbeit this was the crime of a part only, it was not the crime of the whole of those people, for many of them had of old time been friends to the Cassiterides. And after the war was over, and had ended thus prosperously for that nation, and notwithstanding they had put those in authority who were friends to them; yet nevertheless was an army kept up in their land, and they were not dealt kindly with; for they were suffered to export to other countries neither their herds, nor the wool of their flocks; and they were restrained also in many other things.

And lo! after that the Gauls and Iberians had joined in the war, and that the hosts of the Cassiterides were not able to cope with the hosts of their enemies, they were obliged in their own defense to withdraw a part of their army from this island; and the people thereof finding themselves naked and defenseless, feared lest they

---

<sup>25</sup> An apparent reference to the Rockingham-Shelburne Ministry of 1782 which the Duke of Portland came to lead after Rockingham's death. See Cowie, *Hanoverian England*, 352-58.

<sup>26</sup> A reference to Ireland and its Roman Catholic inhabitants. Also, a reference to Oliver Cromwell and his subjection of Ireland during the seventeenth century.

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassiterides*

should fall a prey to the Gauls; and they prayed for leave to arm, and to defend themselves, and their prayer was granted. And when they had armed themselves and found themselves able to meet their enemies in battle, they feared not what the Gauls could do unto them, and their apprehensions vanished away.<sup>27</sup>

**CHAP. XXXI**

And being thus delivered from the fear of their enemies, they began to look around them, and to consider the State of their country, how that they were in subjection to the rulers of the Cassiterides; and it entered into their hearts to lay their case before them, and they complained of the evils which oppressed them; and their evils had been greatly increased by the war, *for lo! the war had brought good to no part of the King's dominions: Yea, it had brought afflictions and evils on every part thereof.*

And they had carried their requests to the foot of the throne, and it was in the time of the old counsellors; and though they listened somewhat to the complaint of these people, yet the relief which they granted them was but small, and the people were not satisfied therewith; and in a short time they petitioned again, and they felt their own strength, and they urged their requests with greater boldness. For they said, 'Do ye not deal with us unjustly? Deal justly with us, as ye would wish to be dealt withal yourselves.' And the old counsellors were puzzled, and knew not on which hand to turn them; for these things were done in their time. And after they were removed, the prayer of these people came before the great council of the nation. And there was a man famous for his understanding, and he was a great Orator, and when he spoke the young men listened with deep attention, and the old lamented the loss of their hearing; and he had long supported the interests of the people (yea, when they were blind to their own interests had he supported them) and he was the great favorite of the people; and he was appointed one of the chief scribes of the nation, and he spoke

---

<sup>27</sup> A reference to Britain's withdrawal of troops from Ireland during the American War, and Parliament's subsequent grants and support to Protestants in Ireland. See Cowie, *Hanoverian England*, 216-18. Also see T W Moody and W E Vaughan, *A new history of Ireland* (Oxford, 1982) IV, 216-219.

[Charles Polhill]

in behalf of these people; and whilst he spoke every tongue was mute and every breath was hushed, for his words were strong and penetrating, and his eloquence, though it flowed rapid as a torrent, yet was it deep and clear as the waters of Pharpar or Abana. And behold, through the power of his eloquence, and the justice of their cause (for their cause was clear as the sun in the midst of the heavens) did he obtain for them all that they desired. And, lo! are they not even at this day as free as their brethren the Cassiterides themselves?<sup>28</sup>

### CHAP. XXXII.

And the proceedings of the great council were just and right, and their actions did honor to the nation: and it seemed as if the Lord blessed their righteous doings; for on the day before the day on which this resolution was taken, did tidings arrive of a great victory and addition of territory gained in the East; and on the day after, of a much greater victory by sea, obtained over the ancient enemies of the King in the West.<sup>29</sup> And the latter victory seemed not more fortunate than providential; for had the battle been delayed for a time, yea for ever so short a season, would not the fleets of their enemies have joined, and their numbers have rendered them invincible; And would not the riches and produce of the isles of Amer have been lost? Yea, *would not the isles themselves have been cut off from the dominions of the King for ever?* And, lo! every mouth was filled with their praise. And the King bestowed honors and rewards on the Commanders, and they found great favor in his sight, and in the sight of all the people.

---

<sup>28</sup> Polhill's reference was probably to one of these Irishmen; Edmund Burke (1729-1797), or Henry Grattan (1746-1820). Alana and Pharpar are references to rivers in Syria. Friedman, *Anchor Bible dictionary*, vol. 1, 6, vol. 5, 303-04.

<sup>29</sup> Polhill is referring to Vice-Admiral Sir George Rodney 's victory over the French fleet at the Battle of the Saints in the West Indies in April 1782, and the defeat of the French-assisted forces at Haidar Ali at Porto Novo in India. See, Barbara W Tuchman, *The first salute: a view of the American Revolution* (New York, 1988), 293-5; William G Langer, *An encyclopedia of world history* (Boston, 1960), 535.

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassitterides*

And with these tidings it came to pass, that the apprehensions of the people decreased, and the new counsellors employed themselves without ceasing, yea with the greatest diligence did they apply themselves in the affairs of the nation. And the increase and strength of the navies was their chief object; and the man to whose care the supplying the ships with provisions, cordage and sails, and with implements of war, was entrusted, was one of the ablest mariners in the nation: and the man to whom the command of the ships was given, was like unto him; and men of valor and experience were sought out for and employed. And the new counsellors grew daily in the favor of the people, and a ray of light began to break through the gloom which surrounded them. But behold, while these things were transacting, and the affairs of the nation were thus taking a prosperous turn, it pleased the Lord that a new calamity should befall them.<sup>30</sup>

**CHAP. XXXIII**

For, lo! the man on whose integrity the people relied, was cut off in the midst of his days! yea, at the very hour that he was pondering in his heart the good he would do unto his country, was he taken away! And the people mourned long and heavily for him; not without cause did they mourn, for his love of his country was pure and unmixed; he was neither to be tempted by bribes, nor terrified by dangers, nor misled by false arguments from pursuing the true interest of the nation: and though the people had confidence in the other counsellors, yet in him was placed their chief trust; and not without reason was it placed, for he was descended from the princes of the land, and his forefathers, for many generations, had been tried and honest men: his possessions were large, but the bounty of his heart was larger; and his zeal for the welfare of the Cassiterides exceeded both. And though in his life-time he had been misrepresented and reviled, by some through malice, by others through ignorance, and by the wicked for that he was a

---

<sup>30</sup> A reference to Augustus Keppel (1725-1786), who was appointed First Lord of the Admiralty in March 1782, replacing Lord Sandwich. See John Knox Loughton in *DNB* s.v. ‘Keppel, Augustus’.

[*Charles Polhill*]

stumbling block in their way; yet though he had suffered thus falsely whilst alive, at his death the tongue of slander was mute, and every mouth was opened in his praise; for truly he was a man, good, and merciful, and just. And the people mourned heavily for him, and their loss was great indeed, for he was the band which tied the other counsellors together; for, lo! immediately on his death, suspicious and misunderstandings arose amongst them, and they disagreed with one another, and separated.<sup>31</sup>

And the hopes of the people sunk, for the danger of the country was imminent, and the expectations of the people were, that the new counsellors would proceed as one man, till they had brought the nation into a state of greater security. And lo! now, instead of mutual trust and confidence, nothing but suspicions and upbraiding were heard; and their time and talents, which at this perilous season should have been employed in combating the designs of their enemies, and the dangers and difficulties they were exposed to, too much of both was laid out in loading their adversaries with accusations, or freeing themselves therefrom.

#### CHAP. XXXIV

Oh! wretched and perverse generation!\* when will ye be wise for yourselves! when will your eyes be opened to your own salvation? Your generosity, seconded by your valor, and hitherto exhaustless stores of wealth, has rescued millions from oppression; your prowess has resisted multitudes in arms – Princes unmindful that they owed their crowns to your generosity; yea, nations, dreading your sword, hitherto ever drawn in the cause of justice. No power on earth could hurt you but your own; and safe from all other perils, with your own hands must you open the dreadful gulf into which you are fallen – Fallen, alas! when to rise again?

---

\* The translator here was obliged to depart from the letter, to preserve the spirit of the original.

<sup>31</sup> Polhill's reference to the death of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, in May 1778

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassitterides*

How are the mighty fallen!<sup>32</sup> how are the protectors of mankind brought low! How are the people whose treasures have been poured out like water, and whose blood has flowed in streams to protect the injured, and vindicate the oppressed whose name has been wafted to the skies, on the breath and blessings of millions, snatched from the iron grip of oppression! How, in one rash moment! by one unhappy act of doubtful interpretation; by one unguarded strain of the nerve of authority; have you weakened your strength, defaced the fair fabric, and destroyed the fame of ages! How have you made your children your enemies, and set yourselves up a laughing stock to the oppressor; yea, even tempted him to put on the guise of humanity, and to exhibit himself as the protector of the oppressed.

But beware, ye children of Amer, how you suffer your wrath to blind your understandings; bend not your ears to his deceitful lore, nor yield assistance to his baleful designs: fair and just (for the instant, in the hour of resentment) may they appear to you, but beware of the serpent beneath! nor farther tempt your fate, by weakening that power which in the hour of distress; in that hour when insatiable ambition shall pull off the mask; when your harbors shall be crowded with sails, and your lands covered with hosts; enemies to your forefathers, enemies to your country and your religion; when drove from your habitations, and from the plains, you shall fly to the mountains for shelter – Reduce not those people, nor farther weaken the strength of that nation, which alone, in that hour of darkness, with the power will have the inclination to save you. What reliance can you have on a nation whose study for years has been to ruin the peace and happiness of mankind, whose increase of glory has been impudently assigned as a reason for wars the most unprovoked and unjust; whose persecution has destroyed thousands of her own people, and drove millions from their homes, to seek for shelter amongst foreign nations; for no other crime than that of worshipping their Creator according to his commands: who have broke through every tie that binds mankind; who have sported with the most sacred oaths; (even until their want of faith has become a proverb) whose power has hitherto been exerted solely to

---

<sup>32</sup> 2 Samuel I:25; I:27.

[Charles Polhill]

rob mankind of their rights, and to increase the woes and calamities of human nature: Yea, who in the madness of their pride, have aimed at universal dominion!

Will the wolf protect the lamb? or the tiger the kid? then may ye also hope for friendship and protection from these people.

Are ye so ignorant of, or so blind to, the history of past times, as to hope that the Gauls are indeed become the friends of Liberty? or that the Iberians are zealous for the establishment of your power? Do the latter wish to preserve the command over their colonies? and will that command be rendered less precarious by your increase of strength? Are ye in a dream, and do ye imagine they are in truth and sincerity your friends? Rouse then from your slumbers, and behold your real friends in your brethren the Cassiterides. How many have mourned for the distresses brought upon you! how many have done their utmost to prevent them; and, failing in that, how many have tried to heal the wounds of both countries! How many are there who have longed to behold the hour, when the mother and the child, throwing away their arms, should rush into the embraces of each other! And even now, are they not all of one mind, and do they not wish for peace and union with you?<sup>33</sup>

Were not the present counsellors of the Cassiterides sensible of the folly of the war? Do they not wish to joint with you as brethren; to enter into a just and solemn league with you? United, you had defiance to the designs of your enemies! unite again, and let not an act of hasty misconduct in the parent, or a false appearance of generosity in her enemies, for ever estrange the child, or prolong the wished-for reconciliation between them.

When their resentments subside, let the children of Amer reflect on the protection their infant state received; on the blood and treasure spent in their defense, by the Cassiterides; against those very people (now their *boasted* friends, *then* their avowed enemies) who openly fought for their ruin; the completion of which they scrupled not to bring to pass, by the assistance of the most barbarous and savage nations.

---

<sup>33</sup> Polhill's warning to the Americans to beware of their French entanglements. Note, he displays his anti-Catholic bias here once again.

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassiterides*

No! Generosity is no more the characteristic of the Gauls, then indolence of the Cassiterides: for a short season they seem both to have changed characters. But the natural bias will return, and each nation will resume their former habits and dispositions.

But whatever may be the event of the war, whatever the dispositions of the children of Amer, O! ye Cassiterides, be ye not wanting to yourselves! Is there any eloquence, is there any valor, any conduct or wisdom left amongst you – let them be all applied; let them be steadily directed to the pressing exigency of extricating the vessel of the State from amidst the numberless shoals which surround her!

Is there any ability, any vigor remaining! laying aside all paltry personal enmities, all private views, all mean selfish considerations, oh! ye great, ye leaders of the people, unit the whole for your own end their preservation; unite them for the Salvation of your country; and reflect (with deep concern reflect) that all united may prove unequal to the task!<sup>34</sup>

When the resources of the nation slowly answer the boundless, though pressing necessities of the state, who but idiots would dream of sharing in her spoils; who but wretches the most abandoned, would, for their private gain, wish to add to her calamities? When the ship is in danger of sinking, none but fools would contend about the helm.

Whether you enter into a treaty, or defer it to a more convenient season, weigh maturely in your own breasts, oh! ye rulers, the consequence of either!

Against the propensity to a rash, hasty, and insecure peace, oppose the consideration of your numerous fleets and armies, of the defeats, and disappointments of your foes. – Against the unnecessary lengthening of the war, weigh the loss of your traffic, and the endless amount of your debts.

Suffer neither your apprehensions to sink into despondency, nor your valor to soar into rashness; keep equally distant from either extreme: Bear with patience, O! ye people, the pressing burdens of the times.

---

<sup>34</sup> Polhill's call for a national regeneration and reform in the wake of Britain's reversals in the American War.

[*Charles Polhill*]

Cut off unnecessary waste, and cleanse the polluted forces of your power, O! ye great; and then may your name once more rise with splendor amongst the nations, and a new phoenix spring from the ashes of the old.

### CHAP. XXXV

And it came to pass at this time, notwithstanding the difference amongst the rulers, that the fortune of the war had turned out in favor of the Cassiterides.

There was a strong fortress, situated beyond the mouth of the River Betis, on one of the pillars of Hercules, won by the valor of their forefathers, and it had for many years been part of the dominions of the king; and, lo! it was an eye-sore to the Iberians, and they had gathered their fleets and their armies together, and had laid siege to it for many months: And the besieged laughed them to scorn. And behold, at this season, the Gauls, with their ships and soldiers, came to the assistance of, and joined the Iberians: And so powerful was the force brought against them, that all men gave up the fortress for lost; and the people, even the princes of their enemies, came to behold the attack, as to a spectacle, yea, as to a certain victory did they come; for they relied on the number of their men, and the valor and skill of their leaders; for they had framed strong and wonderful machines, yea, such as had never been seen before.

And a day was set for the attack, and when the day came, and they had brought the machines with great difficulty and labor, and stationed them before the place: Behold, they were destroyed, yea, in a few hours, by the courage and skill of the besieged, were they reduced to ashes; and the soldiers and mariners therein would also have perished in the flames, and they not been rescued, at the peril of their lives, by the bold and amazing exertions of the besieged, whose valor and humanity their very enemies applauded; yea, even the princes and leaders of their hosts acknowledged: And the actions of those men did honor to the name of the Cassiterides.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Polhill's reference to the successful defence of Gibraltar in 1782 by British General Sir George Eliott. See Morris, *The peacemakers*, 341-42; also see Henry Morse Stephens in *DNB* s.v. 'Elliott, George Augustus'.

*The Chronicle of the Kingdom of the Cassiterides*

And as soon as the winter approached, the great council of the nation were called together. Never were their affairs more embarrassed, nor ever did they stand in greater need of all their sagacity, activity, and prudence; never did they meet in a more perilous, or arduous season. For lo! on the wisdom of their councils hung the last glimmering hope of the Cassiterides.

And behold, the eyes of the whole nation were fixed upon them; and with the utmost anxiety did they await the issue of their determinations. \* \* \* \*

Defunt Caetera [other things are lacking]

## THE DIFFERENT FACES OF MARY WOLLSTONECRAFT

Pamela Clemit

**Barbara Taylor**, *Mary Wollstonecraft and the feminist imagination*, Cambridge Studies in Romanticism, 56, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, xvi + 331pp, hbk, ISBN 0 521 66144 7, £45.00; pbk, ISBN 0 521 00417 9, £16.95.

**Lyndall Gordon**, *Mary Wollstonecraft: A new genus*, London: Little, Brown, 2005, 576pp, hbk, ISBN 0 316 72866 7, £25.00.

In 1927, reviewing the latest biography of Percy Bysshe Shelley, Virginia Woolf remarked: ‘There are some stories which have to be retold by each generation, not that we have anything new to add to them, but because of some queer quality in them which makes them not only Shelley’s story but our own.<sup>1</sup>’ Over the last fifty years, the story of Mary Wollstonecraft’s life and ideas has been similarly reformulated by each generation of biographers, historians, and critics. The contest for interpretation of modern feminism’s leading heroine shows no sign of abating: in the last five years alone, three major biographical studies have appeared, together with a new edition of Wollstonecraft’s letters and a volume in the Cambridge Companions to Literature series.<sup>2</sup> To these works are now added two further in-depth studies, *Mary Wollstonecraft and the feminist imagination*, by the historian Barbara Taylor, author of *Eve and the New Jerusalem: socialism and feminism in the nineteenth century* (1983), and *Mary Wollstonecraft: a new genus*, by the biographer Lyndall Gordon, whose previous subjects include Charlotte Brontë, T. S. Eliot, and Virginia Woolf.

What is it about Mary Wollstonecraft’s life and thought that invites such frequent retellings? Wollstonecraft’s own words

<sup>1</sup> Virginia Woolf, ‘Not One of Us’, *Collected essays*, ed. Leonard Woolf (4 vols, London, 1966-7), 4: 20. The book under review was Walter E Peck, *Shelley: His life and work* (2 vols.,London, 1927).

<sup>2</sup> Janet Todd, *Mary Wollstonecraft: A revolutionary life* (London, 2000); Diane Jacobs, *Her own woman: The life of Mary Wollstonecraft* (New York and London, 2001); Caroline Franklin, *Mary Wollstonecraft: A literary life* (Basingstoke, 2004); *The collected letters of Mary Wollstonecraft*, ed. Janet Todd (London, 2003); *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Wollstonecraft*, ed. Claudia L Johnson (Cambridge, 2002).

### *Different faces of Mary Wollstonecraft*

provide a clue: 'I am ... going to be the first of a new genus', she wrote to her sister Everina on 7 November 1787, as she settled in London to earn her living as a writer: 'You know I am not born to tread in the beaten track – the peculiar bent of my nature pushes me on.'<sup>3</sup> Wollstonecraft's highly dramatized self-presentations as a pathbreaking woman intellectual inspired many late nineteenth- and twentieth-century commentators to present her as an exceptional individual, a heroic pioneer of women's rights whose values mirrored their own political hopes and aspirations. Yet such readings have the paradoxical effect of reducing Wollstonecraft's intellectual significance and simplifying her complicated personality – as both Taylor and Gordon argue from their differing, but equally searching, perspectives.

Each of these writers claims to resist 'heroism'<sup>4</sup> – though Gordon comes perilously close – and each demonstrates, in a variety of ways, that Wollstonecraft was less exceptional than is often thought. Yet each writer is alert to dimensions of Wollstonecraft's intellectual experience which resist conventional categories of interpretation. In order to accommodate this complexity, both Taylor and Gordon seek to remould their chosen scholarly genre. Although Taylor describes her book as 'in many respects a conventional intellectual history', she rejects what she terms the orthodoxy of a 'split between public-political thought and the private self', employing psychoanalytical as well as historical methods to illuminate Wollstonecraft's imaginative responses to her times (pp.4, 18). For her part, Gordon aims to extend the parameters of biography. Whilst her focus on the shaping of Wollstonecraft's 'searching, not obedient, intelligence' (p.18) might be seen as entirely conventional, she resists traditional biographical certainties in her sympathetic attention to what she calls elsewhere the 'unmapped country' of women's interior lives,<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> *Collected Letters*, 139.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Ellen Moers's definition of 'heroism' as a 'stated intention to create a heroic structure for the female voice in literature', *Literary women* (London, 1977), 112, 123.

<sup>5</sup> Lyndall Gordon, 'Women's Lives: The Unmapped Country,' in *The art of literary biography*, ed. John Batchelor (Oxford, 1995), 87-98.

*Pamela Clemit*

and in her tracing of continuities in the life-stories of Wollstonecraft's heirs. Viewed through the diverse, multi-focal lenses provided by these two studies, Wollstonecraft occupies a transitional position. Her life and writings yield both historical and contemporary significances: as well as being grounded in the culture of her era, they raise questions about the nature of women, and their role in society, which have not yet been resolved.

The main aim of Taylor's study is to restore Wollstonecraft to the intellectual world of the British radical Enlightenment. She presents Wollstonecraft as a utopian thinker and emphasizes the visionary, world-transformative character of her thought. Taylor's book is divided into two parts, both of which range across the entire body of Wollstonecraft's writings: 'Imagining Women', which sets up a range of eighteenth-century literary, religious, and philosophical contexts for Wollstonecraft's developing thought; and 'Feminism and Revolution', which examines Wollstonecraft's case for women's emancipation in relation to her utopian radicalism. Taylor's welcome attentiveness to historical contexts results in a series of instructive new perspectives on Wollstonecraft's writings. For example, when Wollstonecraft is repositioned in a group of eighteenth-century learned women authors, *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792) looks less like an isolated utterance, and more like a radical extension of existing arguments for women's intellectual entitlements, 'regardless of the distinction of sex'.<sup>6</sup> When Wollstonecraft's analysis of the debilitated condition of women in a male-dominated society is viewed in relation to the writings of eighteenth-century philosophical historians, it looks less like an unaccountably savage denunciation of her own sex, and more like a reasoned contribution to the longstanding debate amongst British Enlightenment thinkers about the role and status of women in modern civilization.

The most compelling part of Taylor's book, however, is her study of the religious basis of Wollstonecraft's radicalism. Taylor is not the first modern commentator to suggest that Wollstonecraft's political thought is best understood in a theistic framework,

---

<sup>6</sup> *The works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, ed. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler (7 vols. London, 1989), 5:75.

### *Different faces of Mary Wollstonecraft*

but hers is the most comprehensive discussion so far of this relatively neglected area.<sup>7</sup> In her analysis of the various stages of Wollstonecraft's religious development, Taylor gives special attention to her association with the community of Rational Dissenters at Newington Green, presided over by Richard Price, arguing that she was strongly influenced by their emphasis on private judgement, to be freely exercised by all, as the basis of true religion. In this context, Wollstonecraft's famous call for a 'revolution in female manners' in *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* appears first and foremost a summons to women to establish a right relationship with their Maker.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, Taylor observes, such was the hospitality of Rational Dissent to women's egalitarian aspirations that within a quarter-century of Wollstonecraft's death, 'it was Unitarianism that was providing many intellectual leaders for nascent English feminism' (p.108).

Taylor's exploration of the radical theodicy of Rational Dissent is just one of the ways in which her study moves beyond the specific example of Wollstonecraft to present a broader reassessment of British Enlightenment thought. In addition, Taylor proposes a revised view of the imagination in Enlightenment thought, arguing that by the second half of the eighteenth century, well before the Romantic poets, a psychology of the inner life had developed which centred on the imagination as not only a source of true selfhood but also, in E L Tuveson's resonant phrase, 'a means of grace' (p.59).<sup>9</sup> She presents Wollstonecraft's relationship to the publisher Joseph Johnson, who helped her to establish herself as a writer, lent her money, and found her a home, as one of many

---

<sup>7</sup> Other valuable studies include Gordon Spence, 'Mary Wollstonecraft's Theodicy and Theory of Progress', *Enlightenment and Dissent*, 14 (1995), 105-27; Susan Khin Zaw, 'The Reasonable Heart: Mary Wollstonecraft's View of the Relation between Reason and Feeling in Morality, Moral Psychology, and Moral Development', *Hypatia*, 13:1 (Winter 1998), 78-117; and Saba Bahar, 'Richard Price and the Moral Foundations of Mary Wollstonecraft's Feminism', *Enlightenment and Dissent*, 18 (1999), 1-15.

<sup>8</sup> Works of Mary Wollstonecraft, 5: 114.

<sup>9</sup> Ernest Lee Tuveson, *The imagination as a means of grace: Locke and the aesthetics of Romanticism* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1960), 132-63.

*Pamela Clemit*

examples throughout the eighteenth century of a woman writer receiving generous professional support from a man with influence in the publishing trade. Her study of the radical sociability of the Godwin/Wollstonecraft circle, in which women presented themselves as the discursive equals of men, provides a salutary reminder that the changes Wollstonecraft sought were as much private as publicly political. Taylor's book is essential reading not just for students of Wollstonecraft and her associates, but for all those interested in the literary, intellectual, and cultural history of the late eighteenth century.

For the cover of her book, Taylor has chosen a reproduction of John Opie's c.1792 portrait of Wollstonecraft seated reading, quill at the ready – but Gordon's cover displays a different face: a close-up of Opie's thoughtful, serene portrait, painted in the spring of 1797, which has become the best known visual image of Wollstonecraft.<sup>10</sup> Yet these two books do not present a simple contrast between the Enlightenment *philosophie* and the Romantic heroine. For Gordon, who writes for general readers as well as for specialists, the thinker who 'devised a blueprint for social change' is inseparable from the 'pioneer of character' (pp.2, 3).

Despite her bold subtitle, Gordon does not so much present a new version of Wollstonecraft as a more affirmative one, treating life and work as part of one design. Her narrative of Wollstonecraft's revolutionary life and loves has a novelistic amplitude, and she freely intersperses references to the lives and works of later writers who took up what Virginia Woolf called 'the great problem of the true nature of woman' (p.449).<sup>11</sup> Drawing on Woolf's invigorating account of Wollstonecraft's 'experimental' life,<sup>12</sup> Gordon highlights the ways in which her subject eludes the usual categorizations of woman as virgin, mother, wife, or mistress, resisting the life plots which others – including previous biographers – have prepared for her. But this is no story of defeat.

---

<sup>10</sup> John Opie, *Mary Wollstonecraft* (c. 1792), Tate Gallery, London; *Mary Wollstonecraft* (1797), National Portrait Gallery, London.

<sup>11</sup> Virginia Woolf, *A room of one's own* [1929], *A room of one's own/three guineas*, ed. Morag Shiach (Oxford, 1992), 4.

<sup>12</sup> Virginia Woolf, 'Four Figures' [1929], *The common reader*, ed. Andrew McNeillie, 2 vols. (London, 2003), 1: 156-63.

### *Different faces of Mary Wollstonecraft*

On the contrary, Gordon argues, Wollstonecraft was, throughout her life, involved in a creative search for new plots for women's existence, as an alternative to conventional eighteenth-century images of the social lot of women: the worn-out governess, despairing of her prospects in Ireland; the fallen woman, abandoned with a child by her American lover Gilbert Imlay; the female beauty in distress, in need of rescue by the philosopher William Godwin. As Gordon recognizes, such a narrative raises more questions about Wollstonecraft than it resolves: 'How does she find the strength to transform stale plots of existence against overwhelming odds?' (p.5).

In answering this question, Gordon is not satisfied with Godwin's assertion of Wollstonecraft's 'unconquerable greatness of soul':<sup>13</sup> she wants, rightly, to sift all the evidence herself. Some readers may find her ruminative, exploratory narrative unwieldy – a few sections could have been edited down – but her drive towards comprehensiveness is generally a source of strength, leading to informed interpretations. For example, when Wollstonecraft's letters to her sisters from Ireland are 'read ... collectively in the context of her actions' (p.117), they reveal not just youthful despair, as is often claimed, but also a sense of latent powers and renewed purpose. Gordon displays a similar commitment to biographical accuracy in her treatment of archival materials. For example, she presents new evidence, uncovered by the Norwegian historian Gunnar Molden, concerning Wollstonecraft's involvement in discovering the fate of the ship laden with a cargo of silver which Imlay dispatched to Norway in June 1794, but which never reached its destination – although the full story of this murky episode in wartime profiteering, seemingly orchestrated by Imlay and his friend Joel Barlow, might have been better served by separate publication. Elsewhere, Gordon brings the skills of an astute literary critic to the analysis of raw biographical data. Her account of the intimate conversation in letters between Wollstonecraft and Godwin, with 'up to three exchanges a day

---

<sup>13</sup> William Godwin, *Memoirs of the author of a Vindication of the Rights of Woman* [1798], ed. Pamela Clemit and Gina Luria Walker (Peterborough, 2001), 58.

*Pamela Clemit*

dropping through their doors, responses coming off the pulse with the speed of emails' (p.319), is the most subtle and psychologically insightful to date.

This conversation was broken off with three notes from Wollstonecraft dated 30 August 1797, reporting on labour pains which heralded the birth of Mary Godwin later that day, and never resumed: Wollstonecraft died on 10 September. Yet if her life was interrupted, its reverberations are far-reaching. Gordon bravely declares, 'Biography is ceasing to make death more final than it is' (p.446). In her final chapters, she goes in search of 'stories of promise' (p.446) amongst the intellectually ambitious women of the next generation whose lives were touched by Wollstonecraft, to a greater or lesser extent. She gives special attention to the life-stories of Margaret, Lady Mount Cashell (later, Mrs Mason), Fanny Imlay, and Jane (later, Claire) Clairmont, arguing that all three, in different ways, re-enacted key aspects of Wollstonecraft's unconventional life and career.

The reverberations of Wollstonecraft's life do not stop there. Gordon also calls attention to nineteenth-century literary authors who experimented with the independent character Wollstonecraft pioneered, such as Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Henry James, and – perhaps most persuasively – Charlotte Brontë, who in *Villette* (1853), her most autobiographical novel, presents a study of a fiercely independent 'rising character', Lucy Snowe.<sup>14</sup> Gordon's conception of Wollstonecraft as a 'new genus', prefiguring future images of dauntless womanhood, may make her vulnerable to Taylor's charge of 'presentism' (p.10). But this would be a short-sighted view. Gordon's attentiveness to the imaginative reach of Wollstonecraft's story – its emotional, aesthetic, and ideological resonances – does not devalue her portrayal of its lived detail. Her absorbing book should be read, and reread, by all those interested in Wollstonecraft and her much-contested legacies.

Pamela Clemit  
University of Durham

---

<sup>14</sup> Charlotte Brontë, *Villette*, ed. Herbert Rosengarten and Margaret Smith (Oxford, 1984), 442.

## ENLIGHTENMENT IN AUSTRALIA

*Anthony Page*

**John Gascoigne, *The Enlightenment and the Origins of European Australia*, Cambridge University Press, 2002, xiii + 233pp; hbk ISBN/ISSN: 0-521-80343-8, £45.00; pbk ISBN: 0521617219, £19.99.**

John Gascoigne is an Australian scholar who has made a significant contribution to our understanding of Enlightenment in England. *Cambridge in the Age of the Enlightenment* (1989) is a detailed and perceptive examination of the development of Latitudinarian thought at this important institution. Based in Sydney, where the Mitchell Library houses many of the papers of Sir Joseph Banks, it is not surprising that Gascoigne then proceeded to publish two important books on Banks as an advocate of Enlightenment in the service of Empire.<sup>1</sup> This latest offering sees him continue in the direction of tracing the connections between Enlightenment and the establishment of British colonies in Australia in the decades following 1788.

The study of Australian history seems to be entering a third phase. When education systems were first established in Australia they were, in many ways, geared toward teaching young people to pass as English ladies and gentlemen. With Britain's retreat from empire during the twentieth century, Australian culture became increasingly oriented toward the United States following the Second World War. During this period 'Australian History' came into being as a subject in its own right, becoming well established during the rapid expansion of higher education in the 1960s. Now, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, we seem to be entering a phase in which cultural confidence is allowing the development of critical approaches to the national exceptionalist work of recent decades. In line with the increasing interest in transnational and comparative history, study of the British Empire as an early agent of 'globalisation' and regional interaction is in fashion. Hence, a

---

<sup>1</sup> *Joseph Banks and the English Enlightenment useful knowledge and polite culture* (Cambridge 1994), and, *Science in the service of empire: Joseph Banks, the British state and the uses of science in the age of revolution* (Cambridge, 1998).

*Anthony Page*

renewed interest in studying the Australian colonies as part of the ‘British World’.

Gascoigne’s book is also indicative of the recent tendency to stretch the temporal boundaries of the Enlightenment to fit a ‘long eighteenth century’, and to study it as a cultural process that manifested itself in different ways in different national contexts. His study begins with the British settlement of Sydney in 1788 – a starting point and a place few would have considered appropriate for Enlightenment study.

Gascoigne draws a detailed and convincing picture of how the main aims and values of British Enlightenment thought and practice were able to develop relatively unhindered by conservative or Romantic reaction. Various attempts to create an established church or aristocracy in some colonies ran up against stiff opposition. With a high Celtic proportion of the population underpinning religious diversity, Governors tended to support all Christian denominations as partners in the task of promoting morality and education. The Romantic revival of folk culture and reverence for the past had muted relevance to the Europeans in Australia. As Gascoigne observes, ‘it was difficult to write a Wordsworthian reflection on ruins such as Tintern Abbey in a country which lacked any such buildings ... which had gained significance for Europeans thanks to the patina of time’ (p.169).

Following an introductory discussion of the nature of the Enlightenment and Australian history Gascoigne divides his study into two parts. Part 1 has two chapters that outline the peculiar religious and political contexts of Colonial Australia. The bulk of the book consists of Part 2, entitled ‘The Possibilities of Improvement’. Here he presents his central thesis, that it was the Enlightenment’s faith in progress and improvement that pervaded colonial Australian culture. The first section of this part discusses, in turn, desires and efforts to improve the land and human nature. There are chapters on the obsession with advancing agriculture and efforts to establish scientific institutions. The following section considers efforts to promote ‘cultivation of the mind’, the theory and practice of the convict system, and racial attitudes.

The study underlines the profound link between the agricultural revolution and Enlightenment in Britain – a relationship that is

### *Enlightenment in Australia*

starkly revealed in the Australian context. As Gascoigne notes, the British settlers were ‘almost devoid of ecological humility’ (p. 71), and generally responded to the very alien physical environment with frustration and contempt. Everything seemed opposite to Europe. The seasons were opposite, the trees grew on poor soil and shed their bark, the largest mammal hopped on two legs, and the largest animal was a bird. The colonists overwhelming sense of superiority is demonstrated by the fact that they made little or no effort to learn about the land from the Aboriginals, whom they generally viewed as lazy and ignorant. Recent scholarship, however, is revealing the considerable degree to which the Aboriginals had learned to manipulate and shape their environment in the more than 40,000 years since they arrived on the continent. Indeed, as settlement spread, the British followed well-worn Aboriginal tracks, and let their sheep roam over vast pastures created by the strategic use of fire to create hunting grounds. What they saw as wild wastelands, had actually been cultivated by hunter-gatherers for millennia.

Colonisation needs a moral justification. The Spanish pursuit of gold was bolstered by a conviction that it was their duty to bring Christianity to the Americas. The dominant moral justification for British settlement of Australia was related to the extension of agriculture. When eighteenth-century Britons thought of progress and improvement, it is arguable that they thought first and foremost of *agricultural improvement*.<sup>2</sup> For example, the enlightened Cambridge don John Jebb thought there were two ways of ‘co-operating’ with God: ‘in giving happiness to those already in existence’ and ‘in contriving to give being to numerous tribes of rational and irrational animals, and to make them happy’.<sup>3</sup> These two aims, however, could conflict. The colonization of Australia increased the amount of ‘rational animals’, but it hardly increased the ‘happiness’ of those indigenous people who survived the initial impact of disease and violence. John Locke had declared that land

---

<sup>2</sup> This is noted in Roy Porter, *Enlightenment: Britain and the creation of the modern world* (New York, London, 2000), 304-10.

<sup>3</sup> Cited in Anthony Page, *John Jebb and the Enlightenment origins of British radicalism* (Westport, Connecticut, London, 2003), 31.

*Anthony Page*

not subject to settled agriculture was *terra nullius* – ‘land of no-one’. With this assumption as part of their ‘mental furniture’ the British set about enclosing and cultivating aboriginal hunting grounds (p.8). Following a massacre of aborigines at Myall Creek in 1838 the editorial of the *Sydney Herald* declared that since ‘this vast country was to them a common – they bestowed no labour upon the land – their ownership, their right was nothing more than the Emu or Kangaroo’ (p.167).

The rapid spread of agriculture was the dominant feature of nineteenth century Australia. Despite a precarious drought-wracked beginning, the settlement at Sydney took root with equipment, botanical resources and logistical support far superior to that of the seventeenth-century colonists in North America. Only recently widespread in Britain, potatoes flourished in Van Diemen’s Land (now Tasmania). Fine wool Merino sheep, bred in Spain, failed in soggy Britain when imported by Joseph Banks, but thrived and spread across the grasslands of Australia. Even with the discovery of large quantities of gold from the 1850s on, it was said that Australia rode on the sheep’s back. Sheep breeding exemplified science in practice and the wool industry acted as the engine of colonial expansion. By 1850 Australia was supplying 50% of Britain’s wool imports. Visitors from the educated classes found colonial conversations dominated by farming talk of wool prices and weather, and a society in which wealth and social mobility were obtainable through commerce and ‘improvement’ of the land. One settler wrote home from Van Diemen’s Land in 1833 that ‘money, I repeat, is all powerful here’ (p.171). Charles Darwin was staggered at the robustness of Sydney, a settlement that had been raised in decades, compared to the languid, centuries-old towns he had encountered in Latin America. The son of the famous French explorer, Louis de Bougainville, thought Sydney ‘the master work of the colonising spirit’ (p.10).

While the American colonies established their independence with a resort to the language of natural rights, the utilitarian strain of Enlightenment thought dominated in Australian colonies founded by convict labour, governed by military men and profoundly influenced by the values of a nation in the process of industrialisation. While both religious and political rights were

### *Enlightenment in Australia*

increasingly and hotly debated from the 1820s on, the language of rights remained subordinate to the values of utility and improvement – and later in the century ‘even nationalism took a very muted form in Australia, complicated as it was by twin loyalties to Australia and to the British Crown’ (p.171).

During the 1850s the Australian colonies established the most democratic parliaments in the world. This development, however, was far from inevitable. In being founded as convict settlements under military rule, New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land differed from the traditional British practice of founding its ‘white settler colonies’ with representative institutions. Operating in the shadow of two decades of warfare with revolutionary and Napoleonic France, the early governors tended to keep a tight hold on power. This did not go uncriticised, both within the colonies and in Britain. Jeremy Bentham, for example, openly criticised the lack of a separation of powers, declaring that the colonies were no better than Bastilles (p.41). With advocates for political reform drawing on traditional Whig ideology, there was a general feeling that the colonies must be encouraged to outgrow military rule. Demands for trial by jury and representative government were voiced in a robust free press in the 1820s, and colonial opinion became deeply divided over the nature of any future representative institutions.

In contrast to the United States, with its numerous and successful small scale farmers, the pattern of land settlement favoured hierarchy rather than democracy in Australia. The poorly watered soil encouraged large-scale sheep grazing by ‘squatters’ – so called because they illegally went beyond the bounds of settlement with their sheep and squatted on vast tracts of Aboriginal land. With the state promoting the wool industry, the squatters became a powerful class, seeking to emulate the landed gentry in Britain. But at the same time, various governors sought to foster small-scale farming through grants of land to free settlers and emancipated convicts, with varying degrees of success, depending upon the environment and local influence of the squatters.

This policy culminated in the practice of government-funded systematic migration from the 1830s onward, in part inspired by the theories and lobbying of Edward Gibbon Wakefield (1796-1862) and his Utilitarian supporters of systematic colonisation. It

*Anthony Page*

should be noted here that far from being a means of ‘clearing out the dregs’, parishes in Britain often used this system as a way of rewarding the so-called ‘deserving poor’ who were willing and able to contribute part of the cost of their passage.<sup>4</sup> These assisted migrants played a very important role in tilting the social balance in the direction of a democratic polity, and away from a hierarchical society built around convict and coolie labour. Squatter visions of becoming an aristocracy received little support from the Colonial Office.

The second quarter of the nineteenth century was characterised by heated political arguments between members of the ‘squatocracy’ and advocates of democratic political rights. While democrats often drew on the example of the United States and the rhetoric of ‘natural rights’, in general ‘republicanism’ was a term of abuse, and when used by reformers usually referred to the traditional Commonwealthman vision of Britain as a ‘crowned republic’ dominated by a popularly elected House of Commons. In Van Diemen’s land radicals, led by Thomas Horne (nephew of the English radical John Horne Tooke), ran into stiff opposition from the Evangelical Governor George Arthur, who claimed his task was ‘not to build up a free community but to hold in check the criminality of an Empire’ (p.51). The trend, however, was toward the granting of civil rights and by 1842 New South Wales allowed emancipated convicts the right to sue, serve as jurors and to vote.

During the debates over a constitution for NSW in the 1850s, attempts to establish a ‘Bunyip Aristocracy’ were widely ridiculed, and while an upper house of appointed life members was established, in practice it was dominated by the lower house. With urban populations expanding and a dramatic influx of gold diggers, the tide was with radicals like Henry Parkes who declared that ‘the people, growing in enlightenment, would never rest till they had obtained’ universal male suffrage (p.56).

---

<sup>4</sup> Robin Haines, “‘The Idle and the Drunken Won’t Do There’: Poverty, the New Poor Law and nineteenth-century government assisted emigration to Australia from the United Kingdom”, *Australian Historical Studies*, 108 (1997), 1-21.

### *Enlightenment in Australia*

While Enlightenment rhetoric was sometimes used against the Churches when they sought to increase their power in Australia, in general Enlightenment values and organised religion worked together. Treated with suspicion and even resentment as a means of social control by the convicts, religion was, nevertheless, a fundamental part of the mental furniture of many colonial Australians. But theirs were religious attitudes influenced by Enlightenment values. Religion was arguably most important as a badge of social and ethnic identity, with theology generally considered a private matter and less important than moral conduct. State officials tended to view all sects as part of a united effort to promote education, morality and civic culture. There were bitter debates over state funding for church schools, but as Gascoigne notes, ‘in a society which, as *The Australian* put it in 1840, excelled above all others in the extent to which “Mammon has so firmly fixed his throne”, the custodians of both religious and Enlightenment values could agree on the need to promote ideals other than the merely materialistic’ (p.170).

Australia was settled during a period of Evangelical revival in Britain in response to the French Revolution. As a result, examples of deism in the colonies are hard to come by, as it was generally seen as disloyal. Anti-clericalism, however, was widespread, and fairly openly tolerated post-1815. The convicts justifiably viewed religion as an instrument of authority, and freemasonry was very popular among the military. With the exception of George Arthur in Van Diemen’s Land in the 1820s, most of the military men who governed the colonies were anti-Evangelical and saw religion in Enlightenment terms as a practical aid to maintaining social order. When a Spanish expedition arrived in 1793, they openly expressed shock and amazement that after five years of settlement the colonists had still not built a church! This prompted Richard Johnson, an unpopular Evangelical clergyman, to erect a church at his own expense. Soon after the first service it burnt down – probably an act of convict resistance. In the late 1790s Governor Hunter noted that his support for the clergy had ‘not been much relish’d by the colony at large, because order and morality is not the wish of the inhabitants’ (p.24). As the numbers of emancipated convicts, native born and free settlers grew, religion became more

*Anthony Page*

important as a means of social identity and distinction. This generated heated debate over religious rights in the 1820s. The Church of England was never formally the established church, and proposals that it should be ran up against widespread opposition and lack of support from the governors. In the late 1830s government support was granted to all of the major denominations (including the Catholics and, in 1846, the Jewish community), and, despite heated debate, provided aid for their various efforts to establish schools. The Australian colonies thus institutionalised the Enlightenment ideal of the state as a promoter of civilisation and upholder of religious liberty.

The nineteenth-century trend towards secularisation was accelerated in Australia. With the forms of religion that clashed with Enlightenment values being largely ‘eroded or eliminated’, tensions between the two impulses were minimised and they could be seen as united in the task of civilising a new society. In 1824 the colonial secretary wrote to Governor Arthur in Van Diemen’s Land: ‘The problem with Australia is how to render it Christian, virtuous and enlightened’ (p.34). Religion became more intellectual, institutional and individualised, with Christmas, reinvented as a Victorian celebration of ‘family’, the most successfully imported Christian festival. The belief that religion – the source of so much conflict in the old world – is essentially a private matter is deeply embedded in Australian culture.

While there was almost universal belief that the land could be ‘improved’, there was less agreement on the possibilities and means of human improvement. Evangelical laments about original sin notwithstanding, however, Australia provided a place for experiment in social policy and some evidence of humans ‘improving’ in new and stimulating circumstances. The Colonial elite actively drew on Enlightenment thought and values in an endeavour to ‘civilise’ their robust societies. The Colonial Office believed that settlement needed to be concentrated in order to foster civilisation, and expressed deep concern about the spread of squatters. One Secretary wrote in 1831: ‘nothing would be more unfortunate than the formation of a race of Men, wandering with their Cattle over the extensive Regions of the Interior, and losing, like the descendants of the Spaniards in the Pampas of South

### *Enlightenment in Australia*

America, almost all traces of their original Civilization' (p.83). The process of settlement needed to be regulated, education promoted, and Aboriginals and the mass of lower class Anglo-Celts 'civilised'.

A predominantly male and plebeian population was a source of anxiety for the colonial elite. While there were points of tension, state and churches tended to cooperate in establishing schools. Women played an important role in fostering the manners and associations that were considered hallmarks of civilisation. The growing presence and prestige of 'science' as a means of mastering and moulding both the natural and social worlds is very noticeable in the early Australian colonies.

Not surprisingly, Gascoigne is very good on the development of scientific exploration and discussion in the colonies. Since the late seventeenth century, study of 'natural philosophy' had become a key feature of elite culture in Britain, and the nineteenth century witnessed professionalisation and a rapid growth in the prestige of science. Interest in science was motivated by a combination of genuine curiosity, the desire to obtain and display knowledge that marked one out as 'civilised', and the potential for economic gain. With Joseph Banks playing an important role in the initial exploration and settlement of Australia, these motives were present from the start of the colonies. The dominant motive, however, was the desire to apply science for economic gain. Various scientific societies were established in the middle decades of the century, but they struggled for support, were dependent upon the initiative of motivated individuals, and were dominated by agricultural interests. In the 'strongly utilitarian and politically divided atmosphere of New South Wales' science struggled to attract interest (p.91). In contrast Tasmania, owing to the efforts of a couple of keen governors, could boast the first Royal Society founded outside of Britain (founded 1844 and still active). The common motive was to explore nature with an eye to promoting improvement, with agriculture as the main focus. Science could help the settlers cultivate both their land and minds.

The convicts were increasingly subject to regulation and classification. The convict system arguably moved from being relatively 'enlightened' in its early stages to being more coercive

*Anthony Page*

and confining. The ‘assignment system’ saw many convicts farmed out to free settlers with the aim of having *laissez-faire* principles produce classification and surveillance of convicts. An Evangelical military man, Governor Arthur illustrates the way in which Evangelical and Enlightenment utilitarian impulses could combine in the cause of promoting education and moral discipline.<sup>5</sup> With penal stations established as places of ‘secondary punishment’ for re-offending convicts, Arthur saw Van Dieman’s Land as a giant open-air panopticon:

Bentham’s notion, that gaolers should possess a personal interest in the reform of convicts under their charge is beautifully realized in Van Diemen’s Land; settler or farmer, his prosperity depends not only upon the control and discipline, but also, which is more pertinent to the present question, upon the selection of his servant. If a convict is indolent, quarrelsome and vicious or in any way sets a bad example to his fellow servants, it is the master’s interest, if he appear irreclaimable, to get rid of him as soon as possible, and the result is that according to the character of his offence, or offences, he is sent to a road party, a chain gang or perhaps a penal settlement. There is thus maintained throughout the colony a continual circulation of convicts, a distribution of each in his proper place; in short a natural and unceasing process of classification; the mainspring or moving power of which is not the authority of the government, but the silent yet most efficient principle of self interest.<sup>6</sup>

The opportunities for individual initiative under the assignment system combined with access to land after a sentence was served saw transportation to Australia begin to lose the aura of a punishment. By the 1830s greater efforts were being made to classify, constrain and punish convicts.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Boyd Hilton, *The age of atonement: the influence of Evangelicalism on social and economic thought 1795-1865* (Oxford, 1988).

<sup>6</sup> Cited in W D Forsyth, *Governor Arthur’s convict system* (London, 1935), 142.

### *Enlightenment in Australia*

The intentions and actions of the British colonists with respect to indigenous Australians is currently a topic of extremely heated academic and public debate. The inevitably murky truth about the nature of a colonial frontier has become even more muddied by politically motivated polemic from both left and right in which the British are depicted as either genocidal invaders or the most humane and beneficial colonists the Aboriginals could have encountered.<sup>7</sup> Gascoigne avoids engaging in contemporary controversy. He endorses the work of so-called ‘black armband’ historians who have pointed to the many ways colonization had a devastating impact upon Aboriginals, while noting that the Enlightenment language of ‘rights’ provided an avenue through which indigenous interests could be promoted.

Australia was settled when the literate elite of Britain espoused the dominant Christian and Enlightenment belief in the unity of humanity. From the start there is evidence that British officials recognised that the Aboriginals had rights, and some limited moves were made to protect them, or at least soften the blows inflicted by colonisation. But official pronouncements do not amount to effective regulation and policing of a colonial frontier in which ‘squatters’ were eagerly grabbing and clearing land. While there were some efforts to acknowledge Aboriginal rights these were swamped by the drive to ‘civilise’ the landscape.

Eighteenth-century Enlightenment debate over race was characterised by ‘conflict and contradiction’.<sup>8</sup> The explorer James Cook had been able to write in a sympathetic manner about the indigenous Australians – to the enlightened mind they could be positioned in a stadal view of human social development. In the course of the nineteenth century, however, Australian aborigines found themselves confined to the bottom of ‘scientific’ racial

---

<sup>7</sup> See the heated debate generated in both academic and popular media by Keith Windschuttle, *The fabrication of Aboriginal history* (Paddington, NSW, 2002). The main collection of academic responses is Robert Mann ed., *Whitewash: on Keith Windschuttle's fabrication of Aboriginal history* (Melbourne, 2003).

<sup>8</sup> Dorinda Outram, *The Enlightenment* (Cambridge & New York, 1995), 76.

*Anthony Page*

hierarchies. As the colonies grew in size, confidence and independence, the increasingly racist views of the settlers were given greater opportunity to translate into practice. With the colonies moving to self-government in the 1850s, discussions were held in the Colonial office as to whether the British government should ‘retain the power of disallowing any Act which is palpably immoral, especially in relation to the unrepresented Aborigines or immigrants of colour’ (p.164). Such concerns were prompted by colonial politicians such as Robert Lowe declaring that the ‘benighted tribes’ needed to be ‘taught how immeasurably inferior they were in every respect to civilised men’ (p.164). To such a statement might be added an observation by the young Thomas Henry Huxley. A man who synthesised Enlightenment and Romantic thought and became the leading advocate of scientific naturalism, Huxley spent the late 1840s as a young naval assistant surgeon on a ship charting the coast of Australia. He met his wife among the colonial elite in Sydney, and drew on their attitudes and his own experiences when reflecting on the Australian Aborigines in his diary during the return trip to England. Their ‘elimination’, he wrote, ‘from the earth’s surface can be viewed only with satisfaction, as the removal of a great blot from the escutcheon of our common humanity, by all those who know them as they are, and are not to be misled by the maudlin philanthropy of “aborigines’ friends”.’<sup>9</sup> By the middle of the nineteenth-century, for many colonials nothing and nobody could be allowed to stand in the way of ‘improvement’.

In the late nineteenth century the plight of the indigenous people degenerated. Increasingly, ‘scientific’ works were published arguing that the various human races were distinct, and that most races were incapable of being ‘civilised’. In this climate, the traditional Christian belief in a common humanity came under attack by young and combative ‘sons of science’, and notions of European biological racial superiority were viewed favourably by many white Australians. The development of more democratic systems of government in the colonies accelerated racism and policies of

---

<sup>9</sup> Cited in, Adrian Desmond, *Huxley: from devil's disciple to evolution's high priest* (Reading, Mass., 1997), 144.

### *Enlightenment in Australia*

segregation, as Europeans sought to deny political rights for Aboriginals and Asians. The ‘White Australia’ policy was one of the first acts of the newly federated nation in 1901. The notion of Aboriginal rights was not eclipsed, however, becoming a prominent feature of contemporary debate in Australia.

Gascoigne’s study provides a judicious discussion of the influence of Enlightenment attitudes and values on colonial Australia by a scholar who has made a substantial contribution to the recent historiography of the Enlightenment and has also engaged with recent ‘post-colonial’ studies in Australian history. In his first volume of a new history of Australia Alan Atkinson has written that ‘for an entire generation, European order was worked out in Australia as if all the legitimate promises of the Enlightenment might still come true.’<sup>10</sup> While Gascoigne is careful to acknowledge that it was only one strand among several structural and ideological forces that shaped the colonies, he succeeds in demonstrating the importance of Enlightenment thought in the early formation of Australia and lends weight to the observation that European Australia was ‘born modern’.<sup>11</sup> A thoughtful and important contribution to debate over the colonisation of Australia – a debate that has attracted a great deal of public attention of late, but which has unfortunately been dominated by heated and politically motivated polemic – this book transcends such contemporary concerns and offers a permanent source for reflection on the Enlightenment and its legacy.

Anthony Page  
University of Tasmania

---

<sup>10</sup> Alan Atkinson, *The Europeans in Australia: a history*: vol 1, *The beginning* (Melbourne; Oxford, 1997), 7, cited in Gascoigne, *Enlightenment and Australia*, 14

<sup>11</sup> Jan Kociumbas, *The Oxford history of Australia 1770-1860: possessions* (Melbourne, 1992). ix., cited in Gascoigne, *Enlightenment and Australia*, 14.

*Reviews*

**Gillian Russell and Clara Tuite eds., Romantic sociability: social networks and literary culture in Britain 1770-1840,** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, xii + 267pp., hbk ISBN: 0521770688, £45.00.

As a term of literary history and cultural analysis, ‘sociability’ does not – as yet – have the resonance and currency of a conceptual counter like ‘Sensibility’. It deserves to. This important collection of essays make a persuasive case for the centrality of the ‘rubric’ or ‘category’ of sociability to our understanding of Romantic-period literary and political culture. Eleven nuanced essays set out to theorise sociability mainly in the context of the 1790s and the first two decades of the nineteenth century. The book seeks to contrast Romantic sociability with Enlightenment ideals of association (and versions of Romantic sociability with other versions); it also sets out to contest rigid Habermasian models of the public sphere by revealing the complexity of what was actually at stake when men and women ‘got together’ in various senses and in various spaces during this period. I put it like this since *Romantic sociability* attends very scrupulously to the material actuality of association, combining theoretically inflected discussion with a dramatic focus on literal sites and on the discourse and ‘protocols’ associated with them. The volume therefore offers a much-needed historicised, culturally embedded account of the period’s congregational temper. Location is never mere backdrop here: it is constitutive of particular (or ambiguous) modes of language, specific (or ambivalent) meanings, actual (if shifting) relations. We gain access in these essays to taverns, lecture halls, theatres, clubs, dinners, debating societies, shops, masonic lodges, prisons, even mail-coach carriages. The volume represents a salutary corrective to fictions of the solitary self and to critical accounts of Romantic subjectivity that do not adequately take stock of the radical reticularity of Romantic culture (though perhaps thinking in terms of ‘networks’, ‘exchanges’, ‘dialogic relations’ and ‘coteries’ is now the norm in Romantic literary studies as well as in cultural studies more generally). Appropriately, even the editing represents a sociable rather than a solitary enterprise.

*Reviews*

Margaret C. Jacob's opening essay offers some broad historical strokes on the shared idiom of a new 'international republican conversation' which developed after 1789, centred on the issues of slavery and political representation. A principled internationalist outlook was in so many cases the result of an exercise in connected thinking, plain and simple: 'Helen Maria Williams effortlessly saw the linkage: "respecting the rights of man in Europe we shall always agree in wishing that a portion of those same rights were extended to Africa"'. James Epstein's chapter, tracking the circulation of John Frost through various London spaces, gives the reader a good sense of how certain locations – the Percy coffee house, for example, outside which Frost was arrested in 1792 after an argument over semantics – are charged 'discursive arenas' in which speech, meaning and personal identity are up for grabs and subject to various definitions (some of which in this culture of suspicion could, of course, place a noose around a man's neck). What does freedom of speech amount to in a tavern? In a coffee-house? Is 'private' conversation actionable if uttered in a 'public' space, and if so, what dangers do these spaces represent for the friends of freedom and for the man who has drunk one glass too many? And what is the significance of a *gentleman's* utterance in this or that context? Erskine's (unsuccessful) defence of Frost turned in the end on a plea for the inviolability of alcohol-fuelled sociability in the face of entrapment: 'Erskine . . . endeavoured to show that Frost had been "in liquor" . . . While presenting an eloquent plea for the rights of free speech and private conscience, Erskine . . . defended the manly pleasures of heavy drinking. Privacy was defined in homosocial terms. The rights of masculinity were asserted rather than the rights of man'.

The politicisation of Anna Barbauld is the subject of both Anne Janowitz's and Deirdre Coleman's chapters. Reading her 1773 *Poems* against the political poetry and polemical prose of the 1790s, Janowitz traces Barbauld's movement from the 'amiable' social interaction and familial structure of 'provincial Dissenting sociability' to the sociability of 1790s metropolitan radical culture. The move out of the Warrington Academy circle of her father, John Aikin, into a world of political debate is read here as a shift 'from Sensibility to Romanticism', from 'amiability' to 'passion' (the

### *Reviews*

early 1790s was not a time to be ‘amiable’), from ‘meditation’ to ‘intervention’, and crucially, from Aikin’s beautiful daughter to the autonomous radicalised female author who was defined ‘politically’ not ‘familiarly’. Janowitz also charts a mid-decade declension back into ‘private sociability’ and a family structure, and sees Barbauld in *Eighteen Hundred and Eleven* reflecting on ‘pathways of defeat and regeneration’, both autobiographical and public. The most engaging section in Coleman’s chapter on the ‘serious differences’ between Barbauld and Joseph Priestley in the 1770s is her fascinating reading of the bizarre analogy Priestley enlisted to illustrate the irreparable loss he had suffered during the Birmingham Riots of 1791. The destruction of his house, library and laboratory was a gratuitous act of violence which he compared to the wanton annihilation by a ‘female neighbour’ of a young lady’s ‘ingenious imitation of plants in paper’. The analogy shouldn’t work at all, but Coleman identifies precisely why this odd relation between Church-and-King violence and preposterous botanical origami works so well, teasing out what the comparison communicates about late eighteenth-century scientific enquiry, gender relations, public/private spheres and political and religious debates.

Sociability can be empowering and emancipating; it can also, of course, become dissolute and dangerous. Jon Mee probes the limits and regulation of sociability in the 1790s in a discussion of Robert Merry. When does the sociable spirit in poetry and political opinion tip over into something more dangerous, swinish, erotic, vulgar, promiscuous, enthusiastic (in the pejorative sense) and fundamentally *disordered*? Mee sees Merry’s Della Cruscanism as representing ‘a commercial democratization and eroticization of the ideal of sociability’. As Merry circulated (in person, in the radical press), the emotional freedoms and flirtations of his poetical project took on political meanings which violated the boundaries of polite association and called down on him the big squeeze of reaction. Two models of Romantic sociability are offered at the end of the chapter: the first, a closed circuit of friends in allusive conversation represented by the Wordsworth/Coleridge circle, the other, conversely, a more libertarian concept of communication, a centrifugal sociability, represented by Merry, who ‘[threw] out to

*Reviews*

the public the vicissitudes of fancy in the expectation of being enriched by sympathetic echoes'. Clearly, Mee is very much in sympathy with the latter.

As I suggested above, the most absorbing essays in the volume are those which are alive to the ambiguous resonance of rooms. In one of the best chapters, Gillian Russell seeks to inhabit the 'potent space' of Beaufort Buildings, where John Thelwall both lived and lectured. In consequence, it was a highly ambivalent site, and the lecture as 'sociable event' becomes a complex thing when one takes into account the mixed demography and gender politics of the occasion. The 1790s lecturer played many parts – actor, priest, showman, demagogue and host – and the charge of Beaufort Buildings partook of the atmosphere of both church and theatre (unlike, say, the Surrey Institution, which Russell characterises as hosting 'regulated sociability'). Thelwall, Russell argues, 'deliberately conflated the space of his lectures with his own domestic space, constructing a speaking position that merged his identity as a professional and a man'. (Here, Russell might have mentioned that the young Thelwall seriously considered a career in the theatre and that as a writer he was always drawn to the dramatic mode.) A fascinating cultural contextualisation of Byron's poem *The Blues* generates an insightful discussion of 'lecture-room encounters' and of how these spaces could function as 'ante-rooms' leading to further (homosocial, homosexual) relations. Julie A. Carlson's densely argued piece transposes us from the lecture hall-as-theatre to the theatre itself, where, as Hunt marvellously put it (with a jibe at the insidious unsociability of the religious congregation) egotism is dispelled and people come together 'smilingly ... not cut off from each other by hard pews and harder abstractions'. The main focus here is the difference between Hazlitt's understanding of why we (should) go to the theatre and Holcroft's; fundamentally the distinction is between sociability and moral ideology. Along the way, Carlson has some fine things to say about Romantic friendship in an age in which the New Philosophical imperatives of 'universal benevolence' were just too abstract to sustain the individual emotionally: 'One could say that much of the pathos of first-generation Romantic writing is fuelled by the struggle to locate one's friends after having dissolved the

*Reviews*

category in one's youth.' Carlson is persuasive, too, on Hazlitt's exploration of the complex psychological mechanisms and results of empathy and the willing suspension of disbelief when Shakespeare is on stage. Hazlitt recognised how a Shakespeare play both bolsters and unravels our own identities. For him (sounding like De Quincey), actors embody 'stately hieroglyphic[s] of humanity', and we meet our oldest friends in the theatre – not merely in the stalls or boxes, but on stage.

Though at times rather desultory, Judith Barbour's chapter on the way in which William Godwin 'lectured' (not an act he would sanction in the public sphere, of course) his female correspondents – Mary Hays, Elizabeth Inchbald – on social and sexual contracts after the death of Mary Wollstonecraft is a penetrating analysis of the power dynamics of gender relations. Godwin sets himself up as an 'arbiter of literary sociability', defining, in the wake of that death, how relations are now to be conducted. The most entertaining performance in *Romantic Sociability* is Clara Tuite's *tour de force* essay on 'The Byronic Woman: Anne Lister's Style, Sociability and Sexuality'. This piece – like its subject, wonderfully self-aware and intelligently mischievous – focuses on Lister's 'sexual sociability'. Tuite analyses the way in which this lesbian gentry heiress from Halifax 'performed' Byronism (here meaning the poet and his image in culturally commodified forms) by means of a series of 'Byronic prostheses': black clothes ('Lister anticipates Coco Chanel's "little black dress" by just over a century'), books of poetry given as gifts, and manly, martial haircuts. The gentleman becomes outrageously fetishised. Tuite offers a fascinating glimpse of the modes in which Byron, during his own lifetime, functioned as a social 'lubricant' in knowing, 'deviant' circles and as a conversation-stopper in the company of polite husbands and straitlaced wives. Tuite adopts the *double entendre* naughtiness of Byron-Lister: 'Eclat is the speculative social stock that lubricates Lister's social and sexual exchanges'; 'Lister's diaries stage . . . the friction of clashing and competing tribadic class, social, sociable and sexual styles, that do not always rub one another the right way'. Lister emerges in her remarkable diaries as a highly self-conscious social player – 'What sort of

*Reviews*

connection am I forming?’, she asks herself – and as a mordant commentator who can spot a fashion victim, a failed performer, a mile away and make a victim of his social/sexual pretensions: she describes Sir William Ingleby, an ‘eccentric baronet’, as ‘walk[ing] about Ripley & Ripon … in his dressing gown, without smalls or neckcloth … shirt-collar displayed à la milord Byron … the scarecrow impression’. Tuite ends with some cogent remarks on the desirability of social scandal and with a dramatically related account of the mortification that ensues when ‘sociability’ – in this case Lister’s bounding into her female lover’s carriage in front of a shocked ‘audience’ – ‘goes horribly wrong’.

The volume ends with Deirdre Shauna Lynch’s exploration of Romantic retail therapy and of the connections between shopping (a word which makes its first appearance in print in the 1780s), ‘female consumerism’ and the civic participation of women in the public sphere. Countering Habermas’s elision of women from his discussions of the public sphere and its institutions, Lynch focuses on the counter, and on how the transactions that occur over it transform consumer sites into civic spaces and ‘theatre[s] for deliberating and debating’ in which women ‘could produce themselves as public beings’. Habermas is here refined by haberdashery. Once again, the material specifics of cultural history are marshalled in an illuminating way: ‘Gradually over the course of the eighteenth century a policy of obligation-free browsing had been introduced into London emporia; such a policy was in fact to be expected in a new-style “monster-shop” like “Harding, Howell & Co.’s Grand Fashionable Magazine”’. Lynch concludes with a reading of Fanny Burney’s *The Witlings* as a play specifically interested in the issue of the relation between private and public.

*Romantic sociability* is a diverse but also profoundly integrated collection of essays which appropriately engage in conversation with one another. The volume mirrors its theme, representing an enabling act of intellectual sociability, association and exchange. It is itself a model of the good things that can happen when members of an international ‘community’ of scholars get together in the public sphere.

Damian Walford Davies  
University of Wales, Aberystwyth

*Reviews*

**Robert Rix ed., 'A Political Dictionary Explaining the True Meaning of Words' by Charles Pigott. A facsimile of the 1795 Edition**, Ashgate, 2004, xxxi + 175pp (facsimile), +114pp. (annotations), hbk, ISBN 0 7546 3690 9, £50.00 / \$99.95.

What is the true meaning of words? Do dictionaries provide the answers or just offer up possibilities? Charles Piggot (d.1794) believed that he knew their true meaning and that his dictionary would disclose them. They were, however, far from conventional. His meanings were invariably political, con-temporary, satirical and subversive. Indeed, he was not much interested in words whose meanings could not be contested. His dictionary was written at a time when language was deployed with great skill by conservative propagandists, notably Edmund Burke, and by the government and its loyalist supporters. *A Political Dictionary* was an attempt to expose the language of patriotism, subservience, and political contentment.

Charles Piggot's insights came not from deprivation and envy. He was brought up amongst the ranks of the privileged and was educated at Eton and Cambridge. His father was a baronet and wealthy Shropshire landowner. When his son and heir Robert (1736-94) decided to sell the Chetwynd and Chesterton estates in 1776, convinced that war with the American colonies spelt disaster, they were valued at £9,000 a year. The brothers Robert and Charles enjoyed the life of the privileged. Gambling was in their blood. The gaming table and Newmarket race-course, which as Rex points out was restricted to the aristocracy, were Charles's favourite venues. Like most who gamble, he lost more than he gained, and it appears that he came to experience hard times. Today, such a creature would be a perfect candidate for a celebrity reality T V show. His gossip would surely enliven the proceedings. In the late eighteenth century, Piggot's chosen medium was print. He lampooned the *mores* of his aristocratic gambling coterie in *The Jockey Club* (Feb. 1792), for which there would be two sequels and they were followed in turn by *The Female Jockey Club* (1794). Piggot was selling sensationalist disclosures and, increasingly, radical politics as he gravitated from reform Whiggism – he wrote a reply to Burke's *Reflections* – to Painite radicalism. But the move

*Reviews*

to radicalism was not entirely consistent. In *The Female Jockey Club* he returned to gossipy sensationalism with no overt political message. As Robert Rex notes, there is a ‘strange ambiguity inherent in Pigott’s pamphlets’. He suggest that for Pigott the “‘Age of Scandal’” and the age of political enlightenment went hand in hand’(p.xvi). Maybe, but does that solve the ambiguity? If it does, then one would expect sensationalism and political point making to be inseparable. Once can’t deny Piggot’s political seriousness, which led him to involvement in reform politics, and membership of the Society for Constitutional Information and of the London Corresponding Society. One can, however, suggest that his motivation was mixed. His sensationalism may have been derived in part from the need for a hard-up gambler to make money. It is also likely that he shared that element in eighteenth-century libertarianism which was libertine and sought freedom as a means of being able to do what one pleased. At any rate, Pigott’s own morals seem to have been similar to those whom he criticised, and he may not have been above blackmail (p.xvii). It is not unknown for such individuals to come to a sticky end, and Pigott apparently died prematurely. Yet his death was not a result of over-indulgence or dubious activities of one sort or another. It was a consequence of his political idealism. On 30 September 1793 he was arrested for sedition. The charge was soon dropped and he was released on 5 November of the same year. In the interim he was held in Compter Dungeon, north of Newgate. He may have caught typhus (gaol fever) there. Certainly his health never recovered from the experience and he died on 24 June 1794 at his apartments in Westminster.

While in Compter Dungeon, Pigott put the finishing touches to a political dictionary on which he had been working for several years. He continued to add to the work after his release and died before it was quite complete. It was published posthumously the following year by Daniel Eaton. One would hardly expect either consistency or a developed viewpoint from a political polemic cast in dictionary form written over a period of years. Pigott in part intended to counter the Tory bias of Johnson’s dictionary, but whatever biases there are in Johnson’s dictionary, it is still valuable as a work of reference for lexicographers. That is much less true of

### *Reviews*

Pigott's. It isn't systematic; its words are chosen for their value for contemporary political comment. Johnson's dictionary did indeed contain pointed contemporary political and social comment, but for his shorter abstracted version of the folio edition, which in itself is a two volume work, he omitted them. That would hardly be possible for Pigott. Definitions with Pigott come with his own observations, and sometimes there are no definitions at all, just fulminations. And that is the value of the dictionary. It provides a lively insight into the mentality of a particular type of radical. It is anti-monarchical, anti-aristocratic, anti-establishment – one could go on with the antis and come up with few pros. Pigott was well educated and assumed knowledge of enlightenment classics by the likes of Montesquieu, Voltaire and Raynal. He cited Pufendorf's *Law of Nature and Nations* (1672) without even bothering to mention the title of the work (see 'Government', pp.46-48; the first citation was inaccurate). He was particularly well-versed and skilful in deploying the British literature of opposition from the Country proposals of the period of the Glorious Revolution (his grandfather was a Jacobite), the patriot programme of the mid century through to the new Painite radical ideas of the 1790s.

Because Pigott was not tied down to an organised format he could include things on the spur of the moment. For example, 'Cowardice: military ruffians assaulting Dr. Knox, his wife and daughter at the Brighthelmstone theatre' (p.11). He could write entries on the assumption that his readers already knew the conventional meaning, as in the entry on Humanity, defined as 'every species of violence, injustice and oppression' (p.60), and could draw on his literary knowledge for quotations, often adapting them to current circumstance, for example quoting from Macbeth and substituting King George for Macbeth (see 'Sleep' p.132). The dictionary is accompanied with a substantial and valuable section of notes or 'Annotations'. Thus we learn that the entry on 'cowardice' was occasioned by the maltreatment by soldiers of Rev. Vicesimus Knox for preaching universal peace. Given that the editor has gone to so much trouble to annotate the text, it is a pity that the book does not include an index. No doubt he believed that the dictionary itself acts as the index; cross references are

*Reviews*

noted in the Annotations, and brief biographies are provided of the characters most noted by Pigott.

Rex's introduction is the most complete discussion available of Pigott's life. He notes that most scholars have neglected his career. If he is mentioned at all it is usually *en passant*. The entry in the *ODNB*, although updated, needs to be supplemented by Rex's discussion of his career and also by Jon Mee's informative entry on Pigott in Iain McCalman et al, *An Oxford Companion to the Romantic Age. British Culture, 1776-1832* (Oxford, 1999). Charles Piggott's elder brother, Robert, is given much fuller treatment in *ODNB* and its something of a puzzle that he is mentioned only briefly by Rex (pp. xv & xxix n.15). They came out of the same mould. Both were gamblers, both unconventional in their outlook and lives. While Charles pursued a radical career in England, Robert pursued a revolutionary one in France. Rex suggests that Robert may have influenced the development of Charles's radicalism, but this point could surely have been pursued further. The editor also notes that there were three brothers. I presume the other was Arthur, mentioned in P M Ashraf's study, *The Life and Times of Thomas Spence* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1983), as a member of the Society of Friends of the Liberty of Press formed in December 1792. A résumé of the current state of knowledge about all the Pigotts would have been useful. Yet this does not in any sense minimise the value of Rex's recovery of many of the details of Charles Pigott's career. He enables us to catch the tone and overtones of his writings and in re-publishing *A Political Dictionary* he has provided an invaluable tool for researchers in the field. They will use it with a purpose and derive much benefit from it, but it deserves wider readership than that. Indeed, one of the pleasures of the dictionary is to indulge in lexicromancy (if there is such a word), namely opening it at any page and start reading, following up with the references and thence going from one mini polemic to another. Pigott is never boring, is often highly amusing and his sharp comments on authority and the spin which it placed on words, bring to mind many present day parallels. This a most welcome addition to our literature on the late eighteenth century.

Martin Fitzpatrick  
Aberystwyth

*Reviews*

**Anthony Page, *John Jebb and the Enlightenment Origins of British Radicalism*,** Westport, Connecticut and London, Praeger Publishers, March 2003, xiv + 309pp; hbk, ISBN 0-275-97775-7, £39.99 / \$75.95.

As Anthony Page notes at the start of his book, an extended study of John Jebb (1736-1786) is long overdue, and this lucid and elegantly written volume is therefore a most welcome addition to existing work on British radicals and radicalism in the later eighteenth century. Page makes a strong case throughout this volume for Jebb to be considered as a fundamental member of the British reform movement between the 1760s and the 1780s. A reformer in politics, religion and education, Jebb was an able thinker and controversialist who helped to formulate the classic reform demands of the late eighteenth century, and also a central activist who was a founder member of various reform associations.

Page's concern, however, is not only to document Jebb's life and achievements, but also to explain his radicalism by exploring the influence upon him of both a liberal Latitudinarian religious background, through his father and through his education at Cambridge University, and of the Enlightenment philosophy of David Hartley's *Observations on Man* (1749). Latitudinarianism instilled in Jebb a suspicion of authority and the view that religious doctrine should be discovered by each individual for himself, by the application of human rational enquiry to the divinely inspired Scriptures. Humanly constructed liturgies and articles of faith should not be imposed on people: hence Jebb's support for the Feathers Tavern petition of 1771. As Page points out, the combination of Newtonian science, empiricist philosophy and faith in scriptural sufficiency often led to heterodoxy, and Jebb proved this pattern with his journey towards Socinianism, which he had publicly adopted by 1768. This, together with the failure of the Feathers Tavern Petition to release Church of England clergymen from subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles, propelled him outside the Church of England by 1775. Hartley, a friend of Jebb's father, gave Jebb a belief in the necessity of freedom of individual enquiry, thought and expression. His combination of philosophical determinism, the belief in universal salvation and a call to moral

*Reviews*

and religious reform seems to have been instrumental in motivating Jebb's reformist outlook wherever he found himself: in the educational arena at Cambridge, in the Church, in medicine or in politics.

A secondary theme of Page's book is the growing polarisation which it traces between conservative and liberal Whigs and Latitudinarians at Cambridge, on matters both political and religious. The divide was often a prudential one, and was exemplified at a personal level by Jebb's father's unease over his son's movement towards heterodoxy and away from a potentially lucrative career in the church and at Cambridge. This was ironic, given the powerful influence John Jebb senior had had over the development of his son's thinking, and his own liberal theology and political disposition; but Jebb senior had flourished at a time when Latitudinarianism was more dominant. He was 'a careerist', a 'politically tactful Whig' (p.13), and while his son was attracted to careerism, he was unable to swallow his opinions tactfully in aid of his personal advancement. He was twice turned down for the chair of Arabic at Cambridge, and later failed to acquire a medical post and had to resort to private medical practice, because of his religious and political reformism.

As well as being one of the original signatories to the Feathers Tavern petition, Jebb was also a founder member of both the Westminster Association and the Society for Constitutional Information, leading bodies on the radical wing of the political reform movement during the American Revolutionary era. Jebb, indeed, expanded upon James Burgh's notion of a democratically elected national association to organise popular support for constitutional reforms and which, by virtue of its claim to speak for the nation, would have the authority to instruct Parliament on pain of dissolution. He also helped to expand the classic reform platform later known as the six-point Charter for the Westminster Association in May 1780, based on the principles argued for by John Cartwright and others such as James Burgh, Joseph Hulme, Richard Price, Granville Sharp and Capel Lofft in the 1770s. Page suggests that Jebb's legacy has been overshadowed by that of his friend John Cartwright (1740-1824), to whom Jebb said that he owed his conviction of the necessity of universal manhood

*Reviews*

suffrage, because Jebb, unlike Cartwright, never produced a major political treatise (p.268), though he published many short pamphlets. This is no doubt true, but it is surely also because Jebb's human and political lifespans were considerably shorter than Cartwright's. Jebb came later to political reformism than did Cartwright, engaging fully only from around 1779 (p.155), after he had finished his medical training (though he was clearly interested in the American crisis from its outbreak), until his death in 1786, three years before the eruption of the French Revolution. This perhaps only makes his political influence and reputation all the more striking, but it is not difficult to understand why Cartwright's reputation has eclipsed that of Jebb.

Jebb, none the less, was clearly a substantial figure in the early British radical movement, and Anthony Page has given us a thoughtful and thorough study of his life and work in this book.

Emma Vincent Macleod  
University of Stirling

**Pamela Edwards, *The Statesman's Science: History, Nature, and Law in the Political Thought of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2004, pp. ix + 294pp.; hbk., ISBN/ISSN: 023113178X, £30/\$45.00.**

Samuel Taylor Coleridge professed himself to be 'ever a man without a party.' Citing this declaration at the beginning of her impressive new study, Pamela Edwards thereafter dedicates much of her considerable intellectual energy and acumen to its defence. From the start, the scope of the book is rigorously defined; there is little here of Coleridge's life, his financial troubles and addictions, and still less about his poetry. Instead, Edwards concentrates exclusively on Coleridge's political philosophy, and in particular on attacking what she identifies as the mistaken but still widespread view of Coleridge's later thought as a kind of apostasy from his youthful radicalism. While this tight focus is the book's great strength, it also, perhaps predictably, becomes its main weakness.

Edwards' bracing, no-nonsense approach to the question of Coleridge's political backsliding is refreshing, attacking in turn some of the great shibboleths of Coleridge criticism. Thus, the

### *Reviews*

exordium of chapter 1 ('Romantic Radicalism'), having debunked Coleridge the political 'apostate,' swiftly dispatches the figures of Coleridge the 'mime,' Coleridge the 'glacier,' and Coleridge the blissfully unaware or 'unconscious man.' Such characterisations, Edwards maintains, miss the 'critical and polymorphously "oppositional" rather than factional' tenor of Coleridge's writings (p.23). Her case rests on two key planks of argument. Historically, she claims, Coleridge's politics 'owed more to the ancient and tradition-bound British "country" tradition of criticism in politics than it did to the new doctrines of radical anarchism' (p.26). Secondly, she argues that the philosophical foundation of his statesman's science was the Baconian doctrine of the double truth, a seventeenth-century notion of 'the cooperative relationships between opposed dualities of meaning,' which Coleridge absorbed long before he encountered the German revival of the idea that the dialectical opposition of contraries led to progress (p.31). It is this double vision, Edwards argues, that allows Coleridge the political thinker to see permanence and progression as 'essentially fluid and interdependent forces' (p.207).

Accordingly, in chapter 2, 'Attacking the State,' Edwards reveals how Coleridge's 1795 pamphlet *The Plot Discovered* cleverly uses an 'older Whig polemic portraying the constitution as a sublime and ancient instrument of historical and organic refinements' (p.44) in order to lay a rhetorically complex snare for Pitt. In turn, chapter 3 highlights Coleridge's belief that 'reason, constituted through time and practice, provided the only sound ethical foundation for government,' while chapter 4 charts how a timocratically-minded Coleridge drew upon seventeenth-century theories of dialectic to develop a 'dynamic' notion of property, thereby steering a course 'between liberty-as-private-property and liberty-as-community-equality' (p.93). The fifth chapter, 'Morality and Will,' identifies Coleridge's anti-utilitarian language of 'duty, loyalty, and obligation as imposed by a free moral will that voluntarily chose to follow a strict and transcendent moral law' (p.115) as that of a 'communitarian conservative' (p.132), an argument that supports the claim of chapter 6 that theoretical rather than partisan issues after 1800 led Coleridge to attempt a 'conceptual union of Scottish moralism and German idealism' in a kind of "Platonic

*Reviews*

empiricism” (p.141). Chapter 7 further expands on the metaphysical underpinnings of Coleridge’s thought, finding in his *Theory of Life* the ‘master key to the basic ideas that shaped all of his later works of the late 1810s and the 1820s.’ The book concludes with two chapters on Coleridge’s views on church and state. Chapter 8 outlines how Coleridge’s organic and binary view of the state forged his distinctive view of the clerisy as ‘a source of generic conscience and ethical guidance rather than specific political ideologies or doctrinal religion’ (p.181), a point reinforced by the ninth and final chapter, ‘Attacking the Doctrine,’ in which Edwards shows how in Coleridge’s later work the close relationship between political virtue and landed independence is echoed by his grounding of moral virtue ‘in the equally substantial and enduring spiritual property of intellectual capital’ (p.201).

As even this quick run through the chapters suggests, this is a meticulously researched and argued study. Indeed, it should be consulted by anyone interested in Coleridge’s political thought, particularly in relation to its seventeenth-century antecedents. That said, *The Statesman’s Science* is not without its flaws. Throughout, Edwards leans very heavily on *The Plot Discovered* and *On the Constitution of Church and State*, and while students of Coleridge might not be surprised to find that Edwards’ has little to say about Coleridge’s poetry or literary lectures, they might still be startled to discover that *Biographia Literaria* does not even appear in the index. This raises a thorny problem, for though Edwards follows Coleridge’s lead in treating his thought as a dynamic and complex whole, she disregards the aesthetic dimension of both his arguments – Schiller’s name is another striking absence – and her own. Given that the politics of literary form have been a central concern of students of romanticism for over two decades, and that Edwards is apt to deploy romantic tropes such as ‘the growth of the poet’s mind’ to defend Coleridge against charges of political apostasy (p.216), it is unfortunate that she breezily dismisses the New Historicism at the outset as at best ‘oddly reminiscent of the old historicism’ and at worst ‘curiously unhistorical in its historicity’ (p.5). Edwards’ style by contrast is decidedly old school: precise, crystal-clear, fond of enumeration (points frequently come in threes) and delivered in short, even terse

*Reviews*

paragraphs that are never in danger of straying into the country garden of Coleridgean digression. But while Edwards is fastidious (and rightly so) about anachronistic terminology, it is curious that she fights shy of tackling issues raised by the possibility that the disciplinary perspective encoded in her academic style is not one that Coleridge, who was ever alive to the reflexive and aesthetic subtleties of writing history, would likely have endorsed. The result is a book of great analytic power and historical range that, while it professes to be in sympathy with its subject, is less easy around the questions raised by his work than it would have us believe.

Tim Milnes  
University of Edinburgh

**Martin Fitzpatrick, Peter Jones, Christa Knellwolf and Iain McCalman, eds.** *The Enlightenment World*, London: Routledge, 2004., xxi +714 pp., hbk., ISBN 0 415 21575 7, £130.00.

Had Isaac Watts suffered at the hands of a lazy reviewer, one wonders? According to Richard Yeo, he ‘declared against superficial reading, ... scolding those who went no further than the contents page or the index.’ The fact that this reviewer found this remark on page 361 of this book suggests either that the sentence caught my eye as the book fell open at random, or that I have done something towards keeping the ghost of Watts at bay. The truth is that every word has been read. The difficulty would have lain in skipping over the pages, for this tome is as exciting as it is informative. The editors have assembled a team of thirty-nine authors, all of whom have the happy knack, not always in evidence among scholars, of wearing their learning lightly, and of distilling the essence of their several themes – many of which have attracted book-length studies – into concise, lucid and entertaining prose.

The publisher is equally to be praised for a sturdy, handsome, carefully edited, volume which is enhanced by eighty-two well-chosen and well-reproduced illustrations. The reader is further assisted by a glossary of terms (though I should prefer to define the Mennonites as a ‘radical Reformation movement’ rather than as an ‘evangelical sect’), and by indices of persons and subjects. A list of references is appended to every chapter.

### *Reviews*

The work is divided into eight parts, each of which is introduced by one of the editors, and there are thirty-nine topical chapters. Detailed comment on every contribution being precluded, I shall attempt first to convey something of the flavour of the book – a risky undertaking given that the several chapters are already summaries of sometimes vast amounts of material, and then to offer some reflections arising from what I have read.

In a Preface the editors caution us that while it is sometimes appropriate to refer to *the Enlightenment*, the variety of intellectual and other strands which they have to encompass prompts them frequently avoid the definite article. They further make it clear that they do not offer a conglomeration of abstracted ideas; throughout, the several contexts of Enlightenment thought and activity are in view.

Part I concerns the ‘Intellectual origins of Enlightenment.’ Here a running theme is the importance of science as the supreme cognitive authority. This deference was fuelled by the optimism engendered by the ever-increasing number of discoveries made, and by the conviction that the scientific method of Bacon, Newton and others was impartial and ‘objective’: all of this over against a Cartesianism which, while it had dispensed with Aristotelian substantial forms, nevertheless remained satisfied with an entirely speculative mechanical philosophy. Not, indeed, that the responses of debtors to Newton were identical: Hume’s thought took a secular turn, whilst Hartley’s retained a theological dimension. The epistemological enquiries which ran parallel to the scientific work are epitomised in the writings of Descartes and Locke, both of whom went in quest of philosophical certainty. Locke is shown to have been a ‘critical and innovative’ follower of Descartes. The scientific and philosophical activities noted could not but have implications for Christian claims to truth. Among the issues raised by external critics, among whom Spinoza was notable, and internal critics including the Remonstrants, latitudinarians, Locke and Clarke, was the place of revelation. Freethinkers and deists had their say, and from a variety of quarters the authority of Scripture, and the presumed evidential status of miracles and prophecy was questioned. Underlying much of this criticism was a sceptical attitude which could, negatively, call into question long-cherished

### *Reviews*

beliefs and, positively, advance the cause of toleration, for since we have no direct access to the minds of others we cannot be certain of their beliefs. Scepticism concerning the foundation of morals prompted a variety of responses, notably that of Hutcheson and others, which rooted ethics in a moral sense. The significance of the Huguenots' experience and writings in the toleration debates is demonstrated, and the stimulus they provided to reflection on the limits of regal authority is noted.

In Part II, 'Aspects of Enlightenment formations', attention is drawn to the clandestine Enlightenment of which Spinoza was a prominent inspiration, and to the way in which in England, in contrast to other parts of Europe, the Enlightenment was shaped more by the city than the court. The importance of the early Enlightenment in the Dutch Republic – a home to refugees (notably Huguenots), a source of ideas and a laboratory of social reform – is demonstrated, as is the contribution made by the Dutch publishers of books, pamphlets and newspapers to the dissemination of enlightened ideas internationally. In addition, the Dutch were leaders in the field of education: newer ideas and empirical scientific investigations were encouraged, though not at the expense of belief in divine providence, as witness the Dutch 'physico-theology'. Rearguard orthodox Calvinist action notwithstanding, the tide of religious toleration (Spinoza being a catalyst) could not be held back. England, too, was much influenced by its Dutch connections and its Huguenot immigrants, while the Revolution of 1688 introduced a monarchy destined to share power with Parliament. Although the civil rights provision of the Toleration Act of 1689 were limited, the Act did encourage outside observers, Voltaire among them, to perceive England as a pioneer of tolerance and pluralism. The coffee houses and print made their contributions to the flow of ideas, as did the numerous scientific and cultural societies, clubs and Masonic lodges which sprang up in many parts of the country. Through their reading, attendance at scientific lectures and membership of those societies open to them, women became increasingly able to share in the propagation of ideas. In Germany, with its strong natural law tradition, Christian Thomasius, though himself a Christian, strove to check theological influence upon civil jurisprudence,

### *Reviews*

while pietists (whose mystical tendencies did not always preclude radical reformist inclinations), Huguenots, sceptics and Socinians all contributed to the ferment of ideas. In early Enlightenment France the court was central, cultural attainment in the higher reaches of society was high, and Louis XIV, the Sun King, was, by some, well-nigh divinized. But for all the national and provincial academies and the fashionable salons designed to bolster it, absolute monarchy was increasingly questioned, not least by the frequently clandestine but increasingly audible *philosophes*.

‘The High Enlightenment’ is the title of Part III. Questions concerning the nature of truth, humanity and God, the problem of evil, providential purpose, moral obligation and human perfectibility were raised by Christians and their critics. Also widely shared by deists, materialists, atheists and Christians (though not by Voltaire and Kant) was the goal of human happiness. If La Mettrie could declare that ‘The world will never be happy until it is atheist,’ neither Newton nor Locke could forego the hope of eternal rewards. The idea of progress and optimism that it may be achieved were further prominent strands in Enlightenment thought, though more naïve convictions concerning these were shattered by the Lisbon earthquake of 1755, and Rousseau famously read human ‘perfection’ as ‘decrepitude’. As a chronicle of scientific and other progress achieved, the *Encyclopédie* was of outstanding significance and, writing as I am in the week in which scientists have landed an exploratory device on Titan, it is pleasant to be reminded that among all the other scientific inventions of the eighteenth-century was the gravity-defying hot-air balloon. As knowledge of remoter societies increased it became ever clearer to some that human progress was relative to geographical location and historical context. So to increasing interest in the human sciences; to also to such mutually contradictory views of humanity as Hobbes’s pessimistic mechanism and traditional Christian views. Hume’s writings on the psychology of knowledge stimulated discussion, and there were numerous attempts to answer the question how far human characteristics – whether moral or gender – were naturally given or socially and culturally acquired. Some pondered the uniqueness of human beings *vis à vis* other primates. The growing spate of historical writings is discussed with reference to the less-

### *Reviews*

than-absolute distinction between ‘conjectural’ and ‘philosophical’ historians. The former, like Adam Ferguson and Adam Smith sought to delineate the stages of human history; the latter – Hume and Gibbon among them – adopted a narrative approach to historical events and issues. The dissemination of knowledge and ideas was advanced by pedagogical notions derived from Locke’s *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*. Education was seen to involve the stimulation of curiosity in order that the mind, a *tabula rasa*, might be inscribed with ideas. The doctrine of the association of ideas was propounded – supremely by David Hartley – as an explanation of the mental process whereby sensations prompt ideas which can then be associated with further ideas. Rousseau’s ‘minority report’ advocating the isolation of the individual child from society so that he can be taught unimpeded by ‘nature’ ill accorded with his view of what the education of citizens as social being required. If, to Kant, the education of the young was a disciplined affair which inculcated good behaviour conceived as obligatory, to Pestalozzi the objective was autonomous agency achieved by child-centred learning. The political step was taken when education method was employed as an aspect of the state’s policing function – a practice which appealed more to the Germans than the English. It did not go unremarked that the levelling effect of Locke’s epistemology removed the alleged grounds for distinguishing between the educational capacities of males and females. There ensued steps towards the democracy of knowledge – an idea advocated by Joseph Priestley among others.

Part IV directs our attention to ‘Polite Culture and the Arts’. From the 1730s onwards more and more people gained access to art and music through salons, exhibitions and increasingly professional concerts. A few had opportunities for travel, and an interest in landscape was gradually fostered; eventually ‘expression’ replaced ‘imitation’ as the artistic goal. There was a multifaceted discussion of ‘sensibility’ in relation to medicine, philosophy, social reform, the place of women and the French Revolution. A further term, ‘politeness’, was also a topic of debate in salons, universities, scientific societies and Masonic lodges (including those for women). As scientists revealed ever more of the secrets of nature, many artists drew inspiration from its continuing mystery, whilst

### *Reviews*

seeking to emulate the accuracy of the scientists as far as the use of colour was concerned. More classically-inspired artists continued to produce idealized representations of nature. The French *philosophes* did much to stimulate reflection upon music, as did the *Encyclopédie* (to which Rousseau contributed a number of articles on music), and the debate over the relative merits of Italian comic opera and French tragic opera. Of particular interest was the debate between Rameau and Rousseau, the former exalting harmony, the latter melody, as of the first importance in musical expression. There were discussions of the ‘meaning’ of music, while a growing acceptance of the dictum, ‘Art for art’s sake’, prompted the opinions of an increasing breed of non-practitioner critics.

Part V concerns ‘Material and Popular Culture.’ It is a tale of a vastly-expanding print culture ever more accessible to all the reaches of society (from learned tomes to handbills), of technological change, of consumer goods and social status. Encyclopedias played an important part in the transmission of (especially scientific) knowledge, the contribution of Chambers taking pride of place in Britain. Whereas English authorities adopted a more liberal stance, in France many printing activities were clandestine until the freedom of the press was deemed a natural and inalienable right in 1789. With changing ideas and social contexts, and growing economies, came changes in dress, the growing importance of the clothing trade, and a move towards washable fabrics on grounds of health and hygiene. Some spurned the enticements of luxury and devoted themselves to folk culture which, as the gap between rulers and ruled grew wider, became plebeian culture.

‘Reforming the World’ is the title of Part VI. While ideas inspired many changes, the ideas themselves were the products of diverse contexts; and there never was a single intellectual blueprint for realizing the widely-entertained aspiration that the world could be made a better place. If the *philosophes* were, so to speak, the engine of intellectual change in France, their component parts did not function without friction, and they were variously powered by deism, atheism and Christianity. Many of them, having persuaded themselves that a ‘civilization’ was known by its art and literature, were appalled when Rousseau found religion essential to virtue and

*Reviews*

branded the arts as a corrupting force in society. They were more gratified when their opposition to despotism and slavery was endorsed by increasing numbers, though none of them went so far as to contend for political or social equality. The enlightened despotism of Frederick the Great made a considerable impact, and did much to stimulate the study of government, notably at the universities of Halle and Göttingen. Republicanism, too, was revivified, not so much in the sense of popular anti-monarchical sentiment (though Paine was an exception here) as in relation to classical sources – a development typified by the writings of Machiavelli and Harrington. However, although it was classically-stimulated, eighteenth-century political thought was not for the most part inclined to the pessimism inherent in the backward-looking view that the pinnacle of political achievement had been reached in a non-recoverable past. On the contrary, there was, in some countries more than in others, growing optimism in the possibilities opened up by representative government. Diverse accounts were offered of the common good, and of the liberty deemed to be central to it. The accumulation of wealth was increasingly regarded as a sign of civic health, not as one of personal corruption. In the field of economics, the older mercantilism gave way to the realization of the importance of the colonies, and the question whether money was of value in itself, or only as a means to commerce, was widely debated. Developing markets (including those represented by those new consumers, women industrial workers) prompted much economic theorizing, amongst which Adam Smith's free market views were particularly significant. Philanthropy blossomed as the eighteenth century proceeded, but it was clear to those concerned that the provision of assistance to the needy and the establishment of new institutions was not, by itself, enough. The reform of the law was required, hence the relation of philanthropy to questions of human rights, the ending of the slave trade, both of which had international implications. At the same time, and more problematically, humanitarians were tempted to grade societies and races according to their ability to match up to enlightened ideals. Those who agreed in general on the need to reform the law differed over whether pragmatic or more idealistic considerations concerning the

*Reviews*

individual's rights and the need to check the government should take precedence. Wilkes was among those who went to court with the latter view in mind. The natural law tradition continued prominently in Germany, while Montesquieu and Beccaria, respectively, proposed that laws should reflect the current age, and that they should be framed in accordance with the principles governing the human psyche. To Bentham, natural law was redundant, and should be replaced by laws designed to increase the stock of human happiness.

'Transformations and Explorations' concern us in Part VII. The growing interest in voyages and exploration was fed by print, theatrical performances and museum displays. Among the agents prompting the creation of a unified yet diverse world were many who were not members of social elites – soldiers, sailors, and missionaries, among them the Moravians. Intellectually, the Enlightenment concept of an universal human nature was reviewed by those who wished to come to grips with the variety represented by indigenous cultures. At the same time the baleful results of voyages – the importation of firearms and of Western diseases - gave some food for thought. Fascination with the exotic fuelled a Utopian literature and an interest in paradise which was reflected even in garden design. Accompanying this was millenarian speculation, from which Newton was not immune, though there was also a compensating repudiation of 'enthusiasm'. Burke thought that undue faith in human reason was itself a species of enthusiasm; but others, remembering the Civil War and the Commonwealth sectaries, upheld the rights of reason in relation to religious belief. Priestley brought reason to bear upon scriptural interpretation, but this in no way prevented his reading contemporary events in terms of biblical eschatology. Bicheno regarded reading the sign of the times as an Enlightenment exercise in free enquiry, itself a legacy, he (questionably) thought, of the Reformation.

We come finally to Part VIII: 'The Enlightenment and its Critics, Then and Now'. A general thesis of this book, namely, that the Enlightenment is a richly variegated phenomenon, receives its most particular demonstration in the account of the University of Halle, 1690-1730, where Thomasius advocated anti-scholastic civil

### *Reviews*

philosophy, Franke espoused a version of pietism which did not entail quietism so much as the view that the world was reformable, and Wolff purveyed his anti-scholastic Leibnizian metaphysics. The very different critiques of the Enlightenment mounted by Rousseau and Burke are discussed in more detail, and a chapter is devoted to comparisons and contrasts between Enlightenment and current feminism, with special reference to Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Astell, Mary Montague and Catharine Macaulay. Perceptive and balanced accounts of the neo-Marxist critique of the Enlightenment by Adorno and Horkheimer, and the ‘post-modernist’ critique of Foucault, Derrida (both of whom declined the label) and others, bring the main text to completion.

It would be surprising if, in a work of such breadth and complexity, a few errors did not creep in. There is, for example, the declaration that self love in the eighteenth century meant what we should understand as selfishness (p.24); and the description of Birmingham as a city – a status it did not achieve until 1889 (p.113). But I turn from such minor matters to some more substantive observations.

First, there can be no question that the volume as a whole demonstrates the thesis that thought influenced developments in many contexts, but that the influence was mutual: the diverse contexts – geographical, religious, socio-political, cultural – prompted reflection in many fields. It follows that the Enlightenment was no single phenomenon - least of all a philosophical one: for thinking otherwise Jonathan Israel is criticized by Ian Hunter (pp.590-92). Wider cultural aspects apart, Martin Fitzpatrick rightly points out that ‘Enthusiasm and reason found unusual combinations at the beginning of the Enlightenment as they did at the end’ (p.83). He further observes that precisely because there were divergent strands of thought and popular opinion, some authors carefully tailored their writings to different readerships, and, as with Newton’s Socinian ideas, omitted what might prove unpalatable from their published works (p.85).

Secondly, I note the way in which toleration and associated themes rightly constitute a running theme of this book. In their different ways Locke, Bayle and Spinoza are important here, but so are the numerous refugees of the period – especially the Huguenots,

### *Reviews*

and the example of the Dutch Republic. The ripples resulting from the dissemination of ideas of toleration through print, educational institutions and travel reached to many parts of society and to many regions of Europe, albeit at different paces. The issue was not merely toleration under the law, but tolerance of diverse, even contradictory, beliefs. Conscience was elevated along with reason, and in this connection I should have welcomed a little more. Whereas we have discussions of ‘sensibility’, ‘politeness’ and the like, there is little on ‘the right of private judgment’ especially in relation to theology and Christian doctrine. The way in which all sides in the manifold (and, from our vantage-point, variously dispiriting and enjoyable) doctrinal disputes of the eighteenth century appealed to this principle is of more than passing interest; as is the more general impact of Enlightenment thought in this area: if it fostered an individualism which could adversely affect ecclesiology, it also encouraged a much needed moral critique of untoward statements of doctrine from whencesoever they came.

Thirdly, I would observe that many of the issues presented in this book are still with us: natural endowments *versus* socio-cultural influences; secular *versus* religious world views; human rights and the place of women; the legacy (now) of colonialism (in which connection the way in which many early missionaries sided with indigenous peoples against Western commercial interests should not go unnoticed); human rights in general and the place of women in particular. And what of those institutions which might be thought to have been especially concerned with enlightenment, the universities? Margaret C. Jacob writes, ‘While hardly in the vanguard of the Enlightenment, universities also practised forms of politeness ...’ (p.275). That throwaway first clause (though she notes the exception demonstrated by Ian Hunter’s in his excellent chapter on the University of Halle) prompts one to wonder whether present-day universities are in danger of ceasing to be the centres of enlightenment that the best of them had become. The inhibiting factor is no longer, in most places, a conservative clericalism, but a managerialism and *quasi*-commercialism at whose behest marketable ‘products’ are ‘delivered’ to ‘customers’. I fear I verge upon homily – but then, so does Peter Jones, who may, and probably does, have in mind the problematic notion that the

### *Reviews*

educational process should be entirely jolly and entertaining: ‘Only security in skills enables each of us boldly to experiment, confidently to explore, unashamedly to revise’, he declares (p.327). Such security is hard won, and sometimes part of the price is drudgery.

Fourthly, in a volume on the Enlightenment world it is interesting to see how, in some cases, even the most advanced writers seem now to have been singularly unenlightened. Montesquieu persuaded himself of global depopulation, and thought that in ten centuries the world would have become a desert (p.190); Priestley thought that the role of education was to prejudice children ‘in favour of our opinions and practices’ (p.220); while Kant opined that whatever was said by a person ‘black from head to foot’ could only be stupid (p.651). Before we too hastily assume the role of judges, let us ponder the question how far our existing conventions are preventing us from seeing things of importance. We shall not be able to answer the question, but two hundred years hence our heirs and successors surely will.

So to some concluding remarks: Isaac Barrow believed that because ‘one Part of Learning doth confer Light to another ... he can hardly be a good scholar who is not a general one’ (p.351). Of course, it was easier to say that prior to the explosion of knowledge which has subsequently overtaken us. Martin Fitzpatrick and his editorial colleagues were wise to call upon the resources of such an authoritative team of authors, and skilful in planning a composite work which has so high a degree of unity. No liberal arts college, university or sizeable public library should be without it.

Benjamin Franklin said he was ‘almost sorry I was born so soon, since I cannot have the happiness of knowing what will be known 100 years hence’ (p.184). From the stereotypes of the Enlightenment which some writers peddle, it would seem that they do not have the happiness of knowing what happened 200 years ago. This impressive book will come to their aid.

From time to time the contributors adjust themselves to earlier commentators on the Enlightenment, and we may be sure that as the years go by fresh insights will be gained and new interpretations will be advanced. But however great the changes (and long after the last anti-Enlightenment postmodernist has bitten

*Reviews*

the dust) this book will have continuing value; for it will stand as a witness to the way in which a group of authoritative scholars viewed the Enlightenment world near the beginning of Christianity's third millennium.

On page 8 Peter Jones writes, 'It would be a mistake to think ... that the names or achievements of those whom we discuss were known to more than a handful of their contemporaries or their descendants.' But, two hundred years on, *we* are studying them. Here is consolation indeed for any scholars whose book sales disappoint.

Alan P F Sell  
Milton Keynes

**William Gibson,** *Enlightenment prelate: Benjamin Hoadly* (1676-1761), Cambridge, James Clarke & Co., 2004, 384pp., hbk., ISBN: 0227679784, £50.

There can be few clerics in the history of the Anglican Church who have experienced the heights of eulogy and plumbed the depths of opprobrium as thoroughly and as comprehensively as Benjamin Hoadly (1676-1761) who held, successively, the bishoprics of Bangor (1714), Hereford (1721), Salisbury (1725) and Winchester (1734). In this work, which is based on a great deal of research, including an exhaustive survey of the works of one of the most prolific defenders of the Anglican Church, Dr William Gibson deals very sympathetically with a figure who was deeply embroiled in a series of controversies, and he does a great deal to rehabilitate a reputation that has long, he believes, been unjustly maligned. Although Gibson assembles a great deal of information about his subject's life and works, and although the book deals with the main events in his life in a temporal sequence, the author's main concern is not to write a biography, and although he discusses many points that are relevant to Hoadly's theology, the book is not primarily an analysis of his philosophical and theological beliefs. Gibson's main concern, he avows, is with Hoadly's manifold contributions to the defence and reform of the Anglican Church and its establishment as a truly National Church, serving as many of the people as possible.

### *Reviews*

In the first part of his career Hoadly was concerned to defend what he believed had been achieved by the Glorious Revolution of 1689 and, in particular, to defend it against the attacks of the Non-Jurors such as Francis Atterbury and Charles Leslie. The Whig supporters of the Revolutionary Settlement had discarded the notion that the authority of the monarch was founded in Divine Right, and in its place had established the concept that it was founded in the consent of the people. The same process of demystification removed the notion that the clergy derived their authority from the Apostolic Succession and a conception of Episcopal ordination that embodied that doctrine. While in spiritual matters the fount of all authority is Christ's teaching in the Gospels, the source of temporal authority in the church as well as in the state lies in the sovereign who in turn derives his authority from the consent of the people. Gibson shows how as his career developed Hoadly's aim was not just to defend the Revolutionary Settlement against its detractors, but to secure a reform of the Church that would make it much more effective as a National Church by bringing within its folds as many of the Dissenters as possible. His aims could be summed up, Gibson holds, in two words: comprehension and toleration; bringing good order and harmony into the nation by including as many as possible in the National Church, and securing toleration and religious freedom for those who could not become members of the Church. To secure his aims Hoadly needed to make it easier for Dissenters to consider rejoining the Church of England. These aims and purposes can be seen in his *The reasonableness of conformity to the Church of England*. Doubtless, everyone should consider his own private judgement and conscience as to what the scriptures require of him, but no one should allow scruples about what is not necessary to salvation to prevent his associating with fellow-Christians in the National Church.

Perhaps the defining episode in Hoadly's intellectual career was the sermon that he preached before the King and Court on 31 March 1717, on the text 'My kingdom is not of this world'. In this sermon which ushered in the Bangorian controversy Hoadly maintained that in the spiritual world, which he distinguishes sharply from the temporal, Christ alone is sovereign, and since

*Reviews*

every individual has direct access to Christ's teaching through the Gospels, there is no need to interpose a priesthood to determine what the believer is to believe. Every individual, it is true, has a duty to discover for himself what Christ requires of him, but this he can do by consulting the Gospels himself without the direction of a priest.

Underpinning Hoadly's position throughout his career was the belief that if they concentrated their attention on what is essential to redemption and salvation and were not over concerned with 'things indifferent' most Protestants could live in peace and harmony within the same religious society. Along these lines Hoadly's governing passion was for the creation of a unifying, all-inclusive Protestant Church. Throughout his career he sought ways to make things easier for Dissenters: he opposed the Occasional Conformity Bills which were designed to put an end to the practice whereby Dissenters could qualify for offices under the Crown by occasionally taking the sacrament, and he supported campaigns to repeal the Test Act by which Dissenters were prevented from obtaining offices under the Crown. Hoadly appreciated that religious liberty meant more than not being prevented from worshipping in accordance with the dictates of conscience: it also meant having access to positions of privilege and power. In this way his purposes were eminently practical: Gibson shows how successful Hoadly was during his long tenure of the see of Winchester in reclaiming Dissenters in his diocese to the Church.

As part of his rehabilitation of Hoadly's reputation, Gibson deals with accusations levelled against him: that he was an absentee and negligent bishop; that he was a time-server; that he was too fond of finding places for members of his family and friends, and that he was avaricious. Gibson lays to rest the frequently asserted error that Hoadly never visited Bangor during the time he was in charge of the diocese: Gibson shows that he did visit his diocese making the journey from Bristol by sea. Gibson also shows that Hoadly kept a full establishment at Bangor, and that he made arrangements with Bishop Wynne of St Asaph that the latter would make diocesan visitations on his behalf, journeys that his infirmities (Hoadly could walk only with the aid of crutches, and preach from a kneeling position) would have prevented his making. Gibson shows too that

### *Reviews*

Hoadly was anxious that translations into Welsh of the Book of Common Prayer should be made available in all the four dioceses in Wales. Hoadly, it is true, was not averse to pluralities and was assiduous in obtaining preferment for members of his family – he intervened to secure the Archbishopric of Dublin for his brother, John, and he appointed his son, John, to be Chancellor of Winchester – and for friends, notably Arthur Ashley Sykes, John Jackson and Edmund Pyle, but it might be held that the appointments he sought to influence, through Lady Sundon and Queen Caroline, and those he made himself were governed in part by the desire to secure the support of like-minded clerics in his quest for the reform of the Church. On the question of his alleged avariciousness Gibson shows that although he enjoyed the revenues of the rich see of Winchester for over twenty-seven years, the size of his estate at his death was but a fraction of those of some of his contemporaries on the Sacred Bench, notably Thomas Sherlock and John Shute Barrington (see p. 282).

The question naturally arises as to whether Hoadly was a consistent advocate of his main tenets. Central to his position is the belief that all should enjoy religious liberty and that everyone should be free to act in accordance with his own private judgement, and with his own conscience. The feasibility of this position is heavily dependent upon the belief that every person capable of reading the Gospels is able to determine for himself what is essential to his salvation. In the spiritual world every one is capable of deciding what it is that Christ demands of him. In these respects there is no need for a priesthood to determine what the ordinary man is to believe. The meaning of the Scriptures is perspicuous to the ordinary intelligence. The doctrine of *sola scriptura* can be taken in two ways: that the Scriptures contain all that it is necessary to believe, and that the individual who reads the Gospels does not require any other aid than his own understanding. As Gibson points out that the meaning of the Gospels is clear and perspicuous, and does not admit of controversy was widely held in pre-critical times. But for Hoadly freedom is restricted, particularly where belief touches upon actions in the temporal world. Freedom of belief and freedom of action do not extend to Roman Catholics. In the practical world the enjoyment of freedom is governed and thereby

### *Reviews*

restricted by loyalty to the sovereign who is both head of the state and head of the church. Toleration does not extend to those whose supreme loyalty is to a foreign power. Thus Hoadly's liberty is in effect liberty for Protestants. For this reason to talk of liberty of conscience in the abstract can be misleading because liberty for Hoadly is to be enjoyed only within the well defined parameters of what is sanctioned by Scripture and what is required to protect the security of the nation.

Another question that arises from Gibson's presentation concerns the extent to which Hoadly can be said to be a forerunner and progenitor of the Enlightenment in the Britain. Gibson, as we have already seen, adduces several respects in which Hoadly may be said to have inspired the Enlightenment in this country; pre-eminent is the appeal to reason, not just in the narrow sense of adducing empirical evidence, but in the larger sense of appealing to human experience. This involves a considerable degree of demystification as can be seen in his abandoning the doctrine of Apostolic Succession and his treating Episcopal ordination in a way that does not involve a mysterious transfer of power and authority from one generation to another. Hoadly shows himself willing to rely upon the capacity of the individual to search the Gospels for himself and learn from the process what he needs to do to secure salvation and to inherit eternal life. In a very strong sense he preaches the equality of men in their ability to secure their own welfare in this life and in the next. A good illustration of Hoadly's belief that essential truths are accessible to the understanding of the ordinary man is to be found in *A plain account of the nature and end of the sacrifice of the Lord's supper* (1735) in which he defends the doctrine that the significance of the Eucharist lies simply in its being a commemoration of Christ's sacrifice. Another respect in which Hoadly anticipates later thinkers of the Enlightenment lies in the emphasis he places upon making the happiness of the people, in this life and in the next, the object of policy, both in political and in ecclesiastical matters. Gibson is right to emphasize the way in which Hoadly is optimistic in his account of human destiny and in his rejection of a vengeful God in favour of a benevolent one, a God who seeks the happiness of all his creatures. In all these respects Gibson shows that Hoadly was, as he claims, a forerunner

*Reviews*

of later thinkers of the Enlightenment. There is one respect, however, in which Hoadly's teaching is not as strong an inspiration of the Enlightenment as that of some other thinkers, notably Samuel Clarke. This, I suggest, is most clearly seen in their treatment of the doctrine of candour as it touches the use of the Book of Common Prayer and the question of subscription to the Thirty-nine articles. Clarke maintained that one should only subscribe to what one can endorse as being what one believes to be true and for which there is evidence in Scripture. Clarke was clearly of the school that maintains that one should say what one believes and believe what one says. Hoadly, it seems, had a different attitude to creeds and articles of belief. In subscribing, one was attesting that the creed or the articles in question could be used in the work of the Church, without implying that one believed every proposition in the text to be true. Hoadly was much nearer than Clarke was to the tradition that held that the Thirty-nine Articles were to be treated not as 'articles of belief' but as 'articles of peace'. Hoadly's main interest was the unity of the Church and the bringing together under one roof, as it were, all the different denominations of Protestants. This certainly involved acceptance and practical commitment to all those things that are essential to salvation but no-one should allow the quest for unity, peace and harmony within the Church to be imperilled by scruples about 'things indifferent'. If this required sitting loosely to the detail of what is said to be the case, then so be it. Unity was more important for Hoadly than uniformity. Hoadly himself had no scruples about subscribing to the Thirty-nine Articles and he did not expect others to have them. On the contrary, he would not excuse a prebendary from subscribing where preferment traditionally required it, as it did when Jackson was offered a prebend at Winchester. Among many Dissenters, especially among the Unitarians, great emphasis was placed on excluding articles of belief for which there was no warrant in Scripture and clearing the mind of all that was not sustainable was not simply a matter of private judgement in a spiritual world that had little or no relevance to public commitments, but one that demanded public avowal. Among men like Priestley and Lindsey it was essential that one did not subscribe or appear to subscribe to what one did not believe to be true.

*Reviews*

Candour, thus interpreted was one of the foremost if not the foremost of all obligations. No-one would wish to deny that Hoadly was a radical reformer who did much to promote Latitudinarianism in the Anglican Church, to bring the demands that God makes of humans within the scope of the ordinary man's understanding and his capacity to obey, but the paradox remains that Hoadly was reluctant to seek the revision of the official creeds and articles that would more nearly embody what he thought essential to the faith.

Whatever reservations there may be as to Hoadly's role as progenitor of the Enlightenment in distinction from his role as a reformer of the Anglican Church, there can be little doubt that Gibson has rehabilitated Hoadly's reputation as one of the strongest intellectual forces among Anglican clerics in the eighteenth century, especially in demonstrating the ways in which the main tenets of the Christian religion can be made clear to the understanding of the ordinary man. There will be those who will complain that Hoadly's Latitudinarianism diverts attention from the riches to be found among the mysteries of the faith and the blessings that flow from the operation of grace, and, on the other hand, there will be those who will claim that Hoadly did not go far enough towards the kind of secularisation that comes from demanding evidence in support of what is claimed to be true. Yet there can be no doubt that Gibson has shown that Hoadly was a much more substantial figure than many have been willing to believe, and that he made significant contributions to the realisation of his own favourite project of showing that a greater understanding of the claims of the Christian religion is within the capacity of ordinary human beings.

D O Thomas  
Aberystwyth

**Sheldon S Cohen, *British Supporters of the American Revolution 1775-1783. The Role of the 'Middling-level' Activists*,** Boydell Press, Woodbridge, 2004, xvi + 181pp. hbk, ISBN 1 84383 011 6, £45 / \$75.

This book is a scholarly monograph based on extensive research, but the title is deceptive, for it is merely a multiple biography of

### *Reviews*

five obscure men (none famous enough to have made the new Oxford DNB), and one of whom in fact did not favour the American cause. They have been selected because the author came across them during his previous work on American prisoners during the War of Independence. That is the common link. William Hodgson (1725-84) was a London merchant of Yorkshire descent; Thomas Wren (1725-87) a Presbyterian clergyman in Portsmouth; Reuben Harvey (1734-1808) a Quaker merchant of Cork, in Ireland; Robert Heath (1741-1800) a silversmith and evangelist of Plymouth; and Griffith Williams (1741-92) a Welshman who became a London apothecary: his identification, as being from Llanelli, from among several men of the same name is admittedly not certain. The heart of the book is a series of essays on the five men. They are either deliberately meant to be self-contained, or the author distrusted the attention span of his readers, for he constantly repeats the same background information, such as the role of American-born Thomas Digges in masterminding the assistance to prisoners, and the consequences of Burgoyne's surrender at Saratoga in 1777 on the British government's treatment of American prisoners. Each of the chapters is a mini-biography from birth to death, and therefore contains much material not relevant to the theme of the American Revolution. Griffith Williams lived in London, and the description of his Carmarthenshire background has as little to do with that subject as the Cumberland origins of Portsmouth-based Thomas Wren.

Most of the American prisoners were sailors captured when raiding merchant shipping. They were regarded as British pirates and rebels, and not accorded prisoner-of-war status until 1782. This attitude meant that the treatment they received was often harsh, involving the deprivation of food, bedding, clothing, medicine, and other supplies. Sympathisers with the American cause sought to alleviate their plight, and later to expedite their exchange or escape. The roles of the five men varied significantly. William Hodgson in London was active in the raising and distribution of the necessary finances, but had little personal contact with prisoners, and was seemingly not involved in escape attempts. Thomas Wood of Portsmouth was personally concerned with the welfare of prisoners at nearby Forton Gaol, and active in assisting escapers. Robert

### *Reviews*

Heath of Plymouth brought spiritual and material comfort to prisoners at the local Mill Gaol, but out of a Christian spirit. Unlike the other four he did not support the cause of American independence, and was not therefore involved in escape attempts. Reuben Harvey was concerned with prisoners at Kinsale Gaol, near Cork: he collected money in Ireland, and took up complaints of maltreatment. Griffith Williams, whose business was at Wapping in the London dock area, was well placed to smuggle out escaped American prisoners, and engaged in this treasonable practice.

Taken together, these cameos present only an incomplete picture of an obscure part of the American War scene. Moreover the author has already used much of this material in a 1995 book on *Yankee Sailors in British Gaols: Prisoners of War at Forton and Mill 1777-1783*, and in articles on Hodgson and Wren: a footnote in the chapter on Wren(p.61) contains this revealing remark, ‘since this paper was written’. The book is a British slant on a story the author has earlier covered from another perspective.

Peter D G Thomas  
Aberystwyth

### **Books received**

Thierry Belleguic ed., *Lumen, volume/tome XXIII*, 2004, Selected Proceedings of the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies / Travaux choisis de la Société canadienne d'étude du dix-huitième siècle. Academic Printing and Publishing, Kelowna, B.C., ISSN 1209-3696; 323pp., pbk., \$29.95.

William Gibson and Robert G. Ingram eds, *Religious Identities in Britain, 1660-1832*, Ashgate, Aldershot, February 2005, ix + 338pp., hbk., ISBN 0 7546 3209 1, £47.50 / \$94.95.

Amanda Goodrich, *Debating England's Aristocracy in the 1790s. Pamphlets, Polemics and Political Idea*. The Royal Historical Society Studies in History, New Series, Woodbridge, Suffolk and Rochester N Y, The Boydell Press, x + 213pp., hbk., ISBN 0 86193 275 7 ISSN 0269-2244, £40.00 US\$80.00

*Reviews*

Jeremy Goring, *Burn Holy Fire. Religion in Lewes since the Reformation*, The Lutterworth Press, Cambridge, 2003, 192pp., pbk., ISBN 0 7188 3040 7; £17.50 / US\$35.00.

Joseph Houston, *Thomas Reid. Context, Influence and Significance*, Dunedin Academic Press, Edinburgh, Nov. 2004, ix + 192pp., hbk., ISBN 1 903765 196, £25 / \$45.

Eric Nelson, *The Greek Tradition in Republican Thought*, Ideas in Context, no. 69, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004, xv + 296 pp., hbk., ISBN 0 521 83545 2, £45.00.

Alan P F Sell, *Philosophy, Dissent and Nonconformity 1689-1920*, James Clarke and Co., Cambridge, 2003, 300pp., hbk., ISBN: 0227679776 £50•/ \$100.00.

M A Stewart, ‘Independency of the mind in early dissent’, Congregational lecture ; Congregational Memorial Hall Trust, London, 2004, 36p.

Jonathan Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the English Republic 1623–1677*, Cambridge Studies in Early Modern History, Cambridge University Press, August 2004, xi + 258 pbk., ISBN: 0521611954, £21.99 [first published in 1988 in a hardback edition which is no longer available].

Stephen Taylor and David L Wykes, *Parliament and Dissent*, Edinburgh University Press for the Parliamentary History Yearbook Trust, May 2005, viii + 160 pp., pbk., ISBN 0 7486 2195 4, £16.95.

Paul Wood ed., *Science and Dissent in England, 1688-1945*, Ashgate, Aldershot and Burlington, VT, June 2004, xiii + 274pp, hbk., ISBN 0 7546 3718 2, £50.00 / \$99.95.