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Abstract

Set within the context of a neglected history of lay involvement in High Churchmanship, this thesis argues that William Stevens (1732-1807)—a High Church layman with a successful commercial career—brought to the Church of England not only his piety and theological learning, but his wealth and business acumen. Combined with extensive social links to some of that Church’s most distinguished High Church figures, Stevens exhibited throughout his life an influential example of High Church ‘lay activism’ that was central to the achievements and effectiveness of High Churchmanship during the latter half of the eighteenth century and the early years of the nineteenth.

In this thesis, Stevens’s lay activism is divided into two sub-themes: ‘theological activism’ and ‘ecclesiastical activism’. Theological activism was represented primarily by Stevens’s role as a theologian or ‘lay divine’, a characteristic that resulted in numerous publications that engaged in contemporary intellectual debate. Ecclesiastical activism, on the other hand, represented Stevens’s more practical contributions to Church and society, especially his role as a philanthropist and office holder in a number of Church of England societies. Together, Stevens’s intellectual and practical achievements provide further justification of the revisionist claim that eighteenth-century Anglican High Churchmanship was an active ecclesiastical tradition. Additionally, however, Stevens’s life challenges conventional assumptions about the High Church tradition—especially its tendency to emphasise the lives and experiences of clerics. Stevens, it is argued, though a layman, was one of the influential High Churchmen of his age.
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Introduction

In recent years there has been a growing scholarly trend to take the eighteenth-century High Church tradition within the Church of England more seriously. With only a few exceptions, it was for much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries common to treat eighteenth-century High Churchmanship as moribund and as a movement significant only as preparation for the Oxford Movement. Thus, if eighteenth-century High Churchmanship was discussed, it was mostly viewed as a precursor to the Oxford Movement, rarely as a tradition studied for its own ends or merits.¹ Yet as a number of historians of the last three decades have demonstrated, the High Church tradition in the Georgian era was an active ecclesiastical force.² Building and expanding upon this revisionist historiography, this thesis represents an exploration of the life and achievements of William Stevens (1732-1807), a High Churchman and lay member of the Church of England who, in addition to a successful commercial career, dedicated his life to the defence and advancement of the Church of England. In doing this, it is argued that far from being an exclusively clerical force, Anglican High Churchmanship from the mid-eighteenth to early nineteenth century, received much of its influence and direction from Stevens. Stevens was by no means the sole leader of the High Church movement, but he was nonetheless a figure of leadership, especially within the group of High Churchmen known as the ‘Hutchinsonians’.³ Such was Stevens’s involvement in High Church affairs that this thesis has coined the term ‘lay activism’ to describe his life and work. In discussing Stevens as a lay activist, this thesis has drawn attention to a

---

¹ For a discussion of this historiography, see Chapter 1, 31ff.
² See Chapter 1.
³ For the Hutchinsonian elements in Stevens’s life, see Chapter 4, 169-173 & Chapter 5, 285-317.
number of neglected aspects in the recent historiography of Anglican High Churchmanship. One of these is the rich history of lay involvement within the High Church movement, of which Stevens is a notable example; another is the involvement of lay High Churchmen in the commercially-dominated society of late eighteenth-century England—a context made evident from Stevens’s own background in trade and industry. Like other recent biographies of High Church figures, this thesis shows that a biographical study has wider implications than simply the life and achievements of the individual in question.4

Since the nineteenth century there have been numerous references and discussions highlighting Stevens’s life and achievements within the context of late eighteenth-century High Churchmanship.5 With the recent rise in revisionist


historiography, further mentions of Stevens have been frequent. When all that has been written on Stevens is viewed as a whole, there is a convincing suggestion that Stevens’s life merits a full-length, scholarly examination. It is noteworthy in this regard that the most substantial, authoritative and cited account of Stevens’s life remains Sir James Allan Park’s (1763-1838), Memoirs of William Stevens, the first edition being published in 1812 by the Philanthropic Society, London. An important repository of primary sources and contemporary anecdotes, Park’s Memoirs also provides an important account of traditional High Church spirituality and one generation’s esteem of an individual (Stevens) who provided a model of Anglican faith and practice that he and others greatly admired and sought to emulate.

For an overview and analysis of this revisionist historiography, see Chapter 1.


Park was well placed to write Stevens’s life. Both men had been friends since the late 1780s.\textsuperscript{10} Scottish by birth, Park was raised in England from a young age after his father (an Edinburgh surgeon) moved his practice to Newington, Surrey.\textsuperscript{11} After attending a grammar school in Northampton, Park entered Lincoln’s Inn and was called to the bar on 18 June 1784.\textsuperscript{12} Park was fortunate to receive the patronage of the influential Scottish-born, Lord Chief Justice of England, William Murray (1705-1793).\textsuperscript{13} With Murray’s encouragement, Park published a treatise on Marine insurance that proved popular in the field of conveyancing law into the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{14} Park married in 1791 and prospered in the legal profession, gaining in social stature.\textsuperscript{15} Also receiving the patronage of Murray’s successor, Lloyd Kenyon (1732-1802), Park is said to have been one of the most eminent barristers in London by the turn of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{16} Success in law finally earned him the two major promotions of his life: in 1799 as a King’s Counsel and, in 1816, a Judge of the Common Pleas (he was knighted the same year).\textsuperscript{17} On 10 June 1834, four years prior to his death, Park was awarded a Doctor of Civil Law (DCL) from Oxford University.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{10} See Chapter 6, 353.
\textsuperscript{11} Edward Foss, \textit{The Judges of England}, vol.9, London, 1864, 229; for more on Park’s father, see Chapter 3, 137-138.
\textsuperscript{13} James Oldham, ‘Murray, William’, \textit{ODNB}.
\textsuperscript{15} Foss, \textit{The Judges of England}, 230; Hamilton and Harris, ‘Park, Sir James Alan [sic]’, \textit{ODNB}.
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{The Gentleman’s Magazine}, February 1839, 210.
Park was remembered as a stern and proprietorial figure, who conducted his judicial duties with a reputation for maintaining a high degree of courtroom punctuality and etiquette.¹⁹ His record of gaining convictions is said to have made him a favourite of government when attempting to convict ‘eminent malefactors’.²⁰ Not surprisingly, he gave out harsh sentences, a fact that has led some historians to be critical of him.²¹ Park may, of course, have been a stern judge, though he was not averse to acts of judicial kindness. For instance, as a barrister he is known to have sought clemency on at least one occasion to get a capital forgery conviction reduced to transportation.²² Additionally, Park’s membership within the Philanthropic Society and his association with Stevens, attest to a figure with charitable interests.²³ On his death, Park was not remembered as an uncaring judge, but a kind and charitable individual who often helped the poor.²⁴

The aspect of Park’s life that most impressed observers was his fervent High Church devotion to the rites and teachings of the Church of England.²⁵ This is seen

¹⁹ Even to the point of ejecting people from his court if he thought they were dressed too ostentatiously. See, for example, the following story: ‘At the Winchester assizes, ... Sir Frederick Williams was stopped in the very threshold of his exordium by the worthy judge [Park], who said, “I really cannot permit it, Brother Williams; I must maintain the forensic dignity of the bar.” The advocate looked unutterable things at his lordship, and said, “I do not understand you, my lord.” “Oh, yes, you do; you have a most extraordinary wig on; a very extraordinary wig indeed; really I can’t permit it. You must change your wig. Such a wig as that is no part of the costume of this bar” ’ (The Gentleman’s Magazine, February 1839, 210-211; see also, Foss, The Judges of England, 231).


²³ [Anon.], A List of the Members of the Philanthropic Society, London, 1809, 84.

²⁴ The Gentleman’s Magazine, February 1839, 211.

in his publication in 1804 of a short tract promoting the frequent reception of Holy Communion.\textsuperscript{26} The work proved popular; according to Park’s testimony given in the preface to the 1813 edition, 21,000 copies had been sold since its first edition.\textsuperscript{27} Park’s name would become intimately associated with the circle of High Churchmen who coalesced around Stevens. Park was, for example, a founding member of the dining club formed in Stevens’s memory in 1800, the Club of Nobody’s Friends.\textsuperscript{28} The club would become the chief body that fostered Stevens’s memory and achievements.\textsuperscript{29} It is thus not surprising to see Geoffrey Rowell in his recent history of the Club of Nobody’s Friends, note that sometime in November 1812, Park presented to the club the first edition of the \textit{Memoirs of William Stevens}.\textsuperscript{30} The club’s members are reported to have acclaimed and accepted Park’s account of their founder’s life.\textsuperscript{31} The following year, at a meeting on 29 May, the club requested Park to publish the \textit{Memoirs}. Park agreed to do so at his own expense, deciding to dedicate the profits of the publication to the Scottish Episcopal Church.\textsuperscript{32} However, given that a first edition had already been released, it can be assumed that the 1812 edition had perhaps not been widely circulated outside of Park’s social network.\textsuperscript{33} This makes sense given that the title page of the 1812 edition notes that it was printed by the Philanthropic Society, thus perhaps only being issued privately.

\textsuperscript{26} See James Allan Park, \textit{An Earnest Exhortation to a Frequent Reception of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper}, 1st edn, London, 1804.
\textsuperscript{27} James Allan Park, \textit{An Earnest Exhortation to a Frequent Reception of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper}, 8th edn, London, 1813, 4.
\textsuperscript{28} Cokayne, \textit{Biographical List of the Members of ‘The Club of Nobody’s Friends’}, 6-8.
\textsuperscript{29} See Chapter 6, 370-379.
\textsuperscript{30} Rowell, \textit{The Club of ‘Nobody’s Friends’}, 35.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
amongst that society’s members—in addition to some associated members within the Club of Nobody’s Friends. As has been noted, Park was a member of the Philanthropic Society, though it is uncertain if Stevens was ever associated with this charity.\(^{34}\) However, given that the Philanthropic Society put their name to Park’s *Memoirs*, it can be assumed that this charity was aware of Stevens and endorsed his memory. In fact, the Philanthropic Society’s name continued to appear on the second edition of the *Memoirs*, published in 1814, though the title page of this edition indicates that the *Memoirs* were attempting to reach a wider audience. A number of publishers, including the High Church publisher, Rivingtons, had been employed and it was stated that the profits from sales would go to the Scottish Episcopal Church.\(^{35}\) As a demonstration of this, a dedicatory letter penned by Park to the Scottish Episcopal Bishop of Aberdeen, John Skinner (1744-1816), is also present in this edition.\(^{36}\)

Park’s *Memoirs* would go through three more editions, in 1823, 1825 and 1859.\(^{37}\) In the 1823 and 1825 editions, the connections with the Philanthropic Society and the Scottish Episcopal Church had been dropped, as had the dedicatory letter to Skinner. However, a postscript had been added, which was a short obituary of another High Church layman, John Bowdler (1746-1823), a close friend of Stevens who had been present at Stevens’s deathbed.\(^{38}\) By 1823 Rivingtons had also become the sole publisher of the work. The final edition of the *Memoirs*, published

---

\(^{34}\) [Anon.], *A List of the Members of the Philanthropic Society*, 84.


\(^{36}\) Ibid, iii-vi.


in 1859, was not in fact the sole work of Park (who died in 1838), but was edited by Christopher Wordsworth Jnr (1807-1885) and was an edition prepared for the Club of Nobody’s Friends.\textsuperscript{39} Wordsworth Jnr was a member of the club from 1839 onwards.\textsuperscript{40} His influence on the 1859 edition can be seen in his editing and simplification of Park’s grammar, the re-introduction of the dedicatory letter to Skinner and his inclusion of three appendices—the first, a short treatise by Stevens on Confirmation; the second, an annotated booklist penned by Stevens; the third, a membership list of the club.\textsuperscript{41} The fact that this edition came out with the fingerprints of the Club of Nobody’s Friends all over it is a strong indication that Park’s depiction of Stevens’s life and achievements still resonated within the club’s collective memory.\textsuperscript{42}

This multiplicity of editions did not, however, make for a greatly changed text. The 1812 edition is almost exactly the same as the 1825 edition. As an historical source, the \textit{Memoirs} remain crucial in examining Stevens’s life and influence. They indicate Park had access to many of Stevens’s personal papers and financial records, much of which now seems lost. Thus, Park’s extensive quotations from Stevens’s correspondence, in which he frequently quotes entire letters, provides us with one of the few remaining repositories of correspondence penned by Stevens. Also, given the fact that Park personally knew Stevens and had personal knowledge of him and his friends, the \textit{Memoirs} could be said to almost qualify as a primary source. Yet despite its historical value in this regard, Park’s biography was nonetheless a distinctly hagiographic and uncritical piece of writing that almost

\textsuperscript{39} Andrews, ‘ “Master in the Art of Holy Living” ’, 316 n49.
\textsuperscript{40} [Anon.], \textit{A List of the Members of the Philanthropic Society}, 126.
\textsuperscript{41} Park, \textit{Memoirs}, 1859 edn, 147-216.
\textsuperscript{42} Andrews, ‘ “Master in the Art of Holy Living” ’, 316 n49.
elevated Stevens to High Church sainthood, thus requiring the work be read with a highly critical eye.\textsuperscript{43} Park, indeed, left no uncertainty regarding his desire to promote the sanctity of Stevens. This was as much of a motive for the work as his desire to narrate the life of Stevens itself. For Park, Stevens was a ‘master in the art of holy living’, linking him to a High Church tradition of sanctity promoted by divines such as Jeremy Taylor and William Law.\textsuperscript{44} Stevens’s sanctity was evidenced by a strong commitment to philanthropy and ecclesiastical activism, a devout piety manifested in a regular commitment to the services and rites the Church of England and a religious fervour that rejected all forms of ‘enthusiasm’.\textsuperscript{45} Enthusiasm was a bug-bear for eighteenth-century High Churchmen. The term had a pejorative meaning and was used to label what were seen as religious deviations such as excessive emotionalism, a claim to private revelation or the overuse of one’s imagination and emotions.\textsuperscript{46} It was usually used against Methodists and other Nonconformists, though sometimes Church of England Evangelicals were also labelled as such.\textsuperscript{47} Ideologically sound and pious, Stevens was presented as a figure whose religious faith opposed all that was heterodox in his age. Moreover, Stevens’s life was put forward as a model of how holiness could be achieved for those who sought to make religion the central aspect of their lives. This motive is evident on the title page where Park quotes the seventeenth-century English writer, Owen Felltham (c.1602-1668), from his popular work, \textit{Resolves, Divine, Moral, and Political} (1623): ‘He, who desires that the table

\textsuperscript{43} See \textit{ibid}, \textit{passim}.
\textsuperscript{44} Park, \textit{Memoirs}, 4th edn, 14, 36, 85, 131; see also, Andrews, ‘ “Master in the Art of Holy Living” ’, 308.
\textsuperscript{45} Andrews, ‘ “Master in the Art of Holy Living” ’, 310-313.
\textsuperscript{47} Andrews, ‘ “Master in the Art of Holy Living” ’, 313.
of his life may be fair, will be careful to propose to himself the best examples; and will never be content, till he equals or excels them." Given that Stevens had combined a devout religious life with a successful lay career in commerce and industry, Park thought young readers especially would most benefit from reading about Stevens's life, taking him as a model they themselves could emulate.

One view, therefore, which the Author has in submitting this sketch of the life of Mr. Stevens to the world is to prove, and particularly to the young, how much every man has it in his power, even under very discouraging circumstances, by diligence, fidelity, and attention, to advance himself, not only in worldly prosperity, but in learning and wisdom, in purity of life, and in moral and religious knowledge.

This moralistic and religiously didactic motive in the Memoirs provides a plausible explanation regarding the link to the Philanthropic Society present in the 1812 and 1814 editions. The Philanthropic Society was a charity that had as its object the prevention of crime through the reformation of criminal minors, making it a charity with a modus operandi that corresponded to Park's background in the judiciary. The charity thus had a desire to promote a more virtuous manner of living to those children it was attempting to help. Whether the Philanthropic Society actually envisaged using the Memoirs to teach its subjects that a moral and religious life was of benefit to its charitable recipients is uncertain. Nonetheless, a connection between the society and Park's motive in presenting Stevens as a model for young

---

48 See the title pages for all five editions of the Memoirs; see also, Owen Felltham, Resolves, Divine, Moral, and Political, 2nd edn, London, 1820, 362; see also, xxv-xxvi, where the editor of Felltham's Resolves makes reference to Park's biography and Stevens's life.

49 Park, Memoirs, 4th edn, 3.

50 [Anon.], An Address to the Public, From the Philanthropic Society, London, 1792, title page.
people is apparent.\textsuperscript{51} However, if any group of individuals had a vested interest in promoting and nurturing the memory of Stevens, it was his close High Church network of friends, many of whom lived on into the nineteenth century within the Club of Nobody’s Friends.

Park’s influence has meant that those writing up until the present day have usually always relied upon him as their main source when discussing Stevens. It is true that some nineteenth-century writers, like Edward Churton and John Skinner, did add to what is known about Stevens by contributing a small amount of original research; but these writers were an exception to the majority of those who have relied primarily on Park.\textsuperscript{52} It is, of course, true that in more recent times some of the revisionist historians mentioned above, especially E. A. Varley, F. C. Mather, Geoffrey Rowell and Peter Nockles have all made original contributions in highlighting Stevens’s importance as a lay ecclesiastical figure, as well as his neglected role in recent historiography.\textsuperscript{53} These writers have all incorporated Stevens into broader revisionist claims regarding the vitality of late eighteenth-century High Churchmanship. They highlight Stevens as a figure who played a significant role in

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item See for example, Park, \textit{Memoirs}, 4th edn, 7 (emphasis in original): ‘I repeat the assertion for the benefit of the rising generation; for the fact is so, however improbable and strange it may appear to the indolent and slothful; whose sole employment in the period of youth is to kill time, as they call it, by literally doing nothing; or by doing what is worse than nothing, indulging in criminal pleasures, which ruin the constitution both of body and mind. But so did not the excellent person, whose life we are now recording, spend his youth and strength: for from his earliest years he was, what he continued during his long life to be, an example of the strictest purity of life and sobriety of manners, patient industry and attention to business, and of incorruptible integrity’.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
making High Churchmanship an influential ecclesiastical tradition during this time; his combined abilities within the spheres of commerce, theology, philanthropy, practical activism and ecclesiastical networking singling him out as an influential or ‘remarkable layman’, to use Mather’s phrase.\(^{54}\) All of this scholarship suggests that there was something unique about Stevens’s contribution to late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century High Churchmanship.

Some of this recent scholarship was among the first to draw upon the Jonathan Boucher Papers, now housed at the College of William and Mary, Virginia.\(^{55}\) This important repository contains ninety letters from Stevens to Boucher. Rowell, in particular, has made much use of these letters.\(^{56}\) Mather also used these letters to draw attention to Stevens’s previously undiscussed commercial ventures within Wales, in addition to his role in the formation of the British Critic.\(^{57}\) The Boucher correspondence contains a great deal of information about Stevens’s life not contained in the Memoirs—much of which, despite Rowell and Mather’s contributions, is yet to discussed at length. Indeed, the many facets of Stevens’s life—commercial, theological, ecclesiastical and philanthropic—suggest a type of lay activism worthy of a more detailed examination and synthesis.

However, before this thesis proceeds, some discussion regarding terminology is needed regarding to the use of the terms ‘Anglican’ and ‘Anglicanism’ in this study. To this day, owing greatly to the worldwide expansion of the Anglican

---

\(^{54}\) Mather, High Church Prophet, 14’; see also, Varley, The Last of the Prince Bishops, 10; Nockles, ‘Stevens, William’, ODNB.

\(^{55}\) See Earl Gregg Swem Library, Jonathan Boucher Papers, B/3/1-90. When Mather accessed these papers they were held at East Sussex Record Office (see Mather, High Church Prophet, 14 n58 & 60, 314).


\(^{57}\) Ibid, 17; Mather, High Church Prophet, 14 n60, 213-216.
Communion since the nineteenth century, the terms have a wide and common historiographical usage, yet their use date mostly from the mid-nineteenth century, giving them an element of anachronism when applied to individuals living before then who themselves would not have adopted the term. Moreover, given the theological diversity present among Anglicans over the centuries, it is technically more accurate to speak of ‘Anglicanisms’ in the plural. Though aware of this problem, this thesis has nonetheless continued to make use of ‘Anglican’ and ‘Anglicanism’. This is both for historiographical and pragmatic reasons. Not only do the terms have a wide use among historians, a lack of viable alternatives to label individual and collective members of the Church of England (later the Anglican Communion) means such terminology can be maintained.

The structure of this thesis is largely thematic. Chapter 1 deals with the broad history and historiography of High Churchmanship. Here the historical background of the High Church tradition is given, as is a definition of what beliefs and principles constitute High Churchmanship. Similar to the problems relating to the term ‘Anglicanism’, this chapter also contains a discussion dealing with the problems of terminology that relate to ‘High Churchmanship’. From here, the evolution of historical opinion regarding High Churchmanship is analysed. This section has a focus on recent revisionist accounts of High Churchmanship and the recent challenges to this perspective.

60 Nockles, ‘Survivals or New Arrivals?’, 191.
Chapter 2 introduces the lay context of this thesis by a historical survey of notable High Church laymen and laywomen who lived before Stevens. Given the neglected role that the laity has played within High Church historiography, it is necessary to set the context of Stevens’s life by demonstrating that his presence as a lay ecclesiastical figure has a rich—and largely unexamined—tradition within High Church Anglicanism.

Chapter 3 gives the early biographical details of Stevens’s life and then focuses on his commercial background as a wholesale hosier and sometime part-owner of a Welsh ironworks. This aspect of Stevens’s life is emphasised as its importance within previous representations of Stevens has been neglected. Such a discussion gives rise to the similarly neglected relationship between commerce and High Churchmanship in general. Stevens, far from being a lone example of a lay High Churchman who combined piety with commerce, was in fact only one of many High Church laymen who arose to prominence from within the commercially-dominated society of eighteenth-century England.

From here Stevens’s lay activism is studied in detail. Chapters 4 and 5 discuss what this thesis has termed ‘theological activism’—that is, Stevens’s role as a lay divine and theological controversialist. Chapter 4 begins by noting the theological sources specific to Stevens’s own style of High Churchmanship (especially the dominance of Hutchinsonianism), before dealing with the 1770s and Stevens’s role in responding as a published author to the ideological threat of latitudinarianism, the American Revolution and the biblical scholarship of Benjamin Kennicott. Chapter 5, on the other hand, relates mostly to the 1790s and the threat of the French Revolution. Here, Stevens helped launch a number of High Church initiatives—all of which were aimed at the ideological threat of the French
Revolution and the broader intellectual movement of the late Enlightenment. Later in that decade, the continuing (and divisive) presence of Hutchinsonianism within the thought of Stevens and his circle of High Church friends becomes the chief object of discussion.

Chapter 6 is dedicated to ‘ecclesiastical activism’, what is argued as Stevens’s more practical contributions to Church and society. Here Stevens’s activities as a wealthy and dedicated philanthropist are noted and set within the context of a High Church spirituality that emphasised good works as evidence of salvation. Ecclesiastical activism, however, designates a wider involvement in Church and society than simply an individual contribution charity or parochial church life—hence, Stevens’s contributions within Church of England societies and organizations such as the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG) and Queen Anne’s Bounty are analysed. Following the consecration of Samuel Seabury in 1784, Stevens’s lay activism is shown to have a British and, to a lesser extent, a trans-Atlantic context in his work on behalf of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The final section in this thesis deals with the significance of the Club of Nobody’s Friends, founded in 1800.

These chapters will lead to the conclusion that Stevens was one of the most influential High Church figures of his age and that his contributions as a lay activist necessitates a revision of the historiography of High Churchmanship. His rise to ecclesiastical prominence from a commercial background, and his exercising of intellectual and practical influence within an Anglican tradition commonly viewed as clerical, emphasises the importance of the laity to the High Church tradition, and of the need for Church historians to broaden their focus when writing about this Anglican tradition.