

**Periodical Personae: Pseudonyms, Authorship and the Imagined
Community of Joseph Priestley's *Theological Repository***

Luisa Calé



James Gillray's 'The New Morality', published on 1 August 1798 as a fold-out visual satire in the second issue of 'The Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine', July 1798, between pp. 114 and 115. Photograph courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum, London

On 1 August 1798 the *Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine* (1798-1821) embellished its second issue with a fold-out visual satire: James Gillray's *New Morality*.¹ This print illustrates a poem under the same title written by under-secretary for foreign affairs George Canning, which had been published on 9 July 1798 in the final issue of the weekly *Anti-Jacobin* (1797-8).² By the time Gillray illustrated Canning's 'New Morality', the under-secretary had secured him to the counter-revolutionary propaganda effort.³ Through Canning's poem Gillray offers a sort of visual manifesto which emphasizes the continuity between the new monthly and its earlier weekly anti-jacobin periodical form in their common effort to denounce the seditious agency of radical culture. Gillray's print is a representation of the counter-revolutionary periodical it is part of, a representation of the radical press as well as a sort of *Who's Who* of sedition in 1798. In the



centre stands the Leviathan of opposition; in front of him the 'cornucopia of ignorance', an authorless anonymous matrix made out of periodicals such as the

James Gillray's 'The New Morality' Detail:

Luisa Calé, *Cornucopia* Photograph courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum, London

ie Imagined Community of Joseph Priestley's *Theological Repository* in *The Long Nineteenth Century*, 3 (2006) www.19.bbk.ac.uk

Monthly Review, the *Critical Review* and the *Analytical Review* - spouting a mound of papers including the *Monthly Magazine*, *The Enquirer*, *The Wrongs of Women*. Seditious publication networks are presented as a disorderly multiplicity. If the readership of the anonymous heap of papers coming out of the periodical cornucopia is not what Edmund Burke termed a 'swinish multitude',⁴ it is nonetheless a miscreated crowd of apes, asses and other hybrid half-human forms. Among them can be seen, in the form of frogs, the figures of Charles Lamb and Charles Lloyd, a comment on the melodious poems they had published the previous year.⁵ Such a metamorphic crowd is unified under the shared iconography of the liberty cap and subsumed under the features of a series of recognisable figures. In Canning's poem, the names of key historical agents such as Louis-Marie de Larévellière-Lépaux and Napoleon Bonaparte stand out in small capitals, whereas their British counterparts are identified by the initials and some letters of their surnames; the missing letters, marked by dashes, are left for readers to fill in. Alternatively, readers are invited to substitute other names as they see fit.⁶ Gillray takes up this invitation and



James Gillray's 'The New Morality' Detail: Political Justice Photograph courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum, London

of the Duke of Bedford, and the heads of the parliamentary opposition are guided by Gilbert Wakefield and Joseph Priestley in a procession to pay tribute to Larévellière-Lépaux, who embodied the French Directory. Canning was not pleased to see Gillray 'entering into *personal particulars*'. Robert Southey enjoyed the visual satire, but regretted its 'lumping together men of such opposite principles; this was stupid ... the

physionomizes in the form of 'seditious heads' many more figures of the opposition than those Canning had alluded to. The Leviathan bears the head



James Gillray's 'The New Morality' Detail: Wakefield and Priestley Photograph courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum, London

conductors of the *Anti-Jacobin* will have much to answer for in thus inflaming the animosities of this country'.⁷

Having Priestley as one of the heads of the seditious procession might seem anachronistic in 1798: he was seen as such a catalyst in 1791, when the Birmingham riots destroyed his house and library on Bastille day. However, by the time the print came out Priestley had been living in America for four years.⁸ On the other hand, Wakefield's presence by his side restores all the timeliness of the print. For Wakefield was sentenced for sedition on 30 May 1798 and the Duke of Bedford was prominent in the subscription scheme to support him and his family.⁹ Wakefield's publisher Joseph Johnson, also on trial for selling his pamphlet, was indicted on 17 July.¹⁰ In fact, the print confirms the continued mission of the *Anti-Jacobin*, for destroying the radical network of the publisher Joseph Johnson, and his *Analytical Review* in particular, was a task which the *Anti-Jacobin Magazine* prided itself in taking over from its predecessor weekly publication.¹¹

'Lumping together' a multiplicity of oppositional voices behind the faces and names of Priestley and Wakefield involves a process of personification.¹² From what is an otherwise multifarious political and textual energy Gillray's print abstracts a coherent agency of sedition. Once identified, such a Leviathan is anchored to biographical figures, thus controlling the dissemination of meaning and channelling it into a process of cause and effect. Priestley, Wakefield, and the radical periodical sphere guide the opposition towards a Jacobin altar officiated by the French Directory. Through this biographical anchoring, sedition is identified with particular agents, and history can be checked. Through his satirical group portrait, Gillray's print issues an indictment. By holding Priestley and Wakefield accountable for the spreading of sedition, it implicitly sums up their actions and works in a biographical retrospect.

Michel Foucault argues that personifying discourse through the figure of an author marks 'the manner in which we fear the proliferation of meaning'.¹³ Foucault's reflections emerge out of a poststructuralist engagement with *écriture* and the 'death of the author', but his point is

particularly relevant to a time when anonymous publication was preponderant rather than an exception.¹⁴ Attributing texts to the ‘unified personality’ of an author limits their times and modes of inscription, sacrifices the particularity and potential of each textual event to the retroactive continuity of its biographical persona. The scholarly practice of attribution is robustly engaged in identifying the biographical identity behind anonymous texts. While it is clearly important to read these texts in the light of other works written by the same author, the fact that there is no personal name to mark the edges of a text is crucial to ‘the mode of existence, circulation, and functioning of discourses within a society’.¹⁵ Romantic Periodicals are a case in point.¹⁶ Published in a periodical, Gillray’s print presents periodicals as a cornucopia which constantly issues uncontrollable mounds of paper. Giving a face, a name, a biographical referent to the multiple voices and modes of inscription of periodical publication limits the potential, specificity and freedom of their utterance.

Gillray’s print shows just how important it might be not to give the author a name and a face. The freedom of expression and circulation of ideas seems to depend on what William Warner defines as the ‘negation of persons in public discourse’.¹⁷ In this essay, I will take up Foucault’s invitation to ‘locate the space left empty by the author’s disappearance ... and watch for the openings that this disappearance uncovers’.¹⁸ My case study will be an early instance of the dissenting publication network of which Gillray depicts a post-mortem indictment: Priestley’s *Theological Repository* (1769-1771, 1784-1788, reprinted in 1795), the first periodical published by Joseph Johnson.¹⁹ To turn from the *Anti-Jacobin* satire to the periodical culture of Joseph Johnson and his dissenting milieu is to find a different process of naming and personification at work. By resisting biographical forms of identification and accountability, this Unitarian publication network anticipated and projected its own reception. Foucault argues that the historical task in the analysis of discourse consists in taking the disappearance of the author as a chance to study ‘the subject’s points of insertion, modes of functioning, and system of dependencies’.²⁰

The *Theological Repository* is a very interesting case for its use of pseudonyms, which help identify the early construction and articulation of a Unitarian interpretative community.

According to Robert Griffin, ‘pseudonymity is a subset of anonymity’.²¹ As a form of anonymous discourse, pseudonyms safeguard the personal autonomy and freedom of authors in public discourse by protecting them from accountability. Griffin emphasizes ‘the function of anonymity in what Coleridge calls, in *Biographia Literaria*, “an age of personality”’.²² If pseudonymity suspends the individual identity of authors like anonymity, this does not mean negating persons. For indeed personal identity may take other forms. Shedding the identity that inscribes one’s geographical, genealogical and social place in society, pseudonyms offer a space in which to experiment with alternative cultural, social and gender identities and forms of affiliation.²³ Further, the choice of different pseudonyms indicates the wish to suspend the biographical continuity of authorship and try out discontinuous experiments. Conversely, the choice to stick with a pseudonym might mark the wish to imply a continuity of expression between a number of pieces written under the same name and not necessarily by the same person.

Pseudonyms mark the threshold of the periodical sphere. Michael Ketchum and others have explored the function of pseudonyms in the *Spectator* and *Tatler*. Peter Murphy, Mark Parker and James Treadwell have pursued this work in the 1810s, 20s, 30s working on fictional personae - the most famous of whom is Charles Lamb’s ‘Elia’ - in the pages of *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* and the *London Magazine*. On the other hand, Kevin Gilmartin’s work on radical print culture in the 1810s-1820s underlined the culture of personality and the importance of the signature as a way for radicals ‘to join an established order of personal politics’, fighting anonymity, which was ‘associated with a secretive, conspiratorial form of resistance’.²⁴ Yet there is little work on authorial personae in the period 1760s to 1800.²⁵

Pseudonyms act as periodical personae, representations of authorial agency and personifications of periodical spaces, authority, and coteries. They reduce writers and readers to recognisable types. Applying Jon Klancher's argument about circulation, it seems that the pseudonymical editor contributes to the reversibility of writers and readers by enabling forms of projection, identification and assimilation.²⁶ Looking back at the *Spectators* and *Tatlers*, the territory of periodicals is marked by fictional names from their very threshold by the fictional identity of their editors - Mr Spectator, Isaac Bickerstaffe, Mr Sylvanus Urban, and later Mr Christopher North.

* * *

The *Theological Repository* was first published by Joseph Johnson in 1769 and edited by Joseph Priestley. Priestley's plan of cultural circulation envisaged a series of familiar expositions and texts which combined new discoveries and the state of a discipline within its history, along the lines of his *History and Present State of Electricity* (1767). Besides such monographic publications, Priestley envisaged specialised periodicals for each discipline as forums for the debate and the circulation of ideas. The *Theological Repository* offered

a common repository of new thoughts, improvements, and hints, without any recital of what had been done before; or should contain only sketches, and outlines of new and general systems, intended to comprise the whole of any sciences. Into these repositories all persons should be invited and encouraged to throw every new thought that occurs to them, without waiting till it sell into a volume of itself. (TR, I, iv)

Priestley's view of the circulation of culture is permeated by an awareness of the multiplication of ideas and the need to publicize them in an attempt to further the progress of knowledge. The *Repository* constituted an intermediate stage of production in which what was

otherwise communicated and discussed in private correspondence prior to publication found a more public space for intellectual exchange:

a common channel of communication, which shall be open for the reception of all new observations that relate to theology; such as *illustrations of the scriptures, the evidences of revealed religion*, with *objections of all kinds, &c &c* ... the primary object of this work was to provide a receptacle for small pieces of criticism, and single observations, which would otherwise be in danger of being lost, after being noted in a common place book, or an interleaved bible (TR, I, viii)

Priestley was a pushy commissioning editor in requesting pieces and asking his correspondents to write replies to others, trying to foster debate, generating responses from different points of view. The *Theological Repository* functioned as a space where to try out ideas and where he could get feedback and animate debates around some of his own and his friends' articles and inquiries. For instance, Priestley tried to get a response to his piece on the intermediate state of the dead by the Archdeacon Francis Blackburne, the authority on the question,²⁷ an attempt that failed because of the Archdeacon's refusal to publish in a magazine that opened its doors to Deists.²⁸ Later, having passed the test of discussions, such pieces could be united and published separately under Priestley's own signature. 'I think to print *Clemens* separately, with my name', he wrote to Theophilus Lindsey in January 1770, but in February he argued that such work 'is not yet finished; and besides I shall wait till I hear what may be said by way of objection to it'.²⁹ For Unitarians sharing their commonplace books, publishing observations lest they be lost in marginalia or interleaved bibles, meant socializing the fruit of what might otherwise be a solitary practice of reading. The *Theological Repository* provided a virtual debating sphere for dissenting ministers, whom the Test and Corporation acts excluded from university. Later, with the *Analytical Review* (1788-1799) and the *Monthly Magazine* (1796-1811), the scope of Joseph Johnson's periodicals broadened beyond the education of dissenting ministers.

Priestley and Johnson would probably have shared William Wordsworth's anxiety about the 'rapid communication of intelligence',³⁰ but their response was quite different. In 1788 the prospectus of the *Analytical Review* declared the aim to 'diffuse intelligence over the kingdom in general, or to announce it to foreign nations';³¹ eight years later, the purpose of the *Monthly Magazine* was 'to forward the progress of mental improvement upon the most liberal and unshackled plan', and to exercise 'habits of free enquiry to be emancipated from bigotry and prejudice'.³² By contrast, in 1800 Wordsworth would appeal to 'habits of mind' nourished by daily and repeated contact with nature in rural life as a healthy contrast to the sensationalist hunger for news which he saw in public urban culture.³³ Joseph Johnson's periodicals responded to the accelerated production of that sprawling urban print market. If the proliferation of print was to reach larger audiences, it had to be mediated through shorter and more manageable formats. Such was the function of periodicals.

Unlike Sylvanus Urban and his followers, the editor of the *Theological Repository* figures in his empirical biographical and local identity at the threshold of the periodical. In the 'Introduction' to the *Theological Repository* Priestley argues against anonymity and for somebody 'responsible to the public for the conduct of them. They must, therefore, be known to be countenanced by a few persons at least who are generally esteemed to excel in that kind of knowledge which is the subject of them'.³⁴ The prospectus goes on to enlist dissenting ministers Newcome Cappe at York, Andrew Kippis at Wesminster, Samuel Merivale at Exeter, Thomas Scott of Ipswich, William Turner of Wakefield. The periodical's quality is ultimately safeguarded by the juridical persona of Priestley the editor, sanctioned by the approval and encouragement of the Reverend John Aikin, Professor of Divinity at Warrington, and Richard Price of Newington-Green. Through such personal and place names the *Theological Repository* unified Britain into a culture of dissent mediated via London through Joseph Johnson's metropolitan network of publication. Yet when one turns from the

magazine's prospectus to its pages, little trace is found of these geographical and biographical moorings. Instead, the articles are signed 'Theophilus' (lover of God), 'Philalethes' (friend of truth) 'Eclectic', 'Verus', 'Rationalis'...

Pseudonyms in periodicals exemplify a Habermasian 'sphere of private people come together as a public'.³⁵ Through anonymous submissions contributors shed their social position, personal interests, inclinations and particularity. In other words, anonymity tells us that the sphere of periodicals has its own rules; it is a free space where arguments should run for themselves. To efface the contributors' actual identities meant to eliminate some of the obstacles that stood in the way of a free exchange of ideas. Writing to the Reverend Joseph Bretland on 10 October 1785, Priestley wrote: 'your answer to Moderatus will be inserted in the next number. Photinus, whom you are pleased to compliment is myself; but I wish to avoid a contest with Moderatus, as he is a neighbour'.³⁶ In this case, withholding the author's identity guarantees the exchange of ideas by avoiding direct personal confrontation. Like anonymity, pseudonymity suspends the referential anchoring which ties an utterance to an author and a specific location. In the case of pseudonymity, however, suspending the authors' empirical identity does not mean withholding, let alone negating their personal identity. Rather, pseudonymity supplements it with another 'shorthand description', another form of reference.³⁷ The space of the periodical is different from geographical places. Pseudonyms project the geographical sense of neighbourhood onto an ideal sense of community. In the same letter Priestley goes on to announce 'things both for and against the Miraculous Conception in the next number. I am *Ebionita*. *Symmachus* is a neighbour'. Indeed, in a contemporary text Priestley argues that 'Symmachus, whose translation of the scriptures into Greek is so often quoted, and with the greatest approbation by the fathers, was an Ebionite'.³⁸ Not only should neighbours and contemporaries not stand in the way of free expression of ideas, but the very notions of contiguity and contemporaneity are reconfigured in the virtual space of print.

Taken together, the *Theological Repository*'s pseudonyms construct an imagined community.³⁹ If some signatures indicate ideal virtues as they declare their authors 'friends of truth', 'truthful', 'cautious', 'moderate', others come charged with a powerful hermeneutical function. In pamphlets, familiar letters, and treatises Priestley argued that Unitarianism is the faith of the early Christians and follows the letter of the Holy Scriptures. In the *Theological Repository* the move is more radical, because here the early debates are revived not only through minute disquisitions in points of Scripture, but under the signatures of the very early Christians whom Priestley considered Unitarian and treated as sources of evidence to document the Unitarian creed of the primitive church. Thus, on the one hand, Unitarian exegesis tried to identify, restore and assess the writings of those who were called Apostolic Fathers from their having lived in the time of the apostles, and being therefore supposed to retain their doctrines. ... It would certainly be a considerable argument in favour of those doctrines, if they had been *certainly* held by such men; but this can by no means be proved. For it is to be lamented that, few as these apostolical Fathers are, their works are not come down to us as they wrote them, or rather, except a single epistle of Clemens Romanus, which contains no such doctrines as those of the divinity or pre-existence of Christ, the works that are ascribed to them are almost entirely spurious, and the time of their composition is not easily ascertained.⁴⁰

On the other hand, while trying to date them, contributors of the *Theological Repository* also took it on themselves to *add* to their arguments by taking on their signatures. For example, Priestley frequently signed as Clemens and the Reverend Theophilus Lindsey, one of Priestley's most assiduous correspondents, chose to write under the name Patrobas, which could be found in Paul's epistle to the Romans (*Rom. XVI:14*). The same Pauline passage also mentioned Hermas, another pseudonym to be found in the pages of the *Theological Repository*, and a critical source on the pre-existence and divinity of Christ.⁴¹ The *Repository*'s signatures identify the living with the dead, past with present

Unitarians coming together in what seems a transhistorical contemporaneity.

While contemporaneous in their inscriptions in the pages of the periodical, such signatures also mark Unitarian genealogies. For instance, the signatures mentioned in the letter quoted above, Priestley alias Photinus and his neighbour Symmachus, recur in a significant sequence in Priestley's writing. Witness Priestley's injunction to Alexander Geddes: 'confine your attention to the *writers* in defence of Unitarianism ... beginning with Symmachus, and ending with Photinus, who, in the late age in which he lived, was so popular in his Diocese, that three synods, under an Arian emperor, were necessary to expel him; and who continued writing to an advanced age, treating every doctrine except the Unitarian with just contempt.'⁴² Signing under the names of old Fathers helped emphasize and reconstruct the early history of Christianity.

Much as the signatures project public genealogies onto Priestley's interpretative community, the biographical anchoring of such signatures raises the expectation that similar affiliations might apply to the empirical authors signing under such pseudonyms. When such pseudonyms were used in private correspondence and identified through manuscript circulation, they offered a hermeneutic key to Unitarian sociability. If we move from the historical referents activated by the pseudonyms to the biographical persons inhabiting them, further transgenerational identifications come to light. Indeed, the contributor writing under the pseudonym of Symmachus also signs his pieces as Erasmus, impersonations which suggest a history of biblical exegesis, the former having been an antecedent and the latter a critic of Jerome's Bible. To know that in his biographical identity John Palmer alias Symmachus and Erasmus was a former student of Priestley's at Warrington suggests a body of shared readings. With it comes a level of esteem so high as to invert, if only parodically, the pedagogical line of descent so that Priestley alias Photinus becomes the late comer with respect to his pupil Palmer in his identity as Symmachus. The signatures Eusebius and Pamphilus offer another example in which pseudonyms connote the biographical

relationship between contributors. For indeed Priestley tells us that Eusebius of Caesarea, the author of the *Ecclesiastical History*, was ‘surnamed Pamphilus, on account of his friendship for Pamphilus the Martyr’, with whom he co-wrote an apology of Origen.⁴³ That friendship and collaborative scholarship then transfers onto the respective contributors William Turner, who proposed the idea of a *Theological Repository* to Priestley,⁴⁴ and Priestley, who later chose Pamphilus as one of his pseudonyms.⁴⁵

Further genealogical identities emerge from signatures, which construct a specifically eighteenth-century Unitarian tradition.⁴⁶ In a couple of cases authors entered the periodical with pseudonyms by which they were known in other publications. Volume II publishes two articles signed by Philalethes (‘Lover of Truth’). In a Unitarian context, this popular *nom de plume* evokes a seminal exchange of letters on the Logos written in 1730 and republished in 1759,⁴⁷ which had been pivotal in converting Priestley from Arianism to Socinianism.⁴⁸ Its author Philalethes was known to be the Reverend Nathaniel Lardner,⁴⁹ a founding figure for the Unitarian cause. ‘Extracts of the chief Remarks on Dr. Lardner’s Treatise, or perhaps Letter, on the LOGOS, in a letter to Philalethes’ were published in the first volume (TR, I, 431-43), while the third contains a reply to Lardner found in the unpublished papers of his friend the Reverend Martin Tomkins.⁵⁰ This posthumous publication brings the friendship of Tomkins and Lardner, who had studied together in the Netherlands at the turn of the previous century, to the centre of the Unitarian tradition. When the signature Philalethes appears in volume II, it is necessarily inscribed within the perimeters of the work that Lardner published under that pseudonym. Those who knew its author to be the Reverend William Hazlitt could gauge his desire to engage with Lardner’s work.⁵¹

Another eighteenth-century pseudonymous character to enter the *Theological Repository* was the amorous anti-Trinitarian John Bunclé. *The Life of John Bunclé, Esq.* was first published anonymously in 1756 ‘to vindicate my character from misrepresentation and idle stories, and to

illustrate my *memoirs of several ladies of Great-Britain*, I sat down to write a true history of my life and notions'.⁵² Addressed to critics, this prefatory statement seems to contradict the initial claim that 'things in print must stand by their own worth', and not depend on the hope that 'valuable names at the head of it, may preserve' the book.⁵³ Yet the appeal to such referential anchoring is baffled by the absence of the name of the author on the frontispiece, so that 'John Buncler' is the only name that might vouchsafe the quality of the work and of the author of *Memoirs of Several Ladies of Great Britain* (1755), also published anonymously. This parody of authorial identity, accountability, and attribution takes the shape of metalepsis, a process that blurs the borders between reality and fiction, conflating the level of narration with that of narrated events.⁵⁴ If the frontispiece of a book anchors its content to biographical and geographical reference, John Buncler exits from the world of fiction and enters reality as the author of the *Memoirs*. The identity of character and author was confirmed in reviews and periodicals.⁵⁵ So it is hardly surprising to see him enter the *Theological Repository*.

Buncler's first essay for the *Repository* describes a cosy familiar conversation and thus projects a form of Unitarian sociability into the virtual sphere of print. Playing with the illusion of reference, Buncler locates the origin of the essay in a conversation he had enjoyed while spending an evening at W—d in the company of Clemens and Vigilus. This dialogic situation opens the *Repository* to other forms of religious discourse. The allegorical reference activated by the names of Buncler's interlocutors adds a Bunyanesque touch to the picaresque expectation evoked by the *Life of John Buncler*. The narrative world opened up by John Buncler subtly blurs the distinction between the periodical and the novel. Indeed the meeting evoked in the essay might well be a further episode in the character's journey, after some amorous interlude has been 'sandwiched' between Buncler's frequent conversations about theology.⁵⁶ However, if the pseudonyms point to an intertextual practice of reading, the place name anchors the evening to a world outside fiction which strengthens the geography of the *Repository*'s network of circulation.

Wakefield figured as the place of residence of one of the dissenting ministers endorsing the periodical's prospectus. So readers could infer that one of Buncler's friends might be that Mr Turner who figures in the prospectus, thus identifying one of the most recurrent signatures in the periodical.⁵⁷ The author of *The Life of John Buncler* was himself a resident of Wakefield and a friend of Turner's. By entering the periodical sphere in the person of John Buncler, Thomas Amory's essays relocated the reader within the discursive world such signature shorthanded. Admittedly, where the novel makes the most of the Unitarian continuities of matter and spirit and flesh and mind, the 'Unitarian romance' of such amorous entertainments is left to the pages of the novel, whereas the essays in the periodical remind the reader of the character's theological argumentative interludes detached from their narrative surrounds. The libertine form in which John Buncler practised Unitarianism came to haunt the reputation of his author to the point that his son had to specify that his father was not the polygamist he depicted in his novel.⁵⁸ Buncler's embodiment of Unitarianism was also lasting. The parodic potential of his 'theological sandwich' was not lost on William Hazlitt, the better-known son of the homonymous contributor to the *Repository*. In the same year in which his essay 'On John Buncler' came out in the *Round Table*, in a review of S. T. Coleridge's *Lay Sermons* Hazlitt recognized in him the incessant conversation of John Buncler at Harrogate.⁵⁹

Within an interpretative community of shared readings, pseudonymous signatures stand as abridgements or shorthand descriptions of the arguments to come. Different signatures on the same topic anticipated the differences in line of argument to be found in the respective articles, such as Buncler and Clemens on Jesus, or Eusebius, Eucharisticus and Dion on the Lord's Supper.⁶⁰ The dialogic mode with which John Buncler addresses Clemens in his first paper points to other pieces in the *Repository*, thus diversifying the points of view on Jesus the man argued by Clemens from a revealed religion, philologically-based point of view, and by John Buncler from the standpoint of natural

religion.⁶¹ The choice of signature activated, tried out, and opened doctrinal positions for debate.

While the periodical mostly respects the pseudonyms of others, at the end of the third and fifth volumes Priestley felt the need to publicise his own signatures. Although this disclosure reveals just how many articles can be attributed to him, such a move was meant to counteract those who saw the magazine as his personal mouthpiece by showing that he had encouraged and published positions that contradicted his own. In disclosing his own signatures, he enhanced the tendency to unify the pieces signed under the same pseudonym, by further inscribing such periodical pieces into the path of their author. This practice reflects the pieces' own multiple inscriptions inside and outside the precincts of the periodical.

Disclosure, however, came at a great political and personal cost. Much as Gillray's print would later point out, Priestley mediated the transition between the allegorical world of pseudonymous publication and the public sphere. When he publicized the resumed publication of the *Repository* in a letter published in the *Critical Review* in January 1785, Priestley announced that 'it is wished that the writers should conceal their names, it is hoped that many persons may derive great assistance from it in their inquiries'.⁶² In this case, pseudonyms could help ensure that the public domain identified with civil society was not only distinguished from, but also protected from the state, immunising authors against the risks of government repression. This announcement inflamed public debate. A curiously anonymous response published in the *Gentleman Magazine* asked:

Is this the conduct of free, ingenuous inquiry, or is it the art of jesuitism, and the insidious slyness of present Presbyterianism? Will Dr. Priestley set his own name to every sentiment he holds forth in print; and will he invite assassins to stab religion in the dark? Let him blush to see his hand set to his unworthy challenge, and if he wants seconds in the combat, let them not be ashamed to enter their names at the barrier, and come forth, as all the honest enemies of

Christianity have hitherto done, with fair declarations who they are, however unfairly they handle their weapons.⁶³

This response generated a discussion in the pages of the journal. Witness the reaction of a reader of the *Theological Repository*, incensed at the characterisation of Priestley as the ‘Antichrist’ and the invitation to enlist against him: ‘there is some resemblance between the conduct of an anonymous scribbler murdering the character of a person by name, and that of a ruffian who assassinates a man unawares. But what ground of comparison is there, between stating a *query* or *difficulty* relating to religion, without subscribing the name of the writer, and *stabbing religion in the dark?*’⁶⁴ John Towill Rutt identified in these inflamed terms the roots which led to the Birmingham riots of 1791 and Priestley’s subsequent emigration.⁶⁵ Discussion for and against anonymity in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* resumed three years later. Joseph Berington, a Catholic writer espousing the cause of religious liberty and toleration, intervened to suggest that contributions be signed with the authors’ real names as a way of making them answerable for their ideas. Such an innovation, he argued, would discourage unworthy submissions and moderate the tone of ‘acrimonious and illiberal’ ones.⁶⁶ Yet a postscript thanking Mr Urban for publishing a previous submission reveals the religious concern behind the wish for contributors to disclose their real names. That previous message had responded to what might indeed be termed an ‘illiberal’ critique of a Catholic position on transubstantiation expressed in a letter signed by the Abbé Mann. According to Berington it was the Abbé’s known Catholicism which had caused an acrimonious response clearly motivated by anti-Catholic feeling.⁶⁷ The aim to safeguard a free exchange of ideas had prompted Priestley to propose the opposite solution. For him ideas could only be free if abstracted from the personal identities and the religious and political denominations of participants. Whatever the solution, these letters and the debate they opened up show that religious toleration and freedom of expression were central to the configuration and functioning of periodicals and of the modes of circulation of ideas.⁶⁸

Nor were pseudonyms only shields against the individual particulars of their authors. The pseudonyms Priestley adopted after the *Repository* resumed publication in 1784 highlighted the embattled and emotional identifications with which his positions were inscribed in the discursive milieu of the periodical and in the public sphere more generally. The *Repository*'s revival marked the aftermath of a negative review of Priestley's *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* (1782), in which the *Monthly Review* accused him of poor philological skills and a very selective and tendential use of evidence.⁶⁹ Among the most disputed parts of Priestley's writing was his work against the miraculous conception of Christ, proof of which Priestley sought among the Ebionites, who held such beliefs, and by identifying with them the Nazarenes. As a reaction Priestley published pamphlet after pamphlet in the form of letters sent under his own name to his critics, but also looked forward to the opportunity to discuss the topic in the pages of the *Repository* under the explicit signature of 'Ebionita'. Lindsey and others watched Priestley's move with alarm:

This bold attack upon an article of faith which had maintained its ground undisputed for upwards of a thousand years, not only renewed the clamours of bigots against the insolence and impiety of the hardy assailant, but excited considerable apprehensions among many professed friends to free inquiry, who not only feared that the author's own reputation might suffer, and his writings be brought into discredit, and that his usefulness might thereby be greatly impeded, but that the credibility of the Gospel history itself might be impeached, if so large a portion of it should be regarded as spurious.⁷⁰

After many appeals on Lindsey's part, Newcome Cappe joined the discussion under the signature 'Nazareus', which declared him a witness at the place of Jesus's birth. Priestley retorted with the signature of 'Nazareus'.⁷¹

While such signatures mapped the spectrum of positions on the 'miraculous' conception, the choice of Pamphilus signposted Priestley's self-representation as a martyr who withstands the pressure of political

power.⁷² Photinus is another name which marks resistance to political power in pieces published in the *Repository* after 1783. A self-referential dimension of this signature emerges in the *General History of the Christian Church* (1790), where Priestley for a moment imagines how different the Christian Church might have been if men like Photinus had been the tutors of emperor Constantine: ‘Truth does not stand in need of such foreign and heterogeneous supports. It disdains them, conscious of being able to do infinitely better without them. Civil power began at this time to do, and it has ever since continued to do, whatever it could to overthrow this *simple truth*. But it is founded upon a rock, and neither the power of man, nor the gates of death, can prevail against it’.⁷³ Resistance to power had been central to Unitarian discourse since its inception. Philalethes’ famous 1730 letter on the Logos was addressed to ‘*Papinian*, who was a man of mature age, of great eminence, and a diligent reader of the sacred scriptures, has long since accomplished his course in this world.’⁷⁴ For decades Unitarians interrogated themselves on the real identity of this addressee. Faced with a wrong identification, Lardner replied that the name indicated the function.⁷⁵ Edward Gibbon and others speak of Papinian as one of the most eminent lawyers of his time; in addition, Papinian embodied the civil servant’s refusal to argue falsehood on behalf of power. In the mid 1760s, Nathaniel Lardner quoted a source asking why the Prefect Papinian had failed to restrain the fierce treatment of Christians. Elaborating on the question, Lardner argued that ‘either Papinian did not understand the principles of religious and civil liberty, or that he was not able to establish all the schemes of equity, which he had formed in his mind’.⁷⁶ The Papinian of 1730 was Viscount Barrington,⁷⁷ a man of law indeed who had distinguished himself in the cause of religious toleration, but the bearer is contingent; what matters is the ideal successive bearers are asked to live up to.

Through their fictional profiles, pseudonyms question the universal abstract subjectivity required for a Habermasian public use of reason in a rational-critical public debate, revealing the process of abstraction and personification required to enter its sphere. At the same time, their blatant

fictionality also teases the frenzy of attribution, the need to stabilise utterances by anchoring them to the stable identity of a biographical author. Pseudonyms, and even more the possibility to inhabit more than one pseudonym, alert us to the performativity and theatricality of public utterance, encouraging us to read the periodical public sphere as ‘an arena for the formation and enactment of social identities’.⁷⁸

¹ See *Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine*, 1 (July 1798), between pp. 114 and 115, and ‘Explanation of the Satirical Print’, pp. 115-6: see Frederic George Stephens and Mary Dorothy George, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, 11 vols. (London: British Museum, 1870-1954), no. 9240, hereafter abbreviated as BMC, followed by the number of the catalogue entry; see also *James Gillray: The Art of Caricature* (London: Tate Publishing, 2001), pp. 34-36.

² *Anti-Jacobin*, 36 (9 July 1798), reprinted in *Parodies of the Romantic Age*, ed. by Graeme Stones and John Strachan, 5 vols. (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1999), I, 269-285.

³ Years earlier Canning would stop at Mrs Humphrey’s printshop window in St James’s to see if Gillray had immortalised his likeness, because to feature in Gillray’s caricatures marked one’s rise in the world, see Richard Godfrey, ‘Introduction’, in *James Gillray: The Art of Caricature*, p. 19.

⁴ ‘Happy if learning, not debauched by ambition, had been satisfied to continue the instructor, and not aspired to be the master! Along with its natural protectors and guardians, learning will be cast into the mire, and trodden down under the hoofs of a swinish multitude’, see Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790), ed. by Leslie Mitchell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 79. Burke’s image produced a wave of responses, among them Thomas Spence’s *Pigs’ Meat; or, Lessons for the Swinish Multitude, Collected by the Poor Man’s Advocate* (1793-1795). Gillray visualised Burke’s ‘swinish multitude’ as pigs trodden by the white horse of Revelation in *Presages of the Millennium* (BMC 8655), published on 4 June 1795, see Nicholas K. Robinson, *Edmund Burke: A Life in Caricature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), pp. 173-74; see also BMC 8500 and David Bindman, *The Shadow of the Guillotine* (London, 1989), p. 109.

⁵ S. T. Coleridge, *Poems. Second Edition. To which are now added Poems by Charles Lamb, and Charles Lloyd* (London: printed by N. B. Biggs for Joseph Cottle, Bristol, and Messrs. Robinsons, 1797).

⁶ ‘The initials of the four names contained in those two lines do not appear in the original. If any of our readers object to the letters which we have introduced by way of supplying what to us appeared as a defect, they are requested to substitute, in their place, such others as, to them, may appear more appropriate’: see ‘Explanation of the Satirical Print’, *Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine*, 1 (July 1798), 111n.

⁷ Draper Hill, *Mr Gillray the Caricaturist* (London: Phaidon, 1965), pp. 71-72.

⁸ On Priestley's move to America in 1794, see Jenny Graham, 'Revolutionary in Exile: The Emigration of Joseph Priestley to America 1794-1804', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 85/2 (1995), in part. pp. 21-41 on 1791-1794.

⁹ *Memoirs of the Late Gilbert Wakefield*, 2 vols (London: Johnson, 1804), II, 151-158.

¹⁰ Joseph Johnson was put on trial on 17 July 1798 for selling Wakefield's *A Reply to Some Parts of the Bishop of Landaff's Address to the People of Great Britain* (1798), see Helen Braithwaite, *Romanticism, Publishing and Dissent: Joseph Johnson and the Cause of Liberty* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 155-164.

¹¹ *Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine*, 1 (1798), pp. iv-v. The second volume opens with another visual satire, this time by Thomas Rowlandson, which targeted Joseph Johnson and the *Analytical Review* more specifically, see 'A Charm for Democracy, Reviewed, Analysed, & Destroyed Jany 1st 1799 to the Confusion of Affiliated Members', which announces 'Analytical Review Fallen never to rise again' in the bottom right corner (published on 1 February 1799, BMC 9345). See also the infamous reviews of William Godwin's *Memoirs of the Author of the Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, where much is made of Godwin's revelation of Mary Wollstonecraft's relationships with Gilbert Imlay and Henry Fuseli, and the proposed menage à trois with Fuseli and his wife, an ingredient which gives a further referential grounding to what Canning and Gillray denounce as the 'new morality' propounded by radical culture, see *Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine*, 1 (1798), 91-93, 94-102.

¹² On the complementary personification of the public, see S.T. Coleridge: 'The multitudinous public, shaped into personal unity by the magic of abstraction, sits nominal despot on the throne of criticism', *Biographia Literaria*, ed. by J. Engell and W. Jackson Bate, 2 vols. (London: Routledge, 1983), I, 59, discussed by Lucy Newlyn in *Reading, Writing, and Romanticism: The Anxiety of Reception* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 55.

¹³ Michel Foucault, 'What is an Author?', in Josué V. Harari, ed., *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979), p. 159.

¹⁴ Foucault, 'What is an Author?', pp. 143-144, see also Roland Barthes's essay 'The Death of the Author', in the same collection. For a critique of Foucault's argument, and particularly the watershed Foucault identifies with the invention of copyright: 'when copyright historians discuss the author as owner, that author is an abstract legal identity that does not need to have a specific name for it to function in legal discourse', see Robert J. Griffin, 'Introduction', in *The Faces of Anonymity: Anonymous and Pseudonymous Publication from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, ed. by Robert J. Griffin (New York: Palgrave, 2003), pp. 1-4. See also the special issue on anonymity in *New Literary History*, 33 (2002).

¹⁵ Foucault, 'What is an Author?', p. 148.

¹⁶ On Romantic periodicals, see Derek Roper, *Reviewing before the Edinburgh, 1788-1802* (London: Methuen, 1978); Jon Klancher, *The Making of the English Reading Audiences, 1790-1832* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987); Marilyn Butler, 'Culture's Medium: The Role of the Review', in the *Cambridge Companion to British Romanticism*, ed. by Stuart Curran (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 120-147; Mark Parker, *Literary Magazines and British Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Duncan Wu and Massimiliano Demata, eds., *British Romanticism and*

the Edinburgh Review (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002); Kim Wheatley, ed., *Romantic Periodicals and Print Culture* (London: Frank Cass, 2003).

¹⁷ William Warner, *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990), pp. 42-49, discussed in Kevin Gilmartin, *Print Politics: The Press and Radical Opposition in Early Nineteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 35.

¹⁸ Foucault, 'What is an Author?', p. 145.

¹⁹ For a discussion of Johnson's more well-known periodicals, see Braithwaite, *Romanticism, Publishing and Dissent*, pp. 18-19, 67-68, 86-89, 158-159. On the *Analytical Review* (1788-1799), see Walter de Brower, 'Joshua Toulmin in the *Analytical Review*', *Notes and Queries*, 30, 209-212; Brian Rigby, 'Radical Spectators of the Revolution: the Case of the *Analytical Review*', in Ian Small and Ceri Crossley, eds., *The French Revolution and British Culture*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989); Angela Esterhammer, 'Continental Literature, Translation, and the Johnson Circle', *Wordsworth Circle*, 22 (June 2002); on the *Monthly Magazine* (1796-1811), which he founded with Richard Phillips, see Geoffrey Carnall, 'The Monthly Magazine', *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 5 (1954), 158-164; David Chandler, "'A Sort of Bird's Eye View of the British Land of Letters": The *Monthly Magazine* and its Reviewers, 1796-1811', *Studies in Bibliography* (1999), 169-179; Adriana Craciun, 'Mary Robinson, The *Monthly Magazine*, and the Free Press', *Prose Studies*, 25/1 (April 2002), 19-40; and Felicity James's essay in this issue.

²⁰ Foucault, 'What is an Author?', p. 158.

²¹ Griffin, 'Introduction', p. 1

²² Griffin, 'Introduction', p. 2; On Coleridge's attitude towards periodicals and anonymity, see Lucy Newlyn, *Reading, Writing, and Romanticism*, Chapter 2, in particular pp. 49-61.

²³ See, for instance, Alexis Easley's work on the role of pseudonyms in Victorian women's writing: *First-Person Anonymous: Women Writers and Victorian Print Media, 1830-1870* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), p. 7.

²⁴ See Michael Ketchum, *Transparent Designs: Reading Performance and Form in the Spectator Papers* (1985); Peter T. Murphy, 'Impersonation and Authorship in Romantic Britain', *English Literary History*, 59/3 (Autumn 1992), 625-649; Parker, *Literary Magazines and British Romanticism*; James Treadwell, 'Impersonation and Autobiography in Lamb's Christ's Hospital Essays', *Studies in Romanticism*, 37/4 (Winter 1998), 499-521; Kevin Gilmartin, *Print Politics*, 33-36.

²⁵ Mary Robinson is a very interesting case of pseudonyms: see Adriana Craciun, *British Women Writers and the French Revolution* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2005), 74, 78-80, 84-5 (on 'Tabitha Bramble', 'Humanitas', 'Nettle').

²⁶ See Jon Klancher, *The Making of the English Reading Audiences, 1790-1832*, pp. 29-41.

²⁷ See [F.Blackburne], *An Historical View of the Controversy concerning an intermediate state and the separate existence of the Soul between Death and the General Resurrection, Deduced from the Beginning of the Protestant Reformation to the Present Times*, 2nd edn. (London: Goldsmith, 1772).

²⁸ Priestley to Theophilus Lindsay, 27 January and 4 February 1771, in Priestley, *Life and Correspondence*, I, 131-2; Priestley's position on the intermediate state of the dead was published in *Disquisitions relating to*

Matter and Spirit (London, 1777), 224-233; *An History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, 2 vols. (Birmingham and London, 1782), I, 400-426.

²⁹ Priestley, *Life and Correspondence*, I, 108. Robert Schofield notes that the articles on the Lord Supper, published under the pseudonym Paulinus in volume 1, and those on the Four Gospels, which appeared under the signature Liberius in volumes 2 and 3, were the sources for his subsequent 'Observations on the harmony of the evangelist', *Harmony of the Evangelists, in Greek* (1777) and *in English* (1780). Conversely, Schofield also notes that the first article Priestley contributed under the signature of 'Clemens' was a new version of his anonymous *Scriptural Doctrine of Remission* (1761), to which Priestley had added a comparative study which juxtaposed the different positions of Christian scholars to 'Aristotle, Plato, Mohammed, and every other person who has set up for an instructor of others' (17-18)', see Schofield, *The Enlightenment of Joseph Priestley*, 195-6.

³⁰ See W. Wordsworth, 'Preface to Lyrical Ballads (1800)', in *The Prose Works of William Wordsworth*, ed. by W. J. B. Owen and Jane Worthington Smyser, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), II, 128.

³¹ *Prospectus of the Analytical Review; or New Literary Journal, on an Enlarged Plan* (London: Johnson, 1788), iii.

³² *Prospectus of a New Miscellany, to be entitled the Monthly Magazine; or, British Register* (London: Johnson, 1796), 2.

³³ Wordsworth, 'Preface to Lyrical Ballads (1800)', 126, 128. Adriana Craciun suggests that the Preface might be a response to Mary Robinson's 'Present State of the Manners, Society, &c&c of the Metropolis of England', published in the *Monthly Magazine* in 1800 and reprinted, with Craciun's introduction, in *PMLA*, 119/1 (January 2004), 103-119; see also Craciun, 'Mary Robinson, The *Monthly Magazine*, and the Free Press', in part. pp. 30-31. The fact that Coleridge's *Rime of the Ancient Mariner* had been planned for the *Monthly Magazine* before finding its place in *Lyrical Ballads* confirms that the collection should be read dialogically with the periodical. On Coleridge and the *Monthly Magazine*, see Felicity James's contribution to this issue.

³⁴ *Theological Repository* I, vi.

³⁵ Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. Thomas Burger (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989), pp. 33-37. See also Warner, *Letters of the Republic*, 42-49

³⁶ Joseph Priestley, *Life and Correspondence of Joseph Priestley*, ed. John Towill Rutt (London, 1831-2), I, 384; *Theological Repository* VI, 491.

³⁷ See John R. Searle, 'Proper Names', *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), pp. 162-174, in particular p. 168.

³⁸ Joseph Priestley, *Defences of the History of the Corruptions of Christianity* (London, 1783-6), 22; though Priestley also took up the work of Clemens Alexandrinus, whose belief in the humanity of Christ was among the evidence marshalled with a view to substantiate the Unitarian position, see Joseph Priestley, *An History of the Early Opinions Concerning Jesus Christ*, 4 vols. (Birmingham, 1786), pp. 185-188.

³⁹ See Benedict Anderson's definition in his *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, revised edition (London: Verso, 1991), pp. 6-7.

⁴⁰ Joseph Priestley, *An History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ*, 4 vols, (Birmingham, 1786), I, 92-93.

⁴¹ On Hermas and whether he should be included in the canon of the New Testament, see Nathaniel Lardner, *The Credibility of the Gospel History*, 2nd edn. (London, 1750), III, 310-14; see also Joseph Priestley, *An History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, 2 vols (Birmingham, 1782), I, 32-33. Priestley's choice of Hermas as a pseudonym seems odd because Hermas was considered very negatively and quoted in support of the pre-existence of Christ, but on the other hand he also maintained the unit of god and his silence on atonement supported the Unitarian challenge of that doctrine, see *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, pp. 219-220; Id., *An History of Early Opinions Concerning Jesus Christ*, 4 vols. (Birmingham, 1786), I, 103-5; Id., *A General History of the Christian Church, to the Fall of the Western Empire*, 2 vols. (Birmingham, 1790), I, 222-223.

⁴² Joseph Priestley, *Defences of Unitarianism for the Year 1787* (Birmingham, 1788), p. 21.

⁴³ Joseph Priestley, *A General History of the Christian Church*, II, 207-208.

⁴⁴ On Turner's pseudonym, see Rutt's note to *Priestley Life and Correspondence*, I, 112; on his role in the plan of the *Theological Repository*, see *ibid.*, pp. 71-72.

⁴⁵ Priestley acknowledges his use of the signature Pamphilus in his *Letters to the Jews. Part II. Occasioned by Mr. David Levi's reply to the former Letters* (Birmingham, 1787), p. 43 and *Defences of Unitarianism for the Year 1787* (Birmingham, 1788), p. 67.

⁴⁶ For Priestley's attempt to establish and publicize that Isaac Watts had become a Socinian at the end of his life, Priestley to Samuel Merivale, 3 October 1768, in Priestley, *Life and Correspondence*, I, 89.

⁴⁷ See [Nathaniel Lardner], *A Letter writ in the Year 1730. Concerning the Question, Whether the Logos supplied the Place of a Human Soul in the Person of Jesus Christ* (London, 1759).

⁴⁸ Priestley, *Life and Correspondence*, I, 69; Robert E. Schofield, *The Enlightenment of Joseph Priestley: A Study of his Life and Work from 1733 to 1773* (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), p. 194.

⁴⁹ The attribution is confirmed by the fact that the letter was reprinted in *The Works of Nathaniel Lardner*, 11 vols (London, 1788).

⁵⁰ 'A Letter sent by Mr Tomkins, Author of a treatise entitled Jesus Christ the Mediator, to Dr. Lardner, in Reply to his Letter on the Logos', addressed 'to Philalethes', in TR, III, 257-91, on which see Priestley, *Life and Correspondence*, I, 136: 'Dr Lardner's... executor gave me Mr Tomkins's Answer to Dr Lardner on the Logos, for the Repository. It was addressed to Dr Lardner under the name of Philalethes, if I have not been misinformed.' Lardner and Tomkins had gone to study in the Netherland together. In 1709 Lardner preached his first sermon to Tomkins's congregation at Stoke-Newington, see Andrew Kippis's 'Life of Lardner' in *Works of Nathaniel Lardner*, I, ii-iii.

⁵¹ See Rutt's note in Priestley, *Life and Correspondence*, I, 174.

⁵² [Thomas Amory], *The Life of John Bunclie, Esq; Containing Various Observations and Reflections, Made in Several Parts of the World; and Many Extraordinary Relations* (London, 1756), v.

⁵³ [Amory], *The Life of John Bunclie, Esq*, p. iv.

⁵⁴ See Gerard Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, trans. J.E.Lewin (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), pp. 228, 234-236.

⁵⁵ *Monthly Review*, 15 (1756), 497; *Monthly Review*, 35 (1766), 100, 102 footnote. In a letter postmarked Wakefield 19 November 1788 and published in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, Amory's son Robert conflates his father and his best known character, defining him 'my father (John Buncler), Thomas Amory', but argues against the claim that he was 'an Unitarian to a romantic degree', published in the *St James's Chronicle* on 6 November 1788: 'He worships one God through the mediation of Jesus Christ', see *Gentleman's Magazine*, 58/2 (1788), 1062. In 1798 the *Monthly Magazine* claimed him back in the Unitarian fold: On 14 April 1798 Joshua Toulmin sent a 'Letter of the Author of the Life of John Buncler' to the *Monthly Magazine*. In this letter, dated 31 July 1774, Thomas Amory responds to Toulmin's inquiry as to whether Amory was also writing a life of Socinus and whether he would share information and sources, supports Toulmin's decision to write it, praises Socinus's writings and looks forward to a 'useful book... against the incarnation of God, and a Trinity of Almighty persons; the most astonishing, senseless and impious imaginations, that ever got into the heads of great divines and fathers', see *Monthly Magazine*, 5 (May 1798), 364-5.

⁵⁶ 'The rest of this passage, would, we fear, be too rich for the Round Table, as we cannot insert it, in the manner of Mr Buncler, in a sandwich of theology', see William Hazlitt, 'On John Buncler', *The Round Table*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Constable and London: Longman, 1819), I, 159.

⁵⁷ Priestley's correspondence confirms that Turner did sign some articles as Vigilius, often intervening to satisfy the too many queries directed to the editor, see Priestley to Theophilus Lindsay, 21 February 1770, in Priestley, *Life and Correspondence*, I, 112.

⁵⁸ *Gentleman's Magazine*, 58/2 (1788), 1062, responding to *St James's Chronicle*, 6 November 1788.

⁵⁹ William Hazlitt, 'On John Buncler'; Hazlitt, 'Mr Coleridge's Lay Sermon', *Political Essays* (London: Hone, 1819), p. 124. Mr Mudge's impersonation of John Buncler, which Hazlitt recorded in his *Conversations of Northcote* in 1830 was judged so inappropriate as to lead to the temporary suppression of its serialization and later expurgation of all incriminating passages, see William Carew Hazlitt, *Memoirs of William Hazlitt*, 2 vols. (London, 1867), II, 210-212; William Hazlitt, *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt*, ed. by P. P. Howe, 21 vols. (London: Dent, 1930-1934), XI, 220 and 367.

⁶⁰ TR, I, 259-86, 310-314, 314-15.

⁶¹ TR, I, 236-8 responding to 17-45.

⁶² *Critical Review*, 59 (1785), 80.

⁶³ Letter signed P.Q.R., in *Gentleman's Magazine*, 55.1 (February 1785), 112.

⁶⁴ *Gentleman's Magazine*, 55.1 (April 1785), 196-198; in the May issue, see also P.Q.R.'s rejoinder inviting contributors writing about religion to identify themselves by their surname.

⁶⁵ See Priestley, *Life and Correspondence*, I, 377-378.

⁶⁶ *Gentleman's Magazine*, 57.2 (December 1787), 1044, referring to his previous letter published on pp 995-6 reacting to 784-786. See rejoinder in *Gentleman's Magazine*, 57.2 (1797), 1161.

⁶⁷ *Gentleman's Magazine*, 58.1 (1788), 124

⁶⁸ *Gentleman's Magazine*, 58.1 (1788), 3, 122, 123, 316.

⁶⁹ See *Monthly Review*, 48 (June 1783) 515-26 and *Monthly Review*, 49 (August, September 1783) 89-105, 215-48; see also Newcome Cappe's 'In Vindication of Dr Priestley', *Monthly Review*, 49 (1783), 309, and Priestley, *Life and Correspondence*, I, 368-73.

⁷⁰ Thomas Belsham, *Memoirs of the Late Reverend Theophilus Lindsay* (London: Johnson, 1812), pp. 229-230.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 235n, and TR, V.

⁷² See Joseph Priestley, *A General History of the Christian Church, to the Fall of the Western Empire*, 2 vols. (Birmingham, 1790), I, 459, 464.

⁷³ Priestley, *A General History of the Christian Church*, II, 87-88.

⁷⁴ Lardner, *A Letter Writ in the Year 1730*, p. iii.

⁷⁵ See Rutt's account in Priestley, *Life and Correspondence*, I, 69-70n.

⁷⁶ Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (London, 1776), 128-129, 138; Nathaniel Lardner, *A Large Collection of Ancient Jewish and Heathen Testimonies to the Truth of the Christian Religion*, 4 vols. (London, 1764-1767), III, 16-17.

⁷⁷ See Kippis's 'Life of Lardner', in *Works of Nathaniel Lardner*, I, p. lviii; Rutt in Priestley, *Life and Correspondence*, I, 69-70n. In *An Examination of Mr Robinson of Cambridge's Plea for the Divinity of our Lord's Jesus Christ* (London, 1795), p. xviii, Theophilus Lindsay claims instead that the addressee is the Reverend Martin Tomkins.

⁷⁸ N. Fraser, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of actually existing Democracy', in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. by C. Calhoun (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1992), pp. 109-142, especially 114-115 and 125.