

JOHN CHATER

FROM INDEPENDENT MINISTER TO SANDEMANIAN AUTHOR

John Chater is, to put it mildly, elusive. The scanty references which are made to him in relatively inaccessible books ¹ do not enlighten us as to his dates of birth or death. We know that he was an Independent minister who became a Sandemanian, and then turned to writing. Indeed, his most tangible remains are a pamphlet and a long-since-forgotten novel in three volumes, *The History of Tom Rigby*. We cannot claim that Chater is great but sadly neglected, though we hope to show that his life and writings are worth at least a passing glance, especially when viewed against the intellectual background of their day.

The son of an Aldersgate Street watchmaker, John Chater was received as a church member by the Rev. Thomas Bradbury ² of New Court, Carey Street, on 29th September 1752. With a view to the Independent ministry he attended the dissenting academy of Dr Zephaniah Marryatt ³ at Plasterers' Hall, and took his Student Trials on 16th July 1753. Chater was thus nurtured by two of the most formidable orthodox ministers of his day.

Bradbury, born at Wakefield in 1677, was trained for the ministry under Timothy Jollie at Attercliffe. He entered the ministry when only eighteen years of age, and died in harness on 9th September 1759. He supplied the pulpit at Beverley (1697-1699), and then removed to Newcastle-upon-Tyne. In 1703 he accepted an invitation to assist the Rev. John Gilpin of the Independent church at Stepney. On 10th July 1707 he was ordained to the pastoral office at Fetter Lane. Bradbury was a staunch supporter of the Protestant succession: 'From the beginning to the close of his ministry, he annually commemorated the 5th of November, as the anniversary of our deliverance from Popery and arbitrary power, by King William. On these occasions, he employed all his talents of wit and argument, against high church politics, and in deference of revolution principles, and the Hanoverian succession'. ⁴ As a consequence of his somewhat inflammatory loyalty, Bradbury was threatened with violence, and his meeting house was burned by a mob on 1st March 1709/10. Queen Anne, through her Secretary Harley, sought to buy his silence with a bishopric, but to no avail. A hired would-be assassin succeeded no better. On the contrary, it is said that when he went to Bradbury's church in order to acquaint himself with his intended victim he was converted. ⁵

Bradbury took a leading part in the Salter's Hall controversy of 1718. Arianism, the doctrine that the Son is subordinate to the Father, was being preached in the west country, notably in Exeter. Disquieted ministers in that city appealed to their London brethren for advice. The point at issue was not so much Arianism versus orthodox Trinitarianism, as subscription. Bradbury, the hotly zealous Trinitarian, was all for subscription - as was Zephaniah Marryatt who, as the dust of the controversy settled, wrote *A sober defence of the Reverend Ministers who, by a subscription, have lately declar'd their faith in the Trinity. In a humble address to the Reverend Ministers*

who were otherwise minded (1719). The subscribers had won the day by fifty-seven votes to fifty-three.⁶

Bradbury held a number of Lectureships, and was a prolific author of sermons and pamphlets. He found that some of Isaac Watts's explications of the Trinity were suspect, and would not have Watts's *Psalms* sung in his presence - the adaptations of scripture were too free and fanciful for his taste. In 1728, following a dispute over financial matters, Bradbury resigned his pastoral charge, taking a 'very considerable' proportion of the congregation with him. He was at once invited to New Court (Presbyterian) Meeting, and agreed to go provided that the New Court members united with his ex-Fetter Lane group to form an Independent church. This condition was met, and the union took place on 31st October 1728. Here Bradbury continued for over thirty years, and into this doughty orthodox company John Chater was received in 1752.

Though destined for the Independent ministry and from Bradbury's 'stable', Chater's tutor Marryatt was a Presbyterian. Trained at Clerkenwell under John Ker, he later became a D.D. of Aberdeen. Marryatt assumed tutorial duties c.1743, following a ministry to a Southwark congregation which met first in Zoar Street (Union Street) from 1712-c.1740, and then in Deadman's Place, Southwark.⁷ Marryatt continued in pastoral charge until his death. He was a considerable Greek scholar, whose relations with his students were good. Above all, he was orthodox - as the negative evidence provided by Joseph Priestley makes plain. Priestley's parents wished to place their son under Marryatt but as Priestley wrote, 'being at that time an Arminian, I resolutely opposed it, especially upon finding that if I went thither, besides giving an experience, I must subscribe my assent to ten printed articles of the strictest Calvinistic faith, and repeat it every six months'.⁸

I

On 2nd April 1752 John Chater was admitted to the list of ministers of the London Congregational Board,⁹ and in the following year he was called to Newport, Isle of Wight, where he remained until 1758.¹⁰ The Board noted in its minutes of 30th March 1756 that 'Mr. Chater is gone into the country'. Chater was dismissed from the roll of New Court on 4th July 1755, and ordained at Newport on 7th August 1756, the Rev. William Wright preaching the sermon, and the Rev. William Johnson exhorting.¹¹ On 20th March 1759 Chater was restored to the London roll of ministers, by which time he had become pastor of Silver Street, London, in succession to the Rev. Samuel Hayward.¹² In his Diary Dr Thomas Gibbons records: 'Thursd.. June 29 [1758]. Attended the Settlement of the Revd. Mr. John Chater at Silver Street. Preached on the occasion from Ps. 132: 16'.¹³ Chater thus entered into a succession of ministers stretching back to Philip Nye (1596?-1672), one of the four decided Independents at the largely Presbyterian Westminster Assembly of 1643, and a leading member of the (Congregational) Savoy Conference of 1658.¹⁴

John Chater, as we have seen, was reared among men who took their doctrine seriously. We may be forgiven for thinking that some of

them had at least a double motive: the glory of God, and a desire to outstrip their brethren in doctrinal purity and churchly propriety. Be that as it may, Chater soon created tension within his church, and between himself and his fellow ministers. We find, for example, that although the Congregational Board's list of ministers of 25th March 1760 includes the names of Chater and Samuel Pike,¹⁵ their names have subsequently been 'blue-pencilled'; and in the minutes of 18th March 1766 we are informed that it was 'Agreed that Messrs. Pike, Chater and Prentice¹⁶ are not proper persons to be continued on our list'. Why? Because the three in question had embraced Sandemanianism, and Chater had already left Silver Street towards the end of 1765. He had tried without success to remodel the church along Sandemanian lines, and the majority of the members would not have it. In fairness to Chater we must record James Bennett's verdict that 'He was not chargeable, as some, with coming in under false colours, nor is it known that he took unfair advantage of the office he had acquired while holding other sentiments, to turn all things into a new channel; though the conflict that arose might excite suspicion of such an attempt'.¹⁷

Chater joined the Sandemanians of Bull-and-Mouth Street, St Martins le Grand. On 14th December 1765 Pike resigned the pastorate of Three Cranes Meeting, Thames Street, and did likewise. This group, now meeting in a former Quaker meeting house, had begun life in 1762 at Glovers' Hall, Beech Lane, under the leadership of Robert Sandeman himself. He had come to London in 1760.¹⁸ The Sandemanians left Bull-and-Mouth Street for Paul's Alley, Barbican, in 1778.

II

A brief résumé of the rise and influence of Sandemanianism will enable us to understand the doctrines which Chater came to hold. We begin with John Glas (1695-1773), minister of Tealing. When lecturing on the Westminster Shorter Catechism Glas was 'brought to a stand' at question 26: 'How doth Christ execute the office of a King?'¹⁹ The answer, namely, that he does it by ruling over us, did not, thought Glas, square with the taking of the oath of loyalty to the anti-prelatical Solemn League and Covenant (1643). The latter claimed for the King a position for which Glas could find no biblical warrant. He therefore repudiated the idea of a national Church, concluded that local gatherings of saints comprise the true Church, and anticipated the Scottish Voluntary movement by a century.²⁰

Despite the opposition of his father, the Reverend Alexander Glas, and of his father-in-law, the Reverend Thomas Black,²¹ Glas gave practical expression to his ideas. By 13th July 1725 he had founded a 'church within a church' numbering almost one hundred members. They observed the Lord's Supper monthly, practised Christ's teaching in Matthew 13, provided for the poor in their midst, and required unanimity in all matters of doctrine and practice. In time lay - even unlettered - ministry came to be extolled by the Glasites.

On 7th September 1726, after Glas had declared in a sermon on 6th August that in contending for national covenants the fathers 'were not enlightened',²² John Willison raised the matter with the Presbytery

of Dundee. On 16th April 1728 Glas was deposed by the Synod of Angus and Mearns. His appeal was disallowed by the Commission of Assembly of 12th March 1730. Meanwhile Glas had published his ideas in *The Testimony of the King of Martyrs* (1729). The sentence of deposition was lifted in May 1739, though Glas was only to be restored to the ministry of the Established Church if he forsook principles inimical to its constitution. Some opined that this generous act *vis à vis* Glas was prompted by the Assembly's need to show forbearance to someone in view of its stand against Ebenezer Erskine and his more numerous seceders of 1733.²³

If Glas was the founder of the movement which bore his name in Scotland, his son-in-law Robert Sandeman (1718-1771) was the principal controversialist, and the one from which the English, Welsh and American churches took their name. He came into prominence with his published reply to the evangelical Calvinist James Hervey.²⁴ Hervey, who had been at Oxford with Whitefield and the Wesleys, published his *Dialogues between Theron and Aspasio* in 1755. He here defended the doctrine of imputed righteousness - 'imputed nonsense' snorted the Arminian John Wesley; and in the twelfth item in his *A Preservative against Unsettled Notions in Religion* (1758) Wesley sought to prove the point. Hervey, finding Wesley's diatribe 'palpably weak',²⁵ wrote *Eleven Letters* in reply, and these were published posthumously by his brother William in 1766.

Sandeman's *Letters on Theron and Aspasio* (1757) appeared under the pseudonym Palaemon. The motto on the title page is 'One thing needful'; and Sandeman's major contention is that since guilty sinners can do literally nothing towards their own salvation, simple assent to the apostolic testimony concerning the finished work of Christ will save them: 'Every doctrine... which teaches us to do or endeavour any thing towards our acceptance with God, stands opposed to the doctrine of the apostles; which, instead of directing us what to do, sets before us all that the most disquieted conscience can require, in order to acceptance with God, as already done and finished by Jesus Christ'.²⁶ He thus opposed those preachers - Erskine, Whitefield and others - who, he claimed, encouraged sinners to believe that the 'favourable symptoms' of their own hearts were the ground of their acceptance by God, and the evidence of their being 'in favour with God'.²⁷ For him faith is intellectual assent to an understood divine testimony; introspection and emotionalism are to be shunned.

Not surprisingly, some in that nick-naming age charged the Sandemanians with antinomianism. No doubt it could be but a short step from 'All had been done by Christ whatever we feel' to 'All has been done by Christ no matter what we do'. But as far as we can discover the majority of Sandemanians seemed burdened with quasi-Pharisaic obligations rather than the reverse. For example, whereas a sinning excommunicated member could be restored to fellowship once, he could not be so restored after a subsequent offence.

Glas and Sandeman sought a pure church order; they determined to extol the sole sufficiency of grace; and they opposed (with some justification) revivalistic excesses. But their propensity for fashioning

'new laws' led in time to factions of a most disintegrative kind;²⁸ and their way of asserting their 'anti-works' view of justification turned the work of Christ into something that we could take or leave in a coldly cerebral way. In any case, as Edward Williams said, 'A simple assent is a work, an act, of the human mind, no less truly than trust, reliance, confidence, or any other branch of obedience'.²⁹

III

Many were influenced by Sandemanian teaching, or by certain aspects of it, though not all left the denominations to which they belonged. We have seen how John Chater and other Independent ministers came under Sandemanian influence in London. Benjamin Ingham, the north-country evangelist, also became interested in the movement after reading Glas's *Testimony* and Sandeman's *Letters*. He sent two of his preachers, William Batty and James Allen to Scotland, where they met Sandeman in Edinburgh and Glas in Dundee. Allen was converted to their doctrine and practice, with devastating effects upon the Inghamite societies. Of his break with Ingham William Romaine wrote (c.1780), 'There was a blessed work of God among the people, till that horrid blast from the North came and destroyed all'.³⁰

John Wesley had meanwhile begun to denounce Sandemanianism. For all his objections to Hervey concerning imputed righteousness, he sprang to his friend's defence in his *A Sufficient Answer to Letter to the Author of Theron and Aspasio* (1757). On the question of the nature of justifying faith Wesley was at one with Hervey against the 'stark, staring nonsense' of Sandeman. Indeed, were Sandeman's doctrine true, 'every devil in hell will be justified and saved'. The tract ends with a prayer that God will show compassion upon Sandeman: 'Otherwise it will be more tolerable, I will not say for Seneca and Epictetus, but for Nero or Domitian, in the day of judgment than for thee...'.³¹

In 1765 Wesley published *The Scripture Way of Salvation. A Sermon on Ephesians ii. 8*. This was a revision of his sermon on the same text of 1738. In it he carefully defines the nature of saving faith over against Sandemanianism which, as we have seen, had by now reached London. It was from London on 4th January 1768 that Wesley wrote a letter to the Countess of Huntingdon in which he summarised his own position:

If it is the Holy Spirit that bears witness, then all speaking against that witness is one species of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. And when this is done by those who peculiarly profess to honour Him, it must in a peculiar manner grieve that blessed Spirit. Yet, I have been surprised to observe how many who affirm salvation by faith have lately run into this; running full into Mr Sandeman's notion that faith is merely an assent to the Bible, and not only undervaluing but even ridiculing the whole experience of the children of God. But so much the more do I rejoice that your Ladyship is still preserved from that spreading contagion, and also enabled plainly and openly to avow the plain, old, simple, unfashionable gospel.³²

Wales was not immune to Sandemanian influence, but in order to indicate the impact of the teaching there we have first to return to Scotland - this time to those seceders from the Established Church, who, by reason of their refusal to accept the rightness of an oath to be imposed upon all town burgesses, became, in 1747, the Antiburgher Synod.³³ One of the Antiburgher ministers, Robert Carmichael of Coupar Angus, was the first of several of his brethren to embrace Glas's views. His session and congregation complained to Presbytery, and his case was brought on 11th November 1761:

The doctrines propounded by him were such as these: that faith is not the instrument but the fruit of justification; that there is no authority in Scripture for making the gospel call universal; and that in exhorting unbelievers about what they are to do to escape the wrath and curse of God we only encourage them to work out a righteousness of their own. He must also have startled his people when he told them that there is no warrant in the New Testament for National Churches or national covenanting, and that the Presbyterian system of Church government never had a being until Calvin. Refusing to retract, Mr Carmichael was suspended from the exercise of his ministry, and the case went before the Synod.³⁴

In 1762 Carmichael was appointed pastor of a Glasite church in Glasgow, where he was joined by his friend Alexander M'Lean, a Glasgow printer and bookseller. A year later they both resigned over a case of church discipline and, after searching the scriptures, espoused believers' baptism. Thus began the Scotch Baptists who by 1800 had churches as far afield as London (1792), Chester, Beverley, Hull, Whitehaven and Liverpool. In church order they resembled (denying that they 'followed') the Glasites. Communion was held weekly - in their case for baptised believers only; they held love feasts, insisted on unanimity in all matters of doctrine and order, and married 'only in the Lord'.³⁵

M'Lean's teaching did more than anything else to promote Sandemanianism in Wales. There had indeed been earlier Sandemanian apostles in the Principality, John Popkin of Swansea and David Jones of Cardiganshire - a nephew of Daniel Rowland, one of the founders of Welsh Calvinistic Methodism - among them.³⁶ These were active in 1765-6, and were opposed by Rowland's co-founders, Howel Harris and William Williams, Pantycelyn.³⁷ Harris had personal dealings with Popkin,³⁸ and Williams declared of Sandemanianism that 'It chills one's feelings until they despise Heaven's pure breezes'.³⁹ It was no doubt because of the opposition of Harris and Williams that the historian of Welsh Calvinistic Methodism was able to say:

A few individuals in the Methodist body, in the early part of its history, set themselves up as teachers of Antinomian, Sandemanian, and some other strange doctrines... but as their vagaries did not in any perceptible degree affect the Connexion, nor ... form a subject of dispute at any one of its Associations, I have not thought it worthwhile to make any reference to them in the ensuing pages.⁴⁰

The Welsh Baptists did not fare as well - and here we recall M'Lean. In 1796 John Richard Jones, the influential minister of Ramoth Chapel, Llanfrothen, Merionethshire, began to propagate Sandemanianism. Prompted by the writings of M'Lean he came to preach faith as intellectual assent. He introduced 'primitive' practices, and denounced enthusiastic expressions of religious fervour - especially jumping. Christmas Evans joined his crusade in 1795, but in 1798, to Evans's disappointment, Jones left 'the Babylonish Welsh Baptists, and in conscience he separated himself from their errors in doctrine and practice, in order to unite himself to the brethren in Scotland, who received the truth'.⁴¹ Evans reverted to Baptist orthodoxy, and re-formed the damaged North Wales Baptist Association in Anglesey in 1802.

Unlike the Calvinistic Methodists the Welsh Baptists discussed the views of Sandeman and M'Lean in their Association and Quarterly Meetings from 1750 onwards, and also in *Y Cylchgrawn Cymraeg*.⁴² J. R. Jones, however, was all for the local church, and conceded no status to wider groupings. Amongst his followers, in North Wales as in South, such secessions as occurred were generally prompted by the Sandemanian-style requirement of unanimity in doctrine and practice as a precondition of communion.⁴³

It remains only to add that towards the end of our period the English Baptist Andrew Fuller⁴⁴ came into contact with the M'Leanites in Scotland, for they were supporters of Fuller's missionary endeavours. Fuller thus had the embarrassing task of looking gift horses in the mouth, for he could accept neither the details of Sandemanian church practice nor the Sandeman-M'Lean view of justifying faith. In particular he did not see how M'Lean could declare that 'faith is a duty, if it contain no holy exercise of the heart'.⁴⁵ Fuller challenged M'Lean in the appendix to his work, *The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation* (1781), and in 1810 he published his *Strictures on Sandemanianism*. His complaint may be summed up thus: Sandemanianism 'is a bare belief of bare truth'. It excludes 'everything pertaining to the will and the affections, except as effects produced by it'.⁴⁶

Robert Sandeman had been in his grave for nearly forty years when Fuller's *Strictures* were published. At no time had he yielded under the weight of pamphlets which were directed against him. In 1764 he had taken his message to America, accompanied by Andrew Olifant and James Cargill,⁴⁷ and there he died on 2nd April 1771. The crucial debating point as between the Sandemans and the evangelical Calvinists and Arminians emerges in a comparison of the inscription on Sandeman's tombstone with Howel Harris's *Last Message and Dying Testimony*. On Sandeman's tomb at Denbury, Massachusetts are the words: 'Here lies until the resurrection, the body of Robert Sandeman, who, in the face of continual opposition from all sorts of men, long and boldly contended for the ancient faith; that the bare death of Jesus Christ, without a deed or thought on the part of man, is sufficient to present the chief of sinners spotless before God'. For his part Harris distinguishes between viewing and speaking of Christ, and possessing him, and says that the preacher is called 'not to speak of what we have had from the LORD, but what we have now, afresh from him'.⁴⁸

IV

So much for the origin and spread of the doctrine which John Chater came to embrace. What became of him after he left his independent pastorate? At first he kept a bookshop with Thomas Vernor on Ludgate Hill. Shortly he removed to Cheapside, as H. R. Plomer notes:

CHATER (JOHN), bookseller in London, King Street, Cheapside, 1767-8. In the issue of the *Daily Chronicle* of March 31st, 1767, he advertised a sale of books; but he does not seem to have been a publisher. His name occurs in Kent's *Directory* for the year 1768. In partnership for a time with T. Vernor.⁴⁹

In 1767 a one-shilling pamphlet, written by Chater under the pseudonym 'Ignotus', was 'printed for T. Vernor and J. Chater'. Its title was, *Another high road to HELL. An essay on the Pernicious and destructive Effects of the Modern Entertainments from the PULPIT. Occasioned by a Pamphlet entitled The Stage a High Road to Hell.* The full title of the latter pamphlet, also of 1767, is *The Stage the High Road to Hell: being an essay on the pernicious nature of Theatrical Entertainments; showing them to be at once inconsistent with Religion, and subversive of Morality. With Strictures on the vicious and dissolute Characters of the most eminent Performers of both sexes. The whole enforced and supported by the best Authorities both Antient and Modern.* In his prefatory address to the Reverend Mr Madan the anonymous author declares that 'all arts are proofs of the degeneracy of the human species', and of man's forfeiture by the Fall of 'his first exalted condition'. But if this is true of art in general, 'theatrical art must surely be allowed to be the height and summit of all corruption, since the stage shews man to man; that is, shews a fallen creature to himself, and, by laying before him all the various abuses to which the depravity of his nature has subjected him, renders him still more prone to sin... The theatre, then, as it is but a representation of what passes in the heart of man, cannot be considered by any sober christian but as a sink of impurity' which 'conducts to the rocks of perdition'. There follows an extensive catalogue of dramatic and thespian degradation which encompasses Hamlet and Vanbrugh, and in which the singers at the French opera are the epitome of degradation. The author recognises that he will be branded a bigot, 'but I have acquitted my conscience' - without, however, disclosing his name.

In his preface Chater avers that the office of preacher is not in itself a subject of ridicule. However, 'such as God has fitted for that service have a divine right to speak the truth of God as they are able, but, we cannot say they have a divine right to betray or corrupt it... In short, the following pages do not reflect on the clergy for being clergy, but for corrupting the truth and misleading their followers'. The text runs to thirty-five pages, and in it Chater argues that the shame of the immoral player is as nothing compared with the shame of the immoral preacher. Only by the word of God can 'the pernicious nature, and damnable tendency of the modern Pulpit-Entertainments... be discovered.'⁵⁰ There is a devout as well

as a profane way of going to hell, and many preachers are to be found in that way. Chater criticises them in true Sandemanian fashion. Some preachers, for example, call us to a religion of works - 'a sober, virtuous, well-spent life is the best preparative for death'.⁵¹ Others say that we must repent and believe - but this is still to trade in works, for 'it hinges all the hope of a sinner on the sincerity of his faith and repentance'.⁵² The truth is that the gospel 'affords a reason of hope and joy to sinners, without any occasion for a concert of their own sincerity to encourage their hope: And that our faith can never be proved to be unfeigned, but by its having the same effects as it used to have in all such who knew the grace of God in truth'.⁵³ Our true hope arises solely from what Christ has done, and those who share that hope are, unlike grasping, materialistic, honour-seeking preachers, busy in good works.

V

Chater's other publication is his three-volume novel, *The History of Tom Rigby*, which appeared in 1773 (though the title page wrongly gives 1733) at 7s 6d. It was printed for T. Vernor in St Michael's Alley, Cornhill; and J. Boosey, King Street, Cheapside.⁵⁴ In view of the scarcity of this novel⁵⁵ we shall do well briefly to outline its theme.

Mr John Wilkins, a Northamptonshire farmer, meets Alice Jetcombe at Widow Rigby's house, falls in love with her, and marries her. Alice was Mrs Turnbull's maid, and Squire Turnbull fails to conceal his designs upon her even though she is now married - at which point young Tom belabours him with a thorn bush. After further persistence on the Squire's part the Wilkins remove to another farm. There follows the history of Widow Rigby, in the course of which we are introduced to the Kingsleys of Oxfordshire. Charles Kingsley, a clergyman, is courting the doctor's daughter, Maria Wakefield. She rejects his proposal of marriage and he is 'struck of an heap'. Undeterred he presses his suit, and many pages later she falls in love with him. He goes off to visit his mother, and there follows news of his death. The distraught Maria leaves the district. Tom grows up and goes to Cambridge, all intending him for the Church. On a journey between Cambridge and home he saves a Mr Hillaston from ruffians in a wood, and the two become firm friends.

In volume two Lydia Bennett falls in love with Tom, and then comes Hillaston's history at length. He is a tormented soul who has incestuous desires for his sister. The said sister introduces Tom to her friend Maria Leeson, and he is smitten by her charms. But there is Lydia back at home, and during a vacation from college Tom realises that his 'heart had fallen a victim to her charms, had not the idea of the lovely Maria engrossed it'. Finding that a Captain Coates has designs upon Maria, Tom engages the soldier in a duel. The soldier is more seriously wounded than our hero, and thus Tom wins Maria. As a surgeon is dressing Coates's wound, the Captain notices Tom's ring. Tom explains that it is a keepsake from a family friend, Mrs Wilcox - and she turns out to be Coates's sister! A message from Berkshire informs Tom that Mrs Rigby is dying, and he hastens home to see her. Just prior to expiring she informs Tom that she is not his mother, and

that Wilkins will tell him who is. Wilkins, however, is too embarrassed to oblige, and it is not until Mrs Leeson realises the strength of Tom's love for her daughter Maria that she confesses that she is Tom's mother: 'The dreadful sounds were more than Rigby could support: He fell prostrate to the floor'. His mother explains that she had secretly married Kingsley against her father's wishes, and that when he died she became Mrs Leeson. Tom's distress is exacerbated by the thought that he could, unwittingly, have in reality entered into the kind of relationship with his sister which Hillaston desired with his. That unhappy fellow has meanwhile written a letter announcing his intention to take his own life, and news of his death is received to the distress of Hannah Wilkins, who loves him.

As volume three opens Tom, saved from incest, now professes his love for Lydia. She 'gave him room to hope for every thing; and restraining her own fondness, also kept his transports within due bounds'. We then return to Hillaston who is on the point of committing suicide. He purchases laudanum from an apothecary, drinks the potion, and then begins to have doubts: 'I was no longer for this world: but had I a right to rush into the other, at my own will and pleasure?' He thinks of eternal torment and cannot pray. He reads the Psalms, but alighting on words threatening the wrath of God, 'My hair rose on end, my flesh crept on my bones'. He throws himself to the floor - and awakes in bed, the apothecary having suspected his suicidal intention and given him a sleeping draught! 'What thanks do I owe to the God of mercy', cries Hillaston, 'for redeeming me from eternal misery! It shall be my employment in life to pay them'. As his new experience strengthens his old passion for his sister vanishes insensibly. Hannah and Hillaston are reunited, and Rigby takes the stage once more. His mother is dying, and Mr Leeson, having discovered his wife's former association with Kingsley, is angry and jealous. Mrs Leeson begs for forgiveness: 'My life is the sacrifice of my crimes, and may it atone for them' - and Leeson relents. Rigby returns to Berkshire to find that Lydia is reported dead. He and Hillaston take a trip to the continent, and meet up with Mr Chapman, who, by coincidence, was Wilcox's accomplice in the abduction of Lydia who is not, after all, dead. On returning to England they find the convent where Lydia now lives just as a fire is breaking out. By yet another coincidence Lydia jumps from a window into Tom's arms. Tom finds that he has been left a legacy if he takes the name of Kingsley - which he does, and there follow marriages. Hillaston marries Hannah; Tom marries Lydia; Hillaston's sister marries Chapman; Coates marries Maria Leeson. Oh, and Wilcox, his evil deeds discovered, commits suicide. As for the Kingsleys: 'This amiable couple beheld with joy their virtues reflected, in the smiling offspring which Heaven gave them, to crown their pure and constant loves. Reader, imitate their actions - Be good and be happy!'

VI

Our swift telling of Chater's tale accentuates the jerkiness of his plot, but it must be confessed that the joins do show. We have narrative, though many of the characters remain cardboard cut-outs. Life histories are inserted to the detriment of the flow of the story, and coincidences abound. Not one but two people are believed to be

dead but are then found alive after all; Coates turns out to be Mrs Wilkins's brother, Mrs Leeson to be Tom's mother. Obeisance is done to the prevailing cult of sentimentality - as when the females languish to order; and the marriages at the end are too neat and tidy to be fully believable. A contemporary reviewer was quick to complain:

A plentiful but homely entertainment, ill-suited to the delicate taste of those who are accustomed to the literary dainties provided by your Cervantes, your Marivauds, your Fieldings, and other celebrated mental cooks. - It may, however, go down well enough with those who only gape and swallow: and to whom, like the ostrich, it is immaterial whether you are treating them with biscuits or hobnails.⁵⁶

But there is something to be said on the other side. First, there is delightful humour in much of the writing. For example, when, near the beginning of the novel, a bull brings the shy Wilkins and Alice together, it is as if Chater is gently mocking his own mechanics:

A friendly bull in the adjoining field, whether seized with sympathetic compassion for the farmer's case, or perplexed, perhaps, himself with some of those vexatious obstacles that cruelly retard the happiness of lovers, presented himself on the summit of a bank; and roaring hideously, was aiming to make his passage over a ditch before him...

Thus Wilkins becomes Alice's protector. There is something very convenient too about the way in which Lydia fell from a horse 'into Rigby's arms (who was on one knee on the earth)'.

Secondly and more seriously, Chater provides a pioneering treatment of incest in this novel. To our twentieth-century sceptical ears Hillaston may not be the 'warning' that Chater intended him to be, but he does engage our sympathy, and it is worthwhile to return to this part of the book.⁵⁷ Hillaston speaks: 'Oh... my disorder is beyond the reach of medicine or advice... Why was I born? Why do I exist?... I have determined to open my heart to you, Rigby... you only shall know that which is an impenetrable mystery to the rest of the world'. He proceeds to recount his incestuous thoughts concerning his sister: 'My distracted imagination could receive but one idea, and that was the only one which, by the laws of society, nature and religion, I was forbidden to indulge'. He travelled far and wide, avoiding home and his sister, but to no avail: 'The greater distance I was from England, the more severe was my distress'. He was so jealous of Sir Andrew Clements, his sister's suitor, that he warned him off and threw him into a pond - 'he was but little hurt, tho' much frightened'. After this lengthy recital, 'Rigby sat motionless, lost in thought, and froze with horror at the recital of the dreadful story'. He then says, 'You must be weaned from this unhappy affection by gentle means... a remedy that operates and heals too hastily, never has a proper effect... Open your heart to me, Hillaston; let us probe this wound to the bottom, before we proceed to heal it'.

This treatment of incest is interesting in a number of ways. First, the incest was in Hillaston's mind. He did not actually commit

the crime (as he might do in a present-day novel); and the power of his dilemma is in no way lessened as a result. The torment of the unhappy mind is well drawn. Secondly, Chater makes Rigby tender - to us even commonplace - in his response. There is something of 'a trouble shared is a trouble halved' about his reply. But that this liberal and warm-hearted reply should have been made at all in an age which took so seriously the thought of going against the grain of nature, is significant. Hillaston would not have been surprised if his revelation had immediately ended his friendship with Rigby. But it did not. Finally we note that at no time does Rigby preach Sandemanianism to Hillaston. Rigby is the homespun psychologist, not the preacher.

Thirdly, Chater's novel must be seen in its context. He was but one of an increasing number of authors who was out to catch an audience through the bookshops and circulating libraries. It is estimated that whereas between 1700 and 1740 about seven novels only appeared per annum, between 1770 and 1800 the number had increased to forty.⁵⁸ Of these works the vast majority are today unread - even unknown. Chater's literary ploys were typical of many of his novelist contemporaries; and even such a better-known work as Goldsmith's *The Vicar of Wakefield* (1766) presents us with but one real character, the Vicar, who is surrounded by a number of eighteenth-century cut-outs. Moreover Goldsmith's plot has scarcely more shape than Chater's. Again, if Chater is sentimental, so is Goldsmith; but neither is mawkishly sentimental, and some adverse critics too easily pour scorn on those who are simply honouring the conventions of their age.

As for Chater's 'coincidences', it will not be forgotten that the better-known Walpole's *Princess Isabella*, fleeing from the angry lord of the *Castle of Otranto* (1764), was made aware of a secret trap door by a ray of moonshine which shone right on cue. Chater gives us no 'horrors' - in a word, he is the more believable of the two authors. Again, unlike Thomas Holcroft and others who were to follow him, Chater does not bear the sword (or achieve the hortatory dullness) of the social reformer. He does not display a Godwin's perfectibilism. Rather, he is in the tradition of 'my station and its duties', - though even here he allows himself some gentle mockery of the 'orders', as when he writes of the marriage of Wilkins and Alice: 'Let it be observed, for the sober reflection of the rich and exalted, that in some scarce instances, a sort of happiness prevails among the lower classes of people, almost equal (at least in appearance) to that which splendour and wealth are supposed uniformly to ensure to the possessors. It is, no doubt, a deception on the poor creatures, though an happy one'.⁵⁹

Finally, in a way quite typical of its age, *Tom Rigby* is designed to 'improve' the reader. There is an underlying and unrepentant didacticism here which accords well with the eighteenth-century understanding of nature, as an order operating in accordance with immutable laws. Humans are by no means exempt from these laws, and when they flout them it is the worse for them. At times the didacticism rises to the surface. Thus, mothers are advised that 'you render but an ill compliment to yourselves, or to your children, when you express something like wonder at finding them rational creatures'.⁶⁰ The philandering Squire is riding for a fall: 'But surely the day will come, when the proud oppressor shall repent of his injustice... when

humility and modest virtue shall be exalted, and the proud and scornful abased'.⁶¹ From his Mother's death-bed testimony Tom will learn two things: 'that a disingenuous concealment of truth from those who have a right to know everything concerning you is attended with the most dangerous consequences; and that, to scorn the admonitions of parental tenderness is but the beginning of woe'.⁶² And, as already pointed out, we readers are to be good and happy.

VII

The verdict of time upon John Chater is our verdict too. He was a man of the eighteenth century, whose ideas and literary remains could scarcely outlive their time. Indeed it is his eighteenth-century-ness which forms the link between his Sandemanianism and his writings. The same sense of natural order which pervades the novel rebukes the disorder of religious enthusiasm - did not Samuel Johnson define 'enthusiasm' as 'a vain confidence of divine communication'? Enlightenment men were not easily bowled over by fervour - they recalled all too easily, and with horror, the sectarian bitterness of the previous century. Their typical literary men did not lay bare their souls; rather they uttered timeless truths after the manner of the ancients. In this somewhat 'cerebral' soil Sandemanianism could, and did, take root. Just as Chater's literary style was to be superseded by a romanticism which emphasised one's response to nature and vice versa, and led to descriptive writing (as to landscape painting) of a kind untried by Chater, and to the involvement of the author in his novel as something more than a spectator, so the warmth of evangelicalism enveloped and eventually eradicated Sandemanianism.

There is pathos in the remark of Sandemanianism's most distinguished son, Michael Faraday (1791-1867). In answer to a question of Lady Lovelace he replied that he belonged to 'a very small and despised sect of Christians, known, - if known at all - as Sandemanians'.⁶³ At the 1851 religious census six Sandemanian churches only were noted in England, and on 30th March of that year a total of 756 attendances at Sandemanian worship were recorded. The last Sandemanian church in America became extinct in 1890; two survive in Britain to this day.

John Chater was true to his light; but his light was flickering badly even before his century was out.

NOTES

1. Principally Walter Wilson, *History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches and Meeting-Houses in London, Westminster and Southwark*, III, 1810, pp.111-113. James Bennett, *The History of the Church in Silver Street, London, delivered at the laying of the foundation stone of their New Chapel in Falcon Square, on the seventeenth of May, MDCCCXLII*, 1842, p.19. See also D. Bogue and J. Bennett, *History of Dissenters*, IV, 1812, p.121; *Congregational Historical Society Transactions*, I, p.384; II, pp.57, 58, 60.

2. For Bradbury (1677-1759) see *DNB*; Bogue and Bennett, *op.cit.*, III, pp.489-495; G. Eyre Evans, *Vestiges of Protestant Dissent*, 1897, p.182; T. S. James, *The History of the Litigation and Legislation respecting Presbyterian Chapels and Charities*, 1867, pp.690, 715; J. A. Jones, *Bunhill Memorials*, 1849, pp.10-13; A. W. Light, *Bunhill Fields*, I, 1913, pp.191-193; *History of the Bunhill Fields Burial Ground*, 1902, pp.34-36; J. G. Miall, *Congregationalism in Yorkshire*, 1868, pp.229, 374; A. Peel, *The Congregational Two Hundred*, 1948, p.91; W. Wilson, *op.cit.*, III, pp.450-452, 504-535; *Id.*, MSS, Dr. Williams's Library, III, pp.451, 505, 515; *Cong.Hist.Soc.Trans.*, I, p.31; II, pp.315-316; IV, pp.85,339; V, pp.7, 145; VII, pp.110, 112, 213ff, 305; XIV, p.231; XVI, pp.14, 165-166; XX, p.216; *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society*, XI, pp.451, 505, 515.
3. For Marryatt (1684?-1754) see *A Sermon occasioned by the sudden death of the Reverend and learned Zephaniah Marryatt, D.D. preached in Southwark, September the 22nd. By Thomas Hall. To which is added, The Funeral Oration at his Interment, by Thomas Towle. Both published at the People's Request*, 1754; E. E. Cleal, *The Story of of Congregationalism in Surrey*, 1908, p.11; R. W. Dale, *History of English Congregationalism*, 1907, p.536; T. S. James, *op.cit.*, pp.670, 696, 709, 716; H. McLachlan, *English Education under the Test Acts*, 1931, pp.176, 178, 179; J. Waddington, *Surrey Congregational History*, 1866, p.292; W. Wilson, *op.cit.*, IV, 1814, pp. 99-103; *Cong.Hist.Soc.Trans.*, I, pp.323, 326; II, pp.55,57,205; VII, pp.170, 306; XIV, p.88.
4. W. Wilson, *op.cit.*, III, p.510.
5. Wilson suspects that he will 'scarcely be believed' at this point, but claims 'indubitable proof'. *Op.cit.*, III, p.512.
6. Some who voted against subscription were nevertheless trinitarians. Indeed, in a letter the non-subscribers disavowed Arianism and asserted trinitarianism.
7. Marryatt also preached a series of sermons at Gravel Lane. These were published under the title, *The Exalted Saviour, or Jesus Christ the Lord and God of True Believers*, 1719. For his subscription (1732) to *A Declaration as to some controverted points of doctrine*, see G. F. Nuttall, *New College London and its Library*, 1977, p.21 n.41.
8. J. Priestley, 'Autobiography' in his *Works*, ed. J. T. Rutt, 1817-1831, I, p.21.
9. References are to the *Minutes* of the Board for the dates in question. The *Minutes* are at DWL. See also, 'London Congregational Board', *Cong.Hist.Soc.Trans.*, II, pp.50-60; but note that on p.60 Chater's name is wrongly omitted from a minute of 18.3.1766.
10. In the *Short History of the [Congregational] Church [Newport] as read on ... its 250th Anniversary ... 1912*, 1912, Chater's surname only is given as one who had a brief ministry there. He is likewise listed only in C. E. Surman, *Outline notes on three hundred years of Congregational ministry in Hampshire; with many Presbyterian antecedents*, typescript 1961, DWL MS 201.19.

11. Probably William Wright (d.1787), then of Ringwood, Hants. It is not clear which William Johnson is in question. Wilson states that their ordination addresses were published, but they have not so far come to light.
12. For Hayward (1718-1757) see J. Bennett, *op.cit.*, p.18; N. W. Boccock, *Abbey Lane Congregational Church, Saffron Walden, 1933*, p.3; W. Densham and J. Ogle, *The Story of the Congregational Churches of Dorset, 1899*, p.194; G. E. Evans, *op.cit.*, p.201; J. A. Jones, *op.cit.*, p.81; *London Congregational Directory*, ed. A. Mearns, 1889, p.20; J. Murch, *A History of the Presbyterian and General Baptist Churches in the West of England, 1835*, pp.292, 296; W. Wilson, *op.cit.*, III, pp.106-111.
13. See W. H. Summers, 'Dr. Thomas Gibbons' Diary', *Cong.Hist.Soc.Trans.*, I, p.384. For Gibbons (1720-1785) see *DNB*; J. Gadsby, *Memoirs of the Principal Hymn Writers of the 17th, 18th, and 19th Centuries, 1882*, p.62; J. A. Jones, *op.cit.*, p.56; J. Julian, *Dictionary of Hymnology (1892)*, 2nd ed. 1907, p.420; H. McLachlan, *op.cit.*, *passim*; W. T. Whitley, *Baptist Bibliography*, I, p.218; W. Wilson, *op.cit.*, III, p.68, 178-183; *Protestant Dissenter's Magazine*, 1795, pp.489-493; *Cong.Hist.Soc.Trans.*, I, pp.313-329; II, pp.21-38; IV, pp.160, 245, 356; V, p.268; VII, pp.225,227,306; XII, pp.324,333; XIV, p.89; XVI, p.7; XVII, p.65; XVIII, p.61.
14. For Nye see *DNB*. The other clear Independents at Westminster (all in *DNB*) were Thomas Goodwin, William Bridge and Sydrach Simpson. Although he approved of a parochial rather than a gathered church order, Jeremiah Burroughes joined them in publishing *An Apologetical Narration (1643)*. William Carter added his name to their 'dissent' over church government on 9th December 1644, and the *Reasons* for the objections were published in 1648, William Greenhill now joining the signatories.
15. For Samuel Pike (c.1717-1773) see *DNB*; W. H. Summers, *History of the Congregational Churches in the Berks, South Oxon and South Bucks Association, 1905*, pp.117-118; W. Wilson, *op.cit.*, II, 1808, pp.85-99; *Cong.Hist.Soc.Trans.*, IV, pp.230-232; VII, p.306; XIV, p.88. Educated at Stepney, he ministered at Henley (c.1740-1747), Three Cranes, Fruiterers Alley, Thames Street, London (1747-1765). From 1757 he was inclined to Sandemanianism. After a period with his new co-religionists at Bull-and-Mouth Street (1765-1771) he became minister to the Sandemanians at Trowbridge until his death.
16. For Thomas Prentice see W. Wilson, *op.cit.*, I, p.386; *Cong.Hist.Soc. Trans.*, I, p.389; II, pp.59,60; IV, pp.29,32. He was educated at Mile End Academy, and served as assistant minister at Little St. Helen's, London (1762-64), and as minister (1764-1766). He was subsequently removed to Nottingham, where he was living as a manufacturer in 1808.
17. J. Bennett, *op.cit.*, p.19.
18. For Sandeman and Glas see *DNB*. For the Glasites, see J. Ross, *A History of Congregational Independency in Scotland, 1900*, ch.III; H. Escott, *A History of Scottish Congregationalism, 1960*, ch.III; J. T. Hornsby, 'The teaching of John Glas', *The Evangelical Quarterly*,

XII, 1940, pp.151-171; D. B. Murray, 'The Influence of John Glas', *Scottish Church History Society Records*, XXII, Part I, 1984, pp.45-56. For Sandemanianism, see Bogue and Bennett, *op.cit.*, pp.106-125; W. Wilson, *op.cit.*, III, pp.261-276; John Evans, *A Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World*, 12th ed., 1811, pp.206-209. For the prima facie astounding view that Sandemanianism remains to this day an evil to be counterated, see D. M. Lloyd-Jones, 'Sandemanianism', in *Profitable for Doctrine and Reproof*, Puritan Conference 1966, pp.54-71. See also n.19 following.

19. *An Account of the Life and Character of Mr. John Glas*, 1813, p.v.
20. For confirmation of this opinion, see e.g. J. MacLeod, *Scottish Theology in relation to Church History since the Reformation* (1943), 1974, p.186.
21. *Life of Glas*, pp.ix-x.
22. *Ibid.* pp.xi-xiv.
23. For the doctrinal background and relevant sources see A. P. F. Sell, *The Great Debate: Calvinism, Arminianism and Salvation*, Worthing: H. E. Walter, 1982 (American ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983), pp.55-57, 117-118.
24. For Hervey (1714-1758) see *DNB*.
25. See Hervey's *Works*, VI, p.343.
26. R. Sandeman, *Letters on Theron and Aspasio*, 4th ed., 1803, p.11.
27. *Ibid.* p.41.
28. See e.g. John Johnson (1706-1791) and John Walker (1768-1833), in *DNB*.
29. Edward Williams, *An Essay on the Equity of Divine Government and the Sovereignty of Divine Grace*, 1809, p.438.
30. Quoted by R. W. Thompson, *Benjamin Ingham and the Inghamites*, Kendal 1958, p.1. See further, A. P. F. Sell, *Church Planting: A Study of Westmorland Nonconformity*, Worthing: H. E. Walter, 1985. Ingham is in *DNB*.
31. J. Wesley, *Works*, 1773, XX, pp.282, 283, 289.
32. J. Wesley, *Letters*, ed. J. Telford, 1931, V, p.74.
33. Their leader was Adam Gib (1714-1788) for whom see *DNB*. The oath required profession of 'the true religion presently professed within this realm and authorised by the laws thereof...'. Those seceders who were content with this read it as an anti-papist statement; but the Antiburghers took it as referring to the Established Church with all its corruptions, and felt that their protest against that Church had been justified.

34. Robert Small, *History of the Congregations of the United Presbyterian Church from 1733 to 1900*, 1904, pp.565-566. Cf. John McKerrow, *History of the Secession Church*, 1847, pp.285-287. Carmichael was ordained on 2.8.1751, and died in 1774. See the *Memoir of Alexander M'Lean* by William Jones in *M'Lean's Works* VI. Carmichael went to London in 1765 to be baptised by John Gill, for whom see *DNB*; A. P. F. Sell, *The Great Debate*, esp. pp.76-83, 127.
35. For M'Lean, see the *Memoir* at n.34 above. For the Scotch Baptists see A. M'Lean, *Short Account of the Scotch Baptists in his Works*; J. Rippon's *Register*, 1794-97, pp.361-380; Patrick Wilson, *Origins and Progress of the Scotch Baptist Churches*; Percival Waugh in *History of the Baptists in Scotland*, ed. G. Yuille, [1926] chs. III and IV.
36. For Popkin (fl.1759-1824) see *Dictionary of Welsh Biography*. Rowland is in *DWB* and *DNB*.
37. For whom see *DNB* and *DWB*.
38. See Tom Beynon (ed.), *Howell Harris, Reformer and Soldier*, 1958, p.162.
39. Quoted by D. M. Lloyd-Jones, op.cit., p.67. Harris detected Sandemanianism also in Richard Hart, Vicar of St George's, Kingswood, Bath: 'He sets faith wholly in believing the testimony God gave of His Son as a Proposition, and I insist on an appropriation of Him to us too'. See Beynon, op.cit. p.161.
40. William Williams, *Welsh Calvinistic Methodists*, 1884, p.xviii.
41. See D. R. Stephen, *Memoir of Evans*, 1847. Jones (1765-1822) and Evans 1766-1838) are in *DWB*. See further, T. M. Bassett, *The Welsh Baptists*, 1977, pp.110-121.
42. T. M. Bassett, op.cit., pp.114-115.
43. For further references to contemporary Welsh Sandemanianism among the Baptists see *DWB* on Evan Evans (1773-1827); Edmund Francis (1768-1831), who was assistant to Christmas Evans during the latter's Sandemanian phase, but who himself remained a Sandemanian all his life; Thomas Jones (1769-1850), an opponent of Sandemanianism; William Jones (1762-1846), a Scotch Baptist minister first in Liverpool, then in London; David Williams (1719-1792), a Methodist exhorter turned Independent minister, who was 'troubled' by Sandemanianism amongst other heresies. See also T. Witton Davies, 'The McLeanist (Scotch) and Campbellite Baptists of Wales', *Baptist Historical Society Transactions*, VII, pp.147-180.
44. For Fuller see *DNB*; and for his doctrine see A. P. F. Sell, *The Great Debate*, *passim*.
45. A. Fuller, *The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation*, 1810 edn., p.166. See further A. C. Underwood, *A History of the English Baptists*, 1947, pp.190-192.

46. A. Fuller, *Strictures on Sandemanianism*, 1810, p.17. For further examples of 18th century 'cerebralism', see A. P. F. Sell, 'Arminians, Deists and Reason', *Faith and Freedom*, XXXIII, 1979, pp.19-31.
47. Cargill was 'a glover, who had attracted much notice in Scotland, as the first unclerical, unlearned man, who dared to preach and exercise the office of an elder'. So Bogue and Bennett, *op.cit.*, IV, p.123.
48. Howell Harris, *Last Message and Dying Testimony*, 1774, pp.7-8.
49. H. R. Plomer et al., *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1726 to 1775*, 1932, p.51.
50. J. Chater, *Another high road to HELL*, 1767, p.6.
51. *Ibid.* p.18.
52. *Ibid.* p.20.
53. *Ibid.* p.22.
54. It is possible that by the date of publication Chater had died, and that his King Street business had been taken over by Boosey, the erstwhile Independent minister turned Sandemanian. Wilson, writing in 1810, merely says of Chater that his death 'happened many years ago'. See Wilson, *op.cit.*, III, p.112.
55. Which is now being microfilmed.
56. *The Monthly Review; or Literary Journal*, XLVIII, Feb. 1773, p.154.
57. i.e. vol.II, pp.25-52.
58. See Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel*, 1957, p.290.
59. *Tom Rigby*, I, pp.21-22. Godwin, like Chater, came under Sandemanian influence for a time. See *DNB*; Don Locke, *A Fantasy of Reason: The Life and Thought of William Godwin*, 1980.
60. *Ibid.*, I, p.12.
61. *Ibid.*, I, pp.47-48.
62. *Ibid.*, II, p.169.
63. See article 'Faraday' in *DNB*.

ALAN P. F. SELL