

A Natural Passion?: the 1810 reflections of a Yorkshire farmer on homosexuality

Reflecting on the execution of a naval surgeon for sodomy, tenant farmer Matthew Tomlinson postulated in his diary on 14 January 1810 that homosexuality was a ‘natural’ passion undeserving of the death penalty. He wrote that he had been ‘informed’ that same-sex attraction was identifiable in some men from a young age. The diarist struggled to comprehend how a just Creator could countenance capital punishment for an apparently God-given trait. This newly discovered passage offers rare and valuable insight into early nineteenth-century British attitudes towards same-sex love.¹ The present article will summarize Tomlinson’s mental world as revealed in his diary, examining his broader opinions on religion and sexuality before considering the details and significance of his comments on homoerotic desire.

Matthew Tomlinson (1764-1842) lived about a mile south-west of Wakefield at the sixty-seven-acre Dog House Farm on the Lupset Hall estate.² Aged forty-five at the beginning of 1810, Tomlinson was a member of the middling ranks of society. He employed male and female servants and assumed various roles in local government. Tomlinson had served (sometimes reluctantly) as an overseer of the poor and a surveyor of the highways and by 1811 was acting as the collector of the property tax for Alverthorpe with Thornes.³ An avowed introvert, Tomlinson had visited London and occasionally travelled to nearby Yorkshire towns to conduct business at markets and fairs, but preferred the quiet countryside to the hurly-burly of urban life.⁴ He kept extensive diaries, of which only three volumes (numbered 5, 9 and 11) appear to have survived. The extant journals, which document his life between 1806–1812, 1832–1834 and 1836–1839, have been held in the Local Studies collections of Wakefield Library since before 1950.⁵ The diaries have not been published or

digitized, although some of Tomlinson's comments on Luddism and the 1807 Yorkshire election have been previously cited by historians.⁶

Tomlinson's writings detail the management of his land, farm labourers and livestock, local happenings and gossip, and his efforts to find a second soulmate after the death of his first wife in 1804.⁷ Like many such journals, the diary was an intimate repository of the author's thoughts not intended for a wider audience, although at one point Tomlinson correctly predicted that his 'pages of folly' would be perused by others after his death.⁸ The content is also fairly typical of the genre: the diarist frequently offered dour reflections on the transience and misfortunes of life, dwelling on matters of faith, mortality and his own health problems. A reader of the *Leeds Mercury* and the 'Wakefield papers', Tomlinson periodically ruminated on newspaper reports that caught his attention or prompted an emotional response.⁹ He documented discussions with neighbours and even snippets of overheard conversations on topics ranging from the desirability of matrimony to the conduct of the Peninsular War.¹⁰ When reflecting on moral or religious questions and current affairs, Tomlinson sometimes summarized the contrasting views of people within his social circle. He noted for example a 'variety of oppinions [sic]' on the assassination of Prime Minister Spencer Perceval in 1812, ranging from warm approval of Bellingham's 'gallant' and 'serviceable act' to condemnation of the murderer as 'an infernal ruffin [sic]', but was reticent about his own thoughts on the killing.¹¹

A Methodist for nearly 20 years, Tomlinson's religious views and the intensity of his belief moderated with age: by 1808 he no longer considered himself 'a zealous and bigoted religionist' and later decried 'the narrowness of a professing Methodist mind'.¹² Although his former Methodist companions considered him an apostate for renouncing Wesley's creed,

Matthew Tomlinson in 1810 was still an observant Christian, regularly giving thanks to God in his diaries and frequenting both the established Horbury Church and a local Methodist chapel.¹³ His outlook on religion had become broad-minded and ecumenical. In June 1810 he confided in his diary: 'it is to me a matter of small moment what sect, or party of professors I join; all, or the very most, have one motive; one end in view, it therefore appears to me, that if a man can worship amongst any party it bespeaks a generous mind, a liberal soul...'.¹⁴ Despite his relaxed view of denominational distinctions, Tomlinson had no shortage of opinions on theology himself, by turns praising and trenchantly criticizing sermons delivered by a number of local preachers. The disquisitions of 'The Methodist Demosthenes' Samuel Bradburn, who was stationed in the Wakefield circuit between 1806 and 1808, are frequently summarized and critiqued in Tomlinson's diary entries for those years.¹⁵

Determined to make up his own mind, Tomlinson occasionally expressed uncertainty about Christian doctrines and puzzled over discrepancies in Biblical passages.¹⁶ He aimed to improve his knowledge of the world around him by 'reading, thinking, and conversing'.¹⁷ Between 1809 and 1811 Tomlinson mentioned reading: 'the adventures of certain circumnavigators' visiting islands in the South Seas, biographies of Demosthenes, Cicero and Benjamin Franklin, and a reply to the Bishop of Llandaff's 1796 *Apology for the Bible*.¹⁸ Tomlinson was also acquainted with various writings by Thomas Paine. In 1808 he was lent a copy of the deist tome *The Age of Reason* but was clearly already familiar with, if largely unconvinced by, the contents. Even so, Tomlinson tolerated a range of opinions, expressing his firm conviction 'that men who possess a liberal mind, will by no means whatever look disrespectfully down upon his fellow, who doth not, or cannot think exactly like himself.'¹⁹ The diarist's willingness to transcend denominational boundaries, scrutinise sermons and respect differing views likely helps to explain his enquiring stance on homoerotic desire.

Tomlinson's own sexual attitudes and behaviour also merit close attention. There is no evidence that Tomlinson harboured same-sex desires and no other references to homoeroticism in his surviving wartime diaries. On the contrary, the farmer wrote repeatedly and frankly of his attraction to women and remarried in 1810 following several unsuccessful courtships.²⁰ He acknowledged the orthodox Christian view of extramarital sex but tempered it with a dose of pragmatism, writing in 1807: 'I own it to be a crime to impregnate a female previous to marriage, or rather, I mean when there is no intention to marry.'²¹ Elsewhere, however, Tomlinson expressed a belief that trysts between unmarried people were not as heinous as his contemporaries generally believed. Yet he anguished over a carnal misdeed of his own all the same, having breached 'a law of God, and Man' as a widower by impregnating his housekeeper.²²

Tomlinson's meditations on homosexuality were prompted by press coverage of the court-martial and execution of James Nehemiah Taylor, a naval surgeon who was hanged from the yardarm of HMS *Jamaica* on 26 December 1809 for committing sodomy with Thomas Ashton, his sixteen or seventeen-year-old servant.²³ Newspapers across Britain, including the *Leeds Mercury*, reprinted accounts of the case, reporting that Taylor had 'long been addicted to the detestable practice' of sodomy but had repented prior to his execution.²⁴ Yet Tomlinson's reflections demonstrate that not all readers uncritically accepted the reproachful attitudes expressed in the press. Dismayed by the ignominious end of an accomplished medical man, the diarist pondered the justice of Taylor's fate and questioned whether so-called 'unnatural' acts truly merited such an epithet.

If some men felt ‘an inclination, and propensity’ for same-sex intimacy from adolescence, Tomlinson reasoned, ‘it must then be considered as *natural* otherwise, as a *defect* in nature’. Either way, ‘it seems cruel to punish that defect with death.’ He wondered why God would create human beings with innate feelings of same-sex attraction yet also threaten them with execution if they ever tried to act upon ‘the dictates of that nature’. But Tomlinson was ultimately of two minds about homosexuality. He also allowed for the possibility that same-sex desire stemmed from the moral degeneration of man. However, biblical passages seemingly condemning same-sex intercourse, including accounts of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, are noticeably absent from his analysis. The ‘only argument’ for the view that homosexuality was ‘a viciated [sic], and corrupted inclination’, in Tomlinson’s mind, was the perceived absence of same-sex behaviour among animals. If homosexual intimacy was indeed a depraved human choice nurtured by habit rather than an innate predisposition, Tomlinson affirmed that sodomy still merited ‘severe punishment’. Following this line of reasoning, he suggested that capital sentences for rape and sodomy be replaced by the nonetheless grisly alternative of castration, thereby restraining the libido of offenders while enabling them to become useful members of society.

Rather than presenting a coherent philosophy of human sexuality, Tomlinson seems to have been working out his thoughts on the page. The reader is left doubting whether Tomlinson ultimately considered same-sex desire to be innate or degenerate. Lacking definitive evidence to satisfy his curiosity, it appears likely that he remained undecided. The diarist never explicitly endorsed the decriminalization of same-sex activity, leaving open the possibility that he considered genital mutilation an acceptable recourse even if homosexuality proved to be a deep-seated natural proclivity. Alternatively, his expressed support for ‘severe

punishment' such as castration should homoerotic desire turn out to be a perverted choice might imply that he did not otherwise advocate legal penalties.

While Tomlinson's diary entry reflects the thoughts of only one man, his opinions seem to have been influenced by the views of others. Regrettably, the diarist refrained from specifying where and when he had been 'informed' that some males displayed an inclination towards same-sex attraction 'from childhood'. Tomlinson may simply have been alluding to Taylor's remarks to a naval chaplain, quoted in some of the press accounts. The condemned surgeon mentioned 'passions which were implanted in [his] nature and constitution', although this passage did not appear in the condensed *Leeds Mercury* report probably encountered by Tomlinson.²⁵ It seems more likely, given the phrasing and the diarist's habit of drawing on the opinions of others, that his comments referred to conversations with friends or acquaintances about the origins of same-sex desire. Despite Tomlinson's preference for solitude, his business dealings and responsibilities as overseer of the poor brought him into contact with a considerable number of people from all walks of life. Notably, the diarist displayed a willingness to discuss potentially taboo topics even with relative strangers: in 1808 he fell into conversation with two 'rambling' shepherds about 'a variety of things, that might not be evil in themselves, but that are contrary to the common plan, or scheme of Christianity'.²⁶

Although the writings of British diarists on same-sex intimacy over the long eighteenth century have never been systematically surveyed, Tomlinson's reflections are highly unusual both for their content and the very fact of their existence. In an era defined by capital penalties for sodomy and the absence of adequate terminology for conceptualising same-sex love, the prevailing attitude towards such 'nameless offences' among contemporary writers

was silence. Emma Griffin drew on more than 350 working-class autobiographies and diaries for her 2013 book *Liberty's Dawn: A People's History of the Industrial Revolution*. Despite uncovering some relatively forthright accounts of heterosexual intimacy, she was unable to detect 'even a whisper of homosexuality' in these sources, a reticence that 'speaks loudly of our writers' uneasiness with the prospect of same-sex relationships, [and] of the irreparable damage they feared homosexuality might cause to their reputation.'²⁷

Tomlinson's comments on homosexuality, although ultimately inconclusive, complicate and enhance our understanding of historical British attitudes towards same-sex intimacy. The willingness of this casual observer to entertain the proposition that homoerotic desire was an innate God-given tendency rather than an unnatural perversion is significant in itself. Despite the contemporary climate of intolerance and (self-)censorship, the diary entry suggests that more liberal understandings of same-sex attraction were circulating in Regency-era British society more widely than is commonly presumed.

Seth LeJacq, whose research on sodomy in the Royal Navy considers the circulation of sexual knowledge between ship and shore, has recently proposed that the relatively sympathetic press coverage of James Nehemiah Taylor and other naval officers convicted of homosexual offences in the early nineteenth century reflects a 'softening of attitudes' towards homoerotic behaviour. Although his sexual conduct was unequivocally condemned, the surgeon was depicted in accounts of his trial and execution as an 'appealing figure' – an intelligent and able man who had expressed remorse for his actions in his final moments.²⁸ These detailed and widely-disseminated narratives appear to invite compassion more than revulsion and perhaps nurtured more lenient attitudes towards men with same-sex desires

among readers. Certainly, in Tomlinson's case, his admiration of and pity for Taylor occasioned an effort to rationalize the surgeon's behaviour.

The diary passage also offers some insight into historical perceptions of sexual identities. The invention of modern sexual types has been attributed, most famously by Michel Foucault, to the rise of scientific 'sexology' in the later nineteenth century, which defined and frequently pathologized homosexuality in opposition to heterosexuality. Randolph Trumbach, however, has ascribed the emergence of the male homosexual as a distinctive identity in England to the molly houses of early eighteenth-century London. More recent work by scholars including David Halperin and H.G. Cocks tends to stress the diversity of homoerotic self-expression, which varied according to time and place, and resists the urge to craft a unitary history of same-sex desire or impose modern categories onto the past.²⁹ William Gibson and Joanne Begiato correctly contend that sex between Englishmen during the long eighteenth century was generally considered 'a form of lust, the result of a loss of self-control rather than a specific personal identity.'³⁰ Intriguingly, however, Tomlinson was clearly prepared to entertain the idea that same-sex desire was a natural variant of human sexuality: an innate and enduring pattern of attraction perceptible from a young age.

While his comments suggest an appreciation of the concept of sexual orientation in all but name, the diarist failed to mention any specific characteristics associated with same-sex 'passion' that might contribute to a discrete social identity. The stereotypical Georgian molly or sodomite and the homosexual as defined by Victorian sexologists were effeminate and woman-hating figures who inverted gender norms by adopting female manners and dress.³¹ Tomlinson, however, does not connect same-sex desire to gender expression. He is primarily concerned with discerning the 'natural' or 'corrupted' roots of homoeroticism and does not

attempt to define the sodomite as a type set apart from the general population by certain observable attributes.

Tomlinson's contradictory conceptions of homosexual desire should be understood as part of a longstanding dichotomy summarized by the scholar Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick.³² Was homoeroticism the preserve of a particular breed of man whose 'addiction' to same-sex intimacy was caused by an aspect of his nature, or could sodomy be committed by anyone who yielded to an unnatural carnal impulse? These dual understandings have been identified by Joan Cadden in mediaeval pseudo-Aristotelian texts, which despite their disapproval of sodomy sometimes recognised the possibility that a subset of men were constitutionally predisposed, perhaps by anatomical defects, to same-sex desire.³³ In a similar vein, Kenneth Borris has shown that a number of classical and early modern scientific writers believed that homoerotic inclinations could be ascertained by the study of astrological alignments at birth or the examination of a person's bodily characteristics, implying an understanding of same-sex attraction as inherent.³⁴

Capacious definitions of 'natural' sexual behaviour were often invoked in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries to vindicate breaches of conventional mores. As John Sainsbury has demonstrated, the liberty-loving libertine John Wilkes and his associates appealed to a deified conception of nature to justify (heterosexual) carnal indulgence at odds with religious orthodoxy.³⁵ During Tomlinson's lifetime, political and literary radicals including William Godwin and Percy Bysshe Shelley, as well as the social reformer Robert Owen and his followers, challenged the patriarchal institution of marriage and questioned the stigma surrounding extramarital sex by invoking notions of human nature and instinctive behaviour. Owen, for example, argued in the 1830s that monogamous unions contravened the laws of

nature by artificially bridling human affection, although such views gained only limited acceptance.³⁶ Some men and women who engaged in same-sex relationships also rationalized their sexual desires as innocuous and innate, including the naval surgeon whose execution had elicited Tomlinson's comments.³⁷ The Halifax landowner and diarist Anne Lister described her lesbian feelings as 'natural' and 'instinctive' to a lover in 1823.³⁸

As Faramarz Dabhoiwala has argued, new enlightenment understandings of human nature, law and ethics rendered the defence of homosexual relations as natural and harmless 'increasingly possible' by the later eighteenth century.³⁹ A small handful of Georgian writers, often drawing on references to homoerotic practices in classical texts, condoned sex between men along these lines. In the 1749 tract *Ancient and Modern Pederasty Investigated and Exemplify'd*, the earliest published defence of homosexuality in English, Thomas Cannon contended that sexual desire, including same-sex desire, was an inherently natural impulse, with any claim to the contrary being 'downright nonsense.'⁴⁰ The social reformer and utilitarian philosopher Jeremy Bentham advanced the case for the decriminalization of homosexuality in various unpublished writings between the 1770s and the 1820s, suggesting that sodomy was an 'imaginary crime' outlawed 'on no other foundation than prejudice'.⁴¹ The anonymous poem *Don Leon*, seemingly composed by associates of the bisexual Lord Byron in the 1820s or early 1830s, also portrayed same-sex attraction as a natural tendency, 'written into a person's character from the very start of life', according to scholar Charles Upchurch.⁴²

Parallels can also be found for Tomlinson's call to abolish capital punishment for sodomy. Enlightenment notions of legal reform had led to the elimination of the death penalty for homosexual offences in many Continental countries in favour of lesser sentences; France

decriminalised sodomy altogether in 1791. A reduction in penalties seems to have been mooted in elite political circles in Britain in the 1820s, although sodomy remained a capital crime until 1861, with the last executions occurring in 1835.⁴³

Yet the notion that homosexuality was a blameless natural passion, as Dabhoiwala has recognized, remained 'exceptional and objectionable' in the early nineteenth century.⁴⁴ None of the aforementioned English defences of same-sex love seem to have been widely disseminated or particularly influential in their own time.⁴⁵ No copies of Thomas Cannon's pamphlet are known to be extant. The author was prosecuted and obliged to flee the country; the contents of his tract survive only as quoted extracts in the criminal indictment against the pamphlet's printer.⁴⁶ Bentham, for his part, did not dare publicize his radical views on homosexuality in his lifetime for fear of social opprobrium.⁴⁷

After all, this was an age when the act of circulating false allegations of male same-sex tendencies was compared by some contemporaries to physical violence or even murder, such was the reputational odium suffered by the accused.⁴⁸ While historians of English homosexuality in the long eighteenth century variously emphasize ferocious repression or gradual toleration, there can be no doubt of a general atmosphere of virulent prejudice against and persecution of homoerotic acts.⁴⁹ Men convicted or accused of homosexual offences in Georgian Britain were regularly disgraced or put to death, battered by contemptuous crowds in the pillories and forced into exile abroad.⁵⁰ Although H.G. Cocks assessed that homosexuality was 'an everyday, casual and widespread phenomenon', he also charted a rise in sodomy and indecent assault prosecutions in England from the late eighteenth century, with 404 men sentenced to death and 56 actually executed between 1806 and 1835.⁵¹

The musings of Matthew Tomlinson, although tentative and ambiguous, should be considered as part of the ‘semi-clandestine, alternative, minority pattern of argument’ justifying same-sex relations that gradually emerged during the long eighteenth century despite ongoing state repression and public prejudice.⁵² Tomlinson’s comments on homosexual desire, and his diary writings more generally, were framed by his religious convictions, reflecting an understanding of nature with God at its core. His faith-based perspective accords with the thesis recently advanced by Gibson and Begiato, who have argued that religiosity and the Church, rather than hindering the supposed march of rationalism, were in fact central to and often responsible for the evolution of English attitudes towards sex during the long eighteenth century.⁵³ But the diarist’s meditations also seem characteristic of enlightenment approaches to epistemology, frequently displaying open-mindedness, tolerance, a commitment to intellectual self-improvement and a willingness to subject inherited beliefs to rational interrogation based on available evidence.⁵⁴ Significantly, Tomlinson was not a member of the elite intellectual circles around Bentham or Byron, or an associate of the transgressive homosexual networks rounded up by the authorities, for example, in Warrington in 1805 or in London’s White Swan molly house in 1810.⁵⁵ On the contrary, the diarist was a self-proclaimed ‘woman-lover’ and an observant Christian who was perhaps unusually introspective and broad-minded but otherwise rather unremarkable, being neither a radical nor a libertine.⁵⁶ While it is perilous to place too much weight on a single source, Tomlinson’s writings do offer tantalizing evidence that historical attitudes towards same-sex intimacy in Britain could be more diverse and sympathetic than is often assumed. As his diary entry demonstrates, by 1810 it was possible for a Yorkshire farmer to consider seriously the revolutionary idea that homosexuality was a natural, divinely-ordained tendency, discernible from a young age and arguably deserving of acceptance.

Appendix

Wakefield Local Studies, 920:TOM, Journals of Matthew Tomlinson of Dog House Farm

Volume 5, 14 January 1810, pp. 1049-1050

‘Was this week sencibly [sic] affected in reading the behavior, and execution of a Mr ~~Dixon~~ Taylor, surgeon on board the Jemaica [sic] Westindia-man for an unnatural crime: a man of great genius [sic], and a ready turn of wit: it appears a paradox to me, how men, who are men, shou'd possess such a passion; and more particularly so, if it is their nature from childhood (as I am informed it is) – If they feel such an inclination, and propensity, at that certain time of life ~~that~~ when youth genders⁵⁷ into manhood; it must then be considered as natural otherwise, as a defect in nature – and if natural, or a defect in nature; it seems cruel to punish that defect with death. But if it first takes its rise in the human mind from a viciated [sic],⁵⁸ and corrupted inclination; and by cherishing and encouraging such a propensity or inclination it becomes habitual, then it is upon such premises worthy of ~~capital~~ a severe punishment: It must seem strange indeed that God Almighty shou'd make a being, with such a nature; or such a defect in nature; and at the same time make a decree that if that being whome [sic] he had formed, shou'd at any time follow the dictates of that nature with which he was formed he shou'd be punished with death. Now we do not see any symptoms of such a propensity in the brute creation: male invariably seeks the female, and that is the only argument which causes me to think that it is first formed from a visiated [sic] principle. Now as life is very desirous to all animated beings, I think it would be no reproach to the legislative power, were they to mitigate the punishment which is executed upon rapes, and sodomy, from death to casteration [sic]: as I shou'd suppose that if a man was castrated [sic], he wou'd neither have power, or feel inclination to commit such a crime a second time, and he might perhaps become a useful member of society: but when he his [sic] punished with

death, we are certain that he cannot do either any more hurt or good; whereas if he was only castrated [sic], it would be equally put out of his power to commit the same evil, and there would be a great possibility of him doing much good.'

¹ Sean Coughlan, 'The 200-year-old diary that's rewriting gay history', BBC News, (10 February 2020), <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-51385884> [accessed 18 June 2020]. See also 'Yorkshire farmer argues homosexuality is natural in 1810 diary discovery', University of Oxford News and Events, (10 February 2020), <http://www.ox.ac.uk/news/2020-02-10-yorkshire-farmer-argues-homosexuality-natural-1810-diary-discovery> [accessed 18 June 2020].

² Acreage specified in Wakefield Library, Local Studies, 920:TOM, Diaries of Matthew Tomlinson, vol. v, p. 985. Vital statistics derived from vol. v, p. 1144 and *Leeds Mercury*, 12 March 1842.

³ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 865, 928, 979, 1107.

⁴ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 835, 1040.

⁵ W. Matthews, *British Diaries: An Annotated Bibliography of British Diaries written between 1442 and 1942* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, Calif., 1950), p. 161. According to Matthews, four volumes of Tomlinson's diaries were held in Wakefield Library, but the whereabouts of volume 4 (1804–1806) are presently unknown (personal correspondence with Claire Pickering, 19 February 2020).

⁶ K. Navickas, *Protest and the Politics of Space and Place, 1789–1848* (Manchester, 2016), pp. 188, 265–266; K. Navickas, 'Luddism, Incendiarism and the Defence of Rural "Task-Scapes" in 1812', *Northern History*, xlviii (2011), pp. 59–73; E.G. Wilson, *The Great Yorkshire Election of 1807: Mass Politics in England before the Age of Reform*, ed. E. Royle and J. Walvin (Lancaster, 2015).

⁷ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 968, 1092.

⁸ F.A. Nussbaum, 'Toward conceptualizing diary', in *Studies in Autobiography*, ed. J. Olney (Oxford, 1988), pp. 128–140, at pp. 134–136; Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, p. 1001.

⁹ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, for instance pp. 882, 938, 1010.

¹⁰ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, for instance pp. 851, 968, 1024.

¹¹ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 1178–1179.

¹² Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 962, 1113.

¹³ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 825, 845, 894, 1073, 1084, 1088.

¹⁴ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 872, 1009, 1073–1074, 1129–1130.

¹⁵ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 829, 854, 872, 888, 890, 926, 938, 945; T.W. Blanshard, *The Life of Samuel Bradburn: The Methodist Demosthenes* (London, 1871), pp. 258–261.

¹⁶ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 878, 940, 984, 987.

¹⁷ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, p. 947.

¹⁸ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 990, 1036, 1049, 1113. Tomlinson unfortunately does not provide sufficient information to securely identify most of these texts. He attributed the reply to the Bishop of Llandaff's *Apology*, which made 'the Old Testament appear nothing more than a romantic fable', to a certain 'Mackleon'. Presumably this is a reference to A. Macleod, *The Bishop of Landaff's* [sic] "*Apology for the Bible*" *Examined, in a Series of Letters, addressed to that Excellent Man* (London, 1796).

¹⁹ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 935–936, 940.

²⁰ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 844, 944, 964, 992, 1019, 1063.

²¹ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 898.

²² Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 894, 927, 964–965, 991, 994. It has unfortunately proved impossible to ascertain the name of the housekeeper and the outcome of her pregnancy from Tomlinson's surviving diaries.

²³ According to research by Alan Miller based on Admiralty records, Thomas Ashton was a cotton spinner from Stockport who enlisted in the Royal Marines in December 1807, aged 15. He was also arrested for participating in anal sex in Taylor's cabin but escaped from custody when the ship was moored in St. John's harbour, Newfoundland in October 1809. See *The Pink Paper*, 30 September–6 October 1989, pp. 12–13. The Taylor case is also discussed by Seth LeJacq in his recent PhD thesis based on the court-martial transcript held in the National Archives of the United Kingdom. See T.N.A., ADM 1/5400, 11–12 December 1809, and S.S. LeJacq, 'Run Afoul: Sodomy, Masculinity, and the Body in the Georgian Royal Navy' (PhD dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 2016).

²⁴ *Leeds Mercury*, 6 January 1810; *Hull Packet*, 9 January 1810. See also R. Norton, 'Court Martial of James Nehemiah Taylor, 1809–1810', *Homosexuality in 19th Century England: A Sourcebook*, 3 December 2019, updated 10 February 2020. <http://rictornorton.co.uk/eighteen/1810tayl.htm> [accessed 18 June 2020]. The facts of the Taylor case, however, are only incidental to Tomlinson's reflections. His recollection of specific details was clearly muddled by the passage of time between reading the press reports and writing his diary entry: he initially misremembered the surgeon's name and mistook HMS *Jamaica* for a merchant ship.

-
- ²⁵ *Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle*, 1 January 1810; *Leeds Mercury*, 6 January 1810.
- ²⁶ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, p. 968.
- ²⁷ E. Griffin, *Liberty's Dawn: A People's History of the Industrial Revolution* (New Haven, Conn., 2013), p. 144.
- ²⁸ S.S. LeJacq, 'Run Afoul: Sodomy, Masculinity, and the Body in the Georgian Royal Navy', pp. 317–319.
- ²⁹ H.G. Cocks, 'Homosexuality between men in Britain since the 18th Century', *History Compass*, v (2007), pp. 865–889, at pp. 866–875, 878, 880–881; H.G. Cocks, 'Modernity and the Self in the History of Sexuality', *Historical Journal*, xlix (2006), pp. 1211–1227, at pp. 1222, 1227; W. Gibson and J. Begiato, *Sex and the Church in the Long 18th Century* (London, 2017), pp. 195–197.
- ³⁰ Gibson and Begiato, *Sex and the Church in the Long 18th Century*, p. 198.
- ³¹ R. Trumbach, 'London's sodomites: homosexual behavior and western culture in the 18th Century', *Journal of Social History*, xi (1977), pp. 1–33, at pp. 12–13, 17–18; S.S. LeJacq, 'Buggery's travels: Royal Navy sodomy on ship and shore in the long 18th century', *Journal for Maritime Research*, xvii (2015), pp. 103–116, at pp. 106–107; A. Clark, *Desire: A History of European Sexuality*, 2nd edn (Abingdon, 2019), pp. 118, 139–140, 162–163.
- ³² E.K. Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1990), p. 85. See also Cocks, 'Homosexuality between men in Britain since the 18th Century', p. 880 and H.G. Cocks, *Visions of Sodom: Religion, Homoerotic Desire, and the End of the World in England, c. 1550–1850* (Chicago, 2017), p. 9.
- ³³ J. Cadden, *Nothing Natural is Shameful: Sodomy and Science in Late Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia, 2013), pp. 4–7, 76–77, 161–162, 169–175.
- ³⁴ K. Borris, 'Sodomizing science: Cocles, Patricio Tricasso, and the constitutional morphologies of Renaissance male same-sex lovers,' in *The Sciences of Homosexuality in Early Modern Europe*, ed. K. Borris and G. Rousseau (New York, 2008), pp. 137–164, at p. 143; K. Borris (ed.), *Same-Sex Desire in the English Renaissance: A Sourcebook of Texts, 1470–1650* (New York, 2004), pp. 152–172.
- ³⁵ J. Sainsbury, *John Wilkes: The Lives of a Libertine* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 1, 94.
- ³⁶ B. Taylor, *Eve and the New Jerusalem: Socialism and Feminism in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1983), pp. 39–45; A. Clark, *The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, Calif., 1995), pp. 185–187, 192.
- ³⁷ *Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle*, 1 January 1810.
- ³⁸ A. Lister, *I Know My Own Heart: The Diaries of Anne Lister, 1791–1840*, ed. H. Whitbread (London, 1988), p. 297.
- ³⁹ F. Dabhoiwala, *The Origins of Sex: A History of the First Sexual Revolution* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 133–134.
- ⁴⁰ H. Gladfelder, 'In Search of Lost Texts: Thomas Cannon's *Ancient and Modern Pederasty Investigated and Exemplify'd*', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, xxxi (2007), p. 32.
- ⁴¹ Dabhoiwala, *The Origins of Sex*, pp. 134–138.
- ⁴² C. Upchurch, 'The Consequences of Dating Don Leon' in *Queer Difficulty in Art and Poetry: Rethinking the Sexed Body in Verse and Visual Culture*, ed. J. J. Kim and C. Reed (Abingdon, 2017), pp. 24–33, at p. 24. See also L. Crompton, 'Don Leon, Byron, and Homosexual Law Reform' in *Literary Visions of Homosexuality* ed. S. Kellogg (New York, 1983), pp. 53–71.
- ⁴³ Upchurch, 'The Consequences of Dating Don Leon', pp. 26–27.
- ⁴⁴ Dabhoiwala, *The Origins of Sex*, pp. 128, 138.
- ⁴⁵ Gibson and Begiato, *Sex and the Church in the Long 18th Century*, pp. 198, 202.
- ⁴⁶ Gladfelder, 'In Search of Lost Texts', p. 24.
- ⁴⁷ Dabhoiwala, *The Origins of Sex*, p. 137.
- ⁴⁸ *The Sporting Magazine* (November 1809), pp. 101–102; C. Tuite, *Lord Byron and Scandalous Celebrity* (Cambridge, 2015), p. 125.
- ⁴⁹ Gibson and Begiato, *Sex and the Church in the Long 18th Century*, p.196; Cocks, *Visions of Sodom*, p.4.
- ⁵⁰ R. Morrison, *The Regency Revolution: Jane Austen, Napoleon, Lord Byron and the Making of the Modern World* (London, 2019), pp. 145–162.
- ⁵¹ H.G. Cocks, *Nameless Offences: Homosexual Desire in the 19th Century* (London, 2003), pp. xiv–xvii; H.G. Cocks, 'Safeguarding Civility: Sodomy, Class and Moral Reform in Early 19th Century England', *Past & Present*, cxc (2006), p. 122.
- ⁵² Dabhoiwala, *The Origins of Sex*, p. 128.
- ⁵³ Gibson and Begiato, *Sex and the Church in the Long 18th Century*, pp. 286–287.
- ⁵⁴ T. Munck, *The Enlightenment: A Comparative Social History, 1721–1794* (London, 2000), p. 222; R.B. Sher, *The Enlightenment and the Book: Scottish Authors and Their Publishers in Eighteenth-Century Britain, Ireland, and America* (Chicago, 2006), pp. 16–17; M. Fitzpatrick, 'Enlightenment', in *An Oxford Companion to the Romantic Age: British Culture 1776–1832*, ed. I. McCalman (Oxford, 1999), p. 299.

⁵⁵ H.G. Cocks, 'Homosexuality between men in Britain since the 18th Century', p. 873.

⁵⁶ Wakefield Lib., 920:TOM, vol. v, pp. 944, 992.

⁵⁷ 'To give rise to (a physical phenomenon or material object), especially by natural processes; to produce, create.' 'Gender, v.1.' *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, June 2020, www.oed.com/view/Entry/77469 [accessed 25 June 2020].

⁵⁸ 'To render corrupt in morals; to deprave in respect of principles or conduct; to lower the moral standard of (persons); to pervert (the eye, taste, etc.), so as to lead to false judgements or preferences.' 'Vitiate, v.' *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, June 2020, www.oed.com/view/Entry/224055 [accessed 26 June 2020].