

## *The Mock-Preacher* (1739): More than just an anti-Methodist play?

In his 1902 bibliography of eighteenth-century anti-Methodist publications, Richard Green had very little to say about the 1739 play *The Mock-Preacher: A Satyrico-Comical-Allegorical Farce*, which he simply dismissed as a 'coarse, vulgar, filthy production, holding up Whitefield to ridicule in a vile manner.'<sup>1</sup> Green's assessment of the play was true in the sense that, when one compares it to the numerous anti-Methodist publications that were also written during the early years of the evangelical revival, this play was easily the most personal and brutal attack on any individual preacher. Interestingly, the author of *The Mock-Preacher* utilises many of the criticisms that were regularly voiced by opponents of the revival. Such similarities to other contemporary anti-Methodist works will be highlighted throughout this analysis. Unfortunately, one gets the impression that Green only gave the contents of this work a cursory glance and then dismissed it for its bawdy tone. In fact, *The Mock-Preacher* is more than just a critique of the revival. Indeed, while most of the play is dedicated to ridiculing Whitefield, a portion of it also targets the contemporary Church of England, or, more specifically, the High Church faction within it.

According to an advertisement that appeared in the *London Evening Post* on 16 June, 1739, *The Mock-Preacher* was published on 'This Day.'<sup>2</sup> Charles Corbett, a printer and bookseller of Fleet Street, was responsible for the publication and sale of this 32-page-long work, which was priced at sixpence.<sup>3</sup> Although this would have

---

This article originated as a presentation given at the 'Reading, Writing and Religion 1660-1830' symposium at Queen Mary University of London in December 2013. I am grateful for the constructive feedback I received from Alison Searle, Victoria Van Hyning and Peter Forsaith. I also wish to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Brian Young, who kindly read a draft of this article.

<sup>1</sup> Richard Green, *Anti-Methodist Publications Issued During the Eighteenth Century* (London: C. H. Kelly, 1902), p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> *London Evening Post*, 16 June, 1739.

<sup>3</sup> Corbett was involved in the publication and sale of several other anti-Methodist works. The edition of the *London Evening Post* that advertised *The Mock-Preacher* also contained an advertisement for a forthcoming work by 'T.H.', entitled 'The METHODISTS. A SATIRE.' Apparently, this work was going to be 'Printed for Charles Corbett...and sold by D. Henry, Printer, at Reading.' Interestingly, the 28 June edition of the *London Daily Post* contained a 'This Day is publish'd' advertisement for a work by 'T.H.', entitled 'THE METHODISTS, a Satirical POEM.' Evidently, these advertisements were both referring to the same work. Yet, the latter advertisement stated that this work had been 'Printed for D. Henry' and 'sold in London by C. Corbett.' This suggests that the *London Evening Post* got the respective roles of Henry and Corbett mixed up. Unfortunately, no copies of this work appear to have survived. See also *A Compleat Account of the Conduct of that Eminent Enthusiast Mr. Whitefield* (London: C. Corbett, 1739); *Enthusiasm Display'd; or, The Moor-Fields Congregation* ([London]: C. Corbett, 1739).

been 'within the financial reach of the less well-off', the fact that no subsequent editions of *The Mock-Preacher* were published implies that this play did not sell well.<sup>4</sup>

Furthermore, Green's description of this play as a 'production' suggests that he paid scant attention to the anonymous playwright's prologue. The title page of this publication states that *The Mock-Preacher* was 'Acted to a Crowded Audience at Kennington-Common and many other Theatres.'<sup>5</sup> Yet, according to the prologue, it was not the author's intention for this play to be introduced 'on the Stage' and no record can be found of *The Mock-Preacher* being performed at all.<sup>6</sup> By describing Kennington Common, which was a regular venue for Whitefield's open-air services, as a theatre, the author is, in fact, likening the young itinerant's services to theatrical performances. This was not the only anti-Methodist publication that made such a comparison. A later pamphlet entitled *Harlequin Methodist* contained an illustration which depicted Whitefield giving a performance as Harlequin, complete with a black mask and cape.<sup>7</sup> Whitefield's oratorical style certainly resembled that of a performer, which is unsurprising, given that he had displayed a passion for acting and mimicry as a child.<sup>8</sup>

Elsewhere on the title page, there is a reference to the 'Humours of the Mob.' The inclusion of the word 'Mob' suggests that the author is attempting to portray revivalist meetings as events that tended to attract the lower orders. By claiming that Whitefield raised the 'Humours' of this group of people, the author is portraying revivalism as an intellectually inferior phenomenon.<sup>9</sup> Numerous other opponents of Whitefield provided similar descriptions of what they believed to be the typical revivalist audience. For example, a month before *The Mock-Preacher* was published, an article in the *Weekly Miscellany* reported that itinerant preachers were 'Ringleaders of the Rabble.'<sup>10</sup> There is certainly much truth in the claim that Methodism had a special appeal to the labouring poor. This can be partly explained by the fact that, unlike parish churches, open-air revival meetings were devoid of any form of social segregation.<sup>11</sup>

It becomes evident to the reader that the Mock Preacher is supposed to represent Whitefield at the beginning of the first scene, where the preacher compares Christ's birth in a 'Stable' to his own upbringing in 'an Inn.' This is clearly a reference to Whitefield's upbringing in the Bell Inn, a public house in Gloucester that was owned by his father and, subsequently, his brother. By comparing himself to Christ, the

<sup>4</sup> Gavin Budge, Michael Caines, Daniel Cook and Bonnie Latimer, 'Literary and Cultural Figures, Genres and Contexts', in Gary Day and Bridget Keegan (eds), *The Eighteenth-Century Literature Handbook* (London: Continuum, 2009), p. 67.

<sup>5</sup> *The Mock-Preacher: A Satyrico-Comical-Allegorical Farce* (London: C. Corbett, 1739), p. 2.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>7</sup> *Harlequin Methodist, to the Tune of 'An Old Woman Cloathed in Grey'* ([London]: n.p., [1750]).

<sup>8</sup> Harry S. Stout, *The Divine Dramatist: George Whitefield and the Rise of Modern Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), pp. 4-5.

<sup>9</sup> *Mock-Preacher*, p. 2.

<sup>10</sup> *Weekly Miscellany*, 12 May, 1739.

<sup>11</sup> Mark Smith, 'The Hanoverian Parish: Towards a New Agenda', *Past and Present*, no. 216, (August, 2012), p. 94.

preacher instantly comes across as extremely arrogant. Spiritual pride was a charge that Whitefield often faced during the early years of his ministry. This is unsurprising, given that Whitefield's early journals were filled with accounts of divine providence governing his every move (sometimes in even the most obscure of circumstances).<sup>12</sup> One contemporary critic of Whitefield viewed such accounts of divine intervention as an attempt to 'mimick the Apostles.'<sup>13</sup>

Elsewhere, the preacher voices his contempt for 'Riches', which he describes as obstructions to one's 'Passage to Heaven.'<sup>14</sup> Here, the author is mocking the prominence of anti-wealth sentiments in Whitefield's sermons. For example, in one of his earliest sermons, the then 22 year old evangelist had denounced: 'The covetous Worldling, that employs all his Care and Pains in "heaping up riches."<sup>15</sup> Following his condemnation of wealth, the Mock Preacher then instructs his followers to give their money to him, or more explicitly, 'the pretty little Orphans in *Georgia*.'<sup>16</sup> The gullibility of these followers is particularly illustrated later in this scene, when the preacher praises his 'flock' for their many generous donations, but warns them that he 'can't tell indeed how long it will be, before they [the orphans] will have it all...for it is a great way to *Georgia*, and who can tell but that some Accident or other may happen, to prevent my good Design?'<sup>17</sup> It is obvious to the reader that this orphanage in Georgia does not exist and that the preacher has simply filled his own pockets with these donations. The allegation of financial deception was one of the most common criticisms that Whitefield faced. In 1740, Joseph Trapp, an Anglican clergyman and Oxford don, claimed that the amount of money Whitefield had raised over the previous three years was more 'than one of the Generality of the Clergy receives from his Preferment, in *twenty* [years].'<sup>18</sup> Trapp also had his suspicions about whether the destinations of these funds was 'indeed, to be for *Charity*.'<sup>18</sup>

In the following scene, the preacher is away from his audience and it is here that the reader sees that all of this money has enabled him to purchase 'the most costly Linnen', a 'Perriwig of five Guineas Price', and a 'Gold watch.'<sup>19</sup> It is possible that the playwright is adding a touch of irony by describing the preacher's love of finery

<sup>12</sup> For example, in one of his published journals, Whitefield's entry for 22<sup>nd</sup> February, 1737 read: 'This Day I intended to stay on Board to write Letters; but GOD being pleased to shew me, it was not his Will, I went on Shore again.' See George Whitefield, *A Journal of a Voyage from Gibraltar to Georgia* (London: T. Cooper, 1738), p. 3. This particular entry was ridiculed by Bishop Gibson in *The Bishop of London's Pastoral Letter to the People of his Diocese* (London: S. Buckley, 1739), p. 27.

<sup>13</sup> *A Letter to the Right Reverend the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, upon Mr. Whitefield's Extraordinary Manner of Preaching the Gospel, his Criminal Presumption, and Enthusiastick Doctrine* (London: J. Brett, 1739), p. 11.

<sup>14</sup> *Mock-Preacher*, p. 10.

<sup>15</sup> George Whitefield, *The Benefits of an Early Piety. A Sermon Preach'd at Bow-Church, London, Before the Religious Societies, at one of their Quarterly Meetings, on Wednesday, September 28. 1737* (London: C. Rivington and James Hutton, 1737), p. 2.

<sup>16</sup> *Mock-Preacher*, p. 10.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.

<sup>18</sup> Joseph Trapp, *The True Spirit of the Methodists and their Allies (Whether Other Enthusiasts, Papists, Deists, Quakers or Atheists) Fully Laid Open* (London: T. Cooper, 1740), pp. 53-4.

<sup>19</sup> *Mock-Preacher*, pp. 13-4.

and jewellery. Indeed, Whitefield was highly critical of fine dress and similar luxuries, which he described as 'Pomps and Vanities of this wicked World' in his published journal.<sup>20</sup> Similar irony can be found in another scene, where the preacher is holding a meeting with his deputies in a tavern.<sup>21</sup> In a sermon he preached on Kennington Common in 1739, Whitefield chastised his fellow Anglican clergymen for 'frequenting Taverns and publick Houses' and urged the laity to avoid such places too.<sup>22</sup> It is also in this scene that the reader is introduced to the preacher's two deputies. The possibility that the deputies are supposed to represent John and Charles Wesley can be discerned from a conversation between these two characters, in which one deputy refers to the other as 'Brother.'<sup>23</sup> Assuming these characters are indeed meant to represent the Wesley brothers, their subordinate role in the story reflects the fact that most of the early anti-Methodist works primarily targeted Whitefield and not these two brothers.

In a later scene, allegations of crypto-popery and Jacobitism can be discerned from the preacher's description of Spain as a 'Proud Nation.' The preacher then goes on to inform his followers that, during his time in Gibraltar, he had been an 'Eye-Witness to the Bravery' of the English military forces. The falseness of this display of patriotism becomes evident when the preacher declares that he has instructed these soldiers and sailors that 'if their Enemies smote them upon one cheek, they must likewise turn the other.' One can see here that, through his utilisation of Jesus' teachings on pacifism, the preacher has ordered these men to refrain from fighting the Spaniards in Gibraltar. The preacher's candour about his treason, coupled with the fact that none of the crowd appears to be the least bit concerned about it, further suggests that the author is attempting to display Whitefield's converts as gullible and completely oblivious to his blatant treason.<sup>24</sup> The charge of crypto-popery was something that Whitefield regularly faced. There were numerous ways in which Whitefield and other evangelicals were compared to Roman Catholics and a discussion of each of these would be beyond the focus of this study. Most prominently though, it was the way in which these preachers allegedly aroused the passions of their audiences that many found especially reminiscent of popery. For example, one critic of the revival declared 'that a *passionate, mechanical* Religion is the most sublime and pure Spirit that there is in *Popery*.'<sup>25</sup>

Yet, the Mock Preacher also has his critics. One character who has absolutely no time for him is a local cobbler. However, the cobbler's sentiments are not shared by

<sup>20</sup> George Whitefield, *A Continuation of the Reverend Mr. Whitefield's Journal, from a Few Days After His Return to Georgia to His Arrival at Falmouth, on the 11th of March 1741* (London: T. Cooper, 1741), p. 42.

<sup>21</sup> *Mock-Preacher*, pp. 23-4.

<sup>22</sup> George Whitefield, *Jesus Christ the Only Way to Salvation. A Sermon Preached on Kennington-Common* (London: C. Whitefield, 1739), pp. 6, 17.

<sup>23</sup> *Mock-Preacher*, p. 14.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>25</sup> Eusebius, *A Fine Picture of Enthusiasm, Chiefly Drawn by Dr. John Scott, Formerly Rector of St. Giles's in the Fields* (London: J. Noon, 1744), p. iv.

his wife, whose admiration for the 'very fine' preacher borders on infatuation.<sup>26</sup> Anti-Methodist publications often claimed that 'ignorant women' were particularly vulnerable to the 'enthusiasm' of the evangelical revival.<sup>27</sup> This is an allegation that the playwright is clearly attempting to voice through the weak and gullible cobbler's wife, who is also the only significant female character in the play. Furthermore, the alleged spiritual vulnerability of women was deemed to be something that rendered them vulnerable to immorality too. One 1743 anti-Methodist publication evoked images of the Garden of Eden by describing female followers of Whitefield and Wesley as 'Women [who] are most prone to fall, Like *Eve*, their Mother, first of all.'<sup>28</sup> In *The Mock-Preacher*, the author applies this image of the 'fallen' evangelical woman to the cobbler's wife by implying that she has become romantically involved with the evangelist. Indeed, after she informs her husband that the preacher will show her the 'Way to Heaven', the cobbler quips that he will also be guaranteed a 'Place' there, since 'Cuckolds go to Heaven.'<sup>29</sup> By describing himself as a 'cuckold', the cobbler is evidently accusing his wife of adultery. This is confirmed by the wife's angry reaction: 'Do you question my Virtue? Do you call me a Whore?' The cobbler's accusation of adultery appears to have been triggered by his wife's admiration for the preacher. This suggests that the cobbler believes that his wife has been sexually seduced by the preacher, as well as spiritually seduced.<sup>30</sup> Sexual predation was another accusation that was frequently levelled against Whitefield. One contemporary satirist crudely described Methodist Love Feasts as events which enabled Whitefield to observe a 'youthful Creature's lily Breast.'<sup>31</sup>

This confrontation between the cobbler and his wife highlights the detrimental effect that the preacher has had on the stability of this family. At the beginning of this scene, the cobbler angrily complains that he has been left to 'nurse' his offspring. From this, one can see that the author is portraying the evangelical revival as a movement that is both tearing families apart and destroying traditional gender roles. In this instance, it is clearly the traditional role of the domestic wife that has been affected.<sup>32</sup> Familial instability was a regular theme in anti-Methodist works. Around the same time that this play was published, another opponent of Whitefield enquired: 'How many weak women, surprized by his Enthusiasm, will neglect the care of their Families?'<sup>33</sup> Other contemporaries feared that such neglect would eventually lead

<sup>26</sup> *Mock-Preacher*, p. 15.

<sup>27</sup> [Edmund Gibson], *The Charge of the Right Reverend Father in God, Edmund, Lord Bishop of London, at the Visitation of his Diocese in the Years 1746 and 1747* ([London]: n.p., [1747]), p.6. For two other examples of anti-Methodist works which portrayed the revival as a movement that was dominated by females, see the illustrations contained in *Harlequin Methodist* and *Enthusiasm Display'd*. Importantly, these two illustrations specifically depict Whitefield as somebody who gained a following among women.

<sup>28</sup> *The Progress of Methodism in Bristol; or, The Methodist Unmask'd* (Bristol: J. Watts, 1743), p. 20.

<sup>29</sup> *Mock-Preacher*, p. 15.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 15-6.

<sup>31</sup> *The Amorous Humours and Audacious Adventures of One Whd.* (London: M. Watson, 1739), p. 7.

<sup>32</sup> *Mock-Preacher*, p. 15.

<sup>33</sup> *A Letter to the Right Reverend the Archbishops and Bishops*, p. 17.

families into destitution, making them 'burthensome to their Parishes.'<sup>34</sup> For the cobbler, this becomes a reality when his wife informs him that they no longer have any money, as she has 'lent' it all 'to the Lord' (or, more specifically, the preacher's 'cause'). The wife's use of the term 'lent' is an allusion to how Samuel had been 'lent to the Lord' by his mother Hannah, who, after continuously praying to God, had miraculously given birth to the child, despite being infertile (1 Samuel 1: 28). One can discern from this that the cobbler's wife feels just as indebted to the preacher as Hannah did to God.<sup>35</sup>

Whilst it is evident that the anonymous author of this play was no admirer of either Whitefield or revivalism in general, it is also clear from one scene that the author was just as critical of the contemporary Church of England. In this scene, the reader is introduced to three characters called Namirreb, Omnes and Part.<sup>36</sup> That these three characters are supposed to be Anglican ministers becomes clear at the start of the scene, where Namirreb voices his worry that the Mock Preacher's followers will be unable to 'pay their proper Pastors' as a result of their constant donations to the itinerant. Evidently, Namirreb is talking about the payment of tithes. The fact that this criticism is voiced at the very beginning of the scene suggests that the author intended to portray contemporary Anglican ministers as a self-interested group of people, whose main concern about the revival is the effect that it will have on their own finances.<sup>37</sup>

Namirreb goes on to say that the 'Scriptures being translated into *English*, has made every ignorant Upstart turn Preacher, and Coblers are become Commentators.' Part concurs with his colleague and states that 'Religion ought to be couch'd under Mysteries.' Namirreb also argues that the 'Laity should mind their temporal Affairs only, and trust their Souls with us.'<sup>38</sup> From this conversation, one can see that the author is attempting to display contemporary Anglicans as autocratic and popish. These clergymen's High Church leanings can be discerned from their praise for 'Archbishop *Laud*', whom Part describes as 'that glorious Martyr', and their tribute to the 'blessed and immortal Memory' of 'Queen *Anne*.' With regard to the latter monarch, these clergymen lament that, 'Had she liv'd, the *Convocation* would have

<sup>34</sup> *Observations on the Reverend Mr. Whitefield's Answer to the Bishop of London's Last Pastoral Letter* (London: J. Roberts, 1739), p. 26. See also Ralph Skerret, *The Nature and Proper Evidence of Regeneration* (London: C. Davis, 1739), pp. vii-viii.

<sup>35</sup> *Mock-Preacher*, p. 16. I am grateful to Alison Searle for pointing out to me that this is an allusion to the First Book of Samuel.

<sup>36</sup> When spelt backwards, 'Part' and 'Namirreb' become 'Trap' and 'Berriman.' Therefore, the character of Part is supposed to represent Joseph Trapp, who, as has already been argued, was a very vocal opponent of the revival. Namirreb represents William Berriman, another contemporary High Churchman, who preached an anti-Methodist sermon in 1739. This sermon was subsequently published as *A Sermon Preach'd to the Religious Societies in and about London at their Quarterly Meeting in the Parish Church of St. Mary le Bow on Wednesday, March the 21st. 1738-9* (London: John Carter, 1739). 'Omnes' is most likely a misspelling of the Latin term 'Omnis', which means everything and all. This suggests that the character of Omnes represents all of the remaining critics of Methodism within the established Church.

<sup>37</sup> *Mock-Preacher*, p. 20.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 20-1.

taken these Affairs in hand.<sup>39</sup> Around the time that *The Mock-Preacher* was published, another anti-Methodist writer had called for the Convocation to take action against Whitefield, before facetiously adding: 'But I forget, a Convocation now is an *Inquisition!*'<sup>40</sup> Ironically, Part has no qualms about likening the relatively powerful Convocation of Queen Anne's short reign to the persecuting regimes of Roman Catholic nations and proudly calls for a 'Protestant Inquisition.' This further implies that the playwright is likening High Churchmen to papists.<sup>41</sup>

Finally, as a means of dealing with the Mock Preacher, Part suggests utilising 'an unrepeal'd Statute of *Charles* the Second, which forbids preaching in Fields and upon Commons.'<sup>42</sup> Here, the character is referring to the 1670 Conventicles Act (22 Car. II. c. 1), which criminalised the gathering of 'five persons or more' in a house or field 'under colour or pretence of any Exercise of Religion.'<sup>43</sup> Part's enthusiasm for a 69 year old piece of legislation highlights the established Church's desperation and powerlessness against this revivalist threat.<sup>44</sup> Such desperation and helplessness is further implied when Part states his intention to 'muster up all our Forces', adding that he has 'already prepared some Discourses against him [the Mock Preacher]' to be 'communicated to the Publick.' This suggests that, rather than being physically threatening, the established Church's 'Forces' amount to nothing more than a series of literary critiques.<sup>45</sup> Evidently, the author is mocking the many critiques that Anglican

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 21-2. Jeremy Gregory notes that whilst Convocation 'had a negligible part to play in voicing Church interests' after the Restoration, the period between 1701 and 1717 (which covers all of Queen Anne's reign) was an exception to this rule. See Jeremy Gregory, 'Archbishops of Canterbury, their diocese, and the shaping of the National Church', in Jeremy Gregory and Jeffrey S. Chamberlain (eds), *The National Church in Local Perspective: The Church of England and the Regions, 1660-1800* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), p. 32.

<sup>40</sup> Timothy Scrub, *A Letter to Robert Seagrave, M.A., Occasioned by His Two Late Performances: One Entitled, an Answer to Dr. Trapp's Four Sermons. The Other Called, Remarks on the Bishop of London's Pastoral Letter* (London: J. Roberts, 1739), p. 37.

<sup>41</sup> *Mock-Preacher*, p. 21.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>43</sup> 'Charles II, 1670: An Act to Prevent and Suppress Seditious Conventicles.', *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=47409> [accessed: 1 January 2014].

<sup>44</sup> *A Compleat Account of the Conduct of that Eminent Enthusiast Mr. Whitefield*, which was also published in 1739 and sold by Corbett, was one anti-Methodist work that referred to this legislation (p. 14). However, the author of *The Mock-Preacher* could not have consulted this work, which (according to an advertisement that appeared in the *Weekly Miscellany* on this date) was not published until 14 July, 1739. In the prologue of *The Mock-Preacher*, the playwright boasts of having 'diligently' studied the 'History of England' (p. 6). This may explain where the playwright's knowledge of the 1670 Conventicles Act stemmed from. For two later examples of anti-Methodist publications which referred to this legislation, see J. B., *A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Whitefield, Occasion'd by His Pretended Answer to the First Part of the Observations on the Conduct and Behaviour of the Methodists* (London: M. Cooper, [1744]), p. 26; [Edmund Gibson], *Observations upon the Conduct and Behaviour of a Certain Sect Usually Distinguished by the Name of Methodists* ([London]: E. Owen, 1744), p. 4.

<sup>45</sup> *Mock-Preacher*, p. 20.

ministers published in response to Whitefield's preaching and implying that such actions are completely futile.<sup>46</sup>

Initially, the author's ridicule of anti-Methodist literature may seem somewhat ironic, given that *The Mock-Preacher* fits into this category too. Certainly, by referring to other contemporary critiques of the revival, this analysis has demonstrated that the playwright voiced many of the criticisms that Whitefield and other evangelicals regularly faced, including spiritual pride, deception, sexual predation, crypto-popery and familial disruption. This, along with the references to Berriman and Trapp, suggests that some preliminary reading of anti-Methodist works had been undertaken by the author.<sup>47</sup> Yet, by discussing the way in which the anonymous playwright critiqued both revivalism and contemporary Anglicanism, it has been shown that this play is more than just a piece of anti-Methodist satire. In fact, the author clearly intended to portray both revivalists and Anglicans as self-interested tricksters. One can see this from the evident juxtaposition of the preacher's fraudulent activity and the three Anglican ministers' desire to secure tithe payments by preaching a message of 'Mysterics.'

SIMON LEWIS (Oxford)

<sup>46</sup> Approximately 90 separate anti-Methodist books and pamphlets were published during 1738-9. The fact that only slightly more anti-Methodist works were published during the longer period of 1740-5 suggests that opposition to the revival was at its peak during the late 1730s. See Clive D. Field, 'Anti-Methodist Publications of the Eighteenth Century: A Revised Bibliography', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library*, vol. 73, no. 2 (1991), 159-280; Idem, 'Anti-Methodist Publications of the Eighteenth Century: A Supplemental Bibliography', *Wesley and Methodist Studies*, vol. 6 (2014), 154-86.

<sup>47</sup> When the preacher is on trial at the end of the play, the magistrate refers to an Oxford don, who has been maligned by 'Methodists', resulting in a number of recent 'Discourses printed against being over-righteous' (pp. 27-8). The don in question is Trapp, who preached a series of anti-Whitefield sermons at various churches across London and Westminster in 1739. According to Whitefield's journal entry for Sunday 29 April, 1739, the young itinerant actually attended one of these sermons, where he 'heard Doctor Trapp preach most virulently against' him. See George Whitefield, *A Continuation of the Reverend Mr. Whitefield's Journal, from his Arrival at London, to his Departure from Thence on his way to Georgia* (London: James Hutton, 1739), p. 89. These sermons, which Trapp referred to as 'four discourses' in his title page, were subsequently published as *The Nature, Folly, Sin, and Danger of Being Righteous Over-Much* (London: T. Cooper, 1739). Therefore, this is clearly the publication that the magistrate is referring to. An advertisement that appeared in the *London Daily Post* on 5 June, 1739, stated that *Nature, Folly, Sin* was published on 'This Day.' This was only 11 days before the publication of *The Mock-Preacher*, implying that the play was fairly rushed. The playwright would have had substantially more time to consult Berriman's critique of the revival, which was published more than two months before *The Mock-Preacher* (see *London Daily Post*, 12 April, 1739).