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For the sake of consistency, the spelling of proper names has been generally regularized. Thus the spelling "Smyth" is used for King's uncle Sir Thomas, though the form "Smith" also occurs in the contemporary legal records and elsewhere.

Where it seemed necessary for clarity, dates are given in both Old Style and New Style, e.g. January 1, 1742/43. Dates not given in duple form are in Old Style to 1751 and in New Style from the commencement of 1752, unless otherwise noted.

D.C.G.
XINIIMHz EARLY LIFE

The subject of this work should not be confused with two of his senior contemporaries who also bore the name of William King. The elder of these was the Lord Archbishop of Dublin from 1704 until his death in 1729, the other, described by Swift in the Journal to Stella as a "poor starving wit", was a don of Christ Church, Oxford, and the author of a number of miscellaneous works of which A Historical Account of the Heathen Gods and Heroes, published in 1710 and a standard textbook in the classroom for many years, is perhaps the best known. The fact that all three William Kings were associated with Ireland in various ways has probably helped to increase the number of bibliographical errors which have been perpetrated at different times in relation to these three homonymous individuals.

Less is known today about the career of the present biographer than that of either of the other two Kings. Scarcely any information is provided by Daniel Lysons¹, Charles Coote², Alex Chalmers³, and one or

The subject of this work should not be confused with two of his senior contemporaries who also bore the name of William King. The elder of these was the Lord Archbishop of Dublin from 1703 until his death in 1729, the other, described by Swift in the Journal to Stella as a "poor starving wit", was a don of Christ Church, Oxford, and the author of a number of miscellaneous works of which A Historical Account of the Heathen Gods and Heroes, published in 1710 and a standard textbook in the classroom for many years, is perhaps the best known. The fact that all three William Kings were associated with Ireland in various ways has probably helped to increase the number of bibliographical errors which have been perpetrated at different times in relation to these three homonymous individuals.

Less is known today about the career of the present biographee than that of either of the other two Kings. Scraps of information are provided by Daniel Lysons, Charles Coote, Alex Chalmers, and one or


two other writers, but the earliest account that could in any sense be regarded as a biography is given in a long footnote in John Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century.* All subsequent writers are indebted to this footnote; indeed, the life of King in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, written by Gordon Goodwin, is in many places merely a paraphrase of Nichols' account.

William King was born in Stepney, now in East London, but then in Middlesex. The following entry appears in the Register of Baptisms of St. Dunstan and All Saints' Church, Stepney:

1684. March 11, William son of Mr. Peregrine King of Stepney Clerk & Margaret uxor. 6 days old.

This date is, of course, given in Old Style; in modern works of reference King's birth is usually ascribed to March 5, 1685. Gordon Goodwin in the *Dictionary of National Biography* gives the date as March 16, 1685, presumably following the information - or misinformation - which is inscribed in the exergue on King's monument, now in the chapel of Oriel College. It still reads

*Natus Martis XVI**. MDCLXXXV.

I do not know why the wrong date appears in the very place where one would expect to find the truth. It is possible that whoever composed the inscription was attempting to correct the diurnal difference between Old and New Style dates. If so, he made an error by one day: since the normal procedure for converting the diurnal difference between Old and

New Style dates in cases prior to the end of February 1700 is to add ten days to the date in Old Style, the diurnally converted date should surely be March 15, 1685.

Very little is known about either of King's parents, but both his paternal and maternal ancestors had maintained for several generations a relationship with the University of Oxford. His father, Peregrine King, was the son of another clergyman of the same name who matriculated at Magdalen Hall on November 3, 1615, aged 17. He is described in the Matriculation Register of the University as Peregrine King of Buckinghamshire, Plebeius. On October 30, 1616, he was awarded the degree of B.A., and on June 9, 1619, that of M.A. He incorporated at the University of Cambridge in 1621, and in 1637 was appointed rector of the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, Motson (modern Mottistone) in the Isle of Wight. He was still in possession in 1654, when he was described as "an able man and a painful minister of God's word."5

Peregrine junior - William King's father - matriculated at St. Edmund Hall on March 30, 1666, aged 17. He received the degrees of B.A. on Feb. 1, 1669/70, and M.A. in 1672. He was instituted to Rowington (modern Rivington) in Somerset on December 24, 1683, the Patron being Charles II. Precisely how long he spent at Rowington is a mystery; the surviving Consignation Books and clergy lists in

the Somerset County Record Office are silent on the subject, and a curate is invariably named to this small parish. The reasonable inference which may be drawn from these facts is that Peregrine King was probably an absentee incumbent. In 1684 he married Margaret Smyth, one of the daughters of Sir William Smyth of Radcliffe, Buckinghamshire, at All Hallows' Church, London Wall, and settled in Stepney. He would appear to have been a resident of Stepney when his children were born, but the nature of his connection with the parish church of St. Dunstan and All Saints is not clear. His name does not appear among the records of the clergy of the church; the Subscription Books and Visitation Books of the diocese of London, at present housed in the Guildhall Library, likewise provide no information on his status. In 1689 he took the oath of allegiance as curate of Radcliffe, Buckinghamshire, but the Registers of the Church of St. John the Evangelist, Radcliffe, contain no reference to him. While residing in Stepney in 1701 he attorned the rectory of Rowington for £20 per annum to James Knight of Chipstable. Towards the close of his life he dwelt at Ealing, at that time in Middlesex, as one of the lessees of the rectory and its property. His name appears in the Ealing Poor Rate Books intermittently from 1700. The Burial Register of Ealing (1701-1716) gives the date of his interment as August 10, 1714.7

6. Some of these details are available in Joseph Foster's Alumni Oxonienses. Foster gives the date of the appointment of the second Peregrine King to the rectorship of Rowington as 1684; the date of institution to Rowington given above is taken from the archives of the Somerset County Record Office.

7. The Ealing Poor Rate Books are at present deposited in the Ealing Town Hall; the Burial Registers are in the possession of the Church of St. Mary.
King's maternal ancestors are more easily traceable. His great-great-grandfather, Sir William Smyth, was born in 1542 and was a Fellow of New College from 1558 to 1571. He acquired the degrees of B.C.L. in 1565, and D.C.L. in 1573, incorporated at Cambridge in 1583, and became Surrogate for Buckinghamshire and Berkshire. He was also instrumental in obtaining a lease for a thousand years on Akeley manor in Buckinghamshire. Sir William's son, Robert, matriculated at Oxford in 1610, became Principal of New Inn, London, one of the former Inns of Chancery, and was slain in 1645, fighting for the cause of Charles I.

Robert Smyth's elder son, Sir William Smyth of Radcliffe, Buckinghamshire, had a longer career. Born about 1616, he matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford, on March 13, 1634/35, but left the university without taking a degree. He was elected M.P. for Winchelsea in 1640, and held his seat until he was disabled in 1644. Meanwhile he was created a barrister of the Middle Temple in 1641, and received the degree of D.C.L. of the University of Oxford on November 10, 1642. During the Civil War he was governor of Hillesdon House, near Buckingham, where Charles I had a small garrison. King tells the following story of the capture of Hillesdon House by Oliver Cromwell in his posthumously published Political and Literary Anecdotes:

This place was besieged and taken by CROMWELL. But the officers capitulated to march out with their arms, baggage, &c. As soon as they were without the gate, one of Cromwell's soldiers snatched off Sir William Smyth's hat. He immediately

complained to Cromwell of the fellow's insolence, and breach of the capitulation. "Sir", says Cromwell, "if you can point out the man, or if I can discover him, I promise you he shall not go unpunished. In the meantime (taking off a new beaver, which he had on his head) be pleased to accept of this hat instead of your own." 9

Sir William was deprived of his offices during the period of the Protectorate, but was amply rewarded at the Restoration. On May 10, 1661, he was created a Baronet, and was M.P. for Buckingham from 1661 to 1679. In 1664 he was granted, under a patent of Charles II, the right to hold a weekly market at Ratcliffe Cross, a small hamlet in the parish of Stepney, and an annual fair on Michaelmas day at Mile End Green, also within the parish limits. 10 The Court Rolls of the Manor of Stepney refer to him on April 24, 1665, as one of several persons enfeoffing houses on waste ground in Stepney Manor, and his name occurs in several other legal documents in the manorial rolls. 11 He must have maintained a residence in the parish, for his name is listed on March 29, 1687, with those of the vestrymen in the Vestry Book (1662-1747) of the church of St. Dunstan and All Saints. He is described as living "In Ratcliffe". The manorial rolls refer to him again on March 18, 1688/89, as being "of Stepney", and as a lessor of land in Mile End and Bethnal Green.

10. See Pat. 16 Car. II, pt. 11, No. 1, and Pat. 19 Car. II, pt. 6, No. 8.
11. The Court Rolls of the Manor of Stepney are at present deposited in the Greater London Record Office at the County Hall. The significant references are: E/PHI/47 (April 24, 1665); M93/90, page 30 (August 11, 1669); Q/HAL/293 (December 1, 1669); M93/90, page 38 (May 30, 1670); C/93/1535 (March 18, 1688/89).
It would seem that he was active in upholding the legal privileges of the Church of England against the now illegal claims of the Nonconformists. Almost all religious services other than those of the Church of England were by this time forbidden, so that the position of the Nonconformists became essentially that of subversives, who could be punished severely by the magistrates and other authorities. On one occasion, in December 1682, Sir William and a strong guard went to the meeting house of the Independents in Stepney with a view to enforcing the law. The pastor was Matthew Mead, who had formerly been ejected from Shadwell Chapel. Sir William's body of men pulled down the pulpit and broke up the forms; Mead himself escaped, though his goods were seized. Sir William died in Stepney in 1696, and was buried, according to his own instructions, in the chapel of the chancel of Akeley Church under the great stone where his grandfather, Sir William Smyth, was buried.

His will, dated August 18, 1694, and probated on February 10, 1696/97, exhibits considerable generosity. It stipulates:

... give to the children of my Son [in-law Peregrine] King my Estate att Balling which I have settled by deed ... .

Various pieces of real estate, including that at Akeley, are assigned to his only surviving son, Sir Thomas Smyth. When Sir Thomas died without issue in 1732, the Akeley property passed to his cousin, Sir


13. Principal Probate Registry, Somerset House, Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 40 Pyne.
William Smyth of Warden, Bedfordshire. A sum of one hundred pounds is set aside to buy land, the rent of which was to be administered by New College, Oxford, for the benefit of the poor of Akeley, and numerous other legacies are bequested to other individuals.

King's maternal grandfather married twice. His first wife was Margaret, daughter of Sir Alexander Denton of Hillesden: she died apparently without issue. His second wife, King's grandmother, was Dorothy, daughter of Sir Nathaniel Hobart. She could boast of lofty family connections: Sir Nathaniel's brother was an ancestor of the Hobarts, Earls of Buckinghamshire, while her mother, Anne, was the daughter of Sir John Leake of Wyer Hall, Edmonton, and niece of Sir Edmund Verney. Among Sir William's children by his second wife was Dorothy, who in 1682 was married to Charles Wither (or Withers) of Oakley Hall, Hampshire. Educated at Winchester College, he became High Sheriff of Hampshire in 1686. He died in 1697, but as King later married their daughter, Henrietta Maria, Dorothy Wither became his mother-in-law, as well as being his aunt.

The Register of Baptisms of St. Dunstan and All Saints' Church contains entries for two of William's siblings, which read thus:

1690. Nov. 6. John son of Mr. Peregrine King of Stepney clerk & of Margaret uxor 15 days old.

Little information is available on this particular Sir William Smyth, but King provides a piece of gossip in Political and Literary Anecdotes (2d ed., 1819), p.104f. Sir William Smyth of Warden, Bedfordshire, was the nephew of Sir William Smyth of Radclive, Buckinghamshire, and second cousin to William King.
1691. Feb. 4. Robert son of Mr. Peregrine King of Stepney clerk & of Margaret uxor
12 days old. 15

Another brother, Thomas, appears between William and John in the will of Sir William Smyth of Warden, Bedfordshire. 16 He is referred to as "my brother Tom" in a rather untypically informal letter which William wrote in 1721, now in the Public Record Office. 17 The name of John King appears in two legal documents now in the Registry of Deeds at King's Inns, Dublin, dated in 1723 and 1726; in documents of 1775 relating to litigation over the manor of Wavendon, Buckinghamshire, once the property of Woburn Abbey; and in conveyances concerning the sale of Warden rectory and some other properties in 1776. 18

Everything that can now be known about William's childhood must be drawn from what he tells us in his own writings, and principally in the Political and Literary Anecdotes. There he writes:

15. In Old Style dating, the difference between the ages of the two boys is, of course, fifteen months.

16. Principal Probate Registry, Somerset House, Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 319 Spurway. This will was probated at London on November 2, 1741.


18. See The Victoria County History of Buckinghamshire, Vol.IV, p.494. The Warden documents are in the County Record Office, Shire Hall, Bedford; particularly significant are those in the Whitbread Collection, nos.2047-2086, and the Garrard and Allen Collection, no.473.
My mother having died of the small-pox when I was about seven years old, I was sent by my grandfather, Sir William Smyth, to Salisbury, and placed under the care of Mr. Taylor, the master of the free-school in that city. There were at that time two very flourishing schools in Salisbury. 19

These two schools must have been the Choristers' School in the Cathedral Close, and the City Free School which was founded by Queen Elizabeth I in 1569. In 1625 its premises in Castle Street were opened, and here King received his schooling. 20 Long hours of study were demanded of the boys; in 1632 when Mr. Nathaniel Ross was the master, the following regulation was established:

Ordered that the scholars shall not be suffered to go to play on any Monday, Wednesday or Friday, although a remedy [half-holiday] be desired for them by any stranger or other person whatsoever. And they shall not be suffered to go to play on any other day of the week but sparingly and at the master's discretion.


The Free School eventually became known as Salisbury City Grammar School; it closed for lack of support in 1883 and its premises were sold in the following year. No records survive from King's period, though Salisbury Corporation still possesses ten title deeds relating to the foundation.
Despite this apparent severity, King always recollected his time at Salisbury with delight:

THERE IS NO PLACE I have ever seen which I review with so much pleasure and satisfaction as the place of my school education, and the scenes of my boyhood. I feel a thrilling secret joy in every street I pass through. How many agreeable trifles and little amusements do I recollect at almost every step! All my actions were then very innocent, and my errors and follies excusable; not so after I had entered into the great world! 21

An unpublished letter written much later in life by King to Lord Orrery provides an intimate glimpse of the schoolboy at Salisbury writing Latin verses for penny-puffs. He first laments that he would think it hard if, at the age of fifty-six, he could not sell his verses for half the money for which he sold them at sixteen, and then continues:

For I can appeal to some honest Clergy-men, who are still living, as well as to the memoirs of Mother Page the Pastry Cook of New Sarum who flourished in that City in the beginning of this Century, if I did not frequently sell these verses only for a penny-puff. By the way let no objections be made about the puff, for I might have had my pay in ready money, if I had pleased. But I was then too much a man of honour to take ready money for my work. Your Lordship is to observe that these verses I speak of were Hexameters and Pentameters. 22

As King relates these early transactions to his sixteenth year, they must have taken place during his last six months at Salisbury, immediately prior to his going up to Oxford.

On July 9, 1701, King was matriculated at the University of Oxford, and studied for some years afterwards at Balliol College. No academic record survives of his undergraduate years, nor is there any evidence that he ever supplicated for the degrees of B.A. or M.A. But he did graduate with the degree of B.C.L. on July 12, 1709, and received the degree of D.C.L. on July 8, 1715. The Oxford Catalogue of All Graduates (1659-1770) indicates that he was a Grand Compounder, defined in the Preface to the Catalogue as "one who has Forty Pounds per Annum, or upwards, in temporal Estate or Preferment; which must be held for Term of Life at least ......." It is further explained that no place of preferment in the university made a man a Grand Compounder; the privileges accorded to the title were based ultimately on property. The Preface continues: "Upon account of the extraordinary Fees a Grand Compounder pays, he has special Honour done him by the University, with special Privileges which he claims, one of which ....... is to preceed all those that take the same Degree that year." From King's status of Grand Compounder at Oxford, it may be assumed that he was fairly affluent, and probably living on the "small patrimony" which he occasionally mentions in his writings, and which provided him, throughout his life, with a private income. Thus in his last years he could write: "..... let me be ever thankful to Divine Providence, that I have never wanted the necessaries, nor even the comforts of life: and what has given me a very singular pleasure, I have always
been able to spare something to assist a poor friend." 23

It is impossible to form more than the most nebulous picture of King during his periods of residence at Balliol College. The principal sources of information are the Balliol Caution Books and Buttery Books, the Bursar's Books of Battells, and the Admission Book of 1682-1833. As an undergraduate commoner in September 1701, he paid £7 in caution money. Various amounts of money are credited to his name as battells, though his expenses do not appear in any way unusual. He does not seem to have been in residence during the academic year 1704-1705; his name disappears from the Buttery Books in March 1704/5. It reappears in 1709; on June 23 of that year King was promoted from commoner to fellow commoner. His name is on the books again from 1715 to 1719, when he is described as D.C.L.

When he was not at Oxford, King presumably resided at Ealing, where he succeeded his father as lessee of the rectory. His name occurs for the first time in the Ealing Rate Books in 1712. In the entry of May 28, 1712, of The Pension Book of Gray's Inn, 24 he is referred to as "William King, of Ealing, Middlesex, Esq." For an indeterminable period he lived on an estate called Newby, near the church; there is no record of his time spent actually occupying this messuage, though Faulkner describes it as "many years". 25

---

23. Political and Literary Anecdotes, (2d ed., 1819) p.3.
London he used to visit King's Coffee House in Golden Square; its exact whereabouts are now not known.

In 1709 he married his cousin, Henrietta Maria Wither, who was about two years younger than he. The licence of the Vicar-General, dated October 29, 1709, and now in the Library of Lambeth Palace, indicates the place of the marriage as St. Anne's, Westminster. Presumably the marriage took place some short time after the issue of the licence, though there is no record of it in the surviving registers of St. Anne's. By his union to Henrietta Maria, King acquired a brother-in-law, Charles Wither junior, who became, paradoxically, a "hearty Whig". His name occurs occasionally in historical documents relating to his official positions: like his father he was High Sheriff of Hampshire, and to this dignity he added that of Commissioner for Woods and Forests in 1720. He was M.P. for Christchurch from 1726 to 1731, the year of his death. His sister bore King two children: Charles and Dorothy. The scanty information available on them may be quickly reviewed.

According to the Register of St. Anne's Church, Westminster, Charles King was born on January 5, 1710/11, and baptized there on perhaps he may assume a small portion of your action.

26. Political and Literary Anecdotes (2d ed., 1819), pp.237f., 243. The standard reference work, Bryant Lillywhite's London Coffee Houses, does not list a King's Coffee House in Golden Square. From 1702 to 1714 there was a King's Coffee House in James Street, Golden Square; perhaps this is meant. The more famous King Street Coffee House, King Street, Golden Square, was in existence about 1770, but I can find no evidence of its date of opening.
the following March 19. He matriculated at St. Mary Hall, Oxford, where his father was now Principal, on March 30, 1726.

The degree of B.A. was conferred on him on October 17, 1729, and that of M.A. on July 6, 1732. He married a Lucy Blythman in 1737, thereby acquiring wealth, and was Vicar of Great Bedwyn in Wiltshire from 1748 until his death in 1759. In an anonymous list of notes on local ratepayers now preserved at Ealing Central Library, Charles King is described as "a great speculativist, clever but eccentric." Other odds and ends of information about him are to be found in contemporary sources; for example his name crops up in a letter written by Sanderson Miller to Deane Swift, from which we learn that Miller bought Volume I of Clarendon's History of the Rebellion from him in 1734, and in an unpublished letter written by his father to Lord Orrery on July 14, 1741, we read:

I have a Son in Orders who preach'd our Assize Sermon, and as I am told (for I did not hear him) he performed tolerably well. But that you may be assured he has nothing extraordinary to recommend him, he is undignify'd and un-beneficed without so much as half an ounce of preferment. And Your Lordship knows well, that no man in these circumstances was ever allowed to be an excellent preacher. Such as he is however I'll introduce him to Your Lordship the first opportunity. He is a pretty good Classic Scholar and on that account perhaps he may acquire a small portion of your esteem.

He died, according to the note on him in Ealing Central Library, "in the fields coming from Gunnersbury".


King's daughter, Dorothy, was the younger of the two children; she married William Melmoth the Younger, and is the "Cleora" of his Letters on Several Subjects. Their marriage took place at St. George's Church, Hanover Square, on March 5, 1738/39, and is alluded to in Fitzosborne's letters. They seem to have resided for a time at Shrewsbury, but also maintained a home at Ealing. Here Dorothy Melmoth died on June 21, 1761. On May 26, 1762, Mr. Melmoth married again: this time a Mary Ogle at St. James's Church, Bath. According to Thomas Faulkner, he "passed the chief part of his life in retirement at Ealing," and specifically in Ealing House; his first wife must have spent a portion of her married life there.

On May 28, 1712, King was admitted as a Barrister-at-Law of Gray's Inn. On the following July 12 he was called to the Bar, as the entry in The Pension Book of Gray's Inn manifests:

1712 July 12
Ordered that Wm. King Esq. a Member of this Society being Batchelor of Civill Law of the University of Oxford and of Drs. standing there, be admitted to the Barr by the Grace and Favour of the Bench.

29. William Melmoth's once well known Letters on Several Subjects was published in 1742 under the pseudonym of Sir Thomas Fitzosborne, and reprinted several times later. A second volume of letters appeared in 1749. Letter No. 25 relates particularly to Dorothy (No. 35 in Harrison's edition of 1787).

30. Thomas Faulkner, op. cit., p. 240. It is quite possible that Ealing House was adjacent to Newby; in the Ealing Rate Books for 1723 to 1729 William King is described as residing in the next house to William Melmoth. Undoubtedly William Melmoth the Elder is here intended. His name first appears in the Rate Books in 1718; his son's name disappears after 1761.
To be created a barrister of an inn of court less than seven weeks after admittance is indeed unusual. The distinction seems to have been bestowed on King by virtue of his status at Oxford: it was in the nature of an honorary call to the Bar. He never practised as a barrister professionally, as far as is known, and certainly held no official post within Gray's Inn. He may have resided here, but since the rent rolls of Gray's Inn perished in 1941 when the old library was destroyed by German air attack, there is no means of ascertaining the matter.

At some time prior to 1715, King was appointed Secretary to the Chancellor of the University of Oxford, James Butler, Duke of Ormonde. It is reasonable to assume that his appointment to this position reflected the confidence that the authorities placed in him. Since a good deal of the university's correspondence, especially with continental institutions, was conducted in Latin, one of the requisites of the Chancellor's Secretary was the faculty for writing Latin with elegance and a reasonable celerity, an ability which King unquestionably possessed. Furthermore, the Duke was a staunch Tory, and no doubt found in his Secretary a subordinate of mutual sympathies. King's relationship with the Duke of Ormonde seems to have been a congenial one. True, the Dublin born Duke had been present with King William's army at the Battle of the Boyne, but he always showed a measure of personal independence, and was certainly involved, though to an unknown degree, in Jacobite designs in the latter part of the reign of Queen Anne. Shortly after the arrival of George I in England in September 1714, Ormonde was deprived of the captain-generalship, and
though on October 9 he was named to the privy council in Ireland and confirmed in the lord-lieutenancy, he was dismissed from both offices a few days later. On June 21, 1715, Lord Stanhope moved his impeachment, and after a lengthy debate the motion was carried by a majority of forty-nine. Always dignified and gracious to the end, Ormonde refused to pursue a conciliatory course, and left for France on the following August 8. He never returned to Oxford.

Necessarily Ormonde's affairs and movements were partially shrouded in mystery during his last months as Chancellor. He was certainly engaged in preparations for what later proved to be an abortive rising in the west, and was also host to a number of Jacobite gatherings during this final period. King provides an intimate glimpse into one of these, in which most of the principal leaders are assembled.

In 1715 I dined with the Duke of Ormonde at Richmond. We were fourteen at table. There was my Lord Mark, my Lord Jersey, my Lord Arran, my Lord Landsdown, Sir William Wyndham, Sir Redmond Everard, and Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester. The rest of the company I do not exactly remember. During the dinner there was a jocular dispute (I forget how it was introduced) concerning short prayers. Sir William Wyndham told us that the shortest prayer he had ever heard was the prayer of a common soldier just before the Battle of Blenheim, 'O God, if there be a God, save my soul, if I have a soul!' This was followed by a general laugh. I immediately reflected that such a treatment of the subject was too ludicrous, at least very improper, where a learned and religious prelate was one of the company. But I had soon an opportunity of making a different reflection. Atterbury, seeming to join in the conversation, and applying himself to Sir William Wyndham, said "Your prayer, Sir William, is indeed very short: but I remember another as short, but a much better, offered up likewise by a poor soldier in the same circumstances, 'O God, if in the day of battle I forget thee, do then not forget me!'" This, as Atterbury pronounced it with his usual grace and dignity, was a very gentle and polite reproof, and was immediately felt by the whole company. And the Duke of Ormonde,
who was the best bred man of his age, suddenly turned the discourse to a different subject.

In September 1715 Ormonde's brother, Charles Butler, Earl of Arran, signified the Duke's resignation from the Chancellorship and was himself elected Chancellor in his place. Ormonde's popularity lived on among students and dons of Jacobite sympathies: in July 1716 a certain Frank Nicholas of Exeter College was fined, imprisoned, and compelled to apologize in Convocation for publicly shouting "An Ormonde for ever", and there were several similar incidents. The former Chancellor spent the rest of his life on the continent, mainly in Madrid and Avignon, always residing with great magnificence, and enjoying the titles of Captain-General and Commander-in-Chief in England and Ireland, which were bestowed on him at the Jacobite Court by King James. After his death in 1745 his remains were brought back to England and laid to rest in Westminster Abbey.

The Earl of Arran was, according to Hearne, "in all respects much like the Duke", but though undoubtedly a Jacobite, he was in some ways more circumspect than his brother. King was his Secretary from the time of his election on September 10, 1715, until December 1721. From the scanty evidence available it appears that they worked together well, though towards the end of King's period as


32. Register of Convocation Bn. 31, f. 136.
Secretary most of the heads of colleges were trying to influence the Chancellor against him.

Shortly after the elevation of Lord Arran to the Chancellorship, the Jacobite insurrection of 1715 took place. There were to have been three separate risings: one in the highlands of Scotland under the Earl of Mar, another in Cumberland under Thomas Forster with Lord Derwentwater and Lord Widdrington, and a third in the west of England under the Duke of Ormonde. In fact what happened was that the first rising fizzled out after the indecisive battle with government troops at Sheriffmuir, the second was a complete failure, and the third never took place at all. But the authorities were prepared to meet trouble in the west, and dispatched a regiment under a Colonel Pepper to deal with such an emergency. Alarming reports continued to reach London of large numbers of Jacobites in Oxford prepared to assist the insurrection, and so Colonel Pepper's regiment was diverted at Banbury on October 8, marched southwards through the night, and reached Oxford at about four o'clock on the morning of October 9. The town was blockaded, and Colonel Pepper was enabled to secure the ten or eleven men whom he had been ordered to apprehend, with the exception of one Owen, who escaped by climbing over the wall of Magdalen College in his nightgown. One of those taken was Captain Charles Halsted, with whom King maintained a correspondence.

An example of one of King's official letters to Lord Arran is today in the National Library of Ireland, Ormonde MSS, Vol. 177, p. 221, dated June 11, 1721, and written from St. Mary Hall.
over a number of years. This fact was known to the authorities in London by letters which had been intercepted at the post office.

On January 20, 1716, King was admitted a civilian, and became an advocate of Doctors' Commons. The College of Advocates at Doctors' Commons ceased to exist in 1857, and few of the college records survive. But at the time of his admission he was presumably received with the traditional ceremonial, and, duly armed with the rescript of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Vicar-General, accepted first in the Court of Arches and then in the Court of Admiralty.

It is impossible to formulate any clear picture of the part that King played in the life of the college, but it can hardly have been of any special importance.

Most of the documentary information available on King's activities between 1718 and 1722 is to be found in Thomas Hearne's Remarks and Collections. In the middle of 1718 King was involved in Hearne's dispute with the Delegates of the Oxford University Press. The Delegates had intimated that they would publish no more of Hearne's works until he had acknowledged, or made satisfaction for, some allegedly offensive passages in the Preface to his edition of Camden's Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha, published in 1717. On March 21, 1717/18, Hearne

---


35. The best account of the history of the College of Advocates is still William Senior's Doctors' Commons and the Old Court of Admiralty (London: Longmans, 1922). King's name does not occur in it.
received a copy of the accusations made against him in the form of a set of Latin Articles. To a modern reader these twelve Articles seem trifling; in Article 5, for example, Hearne is criticised for having written:

.... notissimum est Henricum octavum ipso Nerone pene crudeliorem ac efferatiorem Caligulaque & Elagabulo quasi turpiorem ....36

He denied the charges made against him in a formal Answer to the Articles, but meanwhile the publication of his edition of Guilielmi Neubrigensis Historia rerum Anglicarum was held up in the printing house over the Sheldonian Theatre. On July 5, 1718, he wrote:

This Day Dr. King (Secretary to my Lord Arran, Chanc. of our University) called upon me, & told me he had carried a Letter from Dr. Mead, signed by, & in the name of, several other Subscribers, to my Lord Arran, requesting him that he would desire the Vice-Chancellor to permit my book to go on immediately. 37

The Dr. Mead here referred to was Dr. Richard Mead, son of the Non-Conformist divine Matthew Mead, who had suffered, de jure deservedly, at the hands of King's grandfather. Richard Mead was one of King's several Oxford physician acquaintances. Like King, he had been born in Stepney. He had studied medicine at the University of Padua, been elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1703, and secured the degree

36. Thomas Hearne. Remarks and Collections (11 vols.; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1885-1921), Vol. VI, pp. 353f. The Alumni Oxonienses, in the entry under King's name, attributes to Hearne the statement that King was "perhaps writer of the Gazettes". Actually Hearne was referring to the William King of Christ Church.

37. Ibid., p.375.
of D.Med. of the University of Oxford, by diploma, in 1707.

Whatever differences their forbears may have had, they were both firmly on Hearne's side in this particular controversy.

On July 9 Hearne wrote:

This Day, in the Afternoon, I met my Proctor, Acton, at Dr. King's at Balliol College. The Dr. told me privately that he believ'd all Things would be ended in a Fortnight's time. He said he must go out of Town next Week. I told him I wish'd he would stay till all was over. Because I was afraid that, in his Absence, some new Tricks would be plaid. He said he believ'd not.

King was evidently doing his best to stop the prosecution, as Hearne attests on July 14:

I was this Morning with Dr. King. He told me he had been with the Principal of Brazen-Nose, & declared to him that he was to be the next Vice-Chancellor. He told him that he must put a stop to my Prosecution as soon as ever he was in his Office, and immediately upon that to permitt Neubrigensis to go on. After a great deal of Discourse, he brought him to yield to this. So that the only Business now remaining is to get a Letter speedily from the Chancellor, & to have it read in Convocation, which, I am afraid, will not be so soon done as I could wish, it being my opinion that Dr. Baron will defer it as long as possibly he can, tho' Dr. King does his Endeavour to have it done at the Beginning of August.

The Principal of Brasenose was Dr. Robert Shippen; Dr. John Baron, Master of Balliol, was the incumbent Vice-Chancellor. On August 3, 1718, Shippen wrote to Lord Arran to the effect that the time of appointing a new Vice-Chancellor was drawing near, and added: "Your Lordship will be pleased at your leisure to give Directions to your Secretary to prepare a letter for that purpose to be sent hither some

38. Ibid.
39. Ibid., pp. 378f.
A letter to Hearne from Dr. Mead, headed "Blomesbury. Aug. 5, 1718", showed that King, though now in London, was still actively helping Hearne’s cause:

This day I waited on my Ld. Arran, and delivered to him your Letter. Dr. John Friend and Dr. Levet were with me, and Dr. King met us there. My Ld received us very kindly. We layd the whole matter before him, and he seem’d fully convinced of the unreasonableness and injustice of your Prosecution.

In subsequent letters from Mead to Hearne, it is made amply clear that King was doing everything in his power to end the matter. He encouraged Lord Arran to appoint Dr. Robert Shippen to the Vice-Cancellariate to replace Dr. John Baron, who was one of Hearne’s active enemies. He later persuaded the Chancellor to write a letter to Shippen with a view to concluding Hearne’s prosecution. Mead, in his letter headed "Blomesbury. Oct. 18, 1718" intimates: "Dr. King proposes to bring my Lord’s Letter to Oxford himself, and is your humble servant.” Eventually the opposition dissipated, the prosecution was abandoned, and Hearne lived to see several more of his books published by the University Press.


41. Hearne, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 384f. Dr. John Friend or Freind of Christ Church and Dr. Henry Levet or Levett of Exeter College were both Doctors of Medicine of the University of Oxford. Dr. Friend was also appointed Professor of Chemistry in 1704 and elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1712. There is a monument to him in Westminster Abbey.

42. Ibid., p. 397
Shortly after the start of Hearne's troubles, King was involved in another academic controversy, thus briefly described in the Remarks and Collections:

1718: Aug. 4 (Mon.). Dr. King, when he was lately in Town, told me that Mr. Digby Cotes, Principal of Magd. Hall, had not paid him his Fees for being Principal of the Hall. The Fees, as he had it from old Will. Sherwin, are 10 Guineas for being Principal of an Hall, and Dr. King, being Register to my Lord Arran, ought to have it. The Dr. mentioned this in my presence, also to Cooper, the University Register, & said, too, that he should sue the Principal. 43

It is not surprising that Digby Cotes remained one of King's adversaries: his name will occur again in that capacity.

On December 9, 1719, King was installed as Principal of St. Mary Hall, in succession to Dr John Hudson, who was recently deceased. He was the thirty-sixth Principal since the appointment of William Croten in 1436, who, if one disregards the very obscure fourteenth century claimant, William de Leverton, was the first known holder of that position. King maintained his Principalship of what he used to refer to as "my monastery" for forty-four years, until his death in 1763. St. Mary Hall was one of the several surviving examples of the medieval non-collegiate academic hall. Originally it had been the parsonage of the rectors of St. Mary's Church until Edward II, in 1325, gave the Church and all of its appurtenances to Oriel College. Subsequently it became independent. In King's time it had no corporate body to govern it and no fellows. The Principal was, in effect, a complete autocrat. Small though it

43. Ibid., p. 210
was, it had an excellent reputation: William (later Cardinal) Allen had been one of its earlier Principals, and among its former students were the poets Sir Christopher Hatton, George Sandys, and Ulpian Fulwell, the mathematician Thomas Harriot, and the political writer Marchmont Needham. Sir Thomas More may also have resided in the Hall for a time, and, if so, could have been one of the St. Anthony Exhibitioners maintained in the Hall by Oriel College.  

Almost all of the surviving evidence on the routine administration of the Hall during the principalship of William King is to be found in the holographic Matriculation Register and Buttery Books, which are preserved today in the Muniment Room of Oriel College. During the years 1719 to 1763 about 170 students matriculated at St. Mary Hall, an average of approximately four each year. The hebdomadal lists in the Buttery Books generally contain about forty names, but the number of members in residence, including the Principal and the Vice-Principal, is rarely higher than thirty, and often much lower. The number of undergraduates listed is never large; twelve to fifteen appears to have been the usual.


45. The formal title of the Matriculation Register is "St. Mary Hall Matriculations, Principals, Buildings, and History." The matriculation lists appear to be complete; the other material was never finished for King's period.
Philip Bury Duncan writes of "the hand-writing ...... which is well ascertained to be Dr. King's in the account-books of St. Mary Hall in Oxford," but it is far from clear to which books he is referring. The Buttery Books of King's period are written in a veritable Vishnu of different hands, and there is no proof that any of them is that of the Principal. Furthermore, there is a manuscript note near the beginning of the Liber Aulae B.M.V. 1764, referring to King's successor, which reads:

Thomas Nowell was admitted Principal of St. Mary Hall, the Eleventh Day of January 1764.

Soon after his Admission he enquired for the Register of the said Hall, or Book, in which he supposed the Hall-accounts were enter'd. But he was informed by Dr. King's Executors that no such Book was in their custody. - The only Book deliver'd to Dr. Nowell was that which contains a Catalogue of Books belonging to the Library, and an Account of the Plate.

The enigma of the account books remains unsolved.

Until January 1722, King held his position of Principal of St. Mary Hall simultaneously with the Secretaryship to the Chancellor. The little available evidence - all of a formal nature - indicates that he fulfilled his responsibilities in both appointments with competence and thoroughness. Evidence of an informal kind is even more sparse. Hearne provides a glimpse of King involved in negotiations for the purchase of the library of Robert Betham, Rector of Silchester, Hampshire. Betham had died in November, 1719.

46. Political and Literary Anecdotes (2d ed., 1819), p. VII.
and had left "a good Study of Books" which had cost him about £900. Some ten months later Hearne wrote:

Sept. 22 (Th.). Calling this Afternoon upon Dr. King, Principal of St. Mary Hall, he tells me that he hath bought Mr. Betham of Silchester's Books, or at least as good as bought them. 47

In the following month King is shown exhibiting to Hearne a remarkable Jacobite medal:

Nov. 5 (Sat.). Yesterday Morning Dr. King, Principal of St. Mary Hall, called upon me, and shewed me the finest Silver Medal that I think I ever yet saw. It is of K. James IIId's Queen, by whch it appears that she is a Lady of admirable Beauty. On the obverse Side, CLEMENTINA - M - BRITAN - FR - ET - HIB - REGINA. The Figure of the Queen. Reverse, DECEPTIS - CUSTODI BUS - FORTUNAM - CAUSAMQUE - SEVOR - MDCCXIX. The Fig. of the Vatican and Trajan's Pillar. Also a Ship, and a Lady (being the Queen herself) in a Chariot drawn by 2 Horses, over whch the rising Sun. 48

Somehow or other King must have acquired possession of one of several Jacobite medals struck on the continent, this particular keepsake commemorating the escape of Princess Clementina Sobiesky from Innspruck on April 28, 1719. 49 It is indeed an exquisite

47. Hearne, op. cit., Vol.VII, pp.70,171. See also pp. 97, 299.
48. Ibid., p. 185
49. It is referred to in R.W. Cochran-Patrick, Catalogue of the Medals of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1884), p. 65, No. 45* and Edward Hawkins, Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland to the Death of George II. (London: British Museum, 1885), Vol. II, p. 444, no. 49. Illustrations of both sides of the medal are to be found in Collection of plates appended to the latter work in 1911: see Plate CXLI I I I, No. 7. Its diameter is 48 millimeters, and some examples were struck in copper. Specimens in both silver and copper are preserved in the Heberden Coin Room of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. A short biography of the engraver, Otto Hamerani, who later became Master of the Mint at Rome, may be found in L. Forrer's Biographical Dictionary of Medallists, Vol. II, p. 404-409.
piece of numismatic artistry. On the obverse side is a delicately wrought bust of the Princess depicted from the left, her flowing hair decorated with a diadem and wreathed with pearls. She wears a pearl ear-ring and necklace, a gown bordered with jewels, and an ermine mantle. On the reverse side she is seated in a chariot drawn at speed by two horses, with the rising sun in the distance. What Hearne calls the Vatican appears to me more like a part of Rome dominated by the Colosseum, but otherwise his description is unmistakable. The words FORTUNAM CAUSAMQVE SEQVOR are inscribed over the top of the scene on the reverse side, and the words DECEPTIS CUSTODIBUS are in the exergue. The name of the engraver appears on the obverse in very minute letters:

OTTO HAMERANI . F [ecit]

Princess Clementina Sobiesky was the grand-daughter of John Sobiesky, King of Poland, the wife of the Old Chevalier and mother of Charles Edward, the Young Chevalier. Her marriage was opposed by George I of England. The Holy Roman Emperor, Charles VI, seeking to gratify him, arrested her on her journey to Italy and incarcerated her at Innsbruck Castle. She escaped, deceptis custodibus, and fled to Bologna, where she was married by proxy to James Edward, who on that occasion was in Madrid. Her father, Prince Louis Sobiesky, commented that she ought to follow her spouse's fortune and cause: hence the wording over the scene on the reverse.

It is occasionally suggested that King took a woman of the same
name under his protection in the 1740's and established her at Finsthwaite, a small village near the southern tip of Lake Windermere in Lancashire. This person could not possibly have been the mother of Bonnie Prince Charlie, who left her husband in November 1724, entered a convent, and died in 1735. There definitely was a woman who called herself Princess Clementina Sobiesky used to be referred to as the "Finsthwaite Princess"; she died in 1771, and a tombstone to her memory was erected in Finsthwaite churchyard in the early 1900's. The identity of this particular sphinx has been much discussed, but even though there were Kings living in Finsthwaite in the middle of the eighteenth century, no connection has been conclusively established between the mysterious "Princess" and the Principal of St. Mary Hall.  

A little more than five months after King had shown Hearne this remarkable medal, he was a guest of the Marquis of Carnarvon at a reception in Balliol College. A list of the participants has survived in the diary of Erasmus Philipps. Not surprisingly, those present were mainly Jacobites:

1721, April 9. Supped with the Marquiss of Carnarvon at his Apartments in Baliol College, where were Lord Lusam and Mr. Legh (his Brother (sons to Legg, Earl of Dartmouth), and Sir Walter Bagott, Bar, Noblemen of Magdalen College, D· King, a Civilian, Principal of St Mary Hall; D· Sedgwick Harrison, a Civilian, and Camden Professor of History; D· Steward, M.D. (a Scotch Gentleman, and Companion to the Marquiss); D· Hunt, Fellow of Baliol College (Tutor to the Marquiss); Robert Craven, Esq. (Bro. to W· Craven, Lord Craven); Stephen and Henry Fox, Esq.s, sons to the famous Sir Stephen Fox, Knt (Gent. Commoners of Christ Church); M· Lees, Fellow of Corpus Christi; M· Humphrey Lloyd, B.D., Fellow of Jesus, and my Brother. The Entertainment here was extremally Elegant, in Every Respect.51

An entry in Hearne's Collections under June 8, 1721, reads:

"..... D· King's Mother is now living near Silchester in Hampshire, but his Father is dead."52 The reference to King's mother is a mistake on Hearne's part: she died when her son was "about seven years old", as he makes plain in the Political and Literary Anecdotes. Hearne is undoubtedly referring to King's mother-in-law, Dorothy Wither, who was residing in Hampshire at this time, and who lived on until 1732. On May 28 of that year she died, and was buried in the Hampshire village of Dean.

Hearne's entry two day's later is of greater value:

June 10 (Sat.). D· King, Principal of St· Mary-Hall, lately told me that he heartily wish'd the whole Body of the University Statutes were printed, so as to be made more common, that the World might see and judge what horrible Tricks are plaid by three or four, or a few more, People here (such as Gardiner, Charlett, &c.), who are for doing everything as they please, & if anything be done contrary to their mind, presently cry out that such as are opposite to them are Enemies to the University, by this means taking upon themselves the name of the University, and excluding

all others, whereas in reality they are the Enemies of the University, and do all that possibly they can to disgrace and ruin her. The Dr. told me he had a good mind to print his own Copy of the Statutes. He said those Fellows I have been speaking of acted most basely by our Chancellor, my Lord Arran, & that my Lord had no Copy of the Statutes at all.\(^53\)

Evidently Ling was deeply involved in academic politics. The names Gardiner and Charlett refer to Dr. Bernard Gardiner, Warden of All Souls, and Dr. Arthur Charlett, Master of University College, two of the heads of colleges whose hostility towards the cause of Jacobitism was generally acknowledged. King, like Hearne, was anti-pathetic to both of them and to their supporters. As Vice-Chancellor from 1712 to 1715 Gardiner had been the leader of the anti-Jacobite elements in Oxford, and was still a powerful force against King, who, by now, seems to have been regarded as the principal protagonist of the Jacobite persuasion. Charlett had opposed King by using his influence against Hearne in his dispute with the Clarendon Press in 1718. Even though the Master of University College was thirty years King's senior, he seems to have exhibited a rather unusual amount of garrulity and also a certain \textit{penchant} for double dealing.\(^54\) Both Gardiner and Charlett had often openly sympathized with the Oxford court Whigs, and both voted against King in the election for the parliamentary representation of the university in 1722.

\(^{53}\) \textit{Ibid.}

\(^{54}\) Some Christ Church men believed that he had acted a double role in their earlier controversy with Richard Bentley. He was also suspected of duplicity in the affair of the dedication of Edward Thwaites' \textit{Heptateuchus, Liber Job et Evangelium Nicodemi Anglo-Saxonice} to George Hickes. In No. 43 of the \textit{Spectator} Charlett,
This election deserves special mention since it constitutes King's only attempt to enter practical politics. The earliest surviving intimation of King's decision to stand as a candidate for the university is contained in a letter written by King to Captain Halsted on October 24, 1721. In it he laments:

I am hard pushed here by my brother H--ds and they intend once more to try their interest with Lord A--n. In the meantime they represent this attempt of mine as a thing perfectly disagreeable to the O--d family.

Writing to Edward Harley, later the second Earl of Oxford, Canon William Stratford of Christ Church commented on the following November 20:

I am afraid we shall have a disturbance in this place. Harrison and his party now canvass openly for a sorry fellow, Dr. King.

The "Harrison" here mentioned is Sedgwick Harrison, Fellow of Corpus Christi College, and staunch supporter of the Principal of St. Mary Hall. Needless to say Canon Stratford was not sympathetic towards King's cause: he was one of King's many Whig opponents in orders.

Shortly afterwards, King resigned his Secretaryship to Lord Arran under pressures the precise extent of which is now impossible

54. (contd) under the uncomplimentary name of Abraham Froth, is made to write an amusing letter dealing with the business transacted at meetings of the Hebdomadal Council.


to determine. There are several contemporary references to this event. One is contained in a letter written by Dr. George Carter, Provost of Oriel, to Archbishop Wake on Dec. 22, 1721:

Dr. King who puts up for Member of Parliament for the University hath quitte[d] his Post of Secretary to our Chancellor, & Mr. Watkins of Christ Church succeeds him in that Office. Dr. King if he stands it out will lose his Election by above two to one I believe; All us [sic] Whigs are against him to a Man. 57

Another is contained in a letter written by Canon Stratford on January 2, 1721/22:

Harry Watkins is Secretary instead of King. The Chancellor told King he could keep him no longer, but to make his dismissal less disgraceful gave him leave to resign. 58

A much fuller account of what happened was inscribed by Hearne in his diary:

Jan. 18 (Th.). Dr. King, principal of St. Mary Hall, being pitch'd upon for a Parliament Man for our University in the ensuing Election (provided the Parliament should be dissolved, as 'tis much talk'd off), by many honest Gentlemen of the University, who mightly desire to throw out Dr. Clarke, this Dr. Clarke's Friends are so nettled at it that most of the Heads of Houses sign'd a Letter to my Lord Arran, Chancellor of the University, signifying that Dr. King is a Fomenter of Differences in the University, a Disturber of the Peace, and I know not what. Upon w'ch some Passages pass'd between my Lord Arran & Dr. King, & the Dr. resign'd his Secretaryship to my Lord (worth above 100 Guineas a Year, as I heard the Dr. say), & Mr. Henry Watkins, M.A., Senior Student of Christ Church, is made his L'ship's Secretary. This base Act of the Heads hath made the Dr.'s Friends the more zealous, & my Lord Arran is much blamed for his Conduct, since he hath no reason to countenance Clarke, who, when in

57. Christ Church Library, MSS. Arch. Wake Epist.16, No. 95.
France, would not so much as see my L'd's Brother, the Duke of Ormond, who was Clarke's great Friend. 59

The University of Oxford was represented in the House of Commons by two members. For the election of 1722 there were three candidates: William Bromley of Christ Church, George Clarke of All Souls, and William King of St. Mary Hall. All three were Tories, but King was the only self-confessed Jacobite. Bromley was the most popular of the three: his reputation for sincerity, prudence, and honesty was generally allowed, and nobody seriously doubted that he would be returned. The real contest was between Clarke and King. The latter was a quarter of a century younger than Clarke, but, even so, his chances of success at first seemed promising. Clarke was temporarily unpopular among different sections of the qualified voters for two reasons: many of the Whigs recalled how in 1705 he had taken part in the fierce contest in the House of Commons for the office of Speaker, voted for the Tory candidate, and been ejected from all his political offices by the Whig ministry; many of the Jacobites, on the other hand, felt disinclined to vote for him because of his very moderate brand of Toryism and his obvious interest in retaining the friendship of both Hanoverian Tories and, if the phrase may be permitted, right wing Whigs. Furthermore, it must also have been manifest to most of the potential voters in Oxford that Clarke was the choice of the majority of the heads of colleges rather than of the electorate as a whole. Very probably these factors had won King some sympathy. On

February 4, 1721/22, he wrote to Captain Halsted: "My brother heads are grown less violent and treat my friends with more temper and humanity." On the following March 7 Canon Stratford commented at Christ Church: "There is some whispering here at present, as though the Whigs of this place would go over entirely to King. I know not what to make of it." This temporary respite, however, produced no lasting results.

Gradually the direction of electoral sentiment turned against King. He had already been, in effect, forced to resign his special relationship to the Chancellor, and had thereby lost a portion of his indirect power. He was the youngest of the three candidates by more than twenty years and, unlike his fellow contestants, had had no parliamentary experience whatever. His Jacobitism alienated many Tories who might otherwise have voted for him, and his lack of prudence was later admitted even by himself. He could on occasion exhibit causticity, sarcasm, and egocentricity, characteristics which would hardly have won waverers to his cause under any circumstances. Outside Jacobite circles he had powerful and vociferous enemies who unceasingly inveighed against him. Gardiner and Charlett were among them, but he had another energetic antagonist in Dr. John Gibson, Provost of Queen's College, and cousin of Edmund Gibson, the highly

60. Public Record Office, State Papers Domestic, 35/30, Item 27. This letter is addressed to Halsted at the Coco Tree in Pall Mall, an established Jacobite haunt.

influential Whig Bishop of London. In his entry for February 11, Hearne reproduced an open letter to the Chancellor, which was commonly believed to have been written by the Provost of Queen’s. It had been, wrote Hearne, "printed and dispersed, but finding that it rather did the Dr. Service than Mischief, great care was taken to have it stifled." Oxford University, the writer proclaimed, was a "Sacred Place, where Peace and Order ought to reign", but if the methods of King were followed, the forthcoming election would be "Mobbish and Popular":

".... Strife, Envy, Hatred, and Contention will rove about like devouring Lions: Order and Government will be no more, but every one will do what is righteous in his own Eyes. If once the Younger and Unthinking Part of the University meet with Success against their Governors, they, like a furious Horse, will too soon feel their own Strength, and throw off all Submission, and, consequently, Opposition and Rebellion will be their first Principle."

Dr. Gibson, whether or not he penned this letter, apparently engaged in other activities not merely epistolary. For example, he successfully dissuaded his brother from voting for King, according to Hearne’s later account:

Sept. 20 (Th.). M'. Gibson of Queen’s Coll., Brother to the Provost of that Name, is curate of Famber and Stadley in Hampshire, D'. King having been his great Friend there, the Dr.'s Mother in Law living at Wyford, wch is situated between both Places; and M'. Gibson, being sensible of the Obligation, promised the Dr. his vote for Parliam Man, but was drawn off by the Threats and illegal Methods of his Brother, the Provost. 63


63. Ibid, p.402.
Dr. Robert Shippen, the Vice-Chancellor, voted for King's rivals after what seems to have been a singular sequence of events.

Hearne writes:

Sept. 15 (Sat.). Dr. King, with all, assured me that Dr. Shippen, our Vice-Chancellor, in the late Election was at first against Dr. Clarke, thinking to have got in his own Brother, Wm Shippen, Esq., the Project being to have got Mr. Bromley to resign, & to bring in the Hon. Rob. Digby, Esq., in his Place. And the better to secure an Interest, the V. Chanc. endeavour'd to get Dr. King (who had certainly once a Majority of Votes in Magd. Coll., tho' they fell off afterwards) to desist, & to draw over his Men for his Brother, but when the V. Chanc. saw that the Dr. was resolv'd to stand it out, he then appear'd strenuous for Clarke and Bromley.

On account of his influential position, Shippen may perhaps have been more instrumental in weakening King's cause than any other single individual. He undoubtedly exerted some pressure on the Chancellor to dismiss King as his Secretary, a singularly ironic situation in view of the fact that King himself had persuaded Lord Arran to appoint Shippen as Vice-Chancellor in 1718. R.J. Robson has suggested that Shippen's behaviour was dictated primarily by the desire to prevent government intervention:

Since the Hanoverian succession the Jacobite proclivities of the University had been restrained by the concern of Convocation and of successive Vice-Chancellors for the 'independency' of the academic body. Politics in the national context must invariably be subordinated to the

---

64. Ibid., p. 401.

domestic interests of the University. These would not be promoted by inviting Government intervention, and the main preoccupation of the governing magistrates throughout the reigns of the first two Georges was to keep out the Dragoons and the Whigs. Thus when Dr. William King, the Principal of St. Mary Hall, and a man very zealous for King James, decided to fight the University constituency in 1722 against Bromley and Clarke, thereby splitting the Tory vote and affording the 'squadron of Whiggs' their opportunity, Vice-Chancellor Shippen and the heads of colleges connived at all manner of chicanery to secure his defeat. 66

Also opposed to King in various ways were Dr. John Morley, Rector of Lincoln; Dr. William Delaune, President of St. John's; Dr. Mathew Panting, Master of Pembroke and most of the other heads of colleges. King's future enemy, John Burton of Corpus Christi College, was among those who did not vote for him, as also were the Public Orator, Digby Cotes of Magdalen Hall; Henry Watkins of Christ Church, King's successor as Secretary to the Chancellor; Sir Nathaniel Lloyd, Fellow of All Souls; Canon Robert Clavering, the Regius Professor of Hebrew, and all the other canons of Christ Church who took part in the election. Thus with so many influential persons arrayed against him, King on the eve of the election could hardly have felt optimistic.

The actual election took place on March 21. A brief report of it was provided by Hearne in his diary entry for the following day:

March 22. (Th.) Yesterday Morning, at 9 Clock, was a Convocation for electing Burgesses for the University. The Candidates were the two old Members, Mr. Bromley and Dr. Clarke, but many having a mind to get Clarke out, Dr. King, Principal of St. Mary Hall, was put up against him. The Convocation continued

'till about half hour after four in the Afternoon, when it appear'd that Dr. King had lost it by a very Majority, the Poll standing thus, the Number whereof on the right hand signifies dubious Votes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Br.</th>
<th>Cl.</th>
<th>K.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon which, the Election was declared, tho', a Scrutiny being desired, the Business was put off 'till this Morning, when there was another Convocation. But there being such a vast disproportion, the throwing out the Bad Votes signify'd nothing to the Interest of Dr. King, who thereupon acquiesc'd, and Mr. Bromley & Dr. Clarke were declared duly elected. I heartily wish Dr. King had succeeded, he being an honest Man, & very zealous for K. James, whereas Clarke is a pitifull, proud Sneaker, & an Enemy to true Loyalty .......

All the commentators on the subject agree that King lost the election by a substantial margin though minor variations of Hearne's aggregates have appeared in the literature of the subject. The only radically different set of results for this poll was provided by Henry Stooks Smith over a century later:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plumpers</th>
<th>Total votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Bromley</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Clarke</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William King (unsuccessful)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Smith's figures are sometimes quoted, but it is not at all clear how they were arrived at. Since they cannot be substantiated they are best disregarded.

The large number of dubious votes given in Hearne's account resulted partly from the obscurity surrounding the technical qualifications for the university franchise. In theory the right of voting was confined to doctors and masters *actualiter creati*, who had paid their fees and kept their names on the buttery books for at least six months prior to the election. In practice it must have been difficult to assess the qualifications of every individual voter, and some heads of colleges had apparently obfuscated the situation further by examining the Butter Book, and striking out the names of several Masters of Arts without their consent. According to Canon Stratford, Harrison and King had taken it upon themselves to secure "many votes, who have no names in any college books, and have left the university many years ago." But even if all the dubious votes cast for King had been counted, he would still have been defeated in the election. On March 22 he demanded a scrutiny as Hearne indicated, but he had lost by such a landslide that the result was a foregone conclusion.

There are two other contemporary accounts of this election, both

---

70. Historical Manuscripts Commission, *op. cit.*, Vol. VII, p. 317. Relevant also in the University Archives is MS. S.P.C.
published anonymously in the same year: A true Copy of the Poll
for Members of Parliament for the University of Oxford, and An
Account of the Late Election for the University of Oxford. 71

According to Hearne, the first of these was a "most silly Paper",
drawn up and published "by that most egregious Coxcomb and Rascal,
Joseph Bowles, Head Keeper of the Bodleian Library .......

He then continues:

It is call'd a true Copy, whereas 'tis a most false one,
and the Explication of the Abbreviatures (as he calls them),
wh. is put on the backside of the Title, is as ridiculous
as 'tis foolish. All sorts of Persons term him a fool, as
well as a Rogue (and very justly), for this and other
Things. This very Fellow promised to vote for Dr. King
in the Election. Nay, Dr. King says that if he promis'd him
once, he promis'd him fifty Times. But when the Election
came, he not only voted against him, but was the Writer of
the Poll for Dr. Clarke and Mr. Bromley, Mr. Jones of
Balliol College being the Writer for Dr. King; now he hath
acted the wretched Part of publishing this very poor,
blockish Paper, rendering himself thereby the Scorn of all
Mankind. I saw Dr. King & Mr. Web (our Senior Proctor for
this year) last Wednesday [i.e. April 11, 1722], when
they spoke of this impudent Fellow with the utmost Contempt,
& Dr. King was pleas'd to say that he hop'd to see that

71. Another pamphlet published shortly before the election entitled
Some Thoughts Concerning the Next Election of Members of
Parliament for the University of Oxford is now lost. It is
referred to in a letter written by Canon Clavering of Christ
Church to Archbishop Wake (Christ Church Library, MSS. Arch.
Wake Epist. 16, No. 97). He explains: "The Author appears in
disguise, and at the same time that he would seem to be for the
old Members, does really appear to be serving Dr. King who sets
himself up in opposition to them."
sorry Rascal expell'd the University. There is one Thing I cannot pass by here, and that is, a good natur'd Thing of the Bp of Chester and D Stratford, who lately (before this Paper came out) sent to D King, & desir'd him to take care of this Fellow, Bowles. This D King mentions himself, & takes it very kindly, notwithstanding they voted both against him. 72

These remarks call for comment. There is now no possible method of determining the veracity of the information given in A true Copy. What must have irritated King's supporters was a system of symbols, freely used throughout the booklet, to indicate good, bad, and doubtful votes queried by the inspectors of both sides. A list of thirty-three voters is given under the heading BALIOL College; of these, thirty-one voted for King, nineteen of whom are categorized as casting "doubtful or bad votes". All the fourteen electors of University College are listed as approving King's rivals, but the only three queries raised relate to "good" votes. In St. Mary Hall, King's own institution, there were, according to the writer, fourteen voters; five of these are castigated as polling votes which were "doubtful" or "bad". 73 Since the technical difference between good, bad, and doubtful votes is nowhere explained, it is impossible to attach any precise significance to these descriptions. If all votes, regardless of their symbols, are totaled, the results are as follows:

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{King} & \text{Opponent} & \text{Total} \\
\hline
72 & 28 & 100 \\
\end{array} \]

73. A True Copy of the Poll for Members of Parliament for the University of Oxford, Taken March the 21st 1721 (Oxford, 1722), pp. 3f, 14. See also the EXPLICATION on page 2.
These aggregates correspond exactly to Hearne's, if one ignores his list of dubious votes. These conflicting estimates do, of course, manifest the unsatisfactory administrative arrangements for university elections of that time and the fact that franchise qualifications were, to some extent, a matter of personal interpretation of unprinted statutes.

The other account is of greater length. Its publication was thus heralded by Hearne:

Aug.17 (Fri.). There is just come out, in 8vo, An Account of the late Election of the University of Oxford for Members of Parliament. I read this Book yesterday. It is well penn'd, and done with good Judgm, & the Matters of Fact mentioned in it are too true. So that, to be sure, it will vex most of the Heads of Houses, who us'd such base Methods to put by Dr. King. 74

This anonymous work is generally attributed to Sedgwick Harrison. It contains no detailed statistical assessments, but it does provide answers to some of the accusations made against King, and also a good deal of background information. Several anecdotes indicate the alleged pressures that were exerted by most of the heads of colleges on their subordinates to vote against King. A letter is quoted from Dr. John Gibson, Provost of Queen's, to another member of the college, and described as "a very modest Performance in Comparison of the rest":

SIR,

If you are on the side of the College for the worthy old Members against some UPSTARTS, who would bring us into confusion, you will have the pleasure and satisfaction of doing what lies in your power, to retrieve the sinking interest of the University, which is not a little struck at in this canvass. The application of those, who would make us unhappy, is, I am told, almost incredible: And it would be an unpardonable neglect in me not to oppose them to the utmost of my power. 75

The anecdotes in this work may be presented with some bias, but the general burden of the argument—that the majority of the heads of colleges sided against King—is indisputably true. In fact only two heads voted for him: the Master of Balliol and the Rector of Exeter. With the exception of St. Mary Hall, Exeter College was the only institution which voted unanimously for King, a significant fact in view of the disputes which he was to have with the fellows of Exeter in the 1750's.

Despite the fact that King lost in this election, it is remarkable how many Whigs voted in his favor, especially in Exeter, Merton, and Wadham Colleges. Two days after the election Canon Stratford explained a few of these cases thus: "The Lord Chancellor sent over hither on Monday and Tuesday Sir John Doyly and others who brought over for King four Whigs of Merton and about six of Wadham, whose names are now actually on the poll for King."76 A more general explanation of this phenomenon may be found in the fact that all three candidates

75. An Account of the Late Election for the University of Oxford (London, 1722), p. 25.
were Tories, and that the university Whigs were divided among themselves as to the best candidates for their purposes. There were moderates such as Canon Clavering of Christ Church and Dr. John Holland, Warden of Merton, who voted for the two less extreme Tories out of a sense of responsibility for the maintenance of university discipline and of a modus vivendi with the government in London. In contradistinction to these "Court Whigs" were the more radical members of the same party, many of them convinced anti-Jacobites, who were desirous of upsetting the position of the moderates, and who presumably felt that voting for King was their best method of achieving this end. The majority of the voters of Exeter College were in this category. Whatever the cause of King's surrising popularity among the extreme Whigs in 1722, he was never again able to recover his prestige with them after his defeat.

When the result of the poll was made known, King let it be known that he was dissatisfied with the manner in which the elections had been conducted. On October 25, 1722, he presented a petition to the House of Commons demanding redress on the grounds that the Vice-Chancellor, as returning officer, had used illegal practices and thereby enabled Bromley and Clarke to be returned although illegitimately elected. His point of view was corroborated in a similar petition presented on the same day by Sedgwick Harrison of Corpus Christi College, Robert Brynker of Jesus College, Joseph Sandford of Balliol College, and some others. The text of neither petition has been preserved: all that remains now is a brief summary of each in
The Journals of the House of Commons. No result accrued from these petitions, and no proceedings seem to have followed from them. They were referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections, but there is no evidence that the Committee took any action on them. Although King had gone to Westminster "to call Walpole, Bromley and Clarke to account", his mission proved ultimately unrewarding.

Perhaps it is just worth mentioning that the echoes of King's petition were still heard a generation later, in 1755, when a doggerel skit on it was published as the Appendix to the anonymous "heroic paraphrase" of his oration at the opening of the Radcliffe Camera in 1749. A note in prose at the beginning claims that it "was the occasion of much pleasantry about the year 1722", when it was still unpublished. It is ostensibly written in imitation of Swift's verse satire The Humble Petition of Frances Harris. The author wisely remained sine nomine. Considered either as verse or as factual evidence it is valueless, as the first six lines make amply clear:

TO THE HONOURABLE HOUSE OF COMMONS, the petition of Dr. King, Whom the Heads of Houses, next to Dr. Harrison, hate like anything. - THAT your petitioner was made Head, because there were no people in the Hall; That your petitioner having no money, in the late Election lost it all; That your Petitioner was called by the sitting Burgesses Dr. Harrison's Tool, And so tho' your Petitioner stood for a Parliament Man, yet he went for a Fool.

77. The Journals of the House of Commons, Vol. 20, p. 43.
When the election was over, some of King's enemies, perhaps to lessen his political popularity further, claimed to know that he had made an offer to Sir Robert Walpole to turn informer against some Oxford gentlemen who were dissatisfied with the Whig government. King was indignant, and wrote to The Evening Post on November 19, 1722, to the effect that the report was entirely false, and that he had "never had the Honour to wait on Mr. Walpole, or to write to him upon any occasion whatever." He further intimated that he regarded what his enemies had propagated as "a base and villainous Calumny", adding, "I never made any such Offers or Overtures; and ......... I never gave a Commission to any Person to make 'em in my name ........."

On November 27 Canon Stratford declared: "He denies that he either went to Walpole, or wrote to him upon any occasion, but he does not deny that he ever sent any one else to him upon any occasion." He posited the suggestion that King sent "his brother-in-law, one Withers, a hearty Whig" to Walpole, but neither this nor any of the other accusations of King's political enemies was based on more than hearsay.

One indirect result of the parliamentary election, according to Hearne, was that it influenced the election for the presidency of Magdalen College on July 29, 1722. The candidate most favored was Robert Lydall, "who had been making interest almost, if not quite, as


long as he had been of the College, & might have carried it, had he not acted falsely with respect to Dr. King, when he stood lately for Parliamentary Man for the Univ. of Oxford, at which many of the Fellows were angry, & deserted him, as he had deserted Dr. King." 82

The consequence was that Lydall's junior, Dr. Edward Butler, was elected.

Even though the affairs connected with the parliamentary election took up a good deal of King's time during 1722, he continued to devote himself to the less spectacular business of academic administration. On September 13 Hearne mentioned that King had recently attended his first meeting of the Hebdomadal Council. 83 The Principal of St. Mary Hall was, apparently, in a characteristically argumentative mood. He disagreed with several of the proposals for administering Bishop Crew's benefaction to the University of £200 per annum. He protested against the suggestion that the Vice-Chancellor should receive £10 per year, maintaining that he should receive ten times that amount. He also dissented from the proposal of giving £20 per year to the registrar of the Vice-Chancellor's court, urging that the position was worth upwards of £100 per year. He felt that there was no justification for giving Bodley's Librarian a proposed £60 per year since 'twas very probable that the same Man hereafter would be Librarian of Dr. Radcliff's Library as well as Bodley's, & then 'twould be a most noble Thing of it self, Dr. Radcliff's Salary being 150 libs.

83. Ibid., p. 400
The other heads then apparently interposed that the two librarianships should be distinct. To this objection King is said to have replied, with a typically acrid thrust at Joseph Bowles, "..... suppose the Bodleian Library hereafter (for, as to the present Librarian, I suppose he will not be regarded) should be a Man of Worth, & be recommended by some great Man or Men above to be Librarian also to the Radcliff Library, I suppose there will be a Complyance to such a Request, & no one of you the Heads will be agt it." This was certainly strong speaking for a newcomer to the Hebdomadal Council, but Hearne adds: "To this they could say nothing."

In determining the precise worth of Hearne's statements on these events one should, of course, bear in mind that they are the informal pronouncements of a staunch Jacobite Tory of much the same political outlook as King himself. Hearne, one of the most outspoken Non-jurors of his day, found it difficult to be charitable even towards Hanovarian Tories, let alone any "rank stinking Whig." But compared to his highly coloured opinions on some Oxford figures, his views on King are expressed in restrained tones. His attitude is explicable: King had few friends who, to use his own words, were veros, stables, gratos, and there is no reason for believing that he regarded Thomas Hearne as one of them. Hearne was low born, a disability for which King vituperated against several other men, and, unlike the Principal of St. Mary Hall, was always of an eremetical disposition. Pope's lines on him in the Dunciad - where he is styled Wormius - though
quite unnecessarily spiteful, no doubt contain a certain degree of truth. The temperamental differences between the two men tend to enhance the value of Hearne's observations: despite their author's political sympathies, they were not patently influenced by any great measure of mutual camaraderie.

One final matter relating to 1722 deserves at least passing mention: the fact that towards the end of this year King appears to have been involved in controversy over the non-payment of sums in arrear charged upon him for the relief of the poor of the parish of Ealing. The surviving account in the Ealing Rate Book for 1722 is obscure, but evidently King had, for some unknown reason, refused to pay two sums totalling twenty-six pounds, seventeen shillings and sixpence in poor rates. A public vestry meeting to discuss the affair and the problems contingent on it was called for December 12, 1722. Whether the decisions arrived at were ever implemented is nowhere recorded, but there is no evidence of later ill-feeling. The Vicar, Dr. Thomas Mangey, was on several occasions before his death in March 1755 the Principal's guest at St. Mary Hall, and his son, John, was for a number of years in residence there, so it may reasonably be assumed that the trouble was not left unsettled.

For more than a decade after the close of 1722 King seems to have played little part in university politics or administration.

84. The text of the account in the Ealing Rate Book for 1722 is reproduced in full in Appendix VI.
Litigation in Ireland kept him out of the country for long periods at a time, and no doubt the affairs of St. Mary Hall absorbed a good part of his energies when he was in Oxford. He was also engaged in the writing of his mock-heroic epic The Toast, which he later regarded as his masterpiece. The events underlying the writing of this satirical literary effort must now be surveyed.

The Toast is King's longest literary work, and he often says the in some detail.

of the strangest and most vituperative places of writing which eighteenth-century England produced. It purports to be a translation by Fergie O'Donald of an original Latin poem "in old mockish rhymes" by a Scots or Laplander, Frederick Scheffer. O'Donald has added several notes and observations to his English rendering. In "The Translator's Preface" he explains that the author went up to Oxford in the beginning of Queen Anne's reign when he was scarcely sixteen years old, and continued there until 1710, when he married an English woman. His wife having died soon afterwards, he returned to Sweden. In 1720 he paid a visit to Ireland to recover a sum of money due to him for a freight of copper, and was obliged to prosecute a long and expensive lawsuit before he could recover any part of his money. What he was awarded after seven years of litigation was only a small part of what was owing him, and insufficient to reimburse him for the costs of the voyage and the law suit.

Scheffer places most of the blame for his losses on the wife of the man to whom he had consigned his effects. O'Donald comments: "The wife of that man was an old sorceress, the lowest and most vicious woman of the age in which she lived, or perhaps of any other age since the creation of the world." She and her cronies in Dublin carried on a running war
The Toast is King's longest literary work, and in some ways one of the strangest and most vituperative pieces of writing which eighteenth-century England produced. It purports to be a translation by Peregrine O'Donald of an original Latin poem "in old monkish rhymes" by a Swede or Laplander, Frederick Scheffer. O'Donald has added copious notes and observations to his English rendering. In "The Translator's Preface" he explains that the author went up to Oxford in the beginning of Queen Anne's reign when he was scarcely sixteen years old, and continued there until 1710, when he married an English woman. His wife having died soon afterwards, he returned to Sweden. In 1723 he paid a visit to Ireland to recover a sum of money due to him for a freight of copper, and was obliged to prosecute a long and expensive lawsuit before he could recover any part of his money. What he was awarded after seven years of litigation was only a small part of what was owing him, and insufficient to reimburse him for the costs of the voyage and the lawsuit.

Scheffer places most of the blame for his losses on the wife of the man to whom he had consigned his effects. O'Donald comments: "The wife of this man was an old sorceress, the lewdest and most vicious woman of the age in which she lived, or perhaps of any other age since the creation of the world." She and her cronies in Dublin carried on a running war
against Scheffer, first hiring a set of villains to assassinate him, and then filing four long chancery bills against him, charging him with all the frauds of which they themselves had been guilty. They even took from him by force of arms the land which he had purchased from them at a very high price, attempting to murder his servants, who opposed them, and outrageously insulting the royal authority. But Scheffer bore up against all this violence with great resolution, and eventually won his case.

Unfortunately, one of his adversaries, the "chief agent of the sorceress," prevented the execution of the court decree given in Scheffer's favour, by insisting on his parliamentary privilege as a member of the Irish House of Commons, of freedom from arrest. Disappointed, Scheffer abandoned the case which had dragged on for so long, and determined to leave Ireland, having arranged a compromise settlement in which he relinquished one half of what was due to him in order to secure the other half. To preserve the memory of this affair, and to transmit the names of his adversaries to posterity, Scheffer wrote this poem in Latin, the language which was most familiar to him. The original title was Phoebus Noctivagator seu Hermaphroditus, but O'Donald changed the title to The Toast as a concession to the Dublin hawkers who he hoped would sell the book.

The truth of the matter is, of course, that the entire work was written, for very definite reasons, by King himself. Scheffer's problems were essentially those of King, the story of whose case can be
pieced together from the Irish court records and from miscellaneous allusions in the text and notes of The Toast.

King's uncle, Sir Thomas Smyth, had, according to The Toast, made a secret marriage with the elderly Countess of Newburgh after a long clandestine intrigue. The Countess was the same lady whom George Granville had celebrated as Myra, and to whom he had addressed a series of amorous verses in the manner of Waller: some inscribed simply To Myra, and others entitled To Myra, The Surrender, To Myra, Loving at First Sight, In Praise of Myra, Myra Singing, Myra in Her Riding Habit, Myra at a Review, and Myra's Parrot, all being in print by 1712. The "Myra" who inspired these effusions was Frances Brudenell, daughter of the self-styled Francis Lord Brudenell, who was heir-apparent of Robert Earl of Cardigan. Born about 1672, she was married in 1692 to Charles Livingston, second Earl of Newburgh in the peerage of Scotland. He had one daughter by her, Charlotte Maria Livingston, who succeeded suo jure to her father's title when he died, shortly afterwards, in 1694. In May 1695 she married Richard Bellew, third Lord Bellew of Daleek in the peerage of Ireland, and their one son, John, who became the fourth Lord Bellew, was born in 1702.

1. Granville's Poems upon Several Occasions appeared in 1712, 1716, 1721, and 1726. The quarto edition of his Genuine Works appeared in 1732. All of these editions were published by Tonson.

2. Frances' father died in 1698, but her paternal grandfather, the Earl of Cardigan, not until 1703, at the age of 96. Her mother was Lady Frances Savile: she died of apoplexy in 1695. See The Complete Peerage, Vol.III, pp.13f. and Vol.IX, p.514.

3. Further information on Myra's daughter is provided in Sir James Paul: The Scots Peerage (Edinburgh, 1904-1914), Vol. 6, pp. 453f.
In 1705 she was described as "a woman of much business and manages all her Lord's affairs and law-suits". Her Lord died on March 22, 1714/15. Sir Thomas Smyth, about a decade earlier appointed Chief Ranger of Ireland, was, so King implies, her third husband, though the marriage was never publicly acknowledged. She never actually called herself Lady Smyth; to her death she seems to have preferred the title Countess of Newburgh. In English literary history she is generally referred to as Myra or Mira.

Not long after the death of her second husband, Myra had, through her extravagance, reduced Sir Thomas to a state of penury, and had also made him responsible for the support of her son. The Chief Ranger of Ireland was driven to such extremes as selling his horses to pay Myra's gambling debts, and borrowing sums of money - which he was later unable to repay - using the Bellew estates and the emoluments from his public office as part of his security. Constantly harassed by creditors, he appealed to his nephew in Oxford, who dutifully arrived in Dublin in 1723. He found Sir Thomas in a state of genteel destitution, his house in Phoenix Park mortgaged for almost as much as it was worth, and the mortgagee about to foreclose the equity of redemption. With imprudent generosity King immediately supplied his uncle with £500, discharged the debt on his house, lent him £1,000 and then repaid another debt of £400. Precisely how much money was handed over in toto will probably never be

known: in one place King gives the figure of 16,000 rix-dollars and in another £3,000. When it became clear that his loans would not be repaid without coercion, King felt himself justified in resorting to legal processes.

At this point Sir Thomas, Myra, the young Lord Bellev, and several lawyers retained by them determined on a policy of defrauding King of his right to repayment. Myra attempted to dispose of Sir Thomas' nephew altogether by hiring three rogues to assassinate him, on the assumption that he was a complete stranger to Dublin, and that no lengthy enquiries would be made about his death. Infelicitously for Myra, one of these ruffians was struck with remorse, and confessed the plot to King, thereby enabling him to escape. Myra then turned to an attorney by the name of Dillon, who was engaged to draw a bill to prove that King's payments of money had been made "in trust for another". Ranged on Dillon's side were Captain John Pratt, Constable of Dublin Castle and Deputy Vice-Treasurer of Ireland, along with several false witnesses. The case dragged on for years, during which time Myra managed to influence, directly or indirectly, such legal personages as Robert Jocelyn, the Attorney General; John Bowes, the Solicitor General; and Dr. Trotter, Judge of the Prerogative Court.

In addition to his other tribulations, King was subjected to at least one act of violence. On this occasion one of Myra's friends, 7. There is some doubt about the exact date. The Complete Works, Vol.

5. The rix-dollar was a coin worth about four shillings and sixpence, or a little less, used in Sweden at the time King was writing.

6. The first allusion to this incident is in the note to verse 17, Book III, of The Toast.
Sir Edward Pearce, apparently led a troop of banditti armed with carbines, pistols, hatchets, and other weapons to force possession of King's residence at Chapelizod, a village close to Phoenix Park. An amusing mock congratulatory ode on this exploit, supposedly written by a young student of Trinity College, in imitation of Horace, Book I, Ode 6, appears in the Appendix to The Toast. When King complained about this incident to the Court of Chancery, Sir Edward evidently made an affidavit that he used no force. He argued that the quiet possession of the house was delivered to him by King's servants, and swore in addition that King had assured him that he "did not desire the Possession of his own House."

On June 20, 1732, Sir Thomas Smyth died, and the executors of his will were appointed: Sir Edward Pearce, and another of Myra's supporters, Sir Edward Crofton. Probably Myra forced Sir Thomas to sign the will when he was in no condition to resist; as King put the matter, "the old sorceress conducted his mind, though she did not conduct his hand." The will disregarded all obligations to King, but its mere existence created a fresh batch of legal problems. Sir Edward Pearce died shortly after the battle had been rejoined, and his death was followed by that of Myra herself in 1735/36.7 After Myra's demise Sir Edward

7. There is some doubt about the exact date. The Complete Peerage, Vol. II, p.102, gives the date of Lady Bellewe's death as February 23, 1735/36; the Burial Register of St.Audoen's Church, Dublin, indicates her burial as taking place on January 4, 1735/36. Obviously these two dates are irreconcilable. Since the latter is a contemporary, local record, it has a strong claim to prima facie credibility. There is no monument to her in St.Audoen's, which is at the time of writing in a half ruined state, but she was buried in the Molyneux vault.
Crofton and Lady Allen, wife of Viscount Allen of Stillorgan, pressed the young Lord Bellew to continue the prosecution of the suit. Eventually, after much further wrangling, King won the case, but had to agree on a financial compromise by which he received only half of the sum awarded him by the court. His expenses throughout the entire period of litigation amounted to far more than the amount of money which he received.

He wrote his last and presumably most considered summary of the whole affair in a lengthy footnote embedded in the final version of his Latin epic, *Templum Libertatis*. There he complains about the evil effects of the legal system brought to the British Isles by the Normans, and continues:


8. Viscount Allen was satirized as "Traulus" by Swift.
9. Opera Guilielmi King, p.92. This note was in all likelihood composed during the early 1750's.
A fragmentary background to these judicial proceedings is provided by the evidences surviving in the Registry of Deeds in King's Inns, Dublin, the Public Record Office of Ireland, in Dublin, and the Public Record Office of Northern Ireland in Belfast. The principal collections of records containing information bearing on the proceedings described in The Toast are:

(1) In the Registry of Deeds: Memorialls of Deeds, Conveyances and Wills.  
(2) In the Public Record Office of Ireland: the Chancery Bill Books, the Chancery Order Books, and the Repertories to Chancery Decree Rolls and Enrolled Decrees.

10. The relevant memorials are principally:
   Vol. 46 : p.175, No.28180; p.272, No.28633.
   Vol. 52 : p.252, No.34462.
   Vol. 53 : p. 36, No.34304.

11. The relevant references are principally:
   Chancery Bill Books (in unnumbered volumes):
      Volume for 1724 - 1726, p. 264
      1727 - 1729, p. 98
      1729 - 1731, p. 390
      1731 - 1733, p. 242
      1740 - 1742, p. 52
   Chancery Order Books:
      Vol. 50, pp. 12, 55, 60, 101, 138, 210, 290, 297.
      Vol. 51, pp. 117, 144.
   Repertories to Chancery Decree Rolls and Enrolled Decrees:
      Vol. 4 (1709 - 1779), pp. 146, 179.
In addition, the Public Record Office of Northern Ireland possesses a relevant Indenture Tripartite made on July 13, 1730, of which William King is one of the signatories.12

The Memorials do not constitute a complete collection of the Irish deeds, conveyances and wills of the period. The registration of these legal instruments was a matter of choice for the parties concerned; consequently, it is impossible to estimate the number of unregistered legal documents of comparable significance affecting the litigation alluded to in The Toast.

The information in the Public Record Office of Ireland is lacunose. The Chancery Order Books Vols. 53 – 103 (c.1727 – c.1746) did not survive the partial destruction of the building during the Civil War of 1922. The Chancery Bill Books do not contain the texts of the bills, so that it is now impossible to identify the "four long Chancery Bills" referred to by O'Donald in "The Translator's Preface". Virtually all of the relevant archives in the Public Record Office of Ireland are of a concise, formal nature, and imply documentary information which is no longer obtainable.

It would have been most illuminating to have available the will of Sir Thomas Smyth. It is listed in the Index of Prerogative Wills (1536-1810), but perished in 1922 along with most of the

original Irish prerogative and consistorial wills of the eighteenth century. All that now survives is a brief entry in Sir William Betham's unpublished Genealogical Abstracts, a collection of 241 holographic volumes compiled partly from documents that were extant in the Public Record Office of Ireland prior to its destruction. In Volume 62, page 59, there occurs the entry:


And that is all that remains.

But despite their hiatus nature, these records do provide undeniable witness of the chronic indebtedness of Richard Lord Bellew and, after his death, of Sir Thomas Smyth. In deeds registered as early as November 8, 1708, Myra's second husband is described as selling lands and premisses, mainly in the County of Dublin, for £500, and in a deed of March 13, 1713/14 (memorial 6079) a long list of his debts and creditors is supplied. Some of these debts are specifically described as "drawn by Lady Newburgh." Memorial 6085 refers to an Act of Parliament entitled "An Act for Enabling Richard Lord Bellew Baron of Duleek to sell part of his Estate for discharge of Debts and Incumbrances affecting the same and for settling the residue thereof on himself for Life with Remainder to his protestant Issue subject to the Enlargement of the Joynture already settled on the Rt. Honble the Countess of
Newburgh his wife." By the deed recorded in the same memorial
Lord Bellem leased a number of "towns and lands" in the County
of Kildare to Sir Thomas Smyth in recognition of an earlier loan
from Sir Thomas of £2,250; later, when Sir Thomas became financially
embarrassed, the same lands figured again in litigation with William
King. The last set of documents to be registered by Richard Lord
Bellem was signed on March 12, 1714/15. One of these instruments,
referred to in memorial 6084, indicates that the securities
previously provided by Lord Bellem were insufficient, and that Sir
Thomas Smyth had become bound in terms of security for him to
several persons and in several sums of money. As a result, more
lands were leased to Sir Thomas in the counties of Kildare and Lowth
for sixty years, the rent to be "one pepper corn yearly if the same
should be demanded." Richard Lord Bellem, it may reasonably be
assumed, never received his one peppercorn, for ten days later he was
dead.

The relevant memorials that follow bear melancholy witness to
the steadily deteriorating financial position of Sir Thomas Smyth.
In the memorial of a tripartite indenture dated July 31, 1716, he is
described as "Guardian of the Rt. Honble John Lord Bellem Baron of
Duleek", and in later memorials is ordered to "grant, assign and
make over" a considerable number of properties to meet what must
have been steadily worsening debts. William King's name appears first in memorial 25085, relating to a tripartite deed of assignment of October 19, 1723; by the terms of this instrument King received, in legal theory, most of Sir Thomas' official emoluments. This document may have been connected with the "Reversional Grant" which King mentions in The Toast as being security for his loans. In a subsequent tripartite deed dated April 21, 1725, and signed by the Countess of Newburgh, Sir Thomas Smyth, William King, and Captain John Pratt, it is directed that the Countess and Sir Thomas must pay King a number of outstanding arrears. From an "article or instrument of agreement" registered on April 21, 1727, it is clear that King had not yet received any of the monies that he was legally entitled to collect from his impecunious uncle. It is not until July 13, 1730, that the surviving documents show the Principal of St. Mary Hall as the recipient of at least a portion of what was owing to him.

For the following eleven years documentary evidence bearing on King's case is extremely sparse. A final bill dated April 25, 1741, was amended again and again, the last amendment being dated in 1746. The decree that resulted is dated July 15, 1746, and indicates

13. Connected with these is the Humble Petition of John Lord Bellew and others for a bill to settle the estates of the late Richard Lord Bellew, in the British Museum, Stowe MSS. 354, folio 231. This document is undated, but should be assigned to 1723. Among the signatures appear those of the Countess of Newburgh and Sir Thomas Smyth.

that the plaintiff, King, should be awarded two sums of £600 and £1800. Thus ended the long sequence of forensic activities which had started twenty-three years earlier. There is no record of the precise amount which King ultimately received.

Disappointing though his experiences must have been, the persons whom he encountered during these years, unknown to themselves, made him a poet. He made this fact plain in the Epistola ad Cadenum, which appears in the beginning of the quarto editions of The Toast:

Non indigna cano. Debentur maxima MIRAE;
Maxima monstriferi, studium quos cogere PAMMO,
Taurorum, & tribadum, furumque, Deumque malorum
Me costus poscunt: & me fecere poetam.

His first poetical work, and probably his first published work of any kind, appeared when he was forty-five years of age, in 1730. Presumably written to relieve his own lacerated feelings, this brief Ode to Mira was first published in Dublin as an anonymous half-sheet ballad, and was reprinted shortly afterwards in London. In it, the bard facetiously promised to sing Myra's praises, despite the

15. A copy of the half-sheet edition is in the British Museum, C.121.g. 8. (179). The same text was reprinted in London - also in 1730 - together with Myra's Answer in the form of a twelve page pamphlet. I do not know of any perfect copy of this pamphlet which survives; two imperfect copies are still in existence: Bodleian Library, G. Pamph. 1286 (14), and the University Library, Cambridge, Hib.7. 732.24. In the half-sheet edition King used the spelling "Mira"; afterwards, it appears generally as "Myra".
shortcomings of his subject:

I will form thee all Divine;
And no Muse shall Lie like mine.

Though Lady Newburgh's name was not mentioned, there could be little doubt that she was the poet's inspiration:

I'll unbend the Work of Time,
I'll restore thee to thy Prime,
Feign, that now thou art as young,
As when am'rous G—ville sung.

In fact King never did fulfill this intention. By the time that he had started to write _The Toast_, the first edition of which appeared in Dublin in 1732, he had abandoned his original plan of presenting Myra as "all divine".

King's early conception of what later was published as _The Toast_ may have undergone modifications in other respects. At the end of the pamphlet of 1730 the following advertisement appeared:

_Speedily will be Published,

THE HERMAPHRDITE._

A _POEM_ in Four _CANTO'S_ 

By Mr. DONALD.

With the

LIFE OF MYRA THE _SORCERESS_,

By Mr. BUTLER.

But in the following year, 1731, when the second edition of _The Toast_ appeared in London, the advertisement was expanded to include the following:

_THere was_ a_ POEM_ in_ Four_ _CANTO'S_ by Mr. DONALD.,

With the

LIFE OF MYRA THE _SORCERESS_,

By Mr. BUTLER._

_SPEEDILY WILL BE PUBLISHED, THE HERMAPHRDITE._

A _POEM_ in Four _CANTO'S_ 

By Mr. DONALD.

With the

LIFE OF MYRA THE _SORCERESS_,

By Mr. BUTLER.
It is impossible to state precisely what this advertisement implied. Perhaps King originally intended to call his projected work *The Hermaphrodite*, and later changed the title to *The Toast*. But of Mr. Butler and his projected book we know nothing. It is conceivable that King intended at first to write two separate works, under different pseudonyms, and finally decided to put all his material into one poem.

Only the first two books of *The Toast* appeared in the edition of 1732. This was a poorly produced octavo volume, quite unimpressive in comparison to the imposing quarto volume which appeared in 1736. There are two forms of the first edition: the second is similar to the first, though it is shorter by twelve pages. In addition to the text of the first two books of *The Toast*, this second form contains a slightly revised text of the *Ode to Myra* and *Myra's Answer*, the latter being an ode which King may not have written for he did not reprint it in the 1736 edition and never acknowledged it. It is possible that this second form of the first edition was pirated. The collation of these two versions is different: that of the first form is

\[ \text{8vo} \]

\[ \sqrt{A}^2, \quad B - G^8; \quad \text{pp. } 14 + 96; \]

that of the second is

\[ \text{8vo} \]

\[ A - L^4; \quad \text{pp. } 88. \]
The history of the writing of the final two books is obscure.

A short time before his death King wrote:

I began The Toast in anger, but I finished it in good humour. When I had concluded the second book, I laid aside the work, and I did not take it up again till some years after, at the pressing instances of Dr. Swift. 16

This statement seems to be contradicted by the contemporary evidence.

First, there are the clear statements of impending publication in a twenty-page booklet, A Letter from Mr. Lewis O'Neil to Peregrine O'Donald, Esq; with Mr. O'Donald's Answer, published in Dublin in 1734 and reprinted in the Appendix to the 1736 edition of The Toast. 17

Mr. O'Neil's letter, dated "Dublin, Feb. 9. 1733/4", written, of course, by King, commences:

According to your Desire, I have directed Mr. C. to advertise the new Edition of the TOAST in all our News Papers. Several ingenious Gentlemen, who apprehended, that the third and fourth Books would never be published, have since been with me, and express much impatience for a sight of this compleat Translation.

The writer then requests Mr. O'Donald to send sketches or descriptions of the copper plates promised in an earlier advertisement. In a


17. There are only a few surviving copies of the 1734 text. Two are in the Cambridge University Library, Hib.7.732.24 and Williams Collection. Another copy is in the Indiana University Library, PR 3539.X75L6. Mr. O'Neil's letter is essentially the same as in the reprint, except that the date in the later version has been changed to "Feb.9, 1734/5".
Note added to the 1736 reprint O'Donald explains:

The Copper Plates will not be finished till next Winter. 18 For several reasons I could not defer the Publication of my Book till that Time .......

and in his answer to Mr. O'Neill he writes:

I have indeed received so many pressing Letters to hasten the publication of this Work, that I cannot any longer disappoint the expectations of the Town.

Finally, there is a letter which King himself wrote to Swift on September 20, 1735, in which he explained that the work was "in such forwardness" that he hoped to have it "finished in six weeks at the farthest." 19 This letter could not have been written more than three years after the publication of the first two books. King must have been working on the text of the final two books for some time prior to this letter, since he could hardly have hoped to produce them, together with their highly intricate notes in Latin and English, in any very short space of time. The weight of evidence seems to indicate that he could not have "laid aside the

18. It is evident from this booklet that King intended to provide copper plate engravings to illustrate the text of The Toast; in actuality, only one, the Frontispiece, ever appeared.

work", after the conclusion of the second book, "till some years after", and that his memory, when he wrote the Anecdotes, may well have been failing him.

The actual printing of the complete text of The Toast must have taken place between September and December, 1736. The third and fourth books appear still to have been in holographic form in September 1736. The complete text seems to have been in print by the beginning of December, a date that may, I believe, reasonably be claimed on three grounds:

1. Some of the quarto copies bear the date 1736.
2. A few quarto copies contain a leaf headed Advertisement by the London Bookseller dated "London, Decemb. the 1st, 1736" 22

20. Ibid., p. 530
22. For example, British Museum, 1466.k.21; Folger Shakespeare Library, PR.3539.K7.T7. In the former case the Advertisement is printed; in the latter, it is written by hand and tipped in.
That King had intended to publish the finished work is demonstrated unquestionably by the advertisement which appeared in six consecutive issues of *The Grub Street Journal* between January 27 and March 3, 1736.23

**Speedily will be publish'd,**

**In One Volume in Quarto,**

THE TOAST: An Heroic POEM, in Four Books,
written originally in Latin by FREDERICK SCHEFFER: Now done into English, and illustrated with Notes and Observations,
by PEREGRINE ODONALD, Esq....

Printed for Lawton Gilliver and J. Clarke,
at Homer's Head in Fleet Street; and at their Shop in Westminster Hall.

The title page of the 1736 version of *The Toast* contains no reference to the printers and no proper colophon. The work probably was done by Gilliver and Clarke, but the reasons for their remaining nameless are not far to seek.

One other indication of intention to publish is contained in the Advertisement by the London Bookseller of December 1, 1736. It

---

reads in part:

I do not expect this Performance should be as well received in LONDON as it was in DUBLIN, where the Scene of Action lies, where the Characters are all known, and where every little Incident and Allusion in the private History are well understood. However, as there is some Humour in the Work, I imagine it will not be disagreeable to an English Reader, and therefore I hope to find my Account in Reprinting it here.

There is no reason for doubting that King wrote this Advertisement, and that he still hoped, towards the close of 1736, to obtain some return for his outlay in the form of royalties.

There are at least three pieces of evidence that the 1736 edition never actually was published, in the usually accepted sense of the word. One is a paragraph in a letter which King wrote to Mrs. Whiteway from St. Mary Hall on June 24, 1737. The relevant passage reads:

You can't imagine how greatly I am vexed and disappointed that I have been so long obliged to keep back my conversation piece [i.e. The Toast]. I have in this respect, wholly complied with the reasoning, or rather with the humours, of some of my friends. They are willing to try their skill in accommodating my Irish affairs; in which, after all, I believe they will be disappointed as much as I have been: for the adversaries I have to deal with, proceed on a principle that will hear no reason, and do no good, not even to themselves, if others are at the same time to receive any benefit by the bargain. However, since you seem so earnestly to desire a second view of this work, I will send you a book by Mr. Swift [i.e. Deane Swift], who intends to go from hence about ten days or a fortnight hence. You will be so kind as to keep it in your own hands until the publication. 24

The second indication occurs in King's Political and Literary Anecdotes. There he wrote:

".... although it has been printed more than thirty years, yet it has never been published: I have, indeed, presented a few copies to some friends, on giving me their honour that they would not suffer the books to go out of their hands without my consent."

This passage, taken literally, leads to insuperable difficulties. The only edition that could have been printed "more than thirty years" was that of 1732, and it was published in Dublin in two versions. The best explanation of the inconsistency is that, since King was writing, as he explains in the Preface, "confined by the infirmities which are incident to old age", he was careless in his statement of the exact number of years, and that the 1736 edition was really intended.

Thirdly, there is a letter written by Charles Godwyn, Fellow of Balliol College, to John Hutchins, the historian of Dorsetshire, and dated on April 2, 1764, a little over three months after King's death. Referring to King, Godwyn remarked:

"He printed, some years ago, a poem in four books, called 'The Toast'. That edition was never published, but some copies of it given to his friends. The rest of the impression lay in his lodgings, and is now ordered to be burnt. It was a dirty subject, and it did not become the Doctor to spend so much time as he did in raking into it."

One other piece of evidence is perhaps worth mentioning.

A copy of The Toast given to Martin Folkes, the President of the Royal Society, presumably by King himself, appeared in the sale catalogue of his library in 1756, two years before he died. However, King interposed prior to the sale, and obtained the copy from Folkes' executors, indicating that it was "never purposed to be sold." 27

On the basis of the available evidence, one can only assume that King intended late in 1736 to publish the volume in the normal manner, but changed his mind and never actually did so. The explicit reason for this volte face was indicated to Deane Swift in a letter which King wrote on March 15, 1737/38, probably addressed to him at the family home of the Swifts, Goodrich, in Herefordshire:

I must beg the favour of you to leave behind you the copy of the Toast, at least to show it to nobody in Ireland: for as I am on the point of accommodating my suit, the publication of the book would greatly prejudice my affairs at this juncture. 28

---

27. See A Catalogue of the Entire and Valuable Library of Martin Folkes, Esq. ....... which will be sold by auction by Samuel Baker, etc., (London, 1756), Item no. 5080.

28. Harold Williams, (ed.), op.cit.ult., Vol. V, p.100. On page 99 the date appears as "March 13th, 1737-8." This would seem to be a misprint; the original source, Deane Swift's Letters Written by the Late Jonathan Swift, D.D., 1768, gives the date as March 15, and thus it also appears in the List of Letters in Volume I of Sir Harold's collection.
Evidently Deane Swift took this injunction to heart, for in his next surviving letter, dated April 25, 1738, King wrote:

I thank you for the promise you make me concerning the Toast. 29

The unpublished 1736 edition is a handsome piece of book production, probably paid for by King himself. The sprinkled calf skin, tooled in gold, thick boards, marbled end sheets, heavy leading, and wide margins must have sent the author's expenses soaring. There is also an elaborate copperplate frontispiece designed by Hubert Gravelot and engraved by Baron. The title page is in two colours — red and black. Prefixed to this edition is the Epistola ad Cademum, under the name of Frederick Scheffer, and followed by fifteen pages of notae, suppositiously written by O'Donald: in the notae it is explained that Cademus is Jonathan Swift, to whom the work is inscribed. Neither the Epistola nor the notae is translated. Furthermore, Book I is lengthened by sixteen lines and Book II by fifty-two lines, and there is a long Appendix extending to 37 pages.

Some bibliographers (e.g. Davis, Martin, and Lowndes,) have mentioned another quarto edition in 1747, though the version produced


in that year could hardly be regarded as an edition in the generally accepted sense of the word. King had continued to make minor changes in the text, and had incorporated these changes in some, at least, of the copies of the text which he probably stored in his rooms in Oxford. Some of these altered copies have the date changed, very neatly in ink, from MDCCXXXVI to MDCCXLVII. Of the copies bearing the later date, a few have the errata, which originally appeared on a fly-leaf in the 1736 edition, neatly corrected in full, both in the text and the notes. These alterations of the date and of the errata are almost certainly in King's own handwriting. In the copies dated 1747 the original M4 is cancelled by *M followed by eight additional leaves *M -- *O1, pages *89 -- *104, which, to judge by the evidence of the notes, belong to 1746 and 1747. There are also, in both the 1736 and 1747 versions, three additional *Q leaves, pages *113 -- *118, inserted between pages 118 and 119, and a different setting of these leaves for each of the two versions. In all the copies I have seen bearing either date, leaf N2 is missigned M2.

The collation of the 1736 version is as follows:

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{A}^4, \text{a}^4, \text{b}^2, \text{B}^4, \text{c}^4, \text{d}^4, \text{e}^4, \text{f}^4, \text{g}^4, \text{h}^4, \text{i}^4, \text{j}^4, \text{k}^4, \text{l}^4, \text{m}^4, \text{n}^4, \text{o}^4, \text{p}^4, \text{q}^4, \text{r}^4, \text{s}^4, \text{t}^4, \text{u}^4, \text{v}^4, \text{w}^4, \text{x}^4, \text{y}^4, \text{z}^4
\end{array}\]

31. The following copies, for example, are fully or partly corrected by hand: Bodleian Library, Vet.A4.d.280; British Museum, 642.e.5 and 441.f.15; Trinity College, Dublin, V.g.43; Victoria and Albert Museum, Forster Collection, 4835; Folger Shakespeare Library PR.3539.K7.A1.
The collation of the 1747 version is as follows:

\[ A^4, a-g^4, k^2, \beta-L^4, M^4(-M^4), *M^4-*N^4, *O^4, N-P^4, Q^4(Q^3 + (*Q^4(-*Q^4))) \]
\[ R-Z^4, Aa-Gq^4, X^1, pp. lxvi, [ii], 188, *89-*104, 89-118, *113-*118 \]
\[ 119-232, [2] \]

The frontispiece, which includes eight half-lines of engraved text, is not included in these collations. The wording of the frontispiece differs in some copies: Mason 0.159 in the Bodleian Library, for example, has the original text covered by two slip cancellantes. Leaf Cc2 is sometimes a cancellans, as in the case of British Museum copy 1466.k.21, and sometimes not, as in the case of British Museum copy 642.4.5. Incidentally, the former of these two copies contains the autograph signature of Dean Swift inside the front cover; this may be the copy which he received from King himself, with the request that it not be taken to Ireland for fear of prejudicing the law-suit. Some copies of the poem dated 1736 contain the 1747 leaves; in these cases King presumably neglected to alter the date. Generally the 1747 leaves are included in the Opera Guilielmi King, the various portions of which seem to have been ready for binding in 1760. The discussion of The Toast that follows is based on the text of 1747, as representing King's most considered version.
The first element of the work, the Epistola ad Cadenum, extends over nine pages and is written entirely in Latin dactylic hexameter. Quite apart from its importance in the corpus of King's writings, it contains some of the most elegant tributes ever paid to Swift. None of the standard works on Swift makes reference to it, and to the best of my knowledge no English translation of it has appeared. Some idea of the extraordinary admiration which King felt towards Swift may be gained from a perusal of the first eight lines of the Epistola:

Semper culte mihi, semper, CADENE, colende; 
O decus & patriae tutamen! Crimina, curas, 
Atque hominum mores, & quicquid pulpitam damnant, 
Seu nunc tu melius tractas irrisor acerbus, 
Seu Phoebi stimulis ignescens fundis Iambos, 
Aut STELLAE laudes recitas & amabile carmen: 
Si locus est interpellandi, en barbarus audet 
Ire salutat tu, veniamque exposcere nugis!...

The first of the motae amplifies King's sentiments:

CADENUS. J. SWIFT D.D. D.S.P.D. sui saeculi deliciae, 
 nec tam patriae, quam humili generis decus. Si virtutes illius contemplemur, nemini secundus; si divinum mentis ingenium, omnibus major. Cujus humanitatem, eloquentiam & eruditionem merito coelebat SCHEFFERUS noster. Tales enim erat, quales sub Augusto principes viri, & ipsi in omni liberali doctrina politissimi, in suis literatis diligenter coluerunt. Linguam Anglicanam usque ad fastigium venustatis provexit; & felicissimis numeris lusit poeta. Quippe CADENI spiritum, vim, & carminum suavitatem vel Flacci curiosa tinctis sibi adoptaret. Sale facetiisque Attico lepore tinctis facile superabat omnes. Sed & in scriptis suis utile dulci semper permiscuit; nec placere magis instituit, quam patriae prodesse. Hanc coloniam semel iterumque in libertatem vindicavit, in aeternum vindicaturus, bona si sua norint coloni. 32

32. King presumably took the name "Cadenu" from Swift's Cadenus and Vanessa, published in London by Roberts in 1726. It comes from Decanus by metathesis.
King (under the name of Scheffer) then explains the purpose and background of the poem, alluding mysteriously in the notae to a Latin comedy, *Venefica sive Testamentum Mortis* from which the author is supposed to have derived some of his inspiration. Short extracts only are provided, but they exhibit King's abilities in the field of humorous Latin writing. In Act 1, Scene 2, Mira (described in the *Dramatis Personae* as "Sage et Androgyne") sings a ludicrous Latin ditty addressed to a *Bombardomachides* (a Grenadier Guard), to which King, on the last page of the work, thoughtfully provides the music.

The *Epistola ad Cadenum* is followed by "The Translator's Preface", in which O'Donald provides in English a brief biography of Scheffer, and discusses some criticisms of his poem, here referred to as a "Gothic performance." After a brief "Author's Preface", supposititiously translated from Scheffer's Latin, and three lesser items, there is a *ΠΕΠΙΟΧΩ* of the poem. The text proper commences on the recto of leaf B1.

The complete significance of *The Toast* is unassessable without a key to the characters. At least four keys have so far appeared in print, and some copies of the text contain manuscript keys.

---

33. William Davis, *op.cit.* pp.106-109; John Martin, *op.cit.* pp.41-43; Pisanus Fraxi (*i.e.* H.S.Ashbee), *Centuria Librorum Absconditorum* (London: Privately Printed, 1879), pp.320-322; Harold Williams, *The Toast, A Paper Read at the Four Hundred and Sixty Fourth Meeting of Ye Sette of Odd Volumes Held at Ye Savoy Hotel on Tuesday the 26th day of January MCMXXXII*, Imprinted for Ye Author at Ye Crozier Press and To be Had of No Booksellers (London?, 1932), pp.36-44. Some copies of the text also contain a printed key which has been tipped in later.
copied by previous owners. The differences between these keys are largely matters of amplitude; there appear to be no significant contradictions among them. The following key to the principal allusions is compiled largely from those already in existence, with additional biographical information.

1. **Myra, Friga**: Frances Brudenell, alias the Countess of Newburgh and Lady Bellew.

2. **Volcan, Vol, Black Hero**: Captain John Pratt, Deputy Vice-Treasurer of Ireland and Constable of Dublin Castle. He was on friendly terms with Swift for a number of years, and is mentioned in the Journal to Stella. In 1725 he was accused of serious illegalities, tried, and found guilty. Afterwards he engaged in coal mining and glass manufacture in Ireland.

3. **Mars**: Sir Thomas Smyth, King's uncle.

4. **B——w**: John Bellew of Gafny, who once cudgelled Sir Thomas.

5. **Mrs. D.**: Mrs. Denton, a married woman with whom Sir Thomas had an intrigue for which he was tried, and according to O'Donald (i.e. King) was "mulcted in the sum of £5,000."

6. **Lord John, Lord C*****: Lord Carteret, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1724-1730.

7. **Hor, Hortensius, B. H., Lord Pam, H——t**: Josiah Hort (1674?-1751), Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh, and later Archbishop of Tuam. Satirized by Swift in The Storm and elsewhere.

8. **Milo**: Butler, a lieutenant of the Yeomen of the Guard.

9. **Clara**: Lady Louth.


11. **Elrington**: Thomas Elrington (1688-1732), Deputy Master of the Revels, Stewart of the King's Inns, and chief of His Majesty's company of comedians in Ireland.
12. **Lord A:** Joshua, second Viscount Allen (1685-1742). In 1707 he married Margaret Du Pass, who became Lady Allen. King maintained that she had tricked him into the marriage.

13. **Ali, Frow, The Imp:** Lady Allen. King describes her as *Judaea, ex Batavorum gente oriunda.* According to *The Complete Peerage,* she was born in St. James's Rectory, Piccadilly.

14. **Otto:** Dr. Trotter, a Master in Chancery and Judge of the Prerogative Court.

15. **Sir Piercy, P---ce:** Sir Edward Lovet Pearce (d. 1733), Surveyor General of Ireland.


17. **George G--n--lle, G---ville:** George Granville, Lord Lansdown.


19. **A---p:** Thomas Herring, Archbishop of York from 1743 to 1747. He raised £40,000 to oppose the Jacobite invasion.


21. **G----n:** Sampson Gideon, the Jewish financier consulted by Walpole.

22. **Laelius:** John Boyle (1707-1762), fifth Earl of Orrery. He was a friend of Swift, and author of Remarks on the Life and Writings of Dr. Jonathan Swift (1752).

23. **M----:** Matthias Mawson (1683-1770). Bishop of Llandaff, 1739; Chichester, 1740; Ely, 1754.


25. **Aristo:** Forrester, an "eminent Lawyer."

26. **Iocco:** Robert Jocelyn (1688-1756). Attorney General, 1730; Lord Chancellor of Ireland, 1739; Baron Newport, 1743; Viscount Jocelyn, 1755.

27. **B---s, Bocca:** John Bowes. Solicitor General of Ireland, 1730; Chief Baron of the Exchequer, 1741; Lord Chancellor of Ireland, 1757; Baron Bowes of Clonlyon, 1758.

28. **Old Chum:** Dr. Monro, King's physician.

29. **Maccar:** McCarty, a footman of Myra, and hired witness against King.
30. **Cacus**: Sir Edward Crofton, Executor with Sir Edward Pearce of Sir Thomas Smyth's will, and suspected, by King, of having forged it.

31. **Curculio**: Captain Cugley, one of Lord Allen's officers.

32. **R—sse**: Lady Rosse.

33. **Miracides**: John, Lord Bellew, Myra's son; not to be confused with John Bellew of Gafny.

34. **P—r D—**: Peter Daly, an Irish lawyer.

35. **W—st**: Richard West, Lord Chancellor of Ireland, 1725.

36. **Clio, Cadenus**: Dean Jonathan Swift.

37. **C.C.**: Colley Cibber.

38. **Dom Fuscus**: Ward, a Judge of the Common Pleas.

Book One of The Toast is entitled "The Night Ramble of the Sun."

It opens with a conventional introduction in the Homeric manner:

Sing, O Muse, Phoebus' Wrath! say what Cause could persuade
So polite a young God his own Toast to degrade.
In a Matron say how a new Furor began;
Who extended her Figure and stretch'd it to Man.

The Latin text, written in trochaic tetrameter, is provided by O'Donald (King, of course) in the notes and observations. O'Donald comments that, though Scheffer commences the poem in imitation of Homer, he does not show Homer's simplicity, for he proposes the arguments of the whole work in the invocation:

Iram Phoebi, Musa, cane,
Et quae plane scias, plane
Dic: "Relate Oeux urbane, quidnam causae, cur ....
Quur ex Vetula impura
Furor novus & figura:
Quis ex Mira finxit mirum;
Ex Matrona Semivirum?
Already the reader is introduced to Myra, the heroine of the poem. Having made reference to the "low pun" which Scheffer made on the name of Myra, O'Donald proceeds to give the reader some further information about her, briefly tracing her progress from hoyden to harridan. She was descended from a good family among the Coritani, a people of Northamptonshire, and was a woman of extraordinary stature, and of vigour and strength of body superior to most of her contemporaries. In her old age she so artfully repaired the damages of time that even Apollo was deceived. Apollo's deception and the incidents which follow upon it constitute the chief matter of the poem.

The story proper commences when Phoebus Apollo arrives at night from the Atlantic Ocean in the form of a toupee-beau, in order to discover how mortals supply the absence of sunlight. He comes to Dublin, surveys the lights in the street, goes to court at Dublin Castle, and admires the splendour of the place. A glittering description of the Vice-Queen's circle follows. Apollo then catches sight of Cupid shooting arrows at random from the eyes of Clara (i.e. Lady Louth). Not wishing to be struck by an arrow, for he remembers his unhappy experience with Daphne, Apollo retires as the ball starts, with the intention of visiting Trinity College. While leaving the Castle he jostles Mars (i.e. Sir Thomas Smyth) and Volcan (i.e. Vol or Captain John Pratt) in the guard room. Mars
and Volcan were the gods who, according to O'Donald, had been exiled from Olympus for repeated offences, and condemned to remain on earth for a period embodied as mortals. They invite Apollo to supper in Vol's Hole, which, according to the notes, was a little, obscure tavern in Dublin to which Vol, while Superintendent of the Finances, used to retire to relax his mind and to seek solace with the mud nymphs of the River Liffey. The three sit down to eat in the tavern, and after some conversation Vol fills a bumper and calls for a toast.

The second book, entitled "The Marriage of Mars and Myra", commences with the poet's address to Ottor (i.e. Dr. Trotter) and Iocco (i.e. Robert Jocelyn), and then describes the several orders of toasts: the household of Jove; the greater goddesses, among whom Venus is particularly distinguished; Thetis and her nereids or sea nymphs; the naiads or water nymphs; the hamadryads or wood nymphs; the sylphs; the muses and graces with their maids of honour; and finally mere mortals. At last Phoebus proposes the toast of Myra, to the great amusement of Vol and Mars. The latter then proceeds to tell the story of his marriage to Myra and of her dissipation of his fortune on paramours, while denying her husband a subsistence. Phoebus recants his toast with the comment:

"I confess, I was dup'd by George G--n--lle's report."

A new round of toasts is then drunk, and the book concludes as Mars and Vol become inebriated, and Phoebus returns to Parnassus.
Book Three is entitled "The Acts of Myra and her Imp."
The poet addresses himself first to Peircy (i.e. Sir Edward Pearce) and Lord Pam (i.e. Bishop Hort), and then offers an invocation to Phoebus. The sun god himself is meanwhile ruminating on his previous night's adventure in Dublin. He doubts the truth of Mars' story, and resolves to take a look at Myra. With the dawn he returns to Dublin, stops over Myra's hotel on Usher's Quay, and peeps into the window of her bedchamber as she is getting out of bed. Here follow some extraordinarily repulsive descriptions of the apolaustic heroine, of her relations with her lovers, and of her imp (i.e. Lady Allen). Revolted, Phoebus issues an edict restraining Myra from all commerce with men.

Towards the close of the third book the author introduces the Episode of the Gridiron. It is not strictly relevant to the main story, and is mainly an opportunity for a more prolonged attack on Vol, his ambition and riches. He purchases a gridiron, conveys it to the treasury chamber, and proceeds to count the public money in it. The author uses this episode to cast aspersions on what he considered the generally unsatisfactory state of the Irish Treasury at the time. The episode concludes with some general reflections made by Mercury and Thetis.

The poet inscribes the fourth book, "The Combat of Mars and the Hermaphrodite," to Cacus (i.e. Sir Edward Crofton). ODonald
notes that Scheffer had originally intended to address the
fourth book to Sir Mars, but that before the work was finished
Mars disappeared, "or according to the general Opinion, he died;
having first appointed Sir Piercy and Cacus his Successors, and
the Executors of his Vengeance." A good deal of the early part
of this book is devoted to a description of an assembly of the
gods on Olympus. Jupiter reviews his vicegerents while Momus
drolls on the absence of Vol and Mars. Juno is angry and demands
their recall, but Jupiter refuses to grant her request. A serious
quarrel is averted by the mediation of Momus, and a reconciliation
is effected. No sooner has this crisis been allayed than Venus
appears, affronted by the recent edict of Phoebus. She cannot
rescind his decree, it being a "standing order of the fates"
that one god may not undo the acts of another. But she feels
obligations towards Myra, and judges, as O'Donald puts it "that
the loss of such an indefatigable servant, so thoroughly experienced
in all venereal rites and ceremonies, would be very prejudicial to
the affairs of her empire." So she transforms Myra into a
hermaphrodite, "transferring at the same time to her new being
all that vigour and vivacity which she was wont to exert in her
womanhood, with all other privileges and advantages usually
annexed to the male sex." At the same time Venus gives Myra the
name of Friga the Great. Fame, disguised as a dwarf, then flies
to Phoenix Park, Dublin, and informs Mars, now referred to as "her quondam Husband," of all that has passed above. Mars is rampageous and determines to do battle with the hermaphrodite. He arms himself in grand mock-heroic manner with \textit{couteau de chasse}, muff ("which no other cou'd wield"), and, what turns out to be his most effective weapon, a full-bottomed peruke:

\begin{quote}
So enormous the Bulk, and so pond'rous the Hair; 
Such a Cov'ring no Head, that was mortal, could bear ....
\end{quote}

He then drives "as furious as Jehu" from his residence in Phoenix Park to Myra's mansion on Usher's Quay. Ignoring a treble voice that thrice repeats, "Sir, my Lady's at Prayers," he forces his way up to her room and bursts open the door. Inside, he discovers Myra and her imp

"In a Posture - the Muse must not venture to shew!"

A ludicrous combat ensues between Mars and Myra. In the end the epicene heroine is blinded when her adversary throws his enormous powdered wig into her face with his whole might, and forces her to abandon her very unmilitary weapons. Jupiter, in his golden scales, meanwhile weighs the fates of the combatants in the approved Homeric manner. Mars trips up the now visionless Myra, and binds her hand and foot while she lies in a swoon. As soon as she revives, he offers her conditions of ransom, which at first she rejects with indignation, but at length, in great danger of being eunuchated,
she supplicates the conqueror and submits:

"Me an Eunuch!" she cries; and with supplicant Hands, Yet indignant submits to the Victor's demands.

With these caustic lines the "translation" of The Toast comes to a rather sudden conclusion.

At the end of his notes and observations, O'Donald adds an epexegesis of thirteen lines in conventional dactylic hexameters which, he says, were transcribed from Scheffer's manuscript by Tir-Oen, a commentator of Cork. They give King a final opportunity to castigate his enemies and to demonstrate the difficulties under which the poem was written. At the same time they manifest that their author was capable of a certain kind of humility; he disarmingly describes at least the Latin parts of The Toast as puerilia carmina, despite the fact that they were written when he was senior:

Haec ego jam senior puerilia carmina lusi
Haec, cum Scheffer eram: macerat dum febris; iniqui
Dum me causidici vexant; dum nigra lacescit
Dente male TRAULI conjux; dum toxica miscet,
Accenditque virum cantu, ferrumque dolosque
ANDROGYNE molitur atrox; dum denegat audax
Depositum, haud imo contentus crimine, MAVORS
Hospitium violans, & avitas VATIS amici
Res moriens lacerat; dum PERSEUS pejerat omnes
Conceptis Divos verbis; dum raucos IOCCO
Bacchatur, VOLLUSque fremit; CACUSque, nefandos
Improbus ipse juvans PERSEI MIRAeque labores
Dat venum mea regna, abjuratasque rapinas.
The Appendix which follows the poem proper contains a number of miscellaneous items, including a set of supplemental notes and observations, and the complete text of the Ode to Myra which had previously appeared on the Dublin streets in 1730. To it are added some extra notes, including one to the effect that Scheffer had taken some useful hints from this Ode, but had much improved on it in The Toast.

Perhaps the most powerful general impression which the poem makes on the reader is one of acrid, and at times ferocious defamation. Even Swift, in such poems as A Beautiful Young Nymph Going to Bed, The Lady's Dressing Room, and Strephon and Chloe, did not exceed the unsavouriness and mordancy of King's description of what Apollo saw when he peeped through the window of Myra's chamber as she rose from her bed:

There he saw the huge Mass tumble out of her Bed;  
Like Bellona's her Stature, the Gorgon's her Head;  
Hollow eyes with a Glare, like the Eyn of an Ox;  
And a Forehead deep furrow'd and matted grey Locks;  
With a toothless wide Mouth, and a Beard on her Chin,  
And a yellow rough Hide in the place of a Skin;  
Brawny Shoulders up-rais'd; Cow-Udders; Imp's Teat;  
And a Pair of bow'd Legs, which were set on Splay Feet.  

However, after a certain amount of titivating with red and white, Myra managed to make herself look fair and blooming, despite her

34. The following three extracts are taken from The Toast, pp. 96-105.
sixty years. Here the poet pauses in his account to pass another sardonic comment:

Thus you see an old Hulk, many years Weatherbeaten
All the Timbers grown rotten, the Plank all Worm-eaten;
Which the Owners, who doom her to make one more Trip,
Scrape and calc, tar and paint, till she seems a new Ship.

Myra's day starts with a series of curses instead of prayers:

Such the Morning Oraisons she us'd to repeat,
Since the Bead-roll of Aves were grown obsolete.
She began with great Jove, whom she curs'd for his Spleen,
Here to fix her Abode, and not make her Vice-Queen:
And she curs'd him again for his Meanness of Spirit,
Who assigned her a Pension far short of her Merit.
Then, because at Threescore she was out of her Prime,
And her tresses were hoary, she cursed Father Time.
Ought her Head, like Mount Aetna's, be cover'd with Snow,
While she feels the fierce Flames, which consume her below?
Then she curs'd her next Kin, who refus'd to adjure,
And the useless old Matrons, untaught to procure.
All the Bankers she curs'd; -- for they weigh Foreign Gold:
And she curs'd the poor Players; -- for their House is too old.

Then she curs'd from her Soul, since her Luck was so ill,
Ace of Hearts, and Groom Porter, and odious Quadrille;
All the Duns, who want Manners, or Patience to wait;
All the Rich, who pass by, and the Poor at her Gate;
Little Priests, and great Prelates, who fix the Church-Pales,
From the Red-Hats of Rome to the Fidlers of Wales;
All the Belles of this Isle, who abhor the French Mode,
And the Bards, who address an old Witch in an Ode.
Next the Morning she curs'd, 'twas so hot and so light;
(If the Sun had been set, she had then curs'd the Night)
Little thinking Don Phoebus that instant was near her,
That the God, whom she thus was blaspheming, could hear her.

35. O'Donald's note to this line reads: "At that Time the old Theatre was standing. But a new Play-House hath since been built in Dublin under the Direction of that wise and honest Architect, who built the new Parliament-House. In the latter you cannot hear, and in the new Theatre you can neither hear nor see."
The eventual blinding of Myra is described with particular virulence:

Pointed Atoms of Powder in Friga's i.e. Mira's red Orbs
Deep infixed, unresisting the Fluid absorbs:
And a Torrent of Tears, while she bellows and raves,
Now impetuous descending, the Salt-Water Waves
Roll a dreary wide Waste all a down her broad Cheeks;
And of all the fine Red only leave a few Streaks. 36

Pungent though the verisimilar translation is, the author demonstrates his particular kind of expertise to the fullest in the notes and observations. 37 King has reproduced with great fidelity the style used by commentators, editors, and translators of Latin classics in the eighteenth century. So full are these notes that on some pages the text nearly disappears altogether. Long extracts are given from the pretended Latin original. Sometimes verses are given only in Latin in the notes, and for obvious reasons are not translated. From time to time, notably in Book III, Scheffer is made to put verses of his original poem into Greek, most of which do not appear in the English translation. In his rhyming Latin -- and Greek -- verses King shows remarkable sophistication, and he

36. The Toast, pp. 185-6

37. In Political and Literary Anecdotes (pp. 97-98) King later wrote: "He [Swift] was chiefly pleased with the Notes, and expressed his surprise that I had attained such a facility in writing the burlesque Latin. The motives which induced me to form the Notes in that manner, was (sic) the judgment I had made on those of Mr. Pope's Dunciad. That Poem, it must be allowed, is an excellent Satire; but there is little wit or humor in the Notes, although there is a great affectation of both."
maintains their quality consistently through almost 200 quarto pages. Furthermore, the notes contain many historically interesting allusions to contemporary personages. For example, John Bowes (when King was writing, Chief Baron of the Irish Exchequer and later raised to the peerage as Baron Bowes of Clonlyon) is thus described (notes, p. 113):

An illiterate Pleader. He was educated in a Cheesemonger's Shop near Billingsgate, where he learned his Oratory, and collected all those Flowers of Rhetorick which he occasionally throws out at the Irish Bar, to supply the Want of Law and Argument.

Dillon is given this description (notes, p. 149):

Dill . . . was a tall fat Lawyer, who without any kind of Learning or Skill in his Profession, had cunning enough to create Suits in all Places, where he was admitted, and to turn them to his own Profit. He advised the Method of cheating Mr. Scheffer, and drew that infamous Bill, by which it was pretended our Author's Purchase was in Trust for another. To support the Allegations of this Bill, he suggested to Vol and Myra all the Matter, out of which they framed their Depositions: And to second this Evidence, he chose for their Associate the greatest villain in the Kingdom; a Fellow who had formerly been Myra's Footman, and was suspected to conduct the Assassins, who were hired to murder our Author.

The notes and observations are replete with King's particular kind of humour. At no time is he in better form than when he is deliberately writing nonsense verse, either in Latin or in English. On page 78, for example, ODonahoe tells his readers that Sir Mars was a great braggadocio, even when sober, but when a little mellow, which
happened generally once a day, he was outrageous in his conversation, and would exalt himself far above all other gods or men. ODonald then writes:

And since I began this Translation, I have seen the First Book of a Poem composed by our Knight in praise of himself, which he calls the Martiad. I remember the first six verses as follow:

I will praise the great God Mars, for of all Gods he's most worthy to be prais'd.
And I'll sing Deeds so mighty, as shall cause ev'ry Reader to stand amaz'd.
I'll relate how he was much stouter than Horsa, who first landed in Kent;
And how he made better Speeches than any Member of Parliament.
How that he could have a Countess or twain, when his Honour inclined to kiss:
And that he could write better Verses than Homer: for he himself wrote This.

And on page 115 ODonald provides an extract from Scheffer's original, demonstrating Bocca's tautological manner of speaking, and also providing an example of the frequently untranslatable feats that King could perform with the Latin language:

Verbo, magne custos (tu no tasti omnia) dicam uno
Nequid inest pol Schefferi
Actis, factis, pactis veri.
Ne quid actis, factis, pactis;
Ne quid factis, pactis, actis;
Ne quid pactis, actis, factis.

Sometimes in his notes and observations ODonald temporarily leaves the course of the story to provide additional information on
the background of his characters. Thus the reader learns about such matters as John Pratt's forge, colliery, and glass factory; Myra's influence in the composition and signing of Sir Thomas Smyth's will; and, on page 65, Sir Thomas' sciamachies with his chair:

It was a Custom inviolably observed by Sir Mars, after he had been cudgelled by Mr. Bellew to kill that Gentleman MENTALLY, once at least, every Day. This gallant Action was performed in the following manner. The Knight, after a plentiful Dinner, being well heated with Wine, his Guests departed, and Servants dismissed, carefully locked his Parlour Door: Then supposing his Adversary to stand before him in the Form of his great Chair, he devoted him Dia inferis, and drawing a Toledo, which he kept for this Purpose, he advanced with a seeming Intrepidity; and pushed with such Skill and Violence, that generally, by the first or second Thrust, the Chair was run through the Body. He then wiped his Blade, and sheathed it with great Complacency; sung an Io Triumphhe sitting upon his Enemy, whom he had thus mortally wounded, and fell fast asleep.

This description is followed by a list of 681 persons "MENTALLY killed by Sir Mars, from the Year 1708 to the Years 1728; faithfully extracted from the Encomium Martis, or Killing no Murder."

In more serious vein, there are in the notes to Book III significant allusions to Jonathan Swift, who "attended in the Court, while Mr. Scheffer's Cause was pleading, to keep a Stranger in Countenance; and perhaps, to give a publick Testimony of the Friendship, with which he honoured our Author." The Dean is amused by the mediocre quality of the harangues which he hears in court:
but he left the Muses and Phoebus to be in attendance:

Hic est ille, qui (amavit Nosmet tamen) occupavit Musis haud inferiores, Phoebo proximos, honores.

O'Donald adds that the Dean's mere presence awed all the Irish pleaders — with the exception of Bocca — into such a decency of behaviour as the authority of the Lord Chancellor could never before oblige them to observe.

The fact that King represented the Latin original as having been written by a Swede may well reflect the interest which he took in the history and contemporary problems of that country. During the so-called "Swedish Plot" of 1716 and the following year, the English Jacobites had received offers of help from Sweden, and some negotiations had taken place: King was in all likelihood aware of what was going on. 38 To broaden his knowledge, he had probably read the Lapponia and some of the other works of the Swedish Latin writer Joannes Schefferus: the coincidence of the surnames could

---

38. The relationship between England and Sweden at this time has been discussed in several articles by J.F. Chance: see The English Historical Review, Vol. 16 (1901), pp. 676ff.; Vol. 18 (1903), pp. 81ff. and 676ff.; Vol. 19 (1904), pp. 55ff.
hardly be accidental. He was no doubt aware of the visit which
the Duke of Ormonde had paid in 1717 to Peter the Great during
the course of the Great Northern War, and of that Czar's desire to
seek out Jacobites who would be willing to enter the service of
Russia. In this conflict, King's sympathy would almost certainly
have been with the Swedes: he never wrote of the Russians with any
degree of affection. In any case, the Duke's mission was a failure,
and Jacobite sympathies towards Sweden seem to have increased as a
result. There is also some evidence that King was concerned about
his own reputation in Sweden, as is implied in one of the anecdotes
collected by Joseph Spence:

'Quid dices de me quando revertetis in patriam
tuam?' Dr. King, to a Swede who had resided in
Oxford some time for his studies, (with a high air
of expecting much).

'Dicam, Insignissime vir, te esse magnum
grammaticum' (and the vast fall in Dr. King's look,
on it ).

39. On these matters see Maurice Bruce, "Jacobite Relations with Peter

40. Joseph Spence, Anecdotes, Observations, and Characters, of Books and
Vol. I, p. 348. A slightly different version of the same story
appears in Samuel Singer's edition of the same work, published in
1858.
In view of the paucity of printed copies of The Toast and the recherché nature of its contents, it is hardly surprising that there are very few allusions to it in the works of contemporary eighteenth century writers. The first reference occurs in a letter written by Swift to Charles Ford, on October 14, 1732:

"There is a most bitter Satyr against Sr Tho. Smyth, Ldy Newburg, and Capt Prat. I take it to have been writ in Oxford, by the means of one Dr King the Head of a Hall there who was Nephew and Heir to Sr Thomas and thought himself wrongd by Ldy Newburg, and I presume employd some young Oxonians to write it. A printer brought it to me, and said a hundred of them were sent to him from England to give about; the Verses are rough, but it is very malicious, and worth reading. It is called the Toast." 41

It is doubtful if Swift and King knew one another at this time.

Probably they met for the first time in the winter of 1734, when King was compelled on account of his lawsuit to remain in Ireland until the summer of 1735. As may be judged from King's later reminiscences, 42 their acquaintance ripened gradually into friendship and admiration, as a manifestation of which Swift entrusted

\[\text{\footnotesize 41. Harold Williams, op.cit., Vol IV, pp. 76f.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 42. In King's Anecdotes (2d ed., pp.97-98), he quotes a few lines from the last letter which he received from Swift. The original letter has not survived. King also relates in the same place that Swift perused the manuscript of The Toast and commented to a lady relative that "if he had read the TOAST when he was only twenty years of age, he never would have wrote a satire."}\]
King with his holographs of *The Last Four Years of the Queen* and *Verses on his Own Death*.

Incidentally, Swift's dictum that "the verses are rough" seems a trifle severe as applied to the English version. King handles his anapaestic tetrametre measure generally with success. He facetiously justified his rather unusual metre by referring to the work of James I published at Edinburgh in 1584, and nowadays usually called *Essays of a Prentice in the Divine Art of Poetry*. O'Donald writes in "The Translator's Preface" (page xlvii):

I have therefore chose the Verse of twelve Syllables in Deference to the Judgment and Authority of one of our own Kings, who in his Art of Poetry (which perhaps he understood as well as the Art of Government) calls it Rouncefallis or Tumbling Verse, and which he assures us is the only proper Measure for Poems of this Kind.

References to The Toast in English literature subsequent to the death of Swift are sparse and relatively unimportant. Prior to the work of Sir Harold Williams, only one journal article on the poem was published: that appeared in 1857 in *Bentley's Miscellany*. In generally denouncing King's work, the author, Archdeacon Arthur Rowan, pronounces a severe condemnation:

... this handsomely 'got-up' volume is so 'farced' with impurity and grossness, that a man seems to forfeit his own manliness and self-respect while looking through the contents of the unreadable production.


44. The article is unsigned, but the authorship has been established by reference to a letter in the Forster Collection. See F.E. Ball (ed.), *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.* (London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1913), Vol. V, Appendix XII, p. 458.
Later he refers to "the almost insane indecency of its contents," "this foul production," and its "overlying filth". He concludes that King's submission of the book to Mrs. Martha Whiteway was "in keeping with the tone and standard of propriety in a day when Clarissa Harlowe was a book recommended to the study of young ladies with as much freedom as Madame Chapone's Letters or Hannah Moore's Moral Strictures would be at present."

Rowan appears to have overlooked the brilliance of King's whimsicality, but his criticisms do manifest one reason why The Toast has never been well known. The imagery is indeed gross, as Rowan indicates. The satire is, in places, obscene, and in this respect, the poem constitutes a kind of ne plus ultra. It is difficult to imagine how any other author could supersede King in this peculiar kind of learned impudence. Furthermore, King's quarrel was essentially private, and only a comparatively small number of persons, even in his own day, could have been expected to take any interest in it. Even if the poem had been published, it would never have attracted more than a tiny proportion of the poetry-reading public. Nevertheless, it calls for assessorial comment: some further observations on it are therefore included in Chapter IX.


EARLY POLITICAL SATIRE

The precise extent to which King aided Jacobite activities will always be an enigma. A large proportion of his correspondence has been lost, and what evidence remains is often far from explicit. In 1735 he is listed "to be Agent to the States of Holland", but the nature of his duties and the extent to which he fulfilled them are nebulous. Among the Stuart Papers at Windsor Castle there survives a letter penned by King from "Ferrara" (i.e. Paris) on November 24, 1736, to James Edgar, Confidential Clerk to King James III, the Old Chevalier. This letter is written partly in cipher, and can be interpreted only with the aid of the key which is included, in another hand, on the notepaper itself. Some examples of deciphered words are as follows:

---


Mr. Drake : King James III
Cambray : Ireland
Dijon : The Hague
little nursery : affairs
Mr. Farquar : King's Service
Gumley : King's friends in Scotland
571 : Scotland
Garth : King's friends
Mercer : Whigs
500 : Duke of Hanover (i.e. George II)
503 : Walpole
473 : King's restoration
Ferrara : Paris
Mr. Gibson : Colonel Daniel O'Brien
Hatton : Col. William Cecil

King commences: "I hope Mr. Drake will excuse me, that I have not sooner answered his last kind letter," a statement that confirms the suspicions of several historians that the Old Chevalier and the Principal of St. Mary Hall corresponded with one another. He continues:

The same affair which carried me to Cambray last summer, obliged me to repair thither again this year much against my will .... It will be impossible for me to attempt a journey to Dijon, till my little nursery is settled. I am in great hopes, this delay hath not yet been in any respect prejudicial to Mr. Farquar, for whom I must ever retain ye' greatest respect.

Gumley is grown very rich. I saw him lately: for I made 571 my way from Cambray.

I could heartily wish some proper steps were taken to unite Garth and Mercer in ye' same interest, which I conceive would not be at all difficult to be effected at this juncture. I mean the same Mercer, who is such a professed enemy to all the measures of 500 and 503. I cannot help intimating this, because I am fully persuaded 473 in a great measure depends on that union.
He concludes in a postscript: "I have not seen Mr. Gibson. I had nothing to say to him from Hatton." The letter is signed by King in his own codename: A. Ingram.

King saw clearly what some Jacobites did not, namely that any resurgence of the Stuart monarchy would require the aid of the anti-Walpolean Whigs. In a reply from James Edgar the writer expresses a desire that "you were at Douay", together with another wish for "the Union and agreement you mention between Messrs. Garth & Mercer, for I see the advantages ......" But nothing decisive came of these proposals to court the extreme Whigs. Walpole for his part strove to divide the Jacobites from his Whig enemies, principally by assuring them of his own feelings of good will toward the Pretender. James III, to thwart this ruse, warned " ...... 'tis fit my friends should know that I have not the least reason to think that Walpole or any other of the present Ministers are anyways favourably disposed towards me." Colonel William Cecil, to whom this admonition was addressed, did not benefit from the advice therein. According to King, he "had a weak judgment, and was very illiterate .......... I believe he was a man of honour, and yet he betrayed his master."

This betrayal on Cecil's part was unintentional, King intimated:

3. The Royal Library, Windsor Castle, Stuart Papers 193/83. The letter is endorsed on the back: "Copy to Dr. King. Jany. 16 1739." This last figure is almost certainly a mistake for 1737.

For he suffered himself to be cajoled and duped by Sir ROBERT WALPOLE to such a degree, as to be fully persuaded that Sir ROBERT had formed a design to restore the House of STUART. For this reason he communicated to Sir ROBERT all his despatches, and there was not a scheme which the CHEVALIER's court or the Jacobites in England had projected during Sir ROBERT'S long administration, of which that minister was not early informed, and was therefore able to defeat it without any noise or expense.

In September, 1737, King was in France, and paid a visit on the Archbishop of Auch, Cardinal Melchior de Polignac. The Cardinal died in 1742, but throughout the remainder of his life King seems to have cherished the memory of this cultured French prelate who for a long time concerned himself in Stuart affairs and had once desired to make James II King of Poland. King calls him "a fine gentleman, as well as an elegant and polite scholar," who had "a most engaging affability, and a peculiar art and manner of obliging every man, who was introduced to him, to lay aside all restraint." King took the opportunity to compliment the Archbishop on a portion of his refutation of Lucretius in Latin verse, Anti-Lucretius, sive de Deo et Natura.

The full text of this work appeared according to the author's wish, posthumously, in 1747, but an extract of about 150 verses had already been published by Jean Le Clerc, the French protestant theologian.

The manner in which these verses were printed is revealed by King: the Cardinal, to gratify Le Clerc's curiosity, repeated them to him once, but even though he was then seventy years old, he was able to

carry them away in his memory. King adds: "I should have inclined to believe that the Cardinal had been deceived, and that LE CLERC had by some means got at the M.S. if I had not known in my own family a most amazing instance of the strength of memory." To which of his relations he was here referring will, barring some unlikely discovery, always remain a mystery.

For a period during the 1730's King attended the meetings of the Red Herring Club in Oxford, an organization founded in 1694, which, to judge from the names in its surviving records, contained a certain proportion of Jacobite members. The Book of the Red Herring Club, 1694 to 1761 includes a collection of Articles agreed to on June 29, 1714, e.g. "that the Club shall be held every Tuesday night at one another's Chambers; and that it shall begin at Seven a Clock and continue till Tom tolls .... that every Member who absents himself upon a Club-night when in Town shall forfeit Sixpence .... that every Member that is not at the Club at eight o'clock by Tom (when in town) shall forfeit Sixpence .... ""King was fined on a number of days under the terms of these Articles, but though these petty amounts have gone on record, there is no indication of the topics that were discussed.


7. Bodleian Library MS. Top. Oxon. f.49. A presumably complete list of members' names appears at the beginning of the second volume, MS. Top. Oxon. e. 281. King seems to have been admitted a member in 1731 or before.
King's first strictly political satire appeared in print in 1737 in the form of an article in the periodical *Common Sense or The Englishman's Journal*. This publication had begun its career on February 5 of that year, founded from abroad by James III as a paper which he could use for his own purposes, but which would not be overtly Jacobitical. A former contributor to *Fog's Journal*, Charles Molloy, became the editor, and for almost two years this curiously non-committal periodical appeared regularly. The term "common sense" was much in use at this time: *Fielding's Pasquin*, first produced in 1736, contains a rehearsal of a tragedy entitled "The Life and Death of Common-Sense", and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu's book *The Nonsense of Common-Sense* appeared a year or so later, to mention only two of the better known instances. But though the title had a fashionable ring, this paper was scarcely a success for the Chevalier de St. George. Molloy could indeed boast of such contributors as the Earl of Chesterfield and George Lyttleton, but the only known Jacobite writer was William King, and no more than one piece by him can be authenticated. It is perhaps significant that Pope, in a letter to John Brinsden of December 15, 1739, confided that he did not wish to have a set of verses on the *Essay on Man* printed in it.

The article in question appeared on May 28, 1737. A copy of


9. This is the date proposed by Harold Williams in "The Old Trumpeter of Liberty Hall", *The Book Collector's Quarterly*, Vol. I, No. 4 (1931), p. 36. The other date which has occasionally been suggested, April 16, 1737, is a palpable blunder.
this issue was sent to Swift together with a letter written by
King, but both were intercepted by the postal authorities. According
to Deane Swift, the article was "written by Dr. King himself." 10

The argument of this essay will appear again in King's Latin poem
Antonietti Epistola ad Corsos, which was published in 1744 as a
folio pamphlet, and reset with slight variations in the collected
Opera. The principal proposal put forward was that the people of
Corsica (by which King meant Great Britain) should plan a new govern-
ment for the future, headed by a king fashioned of oak, "well shaped,
and finely painted; with a Diadem on his Head, a Royal Mantle on his
Shoulders, and a Scepter in his Right Hand." This kind of monarchy
would be superior to the governmental system of Plato's Republic or
Sir Thomas More's Utopia, "which sound well in Theory, but can never
be reduced to Practice." This king should not be a tyrant; he should
be incapable of committing any acts of violence, and should be free
from pride, avarice, and ambition:

He should neither injure himself, or his Subjects, through
the Heat and Intemperance of Youth, or the Folly and Dotage
of old Age. Love, which has made one King a Fool, and
another mad, should never perplex his Head, or hurt his
Constitution. His Manners should be without Blemish. And
his greatest Enemies (if undeservedly he must have Enemies)
should not be able to impute to him any Impurity of Mind, or
unfriendly Disposition, or Unevenness of Temper. In a Word,
I would have such a King as Jupiter first gave to the Frogs;
who, by the Way, possessed his Empire by Divine Right ....

10. Harold Williams, (ed.), The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift
A note on this letter by Deane Swift is to be found in his Letters
Written by the Late Jonathan Swift, D.D. (Dublin, 1768),
The person of the king should be sacred and inviolable. His subjects of all degrees should approach him with the greatest reverence, and those introduced to him for a confirmation of their privileges and employments should be obliged to prostrate themselves and kiss the hem of his garment. He should be placed under a rich canopy and seated on a magnificent throne. A guard of a hundred halberdeers should be appointed to attend him, not so much for the security of his person as to serve for pomp and show at audiences of ambassadors. This guard should be the only standing army in Corsica, for there should be no use for soldiers except to defend the country in the event of an invasion. In that case, every man should be a soldier. New laws should be of no force until receiving his majesty's approbation, which should always be signified by his silence.

To indicate his disapproval, the monarch should pronounce the word veto three times with an audible voice. (The author does not explain how a wooden monarch could speak.) The existence of a spouse for this ligneous ruler should be determined by the senate; King is not enthusiastic on this matter, commenting: "I can prove from ancient History, that a Wooden Queen hath sometimes done as much Mischief as a Wooden Horse, and overturned mighty Kingdoms." But with or without a consort, such a king could do no wrong:

A Succession of such Princes would not be less Glorious for themselves, than Beneficial to their Country: They would be universally esteemed during Their Reigns, and their Memories sweet and precious. Happy had it been for the World, if the long Catalogue of Roman Emperors (three or four only excepted) had been of the Wooden Species!
The not immediately obvious moral, with its subtle innuendos, concludes the article: "Reason, which is the distinguishing Excellence of Human Nature, can only prove a Blessing to those, whether Princes or private Persons, who are Men of Honour and Virtue."

The principal characteristic of this piece is the delicacy and indirectness of its irony. To a reader not acquainted with the political background against which King was writing, it would seem to be divorced of any but the most general significance. Indeed, as was undoubtedly the case with Gulliver's Travels, which had been published only a little more than a decade earlier, many readers could have digested the whole work and remained completely oblivious of any subversive intention on the part of the writer. Slight though it is, it constitutes a good example of King's ability to simulate one point of view, while actually arguing for another. He was to use this device again on several occasions in the future.

This article also illustrates — as if any additional illustration after The Toast were needed — the unique influence which the works of Swift exercised over its author. The irony is certainly Swiftian, created with a polished elegance which Swift himself never quite achieved. That King read most, if not all, of Swift's published work there can be no reasonable doubt, but it is of special significance that the Dean chose King to supervise personally the publishing of two of his manuscripts, those of the Four Last Years of the Queen and the Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift. These two cases deserve discussion in some detail.
The singular pre-publication history of Swift's *Four Last Years of the Queen*, which was composed mainly between September 1712 and May 1713 but issued only in 1758, has been recounted, in its main outlines, in several places. However, it is still possible to add a few extra details to the approved version of what happened. Briefly, Swift set aside the manuscript after its completion, and for twenty-three years gave it little attention. In 1722 he mentioned the manuscript in a letter to Pope, hinting that he occasionally spent some time on it, and he may have taken it to England with him in 1727 with a view to publication. After Swift and King had become acquainted in Dublin the question of printing the manuscript was discussed again: Swift was anxious to see his work in print, and according to Mrs. Whiteway he hoped to profit financially from it. King presumably undertook to make arrangements in London for publication: in a letter written from Paris to Mrs. Whiteway on November 9, 1736, he explained that after his return to London about November 20 he would "put the little MS. to the press, and oblige the whole English nation."


In fact King did not secure possession of the manuscript until about eight months later when it was brought to him from Ireland by Lord Orrery. The exact date of delivery is not known; the closest date is July 2, 1737, when Swift wrote to His Lordship "I have corrected the inclosed .... please to deliver it, with Your own Hand, to Doctor King, at his Chambers in the Temple." 13

It is not clear what publication plans King had in mind. It is reasonable to assume that he had suggested the printing of the work by subscription, and that some of Swift's other friends were opposed to this idea: that is the implication of two sentences in his letter to Mrs. Whiteway of June 24, 1737: "I don't know why the Dean's friends should think it derogatory, either to his station or character, to print the History by subscription, considering how the money arising by the sale of it is to be applied. I am not for selling the copy to a bookseller: for, unless a sufficient caution be taken, the bookseller, when he is master of the copy, will certainly print it by subscription, and so have all the benefit which the Dean refuses." 14 The manuscript was certainly in King's hands by July 23, 15 but about the same time Lord Oxford and Erasmus Lewis were both deprecating publication. Lord Oxford had seen the manuscript in 1727, when it had been lent to him.

while Swift was in England; he still held opinions about it more
than a decade later, for on April 8, 1738, Lewis wrote to Swift
giving him a detailed critique of his work, incorporating the views
of "Lord O —— d, and two or three more." The principal
criticisms involved Swift's version of the founding of the South Sea
Company, and the accuracy of some other specific matters such as the
transactions with the Dutch envoy to England, Monsieur de Buys,
Marlborough's personal courage, Prince Eugene's supposed hint that
Harley might be removed by chance assassination, and the author's claim
that "the present ministers" adhered to republican principles.

It is probable that King soon became of one mind with Lewis and
Lord Oxford, at least in the matter of postponing publication. He
wrote to the Dean on the subject of "some difficulties I was under in
respect of ye publication", but his letters were intercepted, and never
reached Dublin. On April 25, 1738, he wrote to Deane Swift with
regard to the fact that his letters concerning the publication of the
history had not reached the author. "I have not yet had any answer",
he lamented, "and till I receive one, I can do nothing more."

Definite dangers were involved:

16. Harold Williams, ed., op. cit. ult., p. 104. See also the letter
of Erasmus Lewis of August 4, 1737, p. 65f.

17. Ibid, p. 93f. The letters to which King refers in his letter to
Mrs. Whiteway of March 2, 1737/38, have not survived. See also the
letter to Deane Swift of March 15, 1737/38, p. 99f. The date given
on page 99, March 13, is erroneous, as was noted in Chapter II.
"... I might have talked over with you all the affair of the History, about which I have been so much condemned: and no wonder, since the Dean has continually expressed his dissatisfaction that I have so long delayed the publication of it. However, I have been in no fault: on the contrary, I have consulted the Dean's honour, and the safety of his person. In a word, the publication of this work, as excellent as it is, would involve the printer, author, and every one concerned, in the greatest difficulties, if not in certain ruin; and therefore it will be absolutely necessary to omit some of the characters. 18

Here King frankly confesses that it was he who had delayed the publication. The reason that Swift's *Four Last Years of the Queen* was not published in his lifetime was simply that King refused to arrange for the printing of the author's approved text.

It is only fair to add that King's intentions seem to have been the highest. In an unpublished letter written by King to Lord Orrery from London on July 8, 1738, he commented:

As to the History of the Four Last Years of the Queen, I leave it to Your Lordship to do as you shall judge proper. Only I wish, if it be redemanded from me, it may be put into your hands or Mr Popes, that if hereafter it should be mangled or published with many interpolations, which I do not think impossible, since you know there is another copy, the D's friends in that case may have an opportunity of vindicating his memory. 19

This piece of correspondence, which seems to have gone so far unnoticed by Swift's commentators, is of some importance, since it clearly

---


indicates King's hopes that the authentic text would be preserved.

His delaying tactics were apparently based on no motive more sinister
than that of protection for all concerned.

It seems likely that Swift, having suspected that King was pro-
crastinating, proposed that an edition should be printed in Dublin
by George Faulkner. But no success came of this plan either.

Faulkner wrote two letters on the subject to Lord Orrery, which were
shown to King, but the principal result was that His Lordship also
became convinced that the publication of the work should be postponed.

After failing to persuade Faulkner to print his Four Last Years of the
Queen, Swift seems to have let the matter rest for good.

The later history of the manuscript of this work is told by
Faulkner in his pamphlet An Appeal to the Public, the veracity of
which may be generally substantiated from what little extrinsic evidence
exists. Only the connection of King with the manuscript is of
relevance for the present purpose. He was in possession of the holo-
graph in 1740, as is clear from a letter written to Pope by Mrs.
Whiteway on May 16 of that year: "The history of the four last years
of queen Anne's reign I suppose you have seen with Dr. King, to whom he
sent it some time ago, and, if I am rightly informed, is the only piece

Faulkner and Mrs. Whiteway are both relevant.

21. George Faulkner, An Appeal to the Public (Dublin, 1758). This
pamphlet is extremely rare: there are copies in the National Library
of Ireland, Dublin (Swift Collection 32; half title only); and
Harvard College Library (16422, 58*). I do not know of any others.
of his (except Gulliver) which he ever proposed making money by,
and was given to Dr. King with that design, if it might be printed:
I mention this to you, lest the Doctor should die, and his heirs
imagine they have a right to dispose of it." In his reply from
Twickenham of June 18, Pope commented: "I dare say nothing of ill
consequence can happen from the commission given Dr. King." 22
In 1741 Swift furnished Faulkner with a written order commissioning
him to retrieve the manuscript from King. Faulkner travelled from
Dublin to Oxford in September 1741, only to discover that King was
at Bath, and so proceeded on his journey to London. Thence he wrote
to King, who mentioned this piece of correspondence in his next letter
to Lord Orrery, written on the following October 3:

By the last post I had a letter from Faulkner to
tell me, that he has a letter for me from ye Dean
requiring me to deliver the History to his Honour
Faulkner. He says he had been at Oxford for that
purpose. I am truly sorry he missed me: for I wish
to be rid of the M.S. I have desired Faulkner to
send me the Dean's letter, that I may have an authority
for what I do; and I have promised to send Mr. Dean's
papers to him by some safe hand. For Faulkner it
seems, is just returning to Ireland. 23

On October 5 King conveyed his thoughts to Faulkner:

I shall always be ready to receive the Dean's Commands.
But the Manuscript is locked up in my Study at Oxford:
And as you will be gone for Ireland before I can leave
this Place, I will find out some safe Hand, immediately
after my Return to Oxford, by which I may send the Papers
to the Dean. But pray be so kind as to send me his
Letter, that I may have Authority for what I do. — I
write with great Difficulty by Reason of a Contraction in

all my Fingers, for which I am using the Waters of this Place. 24

Faulkner answered this letter; the text has not been preserved.

On October 12 King wrote again from Bath:

... I am sorry I was not at Oxford, when you called there, that you might have taken the Papers with you. If you scruple to send the Dean's Letter by Post for fear of an Accident, leave it for me at any Friend of yours in London, or with Mr. Bathurst the Bookseller, whom I think you know.

Having received this last communication, Faulkner again wrote to King, this time enclosing the Dean's letter and informing him that, since there was business in Dublin that required his immediate presence, he could not stay much longer in London. He requested King to leave the manuscript with Lord Orrery. By coincidence King arrived in London the day before Faulkner had arranged to leave for Ireland. Somehow Faulkner learnt the news of his arrival, and that evening "went to the Doctor's Chambers in the Temple, where he was most politely received, according to the usual Custom, by that Gentleman, where that Affair of the Dean's Manuscript was talked over. The Doctor said, he was very sorry, that he did not know, that he, Faulkner, would be in London at his Return; if he had, he would have brought the Papers from Oxford [sic], and delivered them to him; but was glad he was desired to deliver the Papers to Lord Orrery, from whom he got them." Faulkner assured his readers that the Doctor kept his word and handed over the manuscript to His Lordship.

24. This, the following quotation, and those in the two subsequent paragraphs are drawn from Faulkner's pamphlet.
"who had it some Years in his Custody, without its being called for." To be more precise Lord Orrery had the manuscript in his possession for about a decade, until in 1751 he surrendered it to Faulkner, who handed it over to the Archbishop of Dublin. Thence it was delivered to Lord Chief Justice Singleton. The tangled history of its subsequent publication is enlarged upon by Faulkner, and independent confirmation of his account has more recently been provided by Sir Harold Williams.

Part of the unique value of Faulkner's pamphlet consists in the fact that he supports his argument with morsels of information which, were it not for his mentioning them, would have been irretrievably lost. He explains, for example, that Swift had asked him to make the publication arrangements for the Four Last Years of the Queen with a London bookseller, when King, "remarkable for his great Genius and Learning", persuaded the Dean to let him have the manuscript with the promise that "he would raise him a Sum of some thousand Pounds by a voluntary Subscription in England, to endow his intended Hospital for Idiots and Lunatics." King, it may be assumed, did not keep this promise, probably on the grounds that he was dissuaded from publishing the manuscript; Faulkner specifically mentions that he "neglected the Publication of Proposals for printing that Work by Subscription." Faulkner adds graciously that he felt towards King "the highest Honour and Esteem, having seen him at Dr. Swift's House in Dublin, and at other different Places in that City."
The other work of the Dean of St. Patrick's with which King was intimately connected, *Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift*, was written in the period between approximately November 1731 and May 1732, and the manuscript handed over to King some six years later, during the early months of 1738. While it was in his hands, King took considerable liberties with the copy, perhaps surprisingly in view of the anxiety which he had shown to preserve the authentic text of the *Four Last Years of the Queen*. On the suggestion of Pope and others he made a number of excisions to the extent of about a third of the whole, and then proceeded to farce the other two thirds with an extract over sixty lines long from *The Life and Genuine Character of Doctor Swift*, which had been published in both London and Dublin in 1733. The wording of the interpolation was altered in a few places to make the patchwork less obvious. King also omitted all Swift's notes. The result, despite the adventitious material, was a shorter piece than the author had intended: Swift's original poem, in all likelihood, consisted of 484 lines; King's version, published by Charles Bathurst in January 1738/39, contains 381.

The differences between the two versions have been expatiated upon in Herbert Davis, "Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift," *The Book Collector's Quarterly*, Vol. I, No. 2 (1931), pp. 67-71; and Sir Harold Williams, (ed.), *The Poems of Jonathan Swift* (3 vols.; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1958), Vol. II, pp. 551-553. The date of composition is given as "November, 1731" in the title page of the version published in Dublin by George Faulkner, but Sir Harold Williams has shown that parts of the poem and its notes were completed later.
The earliest surviving intimation that the Verses on the
Death of Dr. Swift was about to appear in print is contained in
King's letter to Lord Orrery of July 8, 1738; it shows that King
at one time intended to have the poem published in September or
October of 1738: "Roch is in the press, and shall certainly be
published in September or the beginning of the next Term. I
believe I mentioned to you the accidents which had retarded the
publication of this work so long, when I had the honour of seeing
you last." 26 For some unknown reason publication was delayed:
perhaps King already suspected that his emendations would incur
Swift's displeasure. There is no doubt about his suspicions in his
letter to the Dean of January 5, 1738/39:

At length I have put Rochefaucault to the press,
and about ten or twelve days hence it will be published.
But I am in great fear lest you should dislike the liberties
I have taken. Although I have done nothing without the
advice and approbation of those among your friends in this
country, who love and esteem you most, and zealously interest
themselves in every thing that concerns your character. As
they are much better judges of mankind than I am, I very
readily submitted to their opinion . . . . 27

26. Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 4. "Roch", of course,
stands for Rochefoucault; it occurs in the first couplet of the
poem:

As Rochefoucault his Maxims drew
From Nature, I believe 'em true . . . .

27. Harold Williams, (ed.), The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift
p. 133.
In subsequent correspondence King defended his decisions in some detail. Writing to Swift on the following January 23 he explained: "..... I may urge the approbation of the public as some kind of apology for myself, if I shall find you are dissatisfied with the form in which this poem now appears." 28 In his letters to Mrs. Whiteway of January 30 and March 6, 1738/39, he expatiated further: "..... I am in some pain about Rochefoucauld [sic], and doubt much whether he will be satisfied with the manner in which he finds it published; to which I consented in deference to Mr. Pope's judgment, and the opinion of others of the Dean's friends in this country, who, I am sure, love and honour him ...... " Specific reasons are given for some particular omissions, e.g.:

The last two lines,

That kingdom he hath left his debtor,
I wish it soon may have a better -
I omitted because I did not well understand them; a better what? - There seems to be what the grammarians call an antecedent wanting for that word; for neither kingdom or debtor will do, so as to make it sense, and there is no other antecedent. The Dean is, I think, without exception, the best and most correct writer of English that hath ever yet appeared as an author; I was therefore unwilling any thing should be cavilled at as ungrammatical.

As King had suspected, Swift was indeed displeased, and with some justice, at the maimed version of his poem published in London. The Dean again approached George Faulkner, this time with more success than in the roughly comparable case of the Four Last Years of the Queen.

28. Ibid., p. 135. The two following quotations are drawn from pp. 136f, 140.
Faulkner published the poem in Dublin, without cuts but with many blanks, under the title Verses on the Death of Dr. S———, D.S.P.D. Copies of this edition were soon reaching London. King's reactions to this development, as he explained them on March 6, 1738/39, are understandable:

I was not a little mortified yesterday, when the bookseller brought me the Dublin edition, and at the same time put into my hands a letter he had received from Faulkner, by which I perceive the Dean is much dissatisfied with our manner of publication, and that so many lines have been omitted .... Faulkner hath sent over several other copies to other booksellers; so that I take it for granted this poem will soon be reprinted here from the Dublin edition .... 29

King's prediction was not fulfilled: the poem was reprinted in London by Bathurst on several subsequent occasions, but not from the Dublin edition. 30 After the affair of the Four Last Years of the Queen there is no evidence of further intercourse between King and Swift. The former's letter of January 23, 1738/39, was the last surviving piece of correspondence to pass between them.

The editing of these two manuscripts of Swift could not have taken a great deal of time. Most of King's energy in the literary field during this period must have been spent on the composition of his several political satires in Latin verse. The first of these, Miltonis Epistola ad Pollionem, appeared in two separate folio editions...

29. Ibid., p. 139.

30. Four editions of the Four Last Years of the Queen were published by Bathurst in 1739. The second edition is in two folio printings differently set; the third also appeared in folio. Another un-numbered edition appeared in octavo. In 1741 a second octavo edition was issued. The complete text of the poem was in fact not printed with accuracy until Sir Harold Williams' edition of 1958.
in 1738. A free translation into English verse under the title
Milton's Epistle to Pollio was published in 1740; it may or may not
have been made by King. The Latin text was revised and reset for
the Opera. There are thus three separate Latin texts of the poem,
and one version in English.

This poem purports to be a work of John Milton which in the 1738
editions has been edited and illustrated with notes by F.S.
Cantabrigiensis, a pseudonym which is not used later. Milton is here
supposed to be addressing Pollio, whose Latin name represents that of
Sir Patrick Hume, first Earl of Marchmont and Baron Polwarth (1641-1724).
A Scottish Presbyterian, he became, after a turbulent early career, a
steadfast supporter of William III and a staunch anti-Jacobite. Sir
Harold Williams has suggested that the use of Milton's name in addressing
Lord Polwarth may have been determined by the fact that a Patrick Hume,
who edited an edition of Paradise Lost for Jacob Tonson, is said to have
been a member of the family of Hume of Polwarth. 31 It could also have
been prompted by the contemporary popularity of Milton's works: they
were widely read and discussed, while a lengthy controversy on his prose
writings had been waged in the summer months of 1738 in the Gentleman's
Magazine, stirred up by the appearance of Thomas Birch's edition in
March of that year. At about the same time John Dalton's revised
acting version of Comus, set to music by Dr. Thomas Arne, was being
well received by large audiences. In Westminster Abbey a bust of

Milton had been erected in 1737, and was now an object of considerable attention. Furthermore the practice had developed in English schools of setting portions of Milton's works for translation into Latin: King was no doubt fully aware of the poet's usefulness to schoolmasters.

Even so, the fact that so convinced a Jacobite as King should associate himself sympathetically with the name of England's principal republican poet, popular though he was, may seem surprising. This paradox is best explained as being a result of the political conditions of the time. Jacobites saw themselves as the victims of Whig tyranny, and in that respect could associate themselves with the puritans of the previous century, whose position under the Stuart monarchs was in some respects comparable to their own position under the Hanoverians. The Tories had produced no poet of the calibre of Milton, so in the exigencies of the political situation he was "adopted" by some of them for the sake of his teachings on liberty. And King quite possibly saw in Lord Polwarth an individual whose disposition towards the Stuarts was, mutatis mutandis, strikingly similar to his own attitude towards the Whigs. His admiration for this militant Scottish peer was probably stimulated by his friendship for Lord Polwarth's son, the second Earl of Marchmont, who, toward the end of his life became a Tory, and to whom King dedicated his Sermo Pedestris.

The *Miltonis Epistola ad Pollionem* would be a more meaningful work if we knew the specific personal allusions intended in the names which King liberally scattered throughout the poem. Their significance was realized in his own day, as King explains in his letter to Swift of January 23, 1738/39: "..... although that piece has escaped the state inquisition, by being written in a language that is not at present very well understood at court, and might perhaps puzzle the attorney-general to explain, yet the scope of the poem and principal characters being well understood, the author must hereafter expect no mercy, if he gives his enemies any grounds or colour to attack him." 33 Cademus is undoubtedly Dean Swift; Pollio, Lord Polwarth; and Pallas, Sir Robert Walpole; but beyond these allusions it is difficult at this distance in time to be specific. In the notes King provides deliberately vague or misleading explanations of most of these names; he gives little or no clue to any particular individual. An incomplete key in an eighteenth-century hand has been written into the margins of the copy in the University Library, Cambridge, *Editio Altera*, Syn. 4. 73. 51, but it is not consistently reliable (Pallas, for example, is indicated as referring to Lord Oxford), and in places it is illegible. In the absence of an authoritative key to this work, inevitably some of its significance is now lost. The fact that contemporaries of the author were intended even though the poem was supposed to have been written by

Milton does not present any insuperable problem: King’s text taken literally does not contain anachronisms except in the matter of the conventional use of classical names. In any case, the attribution of authorship to John Milton is so transparent that few readers with any degree of perception could have been deluded; when King included the second recension of this work in the Opera, he ipso facto abandoned all extrinsic attempt to disown its authorship.

In comparing the separate versions of this poem, one notices certain significant differences. The two editions of 1738 both carry a two page dedication in Latin to Alexander Pope in which the pseudonymous editor indicates that the love of liberty which permeates the poem is a strong reason for ascribing it to Milton:

Bene compertum est mihi, scriptam fuisse hanc epistolam a MILTONE nostro; quo anno incertum ... .

This dedication is not prefixed to the translation of 1740 or to the version in the Opera. The 1738 editions extend to 209 lines; that of the Opera contains 222 and an additional prose postscript which incorporates the substance of the dedication without any mention of Pope’s name. The elimination of all reference to Pope is hardly surprising; it is clear from King’s Anecdotes that their relationship was not always one of mutual admiration.

The two editions of 1738 are distinctly different settings, though there are no significant textual changes. In the Opera the text has been reset with a rather large number of textual changes. Many of these are matters of style and phraseology, some are amplifications, and others seem to have no special importance beyond the author’s personal
caprice. A few inexplicable changes may well have been made for
good reason, but the thinking that motivated them is now obscure.

For example, the first sentence of the poem in the 1738 versions
reads:

Si vis ingenii, mihi si concessa potestas
Carminis, aut tibi qualis inest facundia, dignas,
CADENO quas ante meo, tibi dicere laudes
Inciperem, & Phoebum spirans, & plenus amico,
POLLIO, magna tuae facerem praeconia vitae.

The corresponding sentence in the Opera reads:

Si vis ingenii, mihi si concessa potestas
Carminis, aut, qualis Cadeno, spiritus esset,
Dum canit uxorem, aut patriam defendere doctus
Aggreditur vates, meritas tibi dicere laudes
Inciperem; & Phoebum spirans, & plenus amico,
POLLIO, magna tuae facerem praeconia vitae.

Is any significance to be attributed to the fact that King's final
recension, prepared after Swift's death, contains an obvious reference
to Stella as the Dean's wife?

There is no story in this poem; narrative was in any case not King's
forte. The Miltonis Epistola is essentially a collection of escharotic
laments on the corruption of the Whig government, and the venality of the
times in general. After the critical invocation to Pollio, Milton is
made to say:

O si tam superis cordi populique patrumque,
Quam tibi, jura forent!

The evils of the time are roundly attributed to Sir Robert Walpole:

Pallanti quid non licitum est? Venalia cuncta,
Pax, bellum, leges, divi, monimenta parentum,
Et nati natorum, & qui nascentur ab illis.

Some of the qualities of the ideal monarch are related:
Monarchs in general are exhorted to consult their people's good, and, in a footnote, the Emperor of China is held up as a model:

Sinarum Rex est tanquam paterfamilias, sic populum curans & fovens, ut si omnes ex seipso nati essent; sic in omnium oculis vivens & imperans, ut si patriae, non sibi ipse natus esset.

In the text is quoted the law on which, King says, all Chinese welfare depends:

Summa SALLUS POPULI lex esto, & summa piorum Relligio, summa haec eadem quoque gloria regum.

In contradistinction the Spanish monarchy is singled out for special attack. Milton is represented as saying that if Philip of Spain were to approach the Emperor of China with a view to a federation of their domains, the "pater Sinae" would thus reply:

Qui procul a nobis, semper procul este, latrones Crudeles, avidi, meditantes bella, rapinas, Atque virum strages, quies pacem et munera fertis! Cursatur terras omnes, maria omnia circum; Nempe unus regem vestrum non continet orbis, Nec locus est scleri summo. Quid America vobis? Quid gemini fecisse juvat certamina mundi? An tanti sunt fulva metalla? Latere volentes Effodiuntur opes: operi deus instat Iberus Infando; utque unum valeat ditare tyrannum, En, terras populat late, insontesque Penates; Atque nefas suadet, quantum haud molitur Erinnyas!

The Emperor of China then goes on to comment on Spenser's Mother Hubberd's Tale, which, he explains, has a moral. It soon becomes clear that the monkey is George II; the fox, Walpole; and the lion, the Old Pretender. The conclusion is then drawn:
Ni deus intersit vindex, reducemque leonem
Gratatus, miserae reddat sua gaudia genti.

In the notes it is further explained that the lion is also intended as a symbol of liberty:

Insignia regia leonis, dum altum dormit, furatus est simius & clam eripuit, quibus ornatus leonem simulavit, regnum occupavit, & vulpi permisit. At tandem Deus aliquis leonem expergefacit, increpat, reducit, & inducit in regnum suum. Sic in fabula. Recte an perperam interpreter, existimes velim, mi lector, REDUCEM LEONEM hieroglyphicum esse LIBERTATIS signum, quippe nihil timet, neque suspicax est, neque limis spectat, neque ad dormiendum in loca remota & secretas secedit; quippe denique gratus est, & memor accepti beneficij.

In a passage of considerable grandeur, Milton is made to comment that if Caesar could conquer the whole earth, he would still lust for greater power:

Si terrae vinceret orbem,
Lunam affectaret; posset deducere lunam,
Stultitia peteret coelos, sive Ossan Olympo
Impomat, falsus tonitru seu terreat urbem
Salmoneus, magnique Jovis sibi vindicet aras. 34

Towards the close of the poem, the question is raised whether any reverence remains for Magna Carta:

An, quae cecidit (nam credimus omnes)
E coelo, nulla est sacrae reverentiae chartae?

No direct answer is provided, but the implication in the verses that follow is that liberty must constantly be striven for and guarded, and the reader is warned in capital letters:

CANDIDA LIBERTAS NUNQUAM RESPEXIT INERTES.

34. Does Caesar here represent George II? Or the Holy Roman Emperor? Or the kings of the earth in general? In Antonietti Epistola ad Corsos of 1744 the name "Caesar" is used for Charles VII, Elector of Bavaria.
The poem concludes with an obscure reference to a *pious vates*, said in the notes to be Dr. Donne, though doubtless King had someone else – perhaps Swift or Pope – in mind who often

\[ \text{Haec eadem cecinit, cum tendit Apollinis arcum,} \\
\text{Cum patriae, cum diis violantis adwent ultor.} \]

Thus ends King's first extended poem in Latin dactylic hexameter. The principal characteristics of his later political satires in the same language and meter are already present and well developed: the use of a generally impeccable classical diction and vocabulary, the obvious indebtedness to the best poets of the Augustan age, the highly polished technical sophistication, and the acrid condemnation of everything in the contemporary political scene which did not harmonize with his idealistic Tory and Jacobite principles. Some of his verses have a remarkably caustic power, especially when he adopts the genuine Miltonic technique of filling them with thundering epithets of condemnation:

\[ \ldots.. \text{latrones} \\
\text{Crudeles, avidi, meditantes bella, rapinas,} \\
\text{Atque virum strages, queis pacem et munera fertis!} \]

Even though King is mordant in his vituperations, his tone is always lofty and unquestionably sincere. In the *Miltonis Epistola ad Pollionem* he amply demonstrated that the contemporary policies of the high Tories and the nobility of the classical dactylic hexameter were capable of a very fine degree of synthesis.

If one may believe King's later reminiscences, the *Miltonis Epistola ad Pollionem* enjoyed a wide readership: "As this was
a political satire, and nothing in the same manner had been
published before in this country, it was universally read by those
who either understood, or pretended to understand the language, and
was frequently extolled or condemned according to the prejudice of
party: there was not a courtier, or a creature of the prime minister's,
who did not set himself up as a profound critic, and censured the style
of a composition which perhaps he could not read." 35 King's comment
that nothing in the manner of this work had been published before in
England was perfectly justified: there had been any amount of political
satire in English, but the Miltonis Epistola had no real predecessor.
Prior to the end of the seventeenth century the principal topic of
satire among British writers of Latin had been religion: George
Buchanan's Franciscanus and Henry Oxlinden's Religionis Funus constitute
examples of this type of literature. King was the first Anglo-Latin
satirist to choose the contemporary political scene as his principal
subject.

For some time after King's death the Miltonis Epistola ad
Pollionem continued to be popular among readers of Latin, and was re-
printed by Edward Popham in Volume I of his Selecta Poemata Anglorum
Latina, published at Bath in 1774. Together with King's text Popham
also published a short ode entitled Ad F.S. Epistolae Miltonianae
Editorem, composed by an anonymous author. It demonstrates the kind
of adulatory sentiments that King's work could on occasion elicit from

his supporters:

Numine to sacro bis terque afflavit Apollo;  
Et tua musa placet.  
Anne faventis adhuc dubitas tu candida famae  
Omnia? Pone metum.  
Multis spectatur Venusinae porta Corinthi,  
Non ineunda tamen;  
Hunc ars destituit, natura benignior illum:  
Attamen ipse ratem  
Impellit, felix et fidentissimus idem,  
Saxa per aequorea;  
Perque procellosas syrtes, et per vada caeca,  
Calliopea tibi  
Pandit iter liquidum. - Salve, doctissime vates;  
Gloria gentis, ave!

It is also of some significance that the celebrated classicist and bibliographer Michael Maittaire became involved in the post-publication discussions on the purity of King's Latin style. Hume Campbell, the former Lord Register of Scotland, and Nathaniel Hooke, the author of the Roman History from the Building of Rome to the Ruin of the Commonwealth, decided to approach Maittaire on the subject. Having studied the poem, Maittaire marked eleven expressions as unclassical. Campbell and Hooke communicated these opinions to the author in Oxford. King thus explains how he dealt with these criticisms:

The same evening, by return of the post, I answered nine of MAITTAIRE'S exceptions, and produced all my authorities from Virgil, Ovid, and Tibullus; and by the post following I sent authorities for the other two. I could not help remarking that Maittaire, some little time before, had published new editions of those poets, from whence I drew my authorities, and had added a very copious index to every author; and in these indexes were to be found most of the phrases to which he had excepted in the MILTONIS EPISTOLA. 36

36. Ibid., p. 152f.
King's relationship with Hooke has been the cause of some erroneous statements in the past, especially in the matter of the latter's translation of *Les Voyages de Cyrus* from the French of Sir Andrew Ramsay. Gordon Goodwin, basing his statement on the *Literary Anecdotes* of John Nichols, indicates in the *Dictionary of National Biography* that in 1738 King met Hooke at Dr. Cheyne's house at Bath, and often acted as his amanuensis while he was engaged on the translation. 37 The difficulty about Goodwin's assertion is that it does not harmonize with the following facts:

(1) *Les Voyages de Cyrus* appeared in English in 1727, i.e. the same year as the publication of the French edition in Paris. 38 Subsequent editions of the translation appeared in 1730 and 1739.

(2) Joseph Spence in his *Anecdotes, Observations, and Characters, of Books and Men* wrote thus: "Ramsay's Cyrus was translated by Mr. Hooke in twenty days. Mr. Hooke was then at Bath for his health; and Dr. Cheyne's brother was so good as to write for him". 39

(3) Nichol's statement contains no reference to the year 1738. It reads: "In 1739 he published a Translation of Ramsay's Travels of Cyrus, in 4to. Dr. King, the celebrated Principal of St. Mary Hall in Oxford, informed


Dr. Warton that Hooke's Translation of the Travels of Cyrus was made at Dr. Cheyne's house at Bath, and that he himself had often been Hooke's amanuensis on the occasion, who dictated his Translation to him with uncommon facility and rapidity."

This problem is aggravated by the additional fact that in no edition of the English translation is reference made to any author or translator other than Ramsay himself; Spence lamented that the translation was "generally mistaken for an original for a good while after it was published", and added: "Almost everybody then, and many still imagine, that Ramsay himself had written it in English, as well as in French."

As far as it is now possible to solve the problem, I suggest that Nichols made a mistake in the date, and that numbers of other writers following him have either repeated the same mistake or made others based on it. Hooke's translation must have been made in 1727. Whether the translation was written by King or by Dr. Cheyne's brother is a more difficult problem, but Nichols' use of the word "often" provides a useful clue. What probably happened was that, when he was not in Oxford or Ireland in 1727, King was in a position to visit Hooke at Dr. Cheyne's house in Bath, and while there often acted as the amanuensis; at other times Dr. Cheyne's brother would have filled the same role, and could also have written the final copy for the printer. Though this solution is speculative, it does at least square with all the known facts.

There is no doubt that King was well acquainted with both Hooke and Ramsay. He wrote in his Anecdotes of his friendship with Hooke,
the elder of whose two sons, Thomas, entered St. Mary Hall in 1742, where he is described in the Matriculation Register as the "son of the Historian of Rome." Ramsay, that remarkable son of a Scottish baker, who travelled over the continent, entered the Catholic Church under the guidance of François Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai, and for a little over a year acted as tutor in Rome to the two sons of the Old Chevalier, was admitted by King to St. Mary Hall in 1728, and awarded the degree of LL.D. by the University of Oxford in the same year. Fénelon's saying "I love mankind better than my country", was recounted, together with a delightful story about the distinguished Archbishop by Ramsay to King, who later included it in his Anecdotes with one of his most gracious compliments: "Who amongst all the modern writers is to be more esteemed and admired than Monsieur Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai, and author of Telemachus; whose piety, politeness and humanity, were equal to his great learning?" Ramsay, in King's own words, "hath ever made me reverence the memory of this excellent man."

The sequel to King's Miltonis Epistola ad Pollionem appeared in 1739 under the title Sermo Pedestris. Two folio editions were published in this year: each contains 308 lines with only very minor differences between them. A third version appeared in the Opera: the text and notes are reset and to a certain extent rewritten, though

40. Political and Literary Anecdotes (2d ed., 1819), p. 19f. A slightly different version of the same anecdote is to be found in Spence, op. cit., p. 20f.
there are no major changes. This second recension contains 307 lines. Edmund Curll at the end of the translation of King's Scannum, Ecloga, which he published in 1744, perhaps subsequent to an earlier edition, promised a forthcoming translation of Sermo Pedestris; there is actually no evidence that any English version ever appeared. The two editions of 1739 are prefixed by a two page dedication to A.H.C., which is omitted entirely from the final revision. As in the case of Miltonis Epistola ad Pollionem, the full significance of Sermo Pedestris is lost to modern readers by the lack of a reliable key. In the margins of the copy in the University Library, Cambridge, Editio Altera, Syn. 4, 73.5 ² a key has been inserted by the same hand that wrote the key to Miltonis Epistola, but again its dependability is questionable.

The dedication is a magisterial piece of prose addressed to Alexander Hume-Campbell, second Earl of Marchmont, the eldest surviving son of the Lord Polwarth to whom the Miltonis Epistola ad Pollionem is addressed. Like King he was a lawyer, having studied in exile at the University of Utrecht, and under the Hanoverians had held a number of responsible positions including those of Ambassador to the court of Copenhagen and Lord Clerk Register of Scotland. He had also been one of the British ambassadors to the Congress of Cambrai in 1722, a sworn member of the English privy council, and one of the Scottish representative peers. However, in 1733 he had opposed Walpole's excise scheme, partly in the hope that, by joining with the Prime-Minister's opponents, he might assist in the weakening of Lord Islay's power in Scotland. The bill was dropped, but Walpole was not inclined to forgive those Whigs who
had opposed him. Several were later deprived of their offices; in the process Lord Marchmont was dismissed from his appointment of Lord Clerk Register and was not re-elected in 1734 as a representative peer. He consequently played a part in the unsuccessful attempt to deprive the government of its power to intervene in the election of the Scottish peers, and soon afterwards joined the Tories.

The fact that both King and Lord Marchmont were actively opposed to Walpole may well have brought them together in the first place. In the second half of the 1730's they met frequently; in this way King presumably made the acquaintance of his son Hugh, subsequently the third Earl of Marchmont and a trenchant critic of Walpole's administration. The second Earl died on February 27, 1739/40, but in a letter addressed to his successor and dated February 29, 1739/40, Pope enquires: "What hour shall I meet Dr King tomorrow?", as if he expected the new Lord Marchmont to be conversant with King's movements. The same attitude is displayed again by Pope in a similar letter of January 9, 1740/41. It is not clear whether the third Earl succeeded before the publication of Sermo Pedesbris; if he did, the chances are likely that his father never set eyes on the completed text or on the dedication to himself.

The virtues of the second Lord Marchmont, now that he had been converted to Toryism, are extolled by King in some detail. He is generally agreed by contemporary observers to have been a most capable parliamentary orator, an opinion which King corroborates in his dedication:

Amor patriae, & libertatis tuendae commune studium, quae senibus vires, arma & animos foeminis ministrant, te fecerunt oratorem, & me poetam.

The historical logic of this statement is, of course, questionable. Lord Marchmont was certainly an orator in his Whig days when, according to the approved Jacobite rationale, he would have had little or no libertatis tuendae studium, but there is no record that King was ever called upon to explain this inconsistency. When the dedication was being written, Marchmont seems to have been well-nigh faultless:

Jam diu est, quod te diligere coepi, quia probus es, & doctus, & comis, & liberalis; jam nunc, quia optime de Republica meritus es, teque colere & venerari.

In contradistinction to these excellencies, King is suitably humble about his own achievement in this poem:

Nihil igitur hic reperies splendidum aut excelsum, sed tenuiora omnia & leviora.

But at least the author was not writing for love of money or for personal glory:

Neque ego, ut scis, lucri aliquid peto, cujus non indiget temperantia mea, neque gloriam ex libellis meis me capturum spero; nisi quae, praemium virtutis, bonis omnibus absque invidia deseratur: Qualem & pietas tua, & sociorum tuorum consilia vobis detulerunt.
And the dedication closes with a statement of King’s overall artistic intention:

_Hoc unum vero diligenter curavi, ut Musa mea & pudica & sani coloris, ut est, esse videatur, nullo delationi loco relictō, sed neque dubitationi._

Whether or not one considers King’s muse to be _pudica et sani coloris_ in this work, there is no doubt that this is a less forceful piece of writing than the _Miltonis Epistola_. It is almost a hundred lines longer than the earlier poem, and takes the form of a dialogue between F.S. (Frederick Scheffer or William King) and A.A., his imaginary opponent. F.S. commences the poem by stating that there are some to whom the _Miltonis Epistola_ was displeasing, and in a note printed only in the _Opera_ version adds an obscure allusion to the burning of a copy or copies: _Scilicet quo in viis publicis, curiae decreto, comburatur Miltonis epistola_. F.S. continues to lament the difficulty of finding an acceptable subject about which to write poetry:

_quid faciam, si nec recitare poemata, doctus Quae cecinit vates, Carolo regnante; nec ausim Diis patriis, laticesque meis, sua dona, Camoenis Castalios libare, novumque intendere carmen?_

A.A. tries to be helpful:

_at tibi Pindaricos numeros tentare licebit. Tale tuum fiat carmen._

He makes a number of suggestions for topics drawn from the scene of contemporary European politics; one proposal is to write about Caesar Germanicus, said in the notes to the _Opera_ recension to be the Emperor, Charles VI:
This notion is further embellished:

Manibus da lilia plenis
Gallica, & intexens gemmis auroque, superbis
Necte coronam aquilis.

Other subjects then follow.

One is here impressed by the relative fullness of the notes in the Opera version. King was clearly not inclined to take undue risks in 1739 by being too specific in his references. Thus in the editions of that year A.A. makes the opaque exhortation to F.S.:

Tum plectro majore canas Juvenemque, Senemque,
which could be variously interpreted in terms of the verses which follow. In the Opera it is explained that the young man is Louis XV and the old man Cardinal Fleury. King is, of course, using Swift's protective device of deliberate obscurity. He did not feel at liberty to abandon it completely even in the Opera; some of his notes are so vague as to be merely bewildering. Very likely some of King's readers knew whom the author meant by Horatius, but the uninformed could puzzle over the footnote interminably without reaching one undeniable solution:

Ne in hoc nomine, mi lector, erres, te monitum volo,
Horatium hunc neque Romanum esse, neque poetam,
neque Musis anicum, neque philosophum, neque
divitiarum contemptorem, neque tumultibus urbanis
alienum; sed foederum, indiciarum, pacis & belli
oratorem nervosum, volubilem, canorum, consummatum;
aequalitatis, aequabilitatis, aequanimitatis,
eaquilibratatis judicem unicum.
F.S. is not impressed by A.A.'s proposals:

EHEU, non nostrum est festum componere carmen;
Nec fas Heroas cuivis celebrare poetae,
Quales nunc aequus praefecit Jupiter orbi!

The use of *fas* is a clue to the message that is to follow: all the topics suggested by A.A. turn out to be unlawful. Pastorals in the manner of Virgil are proposed, and F.S. can only reply:

HEU, quid formosi canerem pastoris amores?

He then goes on to make his own decision:

Conabor tragicus decora alta inducere scenae.

But this time it is A.A.'s turn to be pessimistic:

Ah! vetitum aggrederis; nec fas intrare theatrum:
Silicet id curat camerarius.

King does not specifically say so, but I suspect that he intends *camerarius* to mean "Lord Chamberlain". This interpretation harmonizes with the footnote in the *Opera* edition:

Gravi jam senatus consulto scena histrionibus interdicitur,
siquam novam fabulam acturi sunt; nisi hanc ipsam legat,
& perlegat, & perpensam & exploratum habeat, & diplomate
suo muniat magnus camerarius.

These thoughts lead F.S. and A.A. to a lengthy discussion of official censorship. Both speakers nourish an antipathy towards it. In a note which appears only in the *Opera* version, it is manifest that the same kind of practice is not unknown in France:

Divinus ille vir, suae gentis gloria, ille Fenelon
Cameracensis archiepiscopus, postquam immortale illud
opus, Telemachi historiam, ediderat, calumniam &
malignitatem aulicorum eludere non potuit; neque rex
suus, Ludovicus XIV, liberam ejus vocem, aut vultum
pati.

The general conclusion is that the only course of action which is
not unlawful is to write in praise of the government:

At postquam tibi fas magnis praeludere rebus, Gratiisque omnis ineest sermonibus, & satis ipsi Te tibi consulere est aequum, monitoris egentem Nullius .....

All manner of rewards will follow, even a bishopric:

Divitiis auctus nummos in foenore ponas: Hortos, praedia emas: Etiam coelestia tentes Aemulus Ambrosii, titulisque ornatus & ostro Incodas, Divis vel par vel proximus ipsis.

In the notes it is explained that Ambrose was the Bishop of Milan in the time of Theodosius and Honorius: Nihil vero tam dissimile, quam Ambrosius noster * * * ensis, & ille alter Mediolanensis episcopus. The author does not fill the gap: he could be referring to almost any of the contemporary Whig bishops. But the sarcastic force of the final eight lines is quite clear: prelacies go with political subservience.

Attonitus nec in hoc stupras, dubitesve modestus, Tale quod oblatum vberit tibi munus inepto. Quid mirum; si ultra cupiens fortuna jocari, Quae modo plebeio fasces, magnumque tribunal Infido scurrae permisit iniqua regendum; Quae fabro donavit opes & rhetoris artem, Pistori pallam, Cyclopi praemia scribae, Et mimo lauros, tibi dicat, Episcopus esto?

It is questionable whether Sermo Pedestrins, considered as a piece of poetry, is as successful as Miltonis Epistola ad Pollionem. What King published in 1739 was essentially a dialogic argument in verse: it is polished and carefully constructed, but the eristic subject is hardly one which lends itself naturally to poetical treatment. The reader is, in a sense, led from anti-climax to anti-climax; as he follows
the course of the polemic from one speaker to the other he gradually realizes, perhaps with disappointment, that no novum carmen is going to follow. The discussion itself has no real depth: it is in general a collection of expressions of indignation against what King regarded as unjust restrictions on the freedom of the contemporary writer. Sermo Pedestris, though like all of King's serious verse a consummate piece of Latinity, does not fully succeed either as poetry or as dialectic.

To determine whether King followed any particular archetype when he was composing Sermo Pedestris is difficult if not impossible. The form of the dactylic hexameter dialogue is, of course, derived from Theocritus and Vergil, but King's poem is not, strictly speaking, an eclogue, and its matter has no classical precedent. It does bear a certain resemblance to such contemporary vernacular dialogues as Pope's Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot, which, since it was published in 1735, King had in all probability read. But Sermo Pedestris is severely academic in tone, and is clearly intended for a readership more limited than Pope's. Furthermore King, since he was writing in Latin, could not imitate the style of Pope or of any other writer in the indigenous tongue. It is more likely that he regarded Sermo Pedestris and his roughly comparable work Monitor of 1749 as being, at least partly, in the tradition of Latin dialogue satires which the Oxford function of Encaenia had indirectly helped to sustain. One of the most successful of these was a satire on the South Sea Bubble in Latin verse entitled
Commencium ad Mare Australe, written by Herbert Randolph, a don of Christ Church, and published in 1720, the year after King had been elected Principal of St. Mary Hall. This spirited poem contains a long discussion among three speakers — Marcellus, Crassus, and Eubulus — in which Crassus accuses Eubulus of being unpatriotic because he will not invest in the stock of the South Sea Company. In the end Marcellus, completely won over by the arguments of Crassus, departs for the Stock Exchange, paying no heed to Eubulus's eloquent picture of the inevitable day of reckoning. Sermo Pedestris is much closer in spirit and formal structure to Randolph's dialogue than it is to any comparable poem in English.

Flattering though the dedication of this poem to the second Earl of Marchmont undoubtedly is, King's powers as a Latinist were not sufficient to prevent a later rift between himself and the third Earl. The resignation of Walpole in February 1742 removed one of the principal obstacles to agreement between Hugh Lord Marchmont and the Whig administration. He supported the government and the protestant succession during the rising of 1745, and, one may assume, had less and less to do with his father's Jacobite admirer. On March 24, 1746/47, Lord Marchmont wrote to John, Earl of Westmoreland:

I have seen Dr. King. He is well and seems to expect us not to continue with his (Jacobite) friends. I joking confirm'd our aversion to that cause and caution'd him against the folly. 42

There is no subsequent evidence that King's relationship with the third Earl was further maintained.

While he was engaged in the publication of *Sermo Pedestris*, King was also contributing towards the cost of rebuilding the chancel of St. Mary's Church, Ealing. During the 1730's the fabric of the church had been allowed to fall into decay, and services were regularly held in a temporary timber structure erected by voluntary contributions. Towards the end of the decade work was started on the reconstruction of the church, an Act of Parliament was passed "to enable the Parishioners of Ealing in the County of Middlesex, to raise money by Rates upon themselves for finishing the Church of the said Parish", and a Board of Trustees was appointed to supervise the arrangements. William King's name appears as one of the original trustees together with those of the Lord Bishop of London, Lord Hobart, Sir Richard Ellis, Sir Francis Child, Sir George Champion, Sir William Hatton, William Pulteney, William Melmoth, and some two dozen others including Dr. Thomas Mangey, the Vicar of the parish and Chancellor of the diocese. On King's activities as Trustee only one tantalizingly incomplete piece of evidence survives, drawn from the Minutes of Vestry for Ealing Church and Churchyard, 1739 to 1744. Repeated searches have failed to trace this particular volume, but a short quotation from it, for May 26, 1739, is given in Edith Jackson's *Annals of Ealing*. On this day, at a meeting of the Trustees, we are told "that Dr. King proposed to meet the Churchwardens to stake out the ground next week, and how far the chancel extends." He also proposed "to pay yearly such rate or tax equivalent
with other persons proportionally to £180 per annum, in consideration of the Trustees finishing his chancel."  

At least part of King's time in May 1739 was spent in London, if one may believe what the young John Cotton wrote in a letter to Sanderson Miller in that month from "Gidding, Huntingdonshire":

... I saw Dr. King the night before and that was the first time we could meet, I had been twice at the Temple and twice at Tom's Coffee House to enquire for him .... but without success, and they forgot my name at the Coffee House and only told the Dr. a young gentleman had been twice to enquire for him upon which he imagined that it might be Mr. [Deane] Swift whom he knew to be in Town ...... 44

Cotton then laments the fact that he will have to travel northwards alone, suggesting that he should follow the Doctor's example in such circumstances: "I must do like the Dr. and call to Guillot as he to Peter; - 'Guillot, put up the Petronious [sic], will you have any more room?' - 'Yes, Sir'. - 'Put in Caesar and now try to get Sallust into that Corner, riding but ill agree with the present state of my body'."

43. Edith Jackson, *Annals of Ealing* (London: Phillimore & Co., 1898), p. 170f. This author claims that King was Rector of Ealing from 1739 to 1761. I believe this information is wrong: even if he fulfilled some of the secular functions of the Rector, the evidence is that the Rector in canonical theory remained the Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral, as long as the ultimate ownership of the property remained vested in the chancellorship. This matter is referred to again in Appendix VI.

44. This and the following quotation are drawn from Lilian Dickins and Mary Stanton (eds.), *op.cit.*, p. 12f. The letter is dated only "May, 1739." Tom's Coffee House may well be the establishment in Devereux Court near Temple Bar which Pope visited and in which Edmund Curll at one time had a controlling interest. Several other coffee houses of the same name were in existence in 1739; Bryant Lillywhite's *London Coffee Houses* provides descriptions, pp. 580-596.
do not forget the Common Prayer Book." It is not surprising to learn that, when the Principal of St. Mary Hall travelled, he was supplied with classical reading matter.

King also spent a certain amount of the same month — May 1739 — with Pope as a guest of Lord Orrery at his country seat of Marston in Somerset. Pope mentioned the fact in a postscript to his letter to Swift of May 17, 1739:

This I end at Lord Orrery's, in company with Dr King. Where-ever I can find two or three that are yours, I adhere to them naturally, & by that Title they become mine. 45

On the following July 2 King was back at St. Mary Hall, and, as he explained to Lord Orrery, preparing to see Marston again:

This fortnight past I have been on a journey of business and did not return to this place till last night, when I had the favour of your kind letter from Marston. Tho' I have scarce had time to look round our Hall, and tho' I find that riding but ill agrees with the present frame of my body, yet I am preparing for another journey. For I am determined to make you a visit before you leave Old England, as being in some doubt considering my age, and the age you intend to be absent, whether I may ever have the good fortune to see you again. 46

46. Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist.d.103, p.5. The counterpart to this collection of 46 of King's letters written between 1738 and 1745 is at the Houghton Library of Harvard University, MS. Eng.218.2. By collating the letters in these two collections, one is able to acquire a fairly full, though not complete, conspectus of both sides of the correspondence. The group of letters in the Bodleian Library remains as a whole unpublished; a number of the letters of Lord Orrery now at Harvard University were published, some in truncated form, by the Countess of Cork and Orrery in 1903. The two folio and five quarto volumes in which Lord Orrery's letters are contained were acquired by Harvard University in 1923.
Already the infirmities of which King was to complain for the rest of his life were in evidence. Gout was the principal, a malady which, despite his frequent visits to Bath, he never completely overcame. His fingers were severely affected, a fact which he himself was to remark on later, and which is evident from the steadily increasing evidence of trembling in his penmanship from about this time until the last letter which survives, written shortly before his death. His age when he indicated his determination to visit Lord Orrery again was fifty-four years: he was to comment on his mounting years with increasing frequency in the future.

King kept his word and visited Marston soon afterwards. A touching — though obviously rhetorical — tribute to him shortly after his departure was paid by Lord Orrery in a letter of August 27, 1739, written from Dublin:

> When you was gone, my dear Doctor, Marston Bowers lost all their Charms. The Leaves wither'd, the Flowers droop'd, the House-dog grew sullen, the glow Worms died, and Melancholy diffused itself throughout the whole Parish. Our Curate had thoughts of turning Methodist, and the Esquire relaps'd into the Ague by drinking Water. Mr. Scott broke his Ruler, and Twitzer talk'd of planting Thistles and Crab trees. The Harpsicord prov'd out of Tune, Lady Orrery grew hoarse, and little Kate would squeal no more.

Lord Orrery then brings up the matter, already broached at Marston, of his proposed translation of Pliny's epistles, the complete text of which appeared in two volumes, with observations and an essay on Pliny's life, in 1751, the same year as his more famous Remarks on Swift. The translation

was not to be literal. "I would make Pliny an Englishman", wrote Lord Orrery in the same letter, "I would keep up his Sense and Spirit, but I would endeavour to use such Expressions as He himself would have chose had He written in English." He also requests the favour of sending parts of his work to King from time to time for his comments.

In his reply from St. Mary Hall of September 23, 1739, King showed himself to be enthusiastic about Orrery's forthcoming translation: "I design you no compliment", he wrote, "when I add that you only are qualified for it. A Translation of Pliny's Epistles should not be attempted but by a polite Scholar and can never be well executed but by one, who very nearly resembles his author, and participates of the spirit and manners of that great Roman ... In a word Pliny is not to be translated but by one, who speaks, and writes, and thinks, and lives like Pliny." King further intimated that Lord Orrery could not send "a more acceptable present" than parts of this work, and said that he would pass on the sheets to one or two colleagues. He would himself go over the translation also: "I love you too well not to read it with a critic's eye" was his way of putting the matter.

It is impossible to gauge with any degree of precision the influence that King exerted over Orrery's Pliny. In his surviving letters to the translator, King certainly provided a plethora of sympathy and encouragement; such statements as "I approve the whole manner in which you propose to conduct this noble work", "I shall look on your Book as my favourite

mistress", "I am as certain of your success as I am that there will be
another revolution of the Sun" are typical of many others in similar vein.
There is no evidence that King ever actually rewrote any part of Orrery's
scripts, nor was any acknowledgement paid to King in the published version.
In his correspondence King offered assistance of a rather general nature,
such as promises to make "researches among the works of the Medalists and
Antiquaries for the Heads of the principal persons to whom Pliny addressed
his letters," and to advise the author on head-pieces and tail-pieces.
On one occasion he sent "a leaf I took out of a Magazine, which by the date
you see was published in 1738", and on another suggested the use of
decorations comparable to those employed in Conyers Middleton's biography,
The Life of Cicero. King's contribution to Orrery's work was probably no
more specific than these intimations imply. It would be as unfair to blame
King for the shortcomings and infelicities that this version of Pliny's
letters exhibits as it would be to praise him for its passages of undeniable
elegance. The fact that it is in places a loose paraphrase rather than a
translation is the inevitable result of its writer's avowed aim.

While Lord Orrery, with King's blessing, was making his translation of
the letters of Pliny the Younger, King's son-in-law, William Melmoth, was
also working on his English version of the same Latin work. Melmoth's
translation appeared in print in 1746: it is generally conceded to be the
superior of the two. 49 The existence of Melmoth's Pliny is undoubtedly
one reason why Orrery's Pliny has not been more widely known. It would be

49. The English translation used in the Loeb Classical Library edition of
Pliny's Letters is a revised version of Melmoth's.
interesting to know King's opinion of the relative merits of the two
translations, since he must have been well acquainted with both. Un-
fortunately no correspondence between him and his son-in-law has survived,
though in terms of consistency at least, Melmoth deserved rather more
flattery for his version than Lord Orrery did for his.

Most of the winter of 1739 to 1740 was spent by King within his
lodgings at St. Mary Hall. It was bitterly cold in Oxford. In his letter
to Lord Orrery of January 15, 1739/40, he complains that his fingers are
frozen and adds: "Here is truly such a face of Nature as I have never yet
seen, and the present Winter prospect is as fit a subject for poetry and
painting as it is for the contemplation of philosophy." 50 He continues
with an allusion to his being a teetotaller:

I have, however, the good fortune in a general scarcity
to have my Cellar well stock'd, that is, my pump is not
frozen. So that I have not only Water enough for my
own drinking, but I am able to fill all y^ Tea-kettles
and Boilers in this neighbourhood. Some Wags of my
acquaintance maintain that our Well is supply'd from
Helicon.

During this winter King wrote his third Latin political satire,
Scannum, Ecloga, which appeared in print probably in March 1740. A copy
of it was enclosed with a letter which King wrote to Lord Orrery on March
25, 1740. Together with it was an "English Thing" which is not now
identifiable. Thus King describes his most recent Latin work:

50. Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d. 103, p. 9. The following
quotation occurs on the same page.
In the Latin Eclogue I have attempted a new kind of Satire, which you may remember I mention'd to you at Marston, and which I wonder has never been practis'd by any of our modern poets: especially since Virgil hath shown us a plan for a work of this nature in most of his pastorals. One of my Shepherds you see hath ventur'd to address Your Lordship tho' without your consent in so plain a manner, that no one can mistake his meaning. To say the truth I could no longer resist the vanity of telling the World that Lord Orrery is my friend. Nay if you do not forbid it, I shall write that name at length, if this poem shall bear a second Impression.

Scannum never appeared in a second published impression. The work was revised and included in the Opera, but by the time King gathered his Latin works together for this collection, he seems to have forgotten his promise to Lord Orrery. Two English translations also appeared: one in 1741, published by Josiah Graham, and the other in 1744, published by Edmund Curll. Both of these vernacular versions are anonymous. Curll may have issued an earlier edition of his translation; if he did, no known copy has survived.

There are no great differences between the two Latin texts, though throughout the work there are minor variations. The 1740 version contains 205 lines, the Opera recension 204. The dedication to G.K.S.M. (Georgio Keith Scotiae Mareschallo), covering two folio pages, is omitted in the recension. This particular dedication provides a certain amount of flattering information about George Keith, but is more in the nature of an explanatory preface to the poem.

The eclogue, as a poetical form, has been variously cast at different times. The Greek root of the word, ἔκλογη, is not especially helpful:

51. Ibid., p. 11.
it means simply a "selection". The term is generally taken to mean a pastoral dialogue, but it cannot be defined more specifically than that. Of the thirty Idylls attributed to Theocritus — some are not genuine — eleven may be categorized as true pastorals. They were the product of the Alexandrian age, when civilization had become, in a sense, so sophisticated that some readers of poetry turned to the lives and conversation of Greek Sicilian shepherds by way of artistic respite. Theocritus wrote his eclogues in a literary adaptation of the native rustic speech of the Dorian Greeks of Sicily. The effects that he achieved were roughly comparable to those which Burns was later to accomplish by adapting the Scottish dialect for literary purposes. These Greek eclogues were not, of course, literal reproductions of native songs, but they were based on a genuine stratum of reality. The characters are real shepherds of flesh and blood engaged in singing contests or improvisations such as used to take place at Sicilian village festivals. The eclogues of Vergil and Spenser, on the other hand, idealize reality, and in doing so produce an atmosphere which is for the most part artificial. The Vergilian and Spenserian shepherds are not really shepherds at all: they are masqueraders set against a background of stylized rusticity. They may represent real persons, sometimes in political life, or may be embodiments of ideas which the poet prefers not to hint at too openly. King's eclogue is in the tradition of Vergil and Spenser, but is even more artificial than theirs. The shepherds of these artists are quite

52. I am not convinced by the theory of Léon Herrman advanced in Les Masques et les Visages dans les Bucoliques de Virgile that every name in Vergil's Eclogues always represents one and the same person.
transparent, but they do speak their native language. King's English shepherds, by speaking in Latin, are one stage further removed from reality.

King was by no means the first English writer to produce a Neo-Latin eclogue. His numerous predecessors included Thomas Watson, Giles Fletcher, Phineas Fletcher, William Gager, Richard Latewar, and William Hawkins. Nor was he the first poet to compose a satirical eclogue in Latin, for this genre had been written since the time of Mantuan. What is original about Scannum is the fact that the subject under discussion is party politics, treated in a manner which is only incidentally bucolic. The form of this poem is indeed that of the classical eclogue, but its spirit, in general, is that of the Tories-in-opposition.

King, in his dedication, makes the character of his shepherds amply clear when he writes:

Ecce tibi Pastores meos, non quidem de infima plebe, sed urbanioris notae homines; qui norunt sane, quid segetes, quid arbores agant, quid oves & boves: sed & bene hercle norunt, quae sint civium studia, procerum mores, regum consilia.

He points out that it is not alien to bucolic poetry to inveigh against

53. Of the ten eclogues of Mantuan, four are satirical (4, 5, 6, and 9). They appear in Giambattista Spagnoleti, Opera Omnia (2 vols.; Antwerp, 1576) and are reprinted in the edition of W.P. Mustard, The Eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1911). None is political, though the ninth, Falco, on the Roman Curia, influenced Spenser (in the September Aeglogue), Milton, and perhaps King.
malos, indoctos, invidos, pointing out that

Pastorum ille & poetarum princeps, dum Phyllida amat, dumque Pollioni blanditur, Bavio & Maevio ignominiae notam inussit per amnia secula indelebilem.

The princeps is, of course, Vergil, and the reference is to the third eclogue, where Menalcas is at pains to explain, "Phyllida amo ante alias." It is not King's fault that many modern classical scholars do not adhere to the view that Menalcas in this poem represents Vergil and that he personally loved Phyllis - whoever she was. But matters of identification apart, the author has followed his model closely: Polio is indeed flattered and the contemporary poets Bavius and Mevius are stigmatized during the course of Vergil's eclogue.

King continues with the question:

Ecquis autem de Ecloga nostra merito irascatur?

Here there intrudes a consciously self-righteous note: obviously anyone opposed to Jacobite principles would - at least as far as the political content of the eclogue was considered - feel irritation. But he adds:

Lusimus sub umbra, agresti calamo, fictis nominibus. Ac tale temperamentum, necesse est, teneat, quisquis Latinos versus scribere aut cantare parat, sive quid acerbius meditetur, sive quid jucundius.

Advice on personification is then given:

Gothicorum enim & Barbarorum nominum conditione efficitur, quo minus & illi, quos aperte odimus, vel colimus maxime, in carminibus nostris ponantur.

Some lofty tributes are paid to George Keith:

.... eximia tua virtute, pietate, fide, probitate morum, suavitate ingenii, & fraterno amore toto jam notus es in orbe, & magnis regibus dilectus, & magnis Diis.......

and so on. At the opposite extreme are King's enemies,
To these enemies must be added some friends whom King is ashamed to own as such, who admire themselves for their own performances, and complain because his verses have no force or elegance, or, if they do, are obscure:

Obecurus scilicet, ni plane dicam palamque, quis sit Mopsus, quis sit Iulus, quis sit Mavors, quis sit Typhoeus, &c. Quid si dicam? aut in ultimam occidentis insulam relegandus, aut piratarum jussu cum Ecloga mea in mare projiciendus.

Whatever answer King expected to his question, the fact remains that in Scamnum there is the same difficulty that occurs in all his other Latin political satires: no reliable key exists, and so the allusions, with one or two exceptions, remain without precise identification. What can be said with confidence is that King did intend most, if not all, of the individuals named in the eclogue to correspond to real persons, and that their characters were, in his opinion, presented with impartiality. He himself enlarged on this matter in his letter to Lord Orrery of March 25, 1740:

"... both in panegyric and satire I have drawn my characters by my personal knowledge of the men, their virtues and their vices. And as I have never been directed by any interested views, so I have nowhere that I know exceeded the truth."

He corroborates his own opinion of his disinterestedness by adding:

"I have lived long enough to be thoroughly convinced that there is but little virtue in any of our parties; in the Heads and Managers none at all."

Scamnum starts with a description of the author, sitting on a bench near the bank of the River Isis. Like the Tityrus of Vergil's first eclogue, he is *sub tegmine fagi*:

Dum fagus (namque aestus erat) me protegit umbra,
Isidis ad ripas scamno jam forte sedebam:
Scamno, frugiferi dominus quod fecerit agri
Pericolicis sacrum, Musisque dicaverat Alcon.
Laeve, ut marmor, erat, latumque: altare putares.

Though as smooth as marble, this bench is made of oak descended from the same parents as those beams which, sweeping the sea, now

Hispanos terrent, & mittunt fulmina ponto.

The mention of *Hispanos* is a reference to the conflict between England and Spain which started in 1739, generally referred to as the War of Jenkins' Ear. King was opposed to the hostilities, which he regarded as unnecessary, implying that oak trees could be put to better uses than the building of warships.

The author then returns to the bench and the river which runs beside it:

Nam facit, ut melius rus contemplemur amoenum
Gratior & qui fit, dum praeterlabitur, amnis.
Otia dat pigris; praebet solatia fessis,
Et senibus somnum, & mensam messoribus aptam;
Atque suburbanis, si fama est nuntia veri,
Praebet dura nimis, sed grata cubilia Nymphis.

The countryside outside Oxford is described in a highly stylized manner, and the author contemplates the scene:

........... volucrum dulcedine captus,
Floribus aut pascens oculos, fluvialia regna,
Et genus arboreum meditans, annique meatus,
Coelumque, & solis radios .......
Meanwhile two shepherds, Lacon and Tityrus, approach, and King calls on the muse Calliope: *mihi refer ordine versus*. The author realizes that this scene is a long way from Theocritus:

```latex
\ldots quae maxima dona
Pierides dederunt Siculis pastoribus olim,
Arguti calami desunt & fistula nostris.
```

The two shepherds then proceed to sing verses of praise to the Goddess Liberty in an artificial amoebaean manner; how artificial may best be judged by comparing King’s work to Vergil’s third eclogue, in which the Roman poet comes closer than anywhere else to the spirit of Theocritus. In Scamnum the shepherds indulge in no preliminary backchat, and, when they sing alternately, the thrust and party of Vergil’s rather ungenial shepherds, Damoetus and Menalcas, are conspicuously absent. The verses of King’s Lacon and Tityrus are in the nature of formal antiphonal incantations: while they lack all trace of realism, they do exhibit an impressive degree of stateliness and dignity. The nearest classical prototypes of King’s shepherds are Corydon and Thyrsis in Vergil’s seventh eclogue, but whereas they sing four lines apiece alternately for less than fifty lines, Lacon and Tityrus keep up their contest for more than a hundred and fifty.

Lacon commences the duologue by thus addressing the goddess Liberty:

```
Libertas, o si qua dea es, nunc annue vati:
En, tibi surgit opus, si quid mea carmina possunt.
Munera pauperibus tu das, mentemque beatis;
Tu das pascere oves; tu das cantare sub umbra.
```

To this lofty opening Tityrus replies:
O dea Libertas certe: tibi ponimus aras:
Hac vitula, mox & niveo donabere tauro,
Nil mirum, si, regis opus, stas flectilis: at si
Legibus emendes res nostras, aurea fies.

The promise of Tityrus to erect a golden statue in honour of the
goddess Liberty is immediately reminiscent of the similar promise of
Vergil’s Thyrsis to the god Priapus:

at tu,
Si fetura gregem suppleverit, aureus esto.

More invocations to the goddess follow; factitious though they are,
their mellifluous beauty is undeniable:

LACON

Hei mihi, quod pavidae fugiunt sua tecta columbae!
Obscoenas accepta aves nam candida turris.
Si venias, mea Clara; tuo jam numine tutae,
(Sic Venerem ore referis) volucres ad tecta redibunt.

TITYRUS

O formosa veni; nec rustica munera sperne:
Hic cerasi dulces, & mollia fraga leguntur.
Si mea rura colas, habitarunt dii mea rura;
Ipse, nec invitus, sit rursus pastor Apollo.

A perhaps rather jarring reference to Lady Allen, the conjux
barbara Trauli, and Myra, the saga, indicates that the events described
in The Toast were not far from King’s mind when he was writing Scamnum:
perhaps he was already engaged on his revision of the text of 1736. A
number of veiled allusions follow, but not even the notes in the re-
cension of the Opera are enlightening. Thus when Tityrus sings about
infelix Phoëoe, the entirety of the information which King provides on
who she was and why she was unfortunate is this:
Fuit haec puella formosissima e Scotorum gente; quam veneno tollere, aut saltem ei formam eripere Delia ista conata est, semel iterumque puellae insidias molita. Notior haec est fabula aulcis viris, populo vero obscurior.

More details are given on Mopsus: he could be Sir Robert Walpole, but King is careful not to be too precise.

The vituperations against Mopsus finished, Lacon announces that this is the birthday of Iulus:

Huc ades, O Lenaee. Mei est natalis Iuli, Vos lauro juvenem victrici ornate, Quirites. Si tamen has silvas, haec si sua rura reviset, Bina tibi, Fortuna redux, altaria fument.

Tityrus, not be outdone, suggests further manifestations of rejoicing:

Ecce ferunt violas, & candida lilia nymphae, Et, mea dona, rosas inscriptas nomen Iuli. Jam tandem o nostris puerum dii reddite votis! Aurea templum Jovis statuemus, & aurea Phoebos.

But instead of developing this thought, as might be expected, Tityrus goes on to lament the barbar. gens at Cambridge, by which he presumably means the large number of anti-Jacobites:

Musarum sedes, Cami quas alluit unda, En petiit, Geniumque loci divasque fugavit, Barbara gens. Ah! quo te mutas numine, Granta? Nec tamen ille tuus frustra regnavit Apollo.

Some of the following verses are today quite obscure on account of the vagueness of the allusions. But a brief survey of the contemporary European scene leads Tityrus to gloomy moralization:

Nullus adest hostis: Martis tamen omnia plena. Nullus adest (at quid melius speravimus?) hostis. Sic sibi nunc comit promittat militis ardor, Atque ducis plumatus apex, sine clade triumphos.
Lacon now broaches a new subject, and praises Lord Orrery under the name of Laelius. In the Opera version Laelius is replaced by Carolus, though it is not clear who is now intended:

Carole, quae nuper, Phoebos modulante canebas,
Carmina mitte minis. Sic dent laeta omnia Musae,
Ne tibi quid desit: si quid tibi defuit, ex quo
Dii fortet optatam pulchramque dedere Sabinam. 55

Tityrus is still more flattering:

Carole, noster amor, gentis quoque gloria nostrae,
Magni cura Jovis; qui fecit pectus honestum,
Pectus amicitiae tibi, Carole: quo neque possit
Quid melius, nec quid majus generatur in orbe.

The eclogue comes to an end with Lacon's laments that it is unlawful to relate things worthy of the country's divinities, and with the barely disguised hopes expressed by Tityrus for a golden age in the future under the Old Chevalier:

LACON

Haec lusi: neque adhuc pastorla cernere sacra
Aut datnar, aut patriis diis fas est digna referre.
Si tamen ipse meum potui servare tenorem,
Pierides, caussam vatis defendite vestri.

TITYRUS

Nos quoque, conati Latias revocare Camoenas,
Hic fagos inter parvum pro tempore carmen
Fecimus: at quanta o, & quae, Saturnia mundo
Secula si redeant, & jussisert Ipse, canemus!

Perhaps it is not too much to say that Scamnum is one of the most impressive surviving examples in Latin literature of the eclogue in the

55. The orthography of Dii is unclassical. Since the metre requires one long syllable, Dii might be regarded as an example of synizesis.
grand manner: in its way grander than any of Vergil's own. True
the topics sung about by the shepherds in Scamnum do not always follow
one another with logical consistency: the whole exhibits a certain
disjointed quality. But this characteristic is derived from the
conditions of the original amöebean contests. The singer who started
could broach a new topic whenever he wished, and his rival had to invent
an equal number of verses on the same theme — or one deliberately con-
trasted — designed to improve upon the utterance of the first singer.
In the matter of adhering to the rules of the singing match, King is
most punctilious. He cannot maintain Vergil's peculiar quality de-
cribed by Horace as molle atque facetum; there is too much evidence of
personal spite towards his political enemies. For this reason he lacks
Vergil's tenderness and his universality. But if one is going to use
the eclogue for the rather unnatural purpose of disseminating party
political propaganda, it is difficult to see how King's general method of
handling his allegorical medium could be improved upon. 56

56. The most exhaustive discussion of the Neo-Latin eclogue is provided
in W. Leonard Grant, Neo-Latin Literature and the Pastoral (Chapel
divisions of the eclogue are, I think, somewhat arbitrary, but as a
work of reference this book is of considerable value, especially for
the continental poets. The development of the eclogue in England
and Scotland is treated best in Leicester Bradner, Musae Anglicanae
(London: Oxford University Press, 1940).
In the summer of 1740 King suffered an attack of what he described as a violent fever. Writing to Lord Orrery in a not entirely steady hand on August 5, 1740, he lamented his illness which for some time deprived me of all my faculties, and I fear you will perceive they are now but very imperfectly restored to me. This is the first day I have sat down to write, since I got out of my bed; and tho I handle my pen very awkwardly, yet I am resolved to say as much as my strength will permit me .... My hand begins now to tremble, so that I must finish my letter as fast as I can ....

On the following October 28 he was again ailing:

I have been a month in London and for more than 3 weeks I have been confined to my chamber by the Gout, or what ye Physicians call a Rheumatick Gout. The worst has been that ye violence of the distemper has fallen into my right hand; and till this day I have not been able to hold my pen, and that I now handle very awkwardly, my hand being still wrapt up in flannel, and in great pain.

In this same letter occurs the first mention in King's writings of Templum Libertatis:

The times are grown so hard, that I am now preparing a work for ye press in full expectation of getting some money by it. Which is a thing I never aimed at before, tho' I have in ye course of my Life blotted some Reams of paper. What I intend is a Latin poem in 3 Books ....

2. Ibid., p.17. The following quotation is drawn from page 19.
The writing becomes more and more difficult to read, but it is clear that King intended each book to have a head-piece and tail-piece, making six copper plates in all, "so that my subscribers (if I publish it by subscription) may be sure of something for their money."

Perhaps King dictated Templum Libertatis to an amanuensis, but if he wrote the text himself, it must have been under considerable difficulties. His illness continued throughout the winter of 1740-1741, witness, for example, Pope's intimation to Lord Orrery on December 10, 1740: "I am unwilling to add to your Concern, by telling how dangerously ill Dr King is still." 3 King's letters to Lord Orrery during this period contain frequent complaints about the continuing gout in his fingers, and on one occasion - May 20, 1741 - he makes an obscure allusion to a device for overcoming his ailment.

You have been so good to me, that I am resolved to try if I can thank you without my fingers. For that purpose I have invented a wooden instrument, by ye help of which I seem to perform tolerably well, and to be able to write so plainly, that any Clerk in the post-office may read my Letter without calling for a Decypherer.4

From time to time King's condition temporarily improved, as towards the end of the month, when Lord Orrery paid him a visit. In his letter of May 29, written to Lady Orrery "from Dr. King's Study at St. Mary Hall", his Lordship remarked: "He is gaining ground very fast, not so fast as we wish but as fast as the perverseness of his Distemper will admit of."

4. Ibid., p.21.
But until his death the gout in his fingers was always liable to return, especially in cold weather. Thus on New Year's Day 1741/42 he complained, "my hand is so lame that I can scarce hold my pen," and on the second page of his letter to Lord Orrery of December 29, 1742, he wrote in a kind of scrawl:

My Hand will not serve me beyond this page. I have lately had 2 or 3 severe strokes of my old Rheumatism in my hands only - so that I am forced to use them at present with great tenderness. For I would willingly preserve my writing fingers, as long as I keep my senses - that I may be on all occasions able to boast of ye friendship, with which your Lordship and Lady Orrery have honoured ye old Monk of St. Mary Hall. 6

The principal problem concerning Templum Libertatis is that, though King and later his publishers, Charles Bathurst and George Hawkins, spoke of three books, in fact only two ever appeared in print. The problem of the missing third book is aggravated by the difficulty of discovering when the other two were finished. The evidence, taken literally, involves contradictions. Thus on September 4, 1741, King informed Lord Orrery that the work was "finished":

My Temple is just finished, and I intend shall make it's appearance in November. If you do me the favour to come to Bath, you shall see the dress it is now in. It has passed thro' the hands of two of my Critical friends. The oftener I look on this piece, the more I am confirmed in my opinion, that it will quite ruin my Character. But see the obstinacy of an old Author, that knowing this I send it abroad. 7

6. Bodleian Library, MS.Eng.hist.d.103, pp.48,63. The Lady Orrery referred to here is His Lordship's second wife, the former Margaret Hamilton, daughter and sole heir of John Hamilton of Caledon, Co. Tyrone. Their marriage had taken place on June 30, 1738. His first wife, Henrietta, daughter of the Earl of Orkney, had died on August 22, 1732.

In view of his later statements, King could not have been referring to the finished work: he must have intended the first book to be understood. On November 10, 1741, he wrote to Orrery, agreeing with His Lordship's opinion that the whole of Templum Libertatis should appear "at once". Again, only Book One is presumably intended, for when King later refers to Book Two, he describes it as "my second Temple". It is impossible to ascertain with any degree of precision the dates within which the second book was written, but it was probably finished, except for corrections and minor changes, by the end of the following December. On January 1, 1741/42, he remarked:

.... my spirits are so good, that I have begun my 3d Book. And if the evil Genius of Britain be not again triumphant and consequently oblige me to alter my plan, I shall have finished the whole work before next winter.  

Volume I of Templum Libertatis was published in 1742, very probably in early January, with the imprint

LONDINI:
Apvd C. Bathurst, & G. Hawkins, in Fleet Street.

It is listed in the Register of Books of The Gentleman's Magazine for January 1742. On October 31 of the same year King wrote to Lord Orrery from Oxford:

I am printing my second T. which goes slowly, because of the distance I am from ye press. However I must stay till I can finish it.  

8. Ibid., p.47.
9. Ibid., p.49.
10. Ibid., p.61.
On the following January 5 King sent a copy of the second book of the poem to Lord Orrery with an admonition and a promise of another copy to follow:

Your Lordship must not part with ye Templum till it be published. But let any body read it, who pleases. Don't imagine I design this blue-covered thing for ye authors presents. No. You shall certainly have a fine one - marbled and guilded - Believe me ....

This second book, which bears the publication date of 1743, and is listed in the Register of Books of The Gentleman's Magazine for January of that year, must have appeared in the bookshops by January 31, 1742/43, for on that day King wrote:

I have not heard a Word about my Templum from any of my great friends in London, since it was published. So that I do not know their opinion of this performance. However I am little solicitous about it.

And a little later in the same letter he remarks that the third book is still unfinished:

You have certainly encouraged me to proceed. And I hope I shall be able to finish ye Work according to my present plan, as soon as Don Phoebus will give me leave. For, without a Metaphor, it is only the genial heat of the Sun, which can inspire me.

These words constitute the final witness on the third book. Whether it was ever finished and, if so, why it was never published are both unsolved mysteries. But as a result of its absence, King's most important serious work and one of the most forceful Latin poems of its time remains incomplete.

11. Ibid., p.66.
12. Ibid., p.69.
There must have been frequent interruptions in the composition of *Templum Libertatis*. King's letters to Orrery reveal that the Principal of St. Mary Hall was often called upon to provide entertainment for visitors: Lord Orrery himself, Pope, Lord Chesterfield, and various university officials among them. The weather during the autumn and winter of 1741 seems to have been severe: King's correspondence at this period is sprinkled with such *obiter dicta* as "It rains - and blows - and thunders", "I am writing this by the fire-side", "It rains hard - my Head is muddy", and so on. In September of 1741 he journeyed to Bath, even though he felt reservations about the efficacy of the waters. "The truth is," he explained to Orrery on September 9, 1741, "I doubt much whether ye Bath-Water will do me any service, but I am so earnestly exhorted to try it, that I must give up my own opinion to the Sages of Physic." 13 Having reached Bath a little over a week later, he explained that he had been trying the pump for his hands, adding: "I wish I may have any reason to boast of ye virtues of ye Bath Water." 14 In fact he benefited little from the waters of Bath. On October 6, 1741, he wrote:

I have been pumping and pumping to no purpose. And I begin to think that all ye Waters of Bath will not relax my joints. So obstinate they are ..... I believe I shall return to my Monastery sooner than I intended, tho' I must go by ye way of London to look after my Legacy. 15

The legacy to which King here refers must be that which he inherited with his two surviving brothers, Thomas and John, on the death in 1741

13. Ibid., p.33.
15. Ibid., p.42.
of his second cousin, Sir William Smyth of Warden, Bedfordshire.

This bequest deserves some comment. At the time King was writing, it consisted of a number of pieces of property including Akeley manor in Buckinghamshire with its accompanying lands. In 1647 this parcel had been compounded for by King's maternal grandfather, Sir William Smyth of Radcliffe, Buckinghamshire. In his will it was assigned to Sir Thomas Smyth, who reassigned it, as security on his nephew's loans, by deed of November 17, 1724. The reassignation is confirmed in the will of Sir William Smyth of Warden, Bedfordshire, though most of his estate, as he was a bachelor and died without issue, seems to have gone to King's brother John and his family. Because no records of the matter survive in the Buckingham County Record Office, the details of the administration of the legacy are obscure, but the suggestion has been made that the brothers alienated the property. There is no indisputable evidence to indicate that William maintained any further direct connection with Akeley manor. A record does survive of litigation over another piece of land at Aspley Guise in Bedfordshire, which was inherited by John King's son William Smyth King, in a Chancery Proceeding King v. How of February 5, 1763. Though the action mentions both Sir William Smyth of Radcliffe and Sir William Smyth of Warden, the plaintiff's

---

16. The original deed does not appear to have survived, but it is referred to in the Registry of Deeds, King's Inns, Dublin, Memorialls of Deeds, Conveyances and Wills, Vol.52, p.252, No.34462.


celebrated uncle seems not to have been involved. It is certain, however, that King was involved in the probate proceedings in London in connection with the will of Sir William Smyth of Warden, the verified copy of which, with its accompanying certificates and documents, was handed to the executors on November 2, 1741. King gives an indication of what the legacy was worth to him in a letter to Lord Orrery of August 18, 1742:

.... I have been in Buckinghamshire to view a Legacy which was left me about a year ago, and which I find will bring me annually clear of all taxes & charges £60, a very good addition to an old Monk's commons. 19

While King was writing Templum Libertatis, he had, of course, to carry out the various administrative tasks that were incumbent on him as head of St. Mary Hall. In addition, he took upon himself a number of other academic tasks, one of which was the attempt to induce the authorities to confer the degree of D.D. on William Warburton so that Pope would be persuaded to accept the degree of D.C.L. King played a significant though ultimately unsuccessful role in this strange affair, the main outlines of which are fairly clear. During 1741 Pope and William Warburton, later to become Bishop of Gloucester, visited Oxford together. While they were there, the then Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Theophilus Leigh, Master of Balliol, offered the degree of D.C.L. to Pope and that of D.D. to Warburton. The proposal in Warburton's case was singularly unfortunate, because when the circumstances of the offer became known, the resistance of some of the clergy successfully prevented 19. Bodleian Library, MS.Eng.hist.d.103, p.52.
the granting of the degree. Pope refused to be "doctored" unless Warburton were also given the D.D. The Chancellor, the Earl of Arran, refused to implement Dr. Leigh's proposal against the wishes of the opposition and, after prolonged discussions, the tentative plans for both degrees were dropped.

King seems to have done what he could to support Pope on behalf of Warburton. On June 17, 1741, Lord Orrery wrote: "Mr. Pope is at Oxford with Dr. King", and on the following August 12, Pope, now back at Twickenham, confided to Warburton that he was chagrined in the delay over the promised D.D., but added: "Dr. King tells me it will prove no more." 20 King's efforts were, however, unavailing, and on January 13, 1742/43, Pope communicated with Lord Orrery on the matter:

"You are not to be now told, that the Vice Chancellor Dr. Leigh & several Heads of Houses sent & offered Mr. Warburton the degree of a Dr. of Divinity, when he had no such Expectation, after which it was monstrously refused by the unaccountable Dissent of 2 or 3. Dr. King either has, or will acquaint you of the particulars. 21"

Pope's intimation was fulfilled on the following January 31, when King wrote to Orrery on the subject of the refusal. According to this letter, Warburton's orthodoxy had been impugned by Dr. De Blosshier Tovey, Principal of New Inn Hall, and Warburton's enemies had taken advantage of this attack to have the affair of the degree postponed sine die. King was furious; he thus describes Tovey to His Lordship:

21. George Sherburn (ed.), op.cit., Vol.IV, p.436f. Dr. Leigh, shortly after making his offer, had been succeeded in the Vice-Chancellorship by Dr. Walter Hodges, Provost of Oriel, who was opposed to Warburton's receiving the award.
In short, he is a man, who never speaks a serious truth, unless it be sometimes in ye pulpit, when he can't well avoid it; but even there he buffoons with it in such a manner, as to make ye most sacred mysteries appear ridiculous. Judge you, whether any regard ought to have been had to such a man.

This rather uncharitable description is followed by an exhortation to Orrery to communicate directly with the Vice-Chancellor:

I really believe, if in this interim you would give your self the trouble to write a strong letter to the Vice chancellor in favour of Mr Warburton, nothing would have a better effect. For ye Vice in his conversation with me professed ye highest esteem for your Lordship ....

Lord Orrery complied with this request and on February 16, 1742/43 wrote to the Vice-Chancellor. On the same day he wrote again to King, hoping that there would still be a method of solving the matter satisfactorily and bestowing Warburton with the doctorate in Divinity. But all this effort was ultimately of no avail. In his letter to Orrery written on Ash Wednesday, 1742/43, King was forced to admit, "I now perceive that Mr W. has more enemies among our Governors than I imagined." The following September Pope visited Oxford for the third time since the question of the degree was initiated, being, as he wrote later,

... in full assurance of finding Dr King, but he was gone the day before to London; however I took possession of his lodging, & got away the next morning, un-doctor'd, the third time: Sic me servavit Apollo.

---

23. Ibid.
Pope, Orrery and King were together again on February 8, 1743/44, at Burlington House, when King was entertained "with all the elegance, civility, openness and noble qualities that Ld Bultn can show." 27 But by this time the possibility that the degrees might be awarded had in all likelihood been abandoned. There is no evidence that the proposal was ever again revived.

The two published books of Templum Libertatis were incorporated by King, with small variations, in the Opera. Despite occasional published notices of a forthcoming translation, no English version of the work is known to have appeared. The 1742 version of Book One contains an introductory note Bibliopolai Lectori and a prose preface Divae Libertatis Cultoribus, both of which are omitted in the recension. The date given at the end of this preface is Calend. Dec. MDCCXLI. The original text of the first book contains 575 lines; the revision, 617. Book Two was expanded from 612 to 614 lines. In the original folio versions of both books, the notes are inserted at the end of the text; in the Opera they are placed at the foot of the page. In view of the fact that King spent both time and labour in revising the text and notes already published, his decision to leave the final version of the work unfinished is especially puzzling.

Templum Libertatis is an allegorical epic in dactylic hexameter, and among the last of its kind to be composed in Latin. W. Leonard Grant has described the epic as the "least successful of all forms of neo-Latin poetry", 28 and he is undoubtedly correct. The history of the neo-Latin

28. W. Leonard Grant, op.cit., p.44.
epic is strewn with artistic failures, some of monstrous proportions (such as Basilio de' Basini's _Hesperis_ in thirteen books), some merely fragments. Even Petrarch felt reservations about his own epic, _Africa_, but it is only fair to add that portions of it do exhibit literary merit.

A few other neo-Latin epics are still worth reading for their poetical qualities; among them should be mentioned Giacopo Sannazaro's _De Partu Virginis_, Marco Vida's _Christiad_, Phineas Fletcher's _Locustae_, and the _Sarcotis_ of Jacobus Masenius, all of which contain passages of genuine artistry. The latter two productions appear to have influenced Milton, and were probably known to King. Since Book Two of _Templum Libertatis_ is avowedly influenced by _Paradise Lost_, it is highly probable that King was also well acquainted with Milton's _In Quintum Novembris_, the supernatural machinery of which anticipates in some respects that of both _Paradise Lost_ and _Templum Libertatis_. It is possible too that King was conversant with Andrew Ramsay's _Poemata Sacra_; it also was known to Milton, and exhibits a vigorous Latinity comparable in power to that of King.

_Recollections_ may thus be regarded as the product of a long if not particularly successful tradition; truncated though this epic is, it is undoubtedly of greater interest than many of the other works in its own category.

As is the case with so many of King's Latin works, the text is edited by the author himself, and the notes constitute an important part of the

---

29. The Scottish divine and poet Andrew Ramsay (1574–1659) should not, of course, be confused with the author of _Les Voyages de Cyrus_, whose dates were 1686 to 1743.
artistic whole. Both books were originally published anonymously, but the writer's identity was no doubt known to a good proportion of the readers. The Bibliopola Lectori is deliberately evasive in expression:

Carmen hoc, quale vides, imperfectum edidit Poeta ex consilio meo. Quippe quum tres libros simul publicare cogitaret, ego hominem dehortatus sum, ne id faceret. Jamdiu enim opera Latina, qualia cunque sunt, paucos inveniunt Lectores, patronos vero paucissimos. Et quicquid hic noster magnificentius est praefatus de pulchritudine materiae, ac Diva sua; satis hercle scio, quod hujuscemodi scripta sola brevitas excuset: & ne vix haec quidem. Usque adeo semuerunt literae!

Here again King employs one of his favourite literary practices: he writes under the guise of another with a view to confusing his enemies.

In the preface Divae Libertatis Cultoribus the author explains his intentions in composing the work:

LIBER ILLE SPIRITUS, quo adjutore opera omnia mea composui, Epistolas, Sermones, Eclogas (res tenues quidem & tenuiter aestimandas) nunc incitatius fertur, per ambages, Deorumque ministeria praecepitamus. 30

He writes from an exalted position:


His motivation leaves no room for doubt:

Non enim mala ambitione adductus carmen hoc in publicum dedi, quod laureolam mini expectem, vel quod aliquid aut alma matre nostra, aut auribus vestris dignum proferre videar; verum ut quoquo modo satisfacerem amori patriae, & laudibus LIBERTATIS.

30. The italicized quotation is from Petronius.
After having enlarged on these thoughts, he suggests a transmutation of an old paradox:

Ciceronianum istud, seu Stoicum Paradoxum, NISI SAPIENTEM LIBERUM ESSE NEMINEM, sic immutari volo, NISI LIBERUM SAPIENTEM ESSE NEMINEM.

From this position, King is led to speculate on the vice of conformism under tyranny:

Saepenumbero igitur mirari ignavum istud hominum genus, immo pecus ignavissimum, qui de communi sententia deserunt communem salutem, et aequo animo et patienti ferunt spectantque tyrannorum potentiam, praefectos, stupra, rapinas, caedes, parricidia.

He returns briefly to his old theme expounded in Common Sense: if gods can be fabricated out of wood or clay, why not kings also? But he dismisses the facetious suggestion immediately with the comment absint saevi et illiberales joci, and enlarges, in a passage of considerable rhetorical power, on the kind of rulers who are needed:

Cives meos monitos volo . . . . ut in principes Reipublicae nobis eligamus viros sapientes, justos, temperatos, firmos: ut Libertatis numen, quasi Palladium nostrum tueamur et conservemus; quasi Solem ipsum suspiciamus et veneremur; cujus sine auxilio nec serere nec metere datur, nec arbores, nec oves, nec liberi nostri nobis crescunt. Noster hic sit labor, haec meditatio, hoc negotium, hoc otium.

He warns that citizens should be prepared to defend freedom with financial contributions and military intervention:

Et semper parati simus, siquid Respublica detrimenti ceperit, non modo consiliis eam adjuvare, sed opibus, sed armis.

King's final thoughts in the preface represent the development of what he has already expressed. He admonishes his readers against despair, however trying the circumstances:
Si tamen, aut bonorum infirmitate, aut iniquitate temporum, aut temeritate fortunae hostis aliquis externus, aut nostrorum civium vir sceleratissimus tyrannidem occuparit, ne tum quidem turpiter desperemus, necquid relinquamus intentatum, quo dignitas patriae et Libertas recuperetur.

In conclusion he urges that it is preferable to die a thousand times than to be a slave:

Satius est mori, mori millies, quam servire.

A brief summary in Latin of the argument of the first book precedes the text of the poem proper. The work commences with an invocation to the goddess Liberty:

Diva potens, coeli proles pulcherrima, cujus Nomen dulce sonat, semper mihi dulce sonabit, LIBERTAS, fas sit tandem pia pandere sacra, Et sedes reserare tuas: tua splendida facta Fas mihi nota loqui, Musis indicta Latinis.

Liberty is certainly not one of the better known classical deities; King therefore provides a note on her:

Dea apud Romanos, ac, dum tempus erat, divinitate venerabilis; cujus aedem in Aventino monte pater Tiberii Gracchi ex multatitia pecunia fecit, ornavitque aeneis columnis, & pulcherrimis signis & imaginibus . . . .

In keeping with classical convention, Apollo and the Muses — under their Latin name — are not left unmentioned:

Quin tu [i.e. Libertas], si numine dextro Nunc adsis, favesque; aderit mihi magnum Apollo, (Quo venias, veniet) faciles aderuntque Camoenae. Et nitor, & numeris accedant pondera nostris; Atque aliquem hoc vati praestet quoque carmen honorem.

Next the poet, in a passage exhibiting an ostentatious use of extended anaphora, calls upon the companions of Liberty:
Et vos, O Divae comites, clarissima gentis
Nomina Patriciae, rerum columnque decusque,
Qui LIBERTATIS sanctas defenditis aras,
(Muneris hoc vestri est) Divae defendite vatem;
Si mini dirum minitetur foeda Celaeno,
Sive truces regum vultus, & ferrea jura.
Sin teneras aures offendunt verba Latina;
Seu nimius videor; sive est minus utilis armis,
Seu minus apta jocis, sive est mea fabula verax;
Dicite, somnus erat: ni sit quoque crimen in illo.
Nam venia quandoque carent vel somnia vatum.

A note in the recension provides further information on the Divae comites:

Viri primarii, & ii, qui vere sunt, non qui se esse
simulant, patriae parentes. Novum enim est apud nos
hominnm genus, qui, cum patriae & libero populo insidias
maxime cogitant, id agunt, ut cives optimi videantur.

A description of the island of Great Britain now follows:

Est locus ante alios felix, placidissima sedes,
Insula magna, ferax; cujus fundamina rector
Oceanum aeternum ut maneant, solidissima jecit,
Mercedem pactus nullam pretiumve laboris.
Anne igitur mirum, quam sit penetrabile missum,
Et majus fulmen, polus & concussus uterque
Seu nutu, seu voce Jovis, (seu causa malorum
Est alia atque alia: haud etenim cognoscere possis,
Unde tremor terris;) quum erumpant undique venti
Ignesque & fluvii, rigidique cacamina montis,
Et silvae, & rupes laxis compagibus altae,
Et loca mille labent, terrae loca mille dehiscant;
An mirum, si tanto haec insula numine freta,
Saca mari si immota sedet; spectantque penates
(Sed longe spectant) aliena pericula, luctusque,
Eversasque urbes, magnasque impune ruinas?

The disjunctive interrogation at the end of the last sentence is
intended primarily as a rhetorical device; it is followed immediately
by the author's observations on the development of the British Empire:
Quin fovet & populos Neptunus, (nec genus usquam Acrius est hominum) queis & sua jura, suique Imperium pelagi late dedit: omnia velis Aequora nam currunt, quae Sol colluстрat ab ortu, Queis cupid occiduus tingi, quibus imperat Arctos, Sidere quaque tuo, Capricorne, inimica premuntur.

The general fertility and opulence of the island is illustrated by references to the pignces agros, herbam frequentem, lucos placidosque amnes, silvas vetustas, salutiferos fontes, and pascua laeta. The gods themselves, we are assured, have found a home in Great Britain: here golden Ceres commands huge harvests while Pan cares for the flocks of sheep and grazes all the herds of cattle. Other divinities are alluded to:

Jactat dotalia regna
Vertumnus; nec se dubitat praeferre Lyaeo;
Ex quo nectar eum, sine Bacchi numine, vinum Reperit; atque suo traxit fulgere poetam,
Qui primus patrios celebravit honoribus hortos,
Mala ferens Musarum aris; quae, rustica quamvis
Dona, tamen blandi dum laudat carminis auctor,
Et pretiosa facit, facit & gratissima Phoebó.

The poetam here referred to is John Philips, whose poem Cyder was in King's mind when these lines were written. Further sentiments of the same kind follow, all expressed in the stately manner which the author maintains throughout the poem. Despite its obviously artificial quality, King's writing manifests a highly polished marmoreal beauty:

Hic apibus certa est, hic est aptissima sedes:
Omnis & hic arbos, & flos, & suaveolentes,
Pabula quae praebent, herbae, natureia, thymusque,
Rosmaris, & virides casiae: si frigore, morbo,
Aut bello perreunt, parvi sua tecta Quirites
Si subito linquent; haud irreparabile damnum;
Haud opus Arcadíi inventis aut arte magistri,
Unde genus revoces: nec enim defecerit unquam
Progenies felix, nec deert copia mellis.
The glowing description of Britain culminates in a grand encomium of Oxford, which he refers to by a Latinized form of its supposed ancient Celtic name, Rhedychen. The University of Oxford is described in laudatory manner as novas Athenas:

Huc quoque posthabitis tandem venere Camoenae
Fonte sacro Pindique jugis: vidi ipse sorores
Ad Tamesis ripas, Phoebo comitante, sedentes;
Moxque tuis spatiari hortis, divine poeta.

A note explains that the address divine poeta refers to Alexander Pope:

. . . cujus horti jacent ad Tamesim fluvium amoenissimi
quidem et cultissimi: ubi antrum e longinquo aspicias
celeberrimum, bellissime quippe situm, & gemmis radians,
Musarum & Apollinis opus: quod tamen naturae opus esse
credideris.

It is typical of the fairly large number of small revisions that King made in the Opera version of the text that the unequivocal ascription of Pope's grotto to the work of Apollo and the Muses is later modified by the injection of fortasse: Musarum fortasse & Apollinis opus. Is this a sign of disenchantment on King's part?

One of King's grandiloquent climaxes is approaching; he prepares it well:

Saepe etiam laetas vidi, citharasque tenentes
Auratam, magnum Rhedycinae intrare theatrum;
Agnovische Deas, & publica vota precesque,
Atque meis auxi plausus.

Thus the author leads into one of the most superb passages in Anglo-Latin poetry, his unrestrained but completely ingenuous apostrophe to Oxford:
O, divitis aulae
Pierides luxum fugiant, ac limina regum!
Et tibi semper eant comites, dulcissima mater,
O decus, O tutela meae, Rhedycina, juventae!
O decus, O requiesque meae, Rhedycina, senectae!
Ingenii est in me siquid; si noster Apollo,
Et Latiae annuerunt mihi mollia carmina Musae;
Si patriae cecini laudes; inimica tyrannis
Si meus non potuit flecti vel Caesaris auro,
Pallantisve minis aut blanda voce nefandi;
Si lare contentus tenui, si vivere parvo
Et didici, & didicisse juvat; cantamina turpis
Canidae, & lites, & quae nova vulnera sensi,
Frangere si nequeunt vires, aut rungere somnos;
Cuncta tibi fateor debere. Cuncta fatebor,
Quae vatem recte moneas, praecepta Deorum.
Ergo te memorem semper; persolvere grates
Si possim dignas, famamque augere tuorum.

Having sung the praises of Oxford, King proceeds, in a
less personal but hardly less exalted manner, to pay his respects
to London:

Haec est, haec urbs est fama notissima, terrae
Haec patriae caput est, (absitque superbia dictis)
Haec caput est orbis. Neque enim Europaeque Asiaque,
Gens habet ulla paren; magnis ni ex urbis istis
Aemula sigua foret, sibi quas extruxerat olim
Confuci ingenium, & regum pulcherrimus ordo;
Si forte est usquam regum pulcherrimus ordo.

31. In the recension an extra line is added immediately after this
one:

Luxum ultro (neque enim locus est scelerator ullus)

Whatever King's motives were for adding this verse, it is,
needless to say, not artistically necessary. The later edition
of this passage is punctuated with slight variations. An
anonymous translation of the entire section into English verse
From the sting in the last line the reader is quickly taken to an assembly of the gods, where Jupiter announces that he is sending the goddess Liberty to the people of Britain:

LIBER ERIT: Plausu resonant longa atria coeli,
LIBER ERIT: Nutu firmat pia dicta verendo
Rex hominum Divumque, olim majora datusur.

The goddess duly descends and is received by the people of Britain laeto clamore. The tutelary deities of the nation, Ceres, Vertumnus, Pan, and Tamesis, pay homage to Liberty and bring gifts with flattering compliments.

This part of Templum Libertatis contains several elegant speeches and some descriptive lines of considerable artistry. Ceres is first depicted:

Spicea sarta ferens, fruges, & adorea liba,
Et quaeque suro fundit bona Copia cornu.

She eulogizes Liberty with sonorous declamation:

O Dea, grata tuis, semper gratissima terrae!
Pectoris humani (tu scis tamen hoc oriundum
Semine coelesti) tantum tibi laetor inesse.
Atque o semper ames vultus coetusque viriles,
Et tibi non unquam sit terrae cura pudori!

Now that you are present as a witness, she continues, brutes will not devastate the cultivated fields, nor will any victor command his abominable soldiery. Other horrors need not be feared:

Virgo nulla dolos metuet raptoris avari;
Nec mater natam, aut nutrix plorabit alumnam.

32. In the recension this line is revised, and two others added:

Rex hominum divumque; olim quoque cuncta daturus,
Quae studia atque artes, quas mercatura parare
Divitias & opes poterit, vel bellica virtus.
She concludes her speech with an appropriate reference to her daughter:

Hei mihi! Persephonae si tu comes una Puisses,
Cum Siculos legeret flores; conjuncta marito
Non tali nunc illa foret, non praeda tyranni.

Then Vertumnus comes forward:

Dat plenis poma canistris;
Dat modo quae pulchrae mollissima vina pararat
Pomonae potanda, & adhuc in conjuge felix;
Felix illa viro. 33

The god declaims flatteringly to the goddess. He assures her that everything will flourish under her protection, while at the same time he commands evils to disappear. At the end of his speech, King provides a pleasant aside:

Haec dederat pia dicta: probant hominesque Deique:
Dumque probant, Zephyri veniunt, atque evocat Auster
Irrigas herbas, & laetum nunciat annum.

Next to appear is Pan corniger, surrounded by a host of goat-footed divinities. He also brings presents, such as a bowl of milk, eggs, dewy honey water (roscida mella), and a huge cheese:

... opes & culti gloria ruris;
Quem duo vix Satyri possunt cervice subire,
Quem vix sex homines; tanto circundatur orbe
Immanis moles.

He exhorts Liberty to accept these gifts, concluding:

Tu modo, Diva, novas sedes, monitusque Tonantis,
Et stabilem firmes rem certo foedere nostram.

Pan is followed by Tamesis attended by a hundred water nymphs. He is resonant in his praise of the goddess:

Salve, 0 LIBERTAS! (iterabant Naiades omnes
Salve, 0 LIBERTAS!) Divum placidissima salve!

33. The vina here refers to cider.
His laudations indicate that he is well acquainted with the fourteenth book of the Iliad:

Tecum se comparet uxor
Ipsa Jovis, vel (si majori nomine gaudet) Stelliferi regina poli, dum spirat amores,
Blandum cincta, potens alieno numine, ceston,
Et quaerit captare Jovem; me judice victa
Se dicet victam; & cedet tibi regia conjux.

She had her place in Roman history, according to Tamesis:

Tu certe illa dea es, cui consulis annua jura,
Et, quos nunc frustra poscit sibi, Fabriciosque debuit, & Brutos, & duros Roma Catones.

In the matter of the Roman invasion of Britain, Tamesis has nothing flattering to say about Julius Caesar:

O quam te memini pictos monuisse Britannos,
Et servasse diu, cum urbes invadere nostras
Auderet Caesar, cessura sibi omnia sperans;
Sed vidi tantum, referens inglorius arma.

In the matter of the history of England during the Norman conquest, King's political sympathies, put into the mouth of Tamesis, are clearly on the side of the Anglo-Saxons in contradistinction to the invaders. Thus when speaking of the descendants of Hengist, the river-god addresses Liberty in these words:

O quam te memini Hengisti juvisse nepotes!
Jujusti merito. Nostro nil aequius usquam
Saxone: nec proceres, nec plebes tentare quid ausi
Te sine, nec, secum quos portavere, Pennates.

King's tendency to interpret portions of human history in terms of broad and unprovable generalizations, when it suited his argument, is even better illustrated in his long note on Norman law which he inserted in the Opera version of the text. Tamesis explains that it was not
rightful that he or his nymphs should serve the Norman tyrant,
William the Conqueror, and adds:

    Omnia qui rapuit, qui primus jurgia, lites
    Intulit, atque feris rabidum jus saevius armis.

The note amplifies the author's views:

    Normannorum legibus, quibus in Anglia et Hibernia uti mum,
    revera sunt pestes reipublicae: et haud fere quidquam gravior
    unquam ex cogitatum fuit, non dico in liberis civitatibus, sed
    in exteris iis gentibus, ubi reges principesque pro arbitrio
    suo omnia gubernant rapinunte.

From what follows it appears that King's extraordinary attitude was based
on his own unhappy experiences during his Irish litigation: another
instance of his proclivity for allowing his personal misfortunes to warp
his judgement. Tamesis, for his part, is made to comment to Liberty:

    O sit cura, precor, tales tibi pellere pestes!
    Sit, cum tempus erit. Neque sunt haec verba dolentis:
    Nam mihi nunc oblita mala omnia, servitiumque,
    Et labor, & populi clades, & nomina regum.
    Te veniente, iterum faustos sperabimus annos.

Perhaps King sincerely believed that favourable prospects of peace in the
future were impossible as long as the laws inherited from the Normans
remained on the statute books.

    Tamesis continues appositely to comment on the flourishing commercial
activities carried on in the port of London. There are ships bearing
fragrant wines from the vine covered hills of France, Persian garments,
coffee, incense, and merchandise from Turkey.

    In the Opera text, some additional luxuries are incorporated:
    Venia superstitioso transit.
Nostri sub sole jacentes
Ardenti, succos dulces (nec Hymettia mella,
Nec divum hos superat nectar) quos canna quotannis
Jamaicae fundit, sua maxima dona, coloni
Ecce ferunt.

He concludes with a magnanimous flourish:

Quin cuncta tibi sunt denique parta,
Quae mare, quae tellus, vel quae mea numina praebent.

At the close of the speech of Tamesis, the assembled concourse
commences to sing:

Vulgus, proceresque patresque
Circumstant omnes, incondita vota canentes,
Laetitiae pia signa sua.

The goddess Liberty is now to be installed in the templum Libertatis,
a building especially erected for her. A long, solemn procession is
formed; she is led inside and enthroned. Here King takes the oppor-
tunity to provide his readers with a gorgeous description of the building
and its décor. In terms of opulence, Solomon himself would not have been
ashamed of this temple:

Aerea erant tecta, atque aereis innixa columnis:
Aureum erat Divae solium; radiantiaque auro
Delubra, & gemmis aerae: de marmore factus
Interior paries, & sectile vermiculatumque
Arte pavimentum mira: longa atria, & ingens
Circuitus, populique capax. Quodcunque videres
Artificis summum posset jactare laborem.

Tapestries show the defeat of the Spanish Armada:

Servitio assuetos populos, & castra Philippi
Cernere erat, portumque Tagi, saevumque tyrannum,
Et formidatam, innumeris armisque virisque
Instructam, classem. Quid? fertur Iberia tota
Navibus. Addunt se socios, & foedera jungunt,
Degeneres quosquenque tuos, O Roma, nepotes
Vana superstition traxit.
King's reference to the approval of the Roman Church towards the Armada is further developed in his allusion to Pope Sixtus V, whom he calls Jovis ipse sacerdos, and his wicked exhortations to war:

Rex idem regum, diademate tempora cinctus
Turrigero, verbis altis hortatur ad arma.

There follows a brief survey of the course of the Spanish defeat, during which King makes amply clear that the gods were on the English side.

Perhaps the South Wind was most influential:

Insula chara Deis! tibi fortis militat Auster,
Et ruit in classem. Tu gaudens surgere cernis,
Instar montis, aquas: fuerat nec justior unquam
Ira maris. Tu, coelo & vastis freta procellis,
Arma virum, pictosque Deos, magnasque carinas
Nunc agis atque illuc diversas. Naufraga saevis
Pars haeret scopulis, & mox lethalibus undis
Obruitur. Pars en, fugiens, quos spreverat, hostes,
Turbiter, amissis sociiis opibusque, redire
Jam tentat retro, pelagi ludibria nostri.

Thus ended this particular work of Mars:

Atque hoc Martis opus, quod totum terruit orbem,
Quod tantus labor, & decimus vix perficit annus,
(Nec centum reparare queant, totidemque tyranni)
Hora rapit. Pereunt tetrici monumenta Philippi,
Et navalis honos, vastae, miracula mundi,
Moles; & mendax superest tantummodo nomen.

Having digressed on the subject of the Spanish Armada, King returns to the enthronement of Liberty. As the goddess is seated, Jove provides an auspicious omen with a peal of thunder. The goddess Victory descends from the sky and flies round the temple nine times. Liberty appoints men of all ranks of society to be the guardians of her shrine, and admonishes them to be vigilant night and day. She also selects a number of nobles as

---

34. In his revised version in the Opera, King repunctuated this passage in two sentences.
her ministers, men of impeccable reputation:

His amor est patriae nulla mutabilis arte;
His amor est patriae nullo violabilis auro:
Est pudor, & probitas, generosum & pectus honestum,
Propositique tenax, & semper vivida virtus:
Fallere quae nescit mens est, et nescia falli.

Among those chosen, four are mentioned specifically and singled out for praise under the names of Laelius, Maximus, Memmius, and Varius; in the recension these names appear as Cadenus, Maximus, Memmius, and Priscus.

The identity of these men and the reason for King's changes are matters which have in the past aroused discussion. In the notes to the initial text of Templum Libertatis King cited the four original names, and provided this enigmatic note:

Ne quis forsitan de hisce nominibus male erret,
quandam in re tam clara vix errori locus est, horum nobilium
virorum, & clarissimorum civium, cum ad calcem operis mei
perveniam, vera adijicium nomina.

In fact, he never arrived ad calcem operis, and so there has always been ample opportunity for conjecture. According to Leicester Bradner the names in the text of 1742 refer to the Lords Orrery, Gower, Chesterfield, and Cobham; the same identifications are made in the footnotes to an anonymous letter dated Jan. 25, 1741/42, and published in The London Magazine for February, 1742. It is impossible to ascertain how much authority the writer of this letter carries. Different readers must have held different views even in King's own time, as he indicates in the rewritten notes to the recension. Laelius disappears altogether in the later version and is replaced by Cadenus, who is obviously Swift. The suggestion

that Laelius represented Orrery is undoubtedly correct; does his replacement mean that His Lordship later lost favour in King's eyes? Maximus, according to King's notes in the Opera, does not represent Gower, even though this may have been the author's original intention, but the Earl of Oxford:

De hoc nomine, postquam editum est hoc carmen, prope errarunt omnes, id attribuendo homini, cui tum quidem minime conveniebat; et cujus moribus nunc meherecul nihil est tam contrarium, quam hoc elogium. Sed, ut dubitatio omnis jam tollatur, hic agnoscas, quaeso, mi lector, illu striissimi ac primarii illius viri, EDWARDI HARLEY, comitis de OXFORD et MORTIMER, imaginem, quam hisce carminibus effingere, et proferre conatus sum.

King's attitude towards Lord Gower is clearly expressed in the Political and Literary Anecdotes. He had originally been a member of the Old Interest, with whom King had lived "in some degree of intimacy" for many years; his later defection to the Whigs "was a great blow to the Tory party, and a singular disappointment to all his friends . . . . he bartered a most respectable character, and sacrificed his honour and his country." No note is provided in the recension on Memmius, though it is entirely possible that he does represent Lord Chesterfield, who is mentioned specifically as one of the "Heroes of your Temple" in a letter

36. The identification of Orrery and Laelius is virtually confirmed in King's letter of January 19, 1742/43, Bodleian Library, MS.Eng.hist. d.103, p.66, and specifically confirmed in the footnote to page 25 of his Tres Oratiunculae Habitae in Domo Convocationis Oxon. of 1743. The possibility of a rupture of King's friendship with Orrery is discussed further in Chapter VII.

which Orrery wrote to King on September 9, 1741. Varius is undeniably an analogue of Lord Cobham. In the *Opera*, part of the address to Varius is reassigned to Priscus, who is identified in the notes as John Fane, Earl of Westmoreland.

That King at one time intended to publish a key to the original edition, which would presumably have provided information on the original identifications, is clear from the author's letter to Lord Orrery of January 5, 1742/43:

... as, for my own part, I am not altogether inattentive to some threatening expressions, wch have been thrown out, I am providing myself with a Key, wch I intend to publish in a week or 10 days after ye publication of ye poem, especially if it be attacked by any old or new ministerial writers. In ye mean time I have given those gentlemen a short admonition wch you read at ye end of my Notes. 39

Whether the Key which King mentions was ever published or not is doubtful; if it ever did appear, no copy has survived to the present day. The "short admonition" to which the author refers is no doubt that which occurs at the end of the notes to Book Two. It is no substitute for the non-existent key:


Part of the difficulty of settling these problems of identity is that King more often than not couches his sentiments in terms of lofty

38. The Houghton Library, Harvard University, MS.Eng.213.2 (v.4), pp. 241f.
generalizations; thus the same magnanimous comments could frequently
be applied indifferently to several of those men with whose views he
sympathized. Furthermore, the changes in identification in the recension
were made with the minimum of disturbance to the text and, of course, had
to be effected without unsettling the dactylic hexameter. That these
mechanical revisions could be injected into the structure of the text
without leaving any impression of patchwork is partly the result of King's
own powers as a Latinist, and partly the result of the fact that he
deliberately avoided unmistakably recognizable identifications. One
example must suffice to illustrate King's revisions of this portion of the
poem. In the 1742 text the author writes of the virtues of the ministers
whom Liberty chooses (amor patriae, pudor, probitas, and so on), and then
comments of those selected:

His successorum en sunt, quos novimus ipsi,
Quos populos meritis veneratur laudibus omnes:
Quos inter vidi (nec Divae gravior adsit)
Te quoties, LAELI charissime?

In the recension the question is thus recast:

Quos inter, Cadene, (deae quis gravior adsit)
Te quoties, vidi, charissime?

Even though the name - and identity - of the figure under discussion have
been changed, the passage that follows does not seem any less appropriate:

... quem mihi junxit
Foedere amicitiae studium commune, favorque
Musarum Phoebique patris. Quae gratia Musis,
Cui Phoebos debetur honos pro munere tali?
Nam vult esse mihi vel quem sibi legit amicum:
Dignum o, quem legeret. Sed enim nil dignius illo,
Cui placidam mentem, more Deus ipse pudicos,
Cui dedit ingenii vires, & carminis autem.
A special difficulty arises in the case of the verses reassigned from Varius to Priscus. Varius represents Lord Cobham, whose estate at Stow with its temples, gardens, towers, and other adornments is praised a little later in the poem. However, King could not credit the Earl of Westmoreland with such possessions, so he changed the early part of the invocation to Varius to apply to Priscus (an easy revision since the vocative forms of both names have two metrically equivalent syllables) and then added some extra lines intended for Westmoreland. One feels grateful for the note, for the sentiments inserted in the revised version are quite generalized; for example,

\begin{quote}
Dumque foyer, doctasque omnes complectitur artes,
Dumque fidem, et mores patrios & Jura tuetur,
Magna illi cura est, ut sit sibi fama perennis,
Sit salvs pietatis honos: neque praemia sanum
Ulla suae poterint vitae mutare colorem.
\end{quote}

The description of Stow follows, for the most part as it is in the 1742 text, with greatly augmented notes. King here paints a verse picture in the grand manner, impressive in its stately beauty, and amplifying well the note which the author provides on Stow:

\begin{quote}
. . . . cujus magnificientiam nunquam satis mirari potes. 
Horti sunt amplissimi, templis, aris, statuis, tabulis, imaginibus, 
columnis &c. referti; qui magnitudine omnes alios superant, et 
etiam elegantia; nisi si aliquis fastidiosior contenderit hic nimia 
esse omnia.
\end{quote}

It is impossible to gain from a short extract any just concept of the magnificence which King evokes in this lengthy passage: it has to be read in extenso. But perhaps it is worth mentioning that King enhances the effect of the description by expressing his own astonishment at the

40. This particular identification is made clear in the notes to the recension.
grandeur of the place:

Quid, quod & arboreos labryinthos, antra, columnas, Balneaque, & turrees, & pastoralia tecta, Pyramidas, vatum tumulos, pontemque superbum, Her&s, priscosque Deos, & templ& Deorum Daedalies finxere manus? Vidi omnia, rebusque Attonitus tantis stupui.

The conclusion of the description of Stow in its final form is an especially majestic piece of writing, incorporating a lengthy example of anaphora, and consisting syntactically of one single sentence:

Digna loco Titan Vari praecordia fecit, Numine digna loci: Sic pergat dicere Musa, Vare, tuas laudes, modo si constanter ad actum Extremum perstes, nec splendida polluat arva Ambitio, nequeatque tuam vexare senectam: Si tibi, dum juvenes Sardos audire recusas, Crescat amor patriae, quantum horti gloria crescit: Si tibi vel quos ver, vel quos tibi blandior aestas Hic gratos spirat, sint Libertatis odores: Si domus omnis idem, si fontes, saxa, columnae, Si, possent arbusta loqui, tibi consoma, Vare, LIBERTAS O MAGNA DEA EST, arbusta sonarent.

After a further address to Liberty on the part of the author, the scene returns to the temple:

Jamque frequentatur templum; proceresque Britannli, Plebeiique senes, pueri teneraeque puellae, Et lauro ornati vates, auroque nitentes Magnanimi heroes festinant ad tua sacra, Candida LIBERTAS, & te, Dea, rite precantur; Festaque muneribus cumulant altaria dignis.

Solemn vows are paid to the goddess; cows, fat goats, and wild beasts from the mountains are placed on the altars; sweet liquor is presented as a libation. In a note written for the Opera King explains that by dulces liquores he means cerevisia (beer), and adds that Pliny was mistaken when

41. In the recension columnas is emended to lacusque.
he asserted that it was first brewed in Gaul; for King, beer was indigenous to Britain. The sacrifices are offered by a *vir bonus* from Wales: perhaps Sir Watkin Williams Wynn is intended. 42 Then a Scotsman enters:

Deinde pruinosis commigrat Scotus ab oris
Gnarus militiae, frugique, & fortis anicus,
Bellica dona ferens: dunque hanc circumspicit aedem,
Et formam, & comites, Divaeque insignia, jactat,
Nomine communi gaudens, sese esse Britannum.

In the recension the wording of the last line is changed, and two sentences are added making the attribution to the Duke of Argyll unnecessary.

According to the anonymous writer already referred to in *The London Magazine*, the Scotus represents either the Earl of Stair or a general character of the Scots. Whatever his identity, his presence augurs well. He promises honours for those citizens who have merited them, peace for the farmers, and safe seas for the sailors. Already the future of Scotland looks brighter:

*Jamque Caledonii melius procedere Soles*
*Incipiunt, melius gelidi glacialia fulgent*
*Signa poli. Immittis jam libertate fruuntur*
*Orcaedes, & massae sperant. Vix cognita coelo,*
*Nullius vel cura Dei, coelestia tandem*
*Numina sentit ovans, & adorat barbara Thule.* 43

Most of the remainder of the first book is devoted to a speech delivered by a *dux Magnus* on the subject of liberty in general. The anonymous writer in *The London Magazine* posits that the speaker is the Duke of Argyll; King himself in the *Opera* states that he is James Butler,

---

42. *He was the most important of the Jacobites of North Wales, where he was known as "the Great Sir Watkin". Jacobite gatherings were held at Wynnstay under each successive Watkin Williams Wynn from 1710 until after 1850, and from these developed the White Rose League, the principal English Jacobite society. It was reorganized in 1886 as the Order of the White Rose and again in 1926 as the Royal Stuart Society.*

43. *By Thule King means Shetland.*
Duke of Ormonde. This last address in the Liber Primus must have enjoyed a certain popularity, for it was reprinted in full with an anonymous verse translation in The Gentleman's Magazine for March 1742. The dux magnus eulogizes the goddess, and urges those present to be cognizant of their good fortune:

Hic & vestra salus posita est, & gloria gentis, Census, opes, artes: hic tanti est muneren auctor.

In the recension the wording of the last line is changed, and two extra verses are added making the attribution to the Duke of Ormonde unmistakable:

Census, opes, artes, pia quas nunc aula tuetur, Et quas lucrosa mercatura invent urbi, Et docta ingenuas quas academia tradit.

The notes indicate that the aula is the Aula Anae, piissimae reginae, and that the academia is

... Oxoniensis, cui dux ille Ormondus praefuit, bonarum omnium et liberalium artium nutrix et alumna, atque insulae hujus gloria et decus. Quam primarii et clarissimi cives fovent, amantque, quam exterae nationes summa observantia colunt.

After several historical allusions, the speaker asks the rhetorical question

At quid feliciter actas
Res veteres Dirae referam, sua commodat ulro Numina cum nobis praesens?

Liberty still controls the earth, he explains, and the leaders of the world, the poets, and even the gods themselves obey her summons. The oration concludes with a flourish inspired by Juvenal:

Hoc orate Jovem: nostros doceantque nepotes
Hoc unum, quod nos docuere, oracula prima, Annales prisci, & felicia tempora mundi, SI SIT LIBERTAS, NON ULLUM NUMEN ABESSE.
The final speech having been delivered, King thus ends Book One

of Templum Libertatis:

Haec ubi, conticuit. Dat prospera signa futuri,
Dat certa; & patrum, & plebis Dea comprobat acta.
Deinde jubet, votiva aris quaecunque ferantur,
Illis dona dari, qui sunt modo vulnera passi
Pro patria. Affulsit populo, dum talia mandat,
Laetior, ambrosios & ab ore afflavit odores.

The author's last note in the Opera edition of this book may well have
been composed with the events of 1745 in mind:

Quanquam, de seculi hujus heroibus, nunquam mehercule animum
induxi, ut bene existimarem, quorum consilio bella suscepta
sunt et inflammata, quum sit bellis nihil miseriaus; ii tamen,
sive nobiles sive ignobiles, qui pro patria ac libertate
publica fortiter pugnaverint, mea quidem sententia nunquam
satis digne laudari, honoribus decorari, praemiis donari possunt.
Qua propter praedicare soleo, et admirari gerontocomia ista, ubi
veterani milites, et nautae grandaevi, jam belli laboribus
fracti, benigno excipiuntur et aluntur, in hospitia perquam comode
divisi.

This publication appears to have been well received. An anonymous
letter published in The Gentleman's Magazine for February 1742 included
two verbatim extracts from it, preceded by some remarks on "modern Latin
Poetry in general." According to this correspondent, Templum
Libertatis is wholly free from the defects which he finds in the work of
other modern Latin poets, and contains besides "a great Number of real
Beauties". Another anonymous writer in The London Magazine, whose foot-
note identifications have already been mentioned, included with his
selection of extracts some flattering observations on the author:

Among the Roman Historians, Salust is famous for the Characters he gives of some of the Persons mentioned in his History, but no such Thing was ever attempted, so far as I remember, by any of the Roman Poets; which certainly proceeded, either from the Difficulty of the Task, or from their not having a Patron, whose Character they could give with Justice and without Offence. Thank God! the present Age is more propitious to the Poets of this Country; and it must be agreeable to every True Briton, to see this difficult Task attempted with Success by a British Bard, and in as pure Latin as was wrote by any of the Authors of the Augustan Age. 46

No doubt the Latin-reading public was well prepared for the appearance of

Book Two in the following January.

This second book opens on a more subdued note. Thus far, King writes, the Muses have sung only with happiness, but Jove often upsets a favourable plan. The king of the gods now looks askance at the happy times being enjoyed in Britain. Hence proceed the miseries which, the author implies, now exist; he comments briefly on them in a three-verse sentence combining the rhetorical devices of asyndeton, anaphora, and isocolon:

Hinc sine honore aras, hinc fraudes, bella, rapinas,
Hinc late scelerum videas florere ministros,
Hinc fortum ignavis populum servire tyrannis.

King wrote two notes on this last verse: one for the 1743 edition and one for the Opera. It is interesting to see how his thinking changed subtly between the two. The first reads:


Rex ipse in this context refers, of course, to the Old Chevalier; there is no mention of him in the later note:

Quot, quales, quantas terrae regiones ita hodie regnari nobis constat? sed enimvero mira sunt, ni principes isti, qui in pueritia bonis artibus et disciplinis haud liberaliter fuerint instituti, in proiectore aetate vitis obruantur; quique sola spe imperii fuerint educati, non modo injusta ea novam sibi dominationem comparandi, sed rerum omnium cupiditate incendantur.

There follows a further invocation to Liberty, during which reference is made to two of the principal characters in this book, Plutus, the god of riches, and one of his colleagues, Cyclops:

At tu sancta fave, si nunc quoque rite vocaris, LIBERTAS: si me damni instrumenta recentis, Venalis populi mores procerumque noteare Si delicta jubes, aptam superinjice nubem, Aut, precor, arma tuo Vulcania porrige vati: A PLUTO, a PLUTI sociis, coetuque CYCLOPUM Quo nos, & cursus nostros, suetosque labores, Otia quo praestes, quo praestes omnia tuta.

An invocation to Laelius - Lord Orrery - is altered in the recension to apply to Cademus, indubitably Dean Swift. Again, King's compliments are so generalized that he had only to change two half lines: everything else which he wrote about Orrery is allowed to stand, and in fact is equally appropriate to the Dean. In the Opera King added an extra note on the newly inserted vocative, Cadene:

Quo tempore hoc scribemam, in morbum incidunt gravissimum et diuturnum, quem quidem, praesentiente animo, semper reformidat Cademus meus, et quo tandem extinctum fuit clarissimum illud ingenii et patriae lumen. Animi et ingenii vires, ut supra dixi, satis testantur Cadeni opera venustatis, salis, leporis, eruditionis et humanitatis plena.

However much King's opinions about other men may have shifted, he never lost his admiration for the Dean of St. Patrick's Cathedral.

The reader is next taken down into Tartarus, where a messenger arrives to convey the news of Liberty's arrival in Britain. The infernal powers
are furious. Dis quickly calls a conference to decide on a plan of action for getting rid of the goddess. King is here patently influenced by Milton's Satan; indeed, borrowings from *Paradise Lost* are evident throughout the remainder of the book. The assembly of the devils is vividly described:

Convenient Erebi proceres. Ingentior aequo
Exundat Phlegethon, volvitque incendia late
Rarum fluctus. Squalorem vultibus addunt
Terribilem Manes, & longa silentia rumpunt:
Atriaque insolitis implent clamoribus Umbrae.

Plutus rises to speak, and cuts an impressive figure. Non est alter terris sollertior hostis. Tartarus is silent as he prepares to speak:

Circumstant undique Manes
Innumeris, & voces gaudent haurire nefandas
Auribus attentis, dum Plutus talia fatur.

The address of Plutus extends to seventy-nine lines in the original version and eighty in the *Opera* text. An anonymous translation of it appeared in two successive issues of *The Gentleman's Magazine* in 1744. It could be argued that this lengthy harangue is, at least in places, oratory in verse, but its tone compares well with that used in the speeches of Milton's devils. The basic argument of Plutus is that with money all things are possible. He insists that force is not a desirable policy, and demonstrates to the assembly their "power, might, and arms" in the form of masses of gold. Greece and Rome, he argues with dubious historicity, were brought low by overabundance of money, as were many other nations and peoples.

O quantum profuit auri
Majestas, Superum quod reddidit irrita dona;
Quod sua Coelicolas oracula fallere jussit?
Coelicolaque iterum, ni me mea ludat imago,
Deficientque artes, loca nobis debita cedent.

The goddess Liberty, he continues, even though guarded from
Olympus, cannot survive cupidity. He lays bare his plan:

Nil moror excubias vigilum, qui limina templi,
Qui servat aras; cum molles centuriones,
Causidici, proceresque illis miscentur egeni,
Et scribae, venale genus. Mihi dona ferenti
Tota cohors aderit supplex, & foedera vestra,
Quae modo calcavit, firmata mente reposcet.

Liberty herself will succumb:

Ipsque virgo dolis (ipsam tentare vel ausim)
Succubet nostris, pretio qua cuncta patebunt,
Si posuit sedes. Quid? Foemina respuet aurum
Haeccine, tantillum numen? parvosque Penates,
Et magno exiguum dubitabit vendere terram,
Si Deus est aliquis, qui coelum vendidit auro?

Plutus, who is well read in classical mythology, proceeds to give
his audience several examples of his previous victories, concluding
with the case of Jove, who, being enamoured of Danae, the beautiful
daughter of Acrisius, succeeded in his quest only with the aid of the
god of riches:

Ecce, tenet Danaen (vidistis) ahenea turris.
Jupiter hanc ardet. Sed nec pater invent artem,
Tela nec, aeratos valeat queis frangere postes,
Fortia sufficiunt armamentaria coeli.
Poscit opem: ferimus. Mea gaudens induit ora,
Pitque aurum: & vincit, quod nulla potentia Divum,
Quod non vincit amor. Cunctis gratissimus hospes
Tecta subit, Danaenque petit, potit~Arque petitam.

With Jove thus safely in possession of Danae, Plutus concludes his
speech and

...... ingenio plaudunt caeca atria Ditis;
Consiliiumque probant proceres laudantque nefandum.
Dis is delighted with the proposal, and lends Plutus his chariot and horses to make the journey to earth. The chariot, we are assured, is the same as that in which Proserpine was taken down to the underworld. The journey of Plutus is described in some detail:

\[ \text{Per sedes Noctis opacas,} \\
\text{Perque informe Chaos, perque aspera viscera terrae} \\
\text{Fertur ovans; sequiturque viam, quam fecerat olim} \\
\text{Dux Erebi, ut gemino ferialia foedera mundo,} \\
\text{Et facilis fieret superas ascensus ad auras.} \]

The god of riches finally emerges into the daylight in a cavern in Derbyshire, and sends the steeds and chariot of Dis back again to Tartarus. The place where Plutus stands is quite desolate:

\[ \text{Omnis perit arbor, & omnis} \\
\text{Aret ager: squalent montes: nec vota, nec ulla} \\
\text{Ars revocare potest Cicerem infelicibus arvis.} \]

In the recension the author increases the verisimilitude by providing a note on the actual state of the countryside at this spot:

\[ \text{Ager, in quo sita est haec spelunca, et tota, quae circa est, terra informis, infoecunda, infructuosa est.} \]

Before attempting to corrupt Britain, Plutus assumes the outward appearance of a man:

\[ .... \\
\text{hominisque figuram,} \\
\text{Et vestes sumit, frontem &}, \text{cui fidere posses,} \\
\text{Si fronti foret ulla fides: nam sive colorem,} \\
\text{Seu nunc perspicias animum, verique coloris,} \\
\text{Ingenuique animi, fortis, pius esse videtur,} \\
\text{Aptus amicitiae, non unquam oblitus amici.} \]

He then betakes himself to the temple of Liberty. So far the information provided by King as to the geographical position of the temple has been quite vague; we learn a little more from a note in the Opera version:
Atrium atque templum Libertatis, quod in libro superiore
dicitur olim fuisse regia tyranni, cujusdam Rufi (puto) e
Normannorum gente, jacet in occidentali urbis parte prope
Tamesis ripam.

Is one justified in assuming from this enigmatic indication that the
goddess Liberty was enthroned in Westminster Hall?

Plutus enters the building, and soon acquires popularity with the
assembled throng:

Hanc intrat; plebique piae se immiscet, et audax
Omnia respondet scitantibus, Unde? Quis esset?
Utque habitus, gestusque viri mentitur, & ora;
Sic patriam, & proavos, generosaque nomina fingit.
Nec sua nunc aberat merces. Spectabilis auro
Mille capiti splendore oculos; primaque colentum
Mille capiti pietate animos, ex ordine cunctos
Indigetes, magnumque loci dum numen adorat,
Blanditiasque affert, arisque ingentia dona.

Plutus succeeds so well in winning friends that he is made the leader of
the cohort to whom the task of guarding and maintaining the temple is
entrusted. He prepares rich and regal gifts, and by his diabolical
largess corrupts almost the entire nation: not only the poor, but also
the leaders, the nobles, and the bishops. The native divinities and the
loki Genius flee the country as almost everyone succumbs to luxury and
inertia. King deals in particular with four specific cases of corruption
under the names of Ambrosius, Curio, Rufus, and Lollius. He explains in
the notes to the 1743 text:

Nihil in toto hoc opere aut obscurum est aut ambiguum, ni
forsitan de hisce nominibus dubitetur. Quapropter his etiam,
quando mihi commodum erit, vera addam nomina. Nunc vero non
est sane commodum.

In fact, King never did provide the names of the actual persons re-
represented - or misrepresented. Instead, in the recension he changed
the first three names to Augustinus, Scaurus, and Bassus. Lollius was retained. Another figure, whose name is given only as Ruffensis, appears a little later in the original edition: in the recension he appears as Cerealis. He is one of the few enemies of Plutus. He may be identified with Sir Andrew Ramsay, who, though he died in France in May 1743, was still alive when King was writing the initial text of Templum Libertatis. Obit Lutetiae Parisiorum, the author explains in the recension, and also provides some information of a more personal nature, all of which harmonizes with what is known of King's attitude towards Sir Andrew:

Norosus treat vioresque, tortia corda,
Ingeniumque meum morbus; mortemque vocare
Heu, mihi in auxilium miser dolor ipse coegit!
Si prope convalui, si mens est sana, recentis
Dira manent, en, signa mali, quod contudit omnes
Saevius articulos chiragra. Mea scripta retractem,
Scribere plura velit, calamo non apta tenendo
Officium, male firma, suum vix dextera praestat.

Part of the scheme of Plutus is to invite foreign enemies: they molest and plunder the Britons without punishment. Rejoicing in his success, the god of riches now sets about the accomplishment of his final ambition, the complete overthrow of the state. He secures the assistance of a rapacious colleague by the name of Cyclops, and with his aid establishes suzerainty over the country. Plutus is now domi praeses, ad exterobs legatus, ad populum concionator. The state of the nation throughout this conquest by the god of riches is indeed appalling; King's poetry is at its strongest when composed in the form of jeremiads:
Furiosa libido
Quantum egit, monitis si non contraria Pluti!
Omnia sed monitis parent. Jacet obruta virtus.
Fortia nostrorum ridentur facta parentum,
Simplicitas & prisca: fides ridentur & omnes,
Quos incendit amor patriae; populumque tuendi,
Et quibus est studium firmandi fata nepotum.
Ridentur, viles animae, qui praemia poscunt
Ingenii, lauros fragiles, titulosque caducos:
Sic licet haec sibi cuncta habeant, haec munera tantum.
Odit enim Plutus divinas Palladis artes,
Musarumque choros . . .

No Latin poet living during the declining years of the Roman Empire described the corruptions of his time with the disgust and mordancy with which King described the imaginary reign of Plutus. Cyclops, incultum turpemque, is the most revolting single character in the poem. He has most of the vices of Plutus - on a smaller scale - but none of his grandeur.

The god of riches calls him brother:

... fratremque agnoscere posset,
Cui mores Stygii, Divum contemptus, & auri
Dira fames, semperque avidae manus apta rapinae.

Although this grasping, misshapen fiend is laughed at by all to whom he is sent, he is exceedingly useful to Plutus:

hostes
Provocat innumer os: socialia foedera rumpit:
Instituit censum: auget vectigal a, tristi
Et quicquid vexet populum spolietve rapina.

Like his classical namesake he has a large number of relations, the perfida turba Cyclopum, who accompany him in making mischief.

Having seized power, Plutus imposes a system of taxes and imposts, and by this means acquires a large sum of money for himself. The citizens, in their state of corruption, are quite helpless:

Jamque, sua Plutus quod vix speraret ab arte,
VICTA malis cessat pietas, & ubique tacetur
Libertatis amor.
The seers of Phoebus then chant a lugubre carmen: the performers are thus identified in the Opera:

Qui iis temporibus laude ingenii praecepue floruerunt poetae, Swift, Pope, Gay, reipublicae partibus, ac libertatis causae semper favebant . . . .

Their lamentations have an imprecatory quality:

Di, quibus est terram, nunc siqua est, cura tuendi, Aspicite afflictas urbes, & squalida rura, Et maciem populi! Vestris si floruit unquam Albion auspiciis, si grata haec insula Phoebus, Grata fuit Cereri sedes; audite querelas, Et damnis miserae tandem succurrite gentis.

Swift, Pope, and Gay continue their lugubrious elegy in the same strain for another forty-sevei verses, serving a dramatic function similar to that of a Greek chorus.

At the conclusion of this dirge, Plutus, completely confident of his own abilities, approaches the goddess Liberty herself, and supplicates her with feigned piety.

Tum magnos montes, Divae blanditus, & omnes Quot Golconda 48 parit gemmas, regumque favorem, Jura etiam, & veteres aris promittit honores; Si modo virgo suos comites (corrumpere quorum Ille animos tentat frustra) dimittat ab aede; Consiliunque uni credat studiumque CYCLOPI; Omnia si credat.

When nothing comes of the promises of Plutus, he is moved to anger and orders the leaders of the people to leave the temple immediately. Now it is the turn of the goddess to be indignant:

His commota, truci PLUTUM rabidosque CYCLOPAS,
Dissimilique sui, LIBERTAS lumine spectans,
Usque adeone audes? usque urges numina coeli
Fallere cum nequeas, addisque minacia verba,
Dixit? Et horrendum somuerunt atria templi.

The goddess has only to touch Plutus with her sceptre, as Ithuriel
touched Satan with his spear in _Paradise Lost_, and his real nature
becomes manifest to the people:

Tum PLUTUM sceptro feriens (sceptrumque gerebat
Divae Jovis donum) speciem formamque removit
Humana; & Stygios vultus, & reddidit ora,
Immanesque artus. Quin verum denique PLUTUM,
Dum loquor, exhibuit populo, monstrumque, crearat
Quale Chaos quantumque. Illum erubuisse Camoenae
Tum primum perhibent, propriamque odisse figuram.

On this note of diabolical revelation, the second and last surviving book
of Templum Libertatis abruptly finishes.

This book, like the first, seems to have been well received. Thus
an epigram in _The Gentleman's Magazine_ for March 1743 headed _Verses,
occasion'd by reading the TEMPLUM LIBERTATIS_, though anonymous and not
notably inspired, is obviously intended as a compliment to King:

"This work, celestial sister: - must be thine,
For thro' the whole I see thy wisdom shine!"

49. _The Gentleman's Magazine_, March 1743, p.156. In his letter to Lord
Orrery of April 9, 1743, King indicates that he has seen the epigram
(Bodleian Library, MS.Eng.hist. d.103, p.72).
One need not take too seriously King's claim in his letter to Lord Orrery of October 14, 1741, that Lady Orrery, as he wrote, "has inspired me with all that is good in ye Temple of Liberty (if there be any thing good) for I never drew one of my Characters, but I thought of Lady Orrery's good sense, and Wit, and sweetness of temper, and affection for her friends, with all the train of her good and amiable qualities." Rather obviously King's most significant source of inspiration for his greatest Latin work was Milton's *Paradise Lost*. In a sense the influence of the great Republican was incongruous, but King was perfectly capable of recognizing great poetry, regardless of the political propensities of its author. His indebtedness shows itself principally in the plot; since King was writing in Latin he could hardly imitate the style of *Paradise Lost*. In this respect King differs markedly from the other eighteenth-century imitators of Milton, who, as a general rule, followed his style without incorporating his matter.  

It is easy enough to point to defects in *Templum Libertatis* quite apart from the thinness of the plot. The action is slow moving and performed in a setting that is always artificial and contrived. The rationale is of questionable validity: there were numerous political commentators in the 1740's advancing the view that Englishmen were then

enjoying unparalleled freedom. Above all, the poet's attitude reflects the sentiments of only one political pressure group to the complete exclusion of those of the opposition. Nevertheless, it is significant that King's satire in this poem is always of a general nature; he does not allow himself the luxury of indulging in specific Jacobite propaganda, and he never loses his ability to create an atmosphere of hauteur and amplitude. The diabolical loftiness of the second book is not greatly inferior to that of the comparable sections of Paradise Lost. The indictments against contemporary venality are written with a Swiftian force and with a conscious grandeur absent from those of the Dean. However, the author is sometimes led to make statements which, even when judged with sympathy, are somewhat exaggerated. To mention only one example, his depiction of the bishops of his time as being motivated by little except love of money and power is, to say the least, biased. One could demonstrate the evidence of dozens of works of genuine piety written by some of these prelates, quite apart from the role which a number of them played in furthering missionary activities and church building.  

King's greatest strength is his Latin style. The numerous tiny changes that he made in the Opera edition reveal the scrupulous care which he devoted to the construction and phraseology of every line in the poem. The result is a presentation which exhibits a marmoreal smoothness and a lapidary brilliance which few later Latin poets have managed to attain.

52. King's views on this subject were little changed when he was in his final sickness. See Political and Literary Anecdotes (2d ed., 1819), pp. 183-188.
And though King's Latinity has a decidedly pompous quality, *Templum Libertatis* lacks the lumbering character of so many uninspired neo-Latin epics. Despite all its shortcomings, it has no serious contemporary rival.

It is perhaps of incidental interest that this is the only poem by King that seems to have been imitated. Richard Powney in the *Templum Harmoniae* and Michael Clancy in the *Templum Veneris*, both published in 1745, were to some extent indebted to the author of *Templum Libertatis*. The influence of King is especially evident near the commencement of the third book of Powney's poem:

*At tu, carminibus pollens & numine Phoebi,*
*Tu servare vices qui rhetoris atque poetae*
*Idem ausus, summo comes huic succurre labori,*
*Et faveas, precor; in melius dum fingere mores*
*Corruptos acer satira moliris & urbem*
*Venalem, ingenuus libertatisque patronus,*
*Extruis en! reduci jam templa perennia Divae.*
*Tuque tuae referes pretium haud ignobile famae,*
*Seu vocet ad coenas te sermonesque Deorum*
*Pollio, libertatis amans; cui maxima mentem*
*Pieridum studiis & natam rebus aRendisIpsa olim indulsit Pallas: seu Laelius altum*
*Poscat epos, nectatque modos & nobile carmen.*

Neither of these poems exhibits the vigour or the spaciousness of *Templum Libertatis*. In fact, neither is technically an epic: the subtitle of *Templum Harmoniae* is *Carmen Epicum* and that of *Templum Veneris* is *Amorum Rhapsodieae*. Though the Latin epic continued to be written for some time longer on the continent, *Templum Libertatis* was the last attempt at that genre by an English poet.

During the early months of 1743 King suffered from his usual
hiemal attacks of gout. On Ash Wednesday he was lame in both hands
and feet, but, as he explained on April 9, he did succeed in escaping
from an attack of influenza that was raging at the time:

The Epidemical cold, or which ye physicians say is ye
Italian Influenza is got among us here and I think I am ye
only person in our Hall, who have [sic] escaped it hitherto,
which I attribute to my temperance only.

But despite the difficulties created by the inclemency of the weather,
the Principal of St. Mary Hall was preparing the Latin speech which he
delivered in Convocation on the following April 14, when James Hamilton,
Duke of Hamilton and Brandon, was presented for the degree of D.C.L.,
honoris causa. On August 25 of the same year King delivered the Latin
orations when George Henry Lee, Earl of Lichfield, and Lord Orrery were
awarded the same degree. These three speeches were later published with
a Latin preface dated December 1, 1743, under the title Tres Oratiunculæ
Habitæ in Domo Convocationis Oxon. The published text of these orations
may not correspond precisely to what King declaimed; in his letter to
Lord Orrery of September 9, 1743, he intimates that he has been "earnestly
implored" for copies of the three speeches, and adds: "I must (I believe)
1. Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist.d.103, p. 73."
take a resolution to print them after having made some few additions."

The Duke of Hamilton was eighteen years of age when he received the honorary degree, having been a member of the university since February 23, 1740, when he had matriculated at St. Mary Hall. King refers to his youth with tact and delicacy, describing him as

.... optimae indolis adolescentem, et sui ordinis spectatissimum: adolescentem verecundia quidem, sed virum prudentia, sed senem gravitate.

He cannot resist the temptation to imply that such a youth is something of a rarity:

.... gratulor reipublicae, et almae huic Academiae, et literis ipsis pro ingenio tali; quod in homine adolescente rarum est, in nobili vero rarissimum.

The young Duke's family - the same as that of Lady Orrery - is described is glowing terms:

De splendore generis, et vetustate familiae HAMILTONIAE et DUCLASSIAE, unde Dux nobilissimus est oriundus, qua nihil clarius, ne quidem domus regia, (quippe in Gallia, in Germania, in Italia, in omnibus fere Europae gentibus sunt principes et primarii viri, qui ab hac stirpe originem suam se accipisse gloriatur) quot et quanta praedicarem, si mihi spatium esset dicendi?

He does not subscribe to the aristocratic vices so prevalent, according to King, at the time:

.... quam dissimillimus est novis istis hominibus qui superbos titulos et ingentia nomina quaerentes (quae quidem salva et florente republica desperassent) non excellentia generis, aut majorum fama, sed flagitiis suis, sed perfidia summa fiunt nobiles: adeo ut de celsa illa et amplissima, in quam ascenderunt, dignitatis sede dignitatem jam pene omnem sustulisse videantur!

2. Bodleian Library, MS.Eng.hist. d.103, p.79.
Here the speaker checks his own indignation:

At non hic nostrum est cum iniquitate temporis pugnare.
Suo jure utantur aulici: emant, vendant, corrumpant,
corrumpantur.

He concludes with an exhortation to his listeners to adhere to the principles of traditional morality, once again exhibiting his fondness for syntactical parallelism:

Vos autem, viri integerrimi, antiquum vestrum semper ita
tenete morem, vestram tenete authoritatem philosophiae
praesidii, fide et firmitate animi, et liberali semper ita
munitam custodia; ut hunc senatum, hanc venerabilem domum
nulla unquam attingat infamia; ut neque judiciis, neque .
consiliis vestris nefariorum hominum interponatur potentia;
ut denique Academici honores nemini deferantur, nisi qui sit
dignissimus, et honoribus illis et majoribus suis.

King's magnificently rhetorical assessment of this young aristocrat is difficult to verify today, so little is known about his minority. He came of a family of Jacobite Tories: no doubt his views were essentially those of his more famous father. Apart from the formal expressions proclaimed in his speech, King himself wrote little which has survived on the subject of the Duke. In a letter to Sanderson Miller from Bath, dated only "April, 1743", King commented of his speech, ".... in truth I intended it only as a Lesson for his Grace. I wish he may always consider it as such." And in his letter to Lord Orrery of June 6, 1743,

3. His career seems to have been uneventful. In 1752 he married Elizabeth Gunning of Castle Coote, Roscommon, one of the celebrated beauties of the day, and died at the age of thirty-four at Great Tew, Oxfordshire, as the result of a cold.

4. Dickins and Stanton, _op.cit._, p.95.
he shews the newly created Doctor of Civil Law in a state of temporary indecision:

You know I have engaged to attend his Grace of H. to some French Academy and see him settled. He talks of going y^s beginning of August. But as he is at present a very uncertain young Gentleman, I think he will not go so soon. May, I think he will not go at all. 5

Such pieces of evidence are too slender to support any definite conclusion with regard to the Duke, though one may assume that, in his public utterances, King would scarcely have laid himself open to a charge of disingenuousness for the sake of this adulescens. What is undeniable is that King used this occasion, as he did others similar, to extol what he regarded as Jacobite uprightness, and to attack, in heavily veiled language, the morality of the New Interest.

The Earl of Lichfield was somewhat older than the Duke - twenty-six to be precise - and was later to attain the highest honour of the university as Chancellor. King's eulogy for him is grandiloquent, but not unduly fulsome if one considers the oratorical canons of the time. The listeners are given ample assurance of His Lordship's virtues:

> Quicquid enim in viro nobili aut requiere, aut amare solemus, sive elegantiam ingenii, sive probitatem morum, sive, quod omnium est pulcherrimum, amorem patriae; in hoc spectatissimo juvene haec insunt omnia.

The audience is reminded that Lord Lichfield has been an exemplary Member of Parliament,

> .... qui pene puer senator factus nihil pueriliter dixit, nihil fecit; sed pulchra, sed honesta, sed praeclera omnia.

He has always been honest (an epithet with special overtones for Jacobites) and has always held steadfastly in mind "the most sacred name of liberty". Nor is he deficient in private parts:

Sed neque modo in curia et consiliis publicis, sed etiam in otio et privatis officiis ipse ita sibi cunctos devinxit humanitate sua et singulari comitate, ut gravissimi senes eum ament, probissimi juvenes admirentur, colant amici, observent propinquii, invideant pauci, oderit nemo.

King's extended panegyric leads him to a rhetorical climax: a kind of crescendo of exhortation in carefully elaborated parallel constructions:

O! si sic semper curemus decernendos, civibus nimirum huic simillimis; non quia nobiles sunt, aut quia Academicci, sed quia viri boni, et honorum et doctorum amantissimi; non quia hosce petunt honores, sed quia merentur: quod quidem genere, et nobilitate, et cunctis nominibus, et cunctis honoribus est ornatus.

Of the speeches published in *Tres Oratiunculae* King liked the third best. "You will see some little alterations and an addition of a line or two," he wrote to Lord Orrery, but added that "Lead has made ye publication of ye whole necessary." By "Lead" King means the Bishop of Llandaff, Dr. John Gilbert, who, like the other Whig pontiffs, was diametrically opposed to the fundamental aims of Jacobitism. Magnanimous though King had been to Lord Lichfield, the encomium for Lord Orrery manifests a much greater feeling of camaraderie and a degree of flattery which one might consider to be unduly inflated were it not for the similar sentiments constantly expressed in the speaker's private correspondence, with apparently complete candour. Orrery is first presented as

---

hunc nobilissimum virum, .... hunc ornatissimum virum, hunc, in quo glori, LAELIUM \[7\] meum: qui a puero mire studiosos, et avito praeditus ingenio, in almae nostrae Matris sermone ita fuit educatus, ut omni liberali doctrina, et Graecis literis et Latinis haud quisquam hodie sit erudior.

His ability in English is equal to his powers in Latin and Greek:

Anglicani vero sermonis tanta ei est elegantia, tanta oris suavitas, tanta comitas cum gravitate judicii conjuncta et in dicendo et in scribendo, (Lyrica ejus opera testes, et disertissimae epistolae, et jucundissima convictio) ut saepissime arbitratus sim, Apollinem ipsum, ut ita dicam, si Anglice loqueretur, hunc quidem velle imitari.

Compliments are piled on compliments: Orrery is politissimus, pater-
familias prudens, maritus continens, amicus fidelis, hospes liberalis, 
fautor et patronus literarum munificus, quo nihil humanius, modestius, 
sanctius. King's oratory rises to paeans more laudatory than he ever bestowed on any other individual, not excluding Swift:

Neque vero est mirum, quod in hoc clarissimo viro tot animi dotes, totque naturae bona, optimarum artium studiis exculta, reperiantur; quem haec omnia illi plane sunt gentilitia. Quam illustria enim sunt avorum ejus, proavorum, atavorum nomina apud nostros, apud exterors, apud eruditos omnes! Adeo ut hic unus fortasse de tot nobilibus sui temporis ab stirpe ipsius Philosophiae oriundus esse videatur.

He takes the opportunity to compare His Lordship with less worthy men in the land (the audience must have known which political interest the speaker had in mind) and vituperates against those

7. King provides a footnote setting forth references to LAELIUM in Scammum, Ecloga and Templum Libertatis. This constitutes the strongest proof that Laelius is to be taken as representing Orrery in the original editions of these works. As already indicated, the references to Laelius do not occur in the recensions contained in the Opera.
... qui se primos omnium esse contendunt, proceres, antistes, principes Reipublicae; qui tamen simulazione pietatis nihil non impie faciunt, et simulazione publicae utilitatis omnia (pro dolor!) sane apta esse vident suis commodis suoque imperio.

As he draws to his conclusion, he adopts an autobiographical tone:

At vos, si laudationibus meis faveatis, ignoscite, quae, siqua est, est honestissima; quum unum quidem hoc cogito non tantum in hac oratiuncula, sed in omnibus scriptis meis, et in omni vita; ut satisfaciam opinioni vestrae, et praestem eam, quam Reipublicae, quam Academiae, quam ingenio huic excellenti et summo meo amico debo reverentiam.

King adds to the conventional conclusion of such presentation speeches the unusual comment to Convocation, "illustriorem sane legistis nunquam."

In the months immediately prior to the publication of Tres Oratiunculae, King delivered some other speeches which he did not see through the press. Thus on August 23, 1744, he presented the Whig Sir Edward Turner for the degree of D.C.L., honoris causa, and made "a very polite, tho' severe speech on modern patriotism and the times." 8 On October 26 he spoke again in Convocation; Euseby Isham described the performance as "one of ye best Speeches in ye finest and coolest manner I ever heard." 9 The text of neither speech has been preserved.

The preface to the three published orations constituted the start of a peculiar literary "controversy", all of which, with the possible exception of the final piece, was very probably written by King himself. Addressed LECTORI, the preface to Tres Oratiunculae implies that the author has been attacked by some anti-Jacobite canon and that other members

8. The London Evening Post, No. 2625, September 1-4, 1744.
of the New Interest are engaged in personal onslaughts against him.

The canon in question is Dr. John Gilbert, Bishop of Llandaff, who, after his consecration, continued to hold the canonry at Christ Church which he had received from the crown in commendam. He went so far as to call for the expulsion from Convocation of the Principal of St. Mary Hall, as is made manifest in King's letter to Lord Orrery headed "Bagshot Oct. ye 6th 1743":

Would you think (yes you would) that Leaden Gil--t has been pleased to criticize my speeches, wch he did not hear, and to abuse me most outrageously in all places for he does not know what. .... Among other things he says, that if he had been in the Convocation, he would have moved ye House to expel me. To this I have answered, that altho' I am persuaded no person would second his motion, yet I will submit to be expell'd, if he can make it. You know he must make it in Latin. 11

The bishop did not propose the motion to Convocation, and the Principal of St. Mary Hall remained unexpelled.

King's grievances against Bishop Gilbert are expounded at greater length in the preface to Tres Oratiunculae. He first makes it plain that he is publishing these speeches "ut obviam irem malevoli cujusdam CANONICI injuriis," and continues:

Nam ex quo tempore libertatis & patriae laudes, & ingenuarum artium studia, & optimorum civium virtutes in senatu nostro celebrare aggressus sum; & quod neutiquam a meo munere alienum esse arbitrabar, novorum hominum in rempublicam perfidiam & priditionem leviter notavi; ita rei novitate perculsus est vir iste magnificus, ut ultra modum intumuerit (quanquam semper intumescit notabiliter) meque in convivis rodere, maledictis lacessere, & procacissima censura in odium & invidiam vocare vix usquam destiterit.

10. In 1749 he became Bishop of Salisbury and in 1757 Archbishop of York. The Dictionary of National Biography corroborates King's general contentions: "Gilbert seems to have possessed few qualifications to justify his high promotion in the church. He was neither a scholar nor a theologian. Nor were these deficiencies compensated by graces of character."

King regarded him, as he did the other Whig clergy, as receiving
unjustifiable political favours from the state:

En, hic ille est, qui modo dite sacerdotium arroganter
recusavit: nempe cogitat (vide, quid avaritia impudenter
cogitat!) ditissimum; quo scilicet erit contentus; & quo
(eheu! ita est seculum) fortasse donandus. Nos autem nomine
interea his ipsi praecclare admonemur, quid de re amplissima,
de speciosis titulis de regum, quae cuncta sunt, donis statuat
deus optimum maximus; quanti faciat, et quam nolit ea esse
virtutem praemia; quae talis vir, qui virtutibus plane omnibus
caret, sine aut periculo, aut contentione, aut sumptu sibi
potuit comparare?

He continues to allege further shortcomings on the part of Gilbert,
especially that he is literis vix mediocriter imbutus despite the fact
that he holds a canonry which is ornatissimam et fructuosissimam. The
publication of these speeches, he indicates, is the result of the insolent
and contemptuous threats which have been offered him.

Bishop Gilbert did not answer these charges, and so King wrote an
answer instead. It takes the form of two short works: Epistola Canonici
Reverendi Admodum ad Archidiaconum Reverendum Admodum and Epistola
Objurgatoria ad Guilielmum King, LL.D., which are nowadays only to be found
together, in a single binding with consecutive page numbers. 12 The
Epistola Canonici is the first of King's two satires in doggerel
Latin prose, and is intended to be in imitation of Gilbert's Latin
style. The archdeacon to whom it is addressed is not identifiable;
he may have been only a literary device.

The total effect is ludicrous as for nine pages the supposed

12. There were two editions in 1744 of the combined publication: in the
first, page 24 is mianumbered 23, and there is an Erratum at the foot
of page 30; in the second, page 24 is numbered correctly and the
Erratum is emended. Though these two pieces have their separate
title pages in both editions, it is quite possible that they were never
published singly.
author rants in appalling Latin against

..... impudenti isti Doctori, qui locutus est tam multa contra me in sua praefatione.

The Epistola Canonici and the comparable Epistola Dedicatoria to
Oratiuncula Habita in Domo Convocationis Die Oct. 27, 1756 (attributed
to Robert Jenner, the then Regius Professor of Civil Law) must constitute
two of the worst pieces of continuous Latin prose ever to appear in print.
Grammatical and syntactical blunders, stylistic lapses, logical fallacies
and factual inaccuracies are crawling all over the pages. Gilbert is
represented as a kind of prelatical nincompoop explaining to his
venerabilis frater, the archdeacon, the causes of his antagonism towards
the author of Tres Oratiunculæ:

Ultima aestate ego eram ad prandium cum multis alii generosis
ad domum Domini H. cum unus vir, qui ibi erat una ad tabulam,
dixit aliquid bonum de isto Doctore, et suis Oratiunculis; quod
me fecit magis rubeum in facie, quam ego sum ordinarie, et magis
iratum, quam unquam fui in tota mea vita. Tunc ego responsi:
iste Doctor est magnus Jacobita, et non amat regem, et debit
expelli ab Universitate pro suis Oratiunculis, quae sunt plenae
seditionis, et abutuntur Episcopos et nobilitatem et omnes
ordines virorum, ut ego audivi ab illis qui audierunt istas
Oratiunculas pronunciatus.

He continues to expatiate in the same jejune, Anglicized Latin on the
subject of King's preface, in qua scandalizavit me, quantum est possibile,
ut videtis. His lawyer, he writes, has told him that he does not have a
good legal case against the author because the language of the preface is
not sufficiently plain. This state of affairs seems to him to constitute
a serious defect in the law, cum omnes pueri in Universitate sciunt, quod
ego certe intendor per istam præfationem. However, he continues, he has
a friend, a magnus minister, who has advised him to find someone who can
write a reply to the preface in good Latin; thus he has commissioned a mirabilis disputer et jocator to write for him the *Epistola Objurgatoria*. He is delighted to have found such an individual

... ponere ea omnia in bonam Latinitatem, quam ego quidem nunquam curavi, quia non est utilis in minimo ad promotiones et translationes in nostro ordine ... .

King is shortly to discover what a mistake he has himself made:

Sed propecto quando haec OBJURGATORIA publicabitur, ille statim inveniet suum errorem, et me odierit, ut si essum unus diabolus; dum ego gloriosse dico cum Apostolo, veni, vidi, vici.

There is no signature, but the letter is dated "EX STUDIO MEO infra decimam & undecimam in mane post jentaculum. Jan. 30, 1744."

One of the incidentally interesting aspects of this atrociously written letter is the indirect attack on the scholastic deductive logic that was still being taught at Oxford. Gilbert is represented as using it to argue that King was illogical when he accused him of lacking gravity while at the same time being "leaden". Like Lewis Carroll, King was a master at composing the facetious logical deduction:

... quodcumque est plumbeum, id est grave, secundum quod communiter dicitur et proverbialiter; grave ut plumbum. Ergo, si plumbeitas mihi non deest, gravitas non deest; et e contra si gravitas mihi deest, plumbeitas deest.

This is followed by a deliberately transparent syllogistic argument in which Gilbert assails with comic sincerity King's insinuation that he (a man) is lacking humanity:

Omnis homo est humanus, sed omnis humanus habet humanitatem, ergo omnis homo habet humanitatem: Qui habet humanitatem, ei humanitas non deest, sed homo habet humanitatem, ergo homini humanitas non deest. Et hoc est secundum istam infallibilem regulam, quam posuit unus magnus philosophus et bonus Theologus, (cujus nomen ego non memini nunc) qui dixit valde laudabiliter
et logialiter, Homo sum: nihil humanum a me alienum puto. 13

Argumentation such as this, Bishop Gilbert is made to assert, non modo objurgabit, sed secabit istum Guilielmum frustillatim, et percutiet eum mutum in aeternum.

The Epistola Objurgatorica is dated Pridie Calendas Februarias, and purports to have been completed the day after Gilbert's letter. It is preceded by a short notice, BIBLIOPOLA LECTORI ERUDITO, in which the bookseller declares with a certain appropriateness:

DONO mihi missa est haec Epistola plumbea pyxide inclusa, & mirato capite obsignata. Si quaeris, Unde? Nescio.

Consequently the author is presented as anonymous, but the bookseller has his own opinions on the book itself:

Id sane venustum est, si ei viro, quem defendit facetus scriptor, totum displiceat: venustius, si tibi tuique simillimus satis placeat: verum hercle certe venustissimum, si mihi bono lucro fiet futurum.

There is no real argument in the sixteen pages over which this brief work extends: it is essentially a mock-serious presentation of Gilbert's imaginary case against King. The Whig to whom it is credited, a lawyer in the Middle Temple, writes better Latin than the bishop, but his case is just as banal. It would be tiresome to summarize this piece: its humour consists principally in its elaboration, at times ad nauseam,

13. This quotation (or misquotation) is from Terence. The original passage said by Chremes to Menedemus in the Heautontimorumenos, reads in modern editions:

Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto.
of the most trivial logomachies in purposely muddle headed fashion, filled out with numerous examples of unfounded personal abuse against King and equally unfounded praise of the "leaden man". A single example must serve to illustrate King's manipulation of this singular kind of satire and his ability to make amusing (at least from time to time) what is in essence nothing more than a tissue of twaddle.

One of the arguments used in favour of the episcopal Canon of Christ Church is that King's epithet plumbeus, far from detracting from his merit, is actually extremely appropriate:

Quod denique studes inclyto viro invidiam facere PLUMBEOS clamando (quorum mentionem, haud dubito, quin tecum putaris sane callide injectam esse, atque id verbum salsissime dictum) nihil profecto est ineptius, aut a re tua tam alienum. Quid enim? Quinam homines sunt vere plumbei? Praeclarissimi videlicet heroes, philosophi, et poetae veteres; quorum vultus in procerum aedibus, atris, hortis usquequaque se ostendunt ex plumbo effici. Quinetiam deos plumbeos, qui tamen coelitum sunt elegantissimi, et bonis literis favent, Apollinem et Mercurium, quoties ego contemplatus sum? quoties deas, catas, doctas, pulchras, Minervam Musasque Gratiasque ex eadem materia bellissime expressas?

This last piece of special pleading (if the term may be allowed) is corroborated by further evidence from nearer home in the form of a footnote to Musasque:

Quae hodie praesunt Musae TYPOGRAPHEO CLARENDONIANO, in conspectu omnis populi stantes, eae quidem plumbeae sunt. Nonne?

On these premisses the supposititious author reaches a triumphant conclusion:

Plumbeos omnes, ii cujuscumque sunt ordinis, aut ubicunque sedes suas posuerunt, diligentius inspice, perspice explora; nusquam unquam invenies aut illepidum caput, aut invenustum; id nisi sit fortasse quiddam regium: quod nihilominus et dignitas personae et mos gentium excusarit satis, si parum cerebri habeat.
At this stage the reader is presented with a caveat to the statement just made, and thence the idiotic polemic meanders on, proving nothing except King's competence in caricaturing a certain kind of inferior thinker. No evidence survives of Gilbert's own reaction to all this, but whatever he thought, it is unlikely that the Principal of St. Mary Hall was yet prepared to let the matter rest.

_Epistola Objurgatoria_ was followed by _A Letter to a Friend Occasioned by Epistola Objurgatoria_, dated March 23, 1744. Almost certainly this brief pamphlet is the work of King himself, though on the title-page the author is given as S.P.Y.B. The usual explanation of these initials is that they stand for Samuel Parker, Yeoman Bedel. The nature of the relationship between King and Parker is now far from clear: Parker was a younger man who had matriculated at Magdalen College in 1730 and had been yeoman bedel of the university since 1731. Why King should have wished to impersonate him will probably never be determined, but it is equally unlikely that any other person is intended. He is represented here as complaining to some nameless friend that he has been erroneously attributed with the authorship of _Epistola Objurgatoria_:

_The Gentlemen tell me, I am the Author of it; but, as I have a Soul to be saved, I am as innocent of any hand in it as the Child unborn .... I thought I would write to you about it, and let you know I never did, nor ever will, trouble myself to write for or against any Man._

This contention is elaborated at some length and with an excessive use of cliché and proverbial quotation: very likely the superficial, periphrastic style is intended to mirror Parker's limited conversational powers. He is made to issue some naive reactions to the false attribution of its
authorship, being "ready to go wild about it" and "almost worried to
death". He regards Epistola Objurgatoria as a "wicked Book" and
declares his abhorrence of it. He complains because men who think he
really is the author unkindly mutter scraps of Latin about him to one
another. One, for example, cries:

\textit{Invidus alterius rebus macrescit opimis.}

Parker's comment is:

\begin{quotation}
So, because I am thin and meagre, truly I must be envious;
when all the World knows (the more's my Misfortune) my poor
Visage is thus miserably reduced merely by the plaguy Tooth-
ach.
\end{quotation}

A good deal of the force of this kind of writing is inevitably lost to
readers who have never known S.P.Y.B. personally.

The last item in this strange series is entitled \textit{A Chiding Letter to}
S.P.Y.B. in Defence of Epistola Objurgatoria. No author's name is given,
but this short pamphlet of nineteen pages is generally attributed to King.
It takes the form of a letter, dated May 4, 1744, in answer to that of
Samuel Parker. The anonymous writer claims to be indignant at Parker's
letter and waxes strong against him:

\begin{quotation}
How durst you write that LETTER of the 23d of March? Was
it for one of your mean Abilities to enter the Lists with a Man,
not only of fine Parts and elevated Genius, but a Wit of the
first Magnitude? Is he, think you, Sir, to be called to Account
by every Blockhead that can get a Sheet of Paper to scribble on?
\end{quotation}

This tone is maintained fairly consistently to the end: S.P.Y.B. is roundly
condemned, and King is enthusiastically extolled together with Epistola
Objurgatoria.

\textit{A Chiding Letter} is indeed an oddity. If King really was the author,
he was composing appreciably below his usual standard, and with a surprising
poverty of sophistication. Furthermore, this piece lacks his customary clarity, especially in its use of pronouns without a definitely unambiguous antecedent. The amount written in an earnest—not mock-serious—tone in praise of King himself is proportionately much greater than is to be found in any work definitely known to be by him. In this publication it seems to be taken for granted that King really is the author of Epistola Objurgatoris, a fact which he had hitherto not admitted. On the other hand, the writer does not explicitly regard King as the author of A Letter to a Friend of March 23, and assumes throughout S.P.Y.B.'s authorship of it.

None of these considerations constitutes prima facie evidence against King's authorship of A Chiding Letter. To one so capable of disguising his literary personality, a work with an unauthentic quality would not have been difficult to create. In the circumstances in which he was placed, King had good reason for wishing to envelope the entire controversy in a haze of confusion. But in the last analysis one can only regard the established bibliographical attribution to King with some suspicions, especially in view of such heavy-handed and questionable compliments as these, which if I interpret them in their context rightly, are intended to be taken literally without ironic innuendo:

The Dr .... is perfectly well satisfied of his own entire Merit, notwithstanding the small Value others sat on it .... The Doctor, far from regarding what such a Tool as you says of his more than Attic Performance, is for ever reading it, and for ever admiring it: And prithee, Fellow, if you will needs attempt to be witty, learn of him the Difference between Attic Irony, and Elegance of Wit; and your intemperate Scurrility, and illiberall Banter .... He is Master of a courtly Stile, which he fails not to improve with Plenty of Attic Seasoning .... In one Word to attack the Doctor is to attack the united Elegance
King could have penned these statements, but their expressions are not typical. If he did compose them, whom was he attempting to impersonate? And why should he choose to defend himself in so mediocre a manner against a simulated attack which - in all probability - he had himself written? To such questions there are at present no precise answers.

At about the same time as he was engaged in this controversy, King was rebuilding the east range of St. Mary Hall with the aid of contributions furnished by old members. The style which he decided upon may be described as eighteenth-century Elizabethan: its simple rusticity was in all likelihood regarded as a pleasant anachronism. He also added a new room to the Principal's lodgings, which in those days were in the northwest corner of the Hall quadrangle. Though King's east wing still survives today, little remains of the lodgings which he occupied. The reconstruction of the west side of the Hall in 1826 and the addition of the Rhodes Building some eighty-five years later have now replaced the quarters used by successive Principals until the union with Oriel College in 1902.

The spring of 1744 also saw the publication of another Latin work by King, Antonietti, Duci Corsorum, Epistola ad Corsos, the argument of which had already appeared in 1737 in Common Sense. The later version which appeared in the Opera bears the title Antonietti, Corsorum Ducis, Epistola

---

ad Corsos. There are other slight variations between the texts.
The 1744 printing is preceded by an introductory prose paragraph under the heading *Editor Lectori* and by another more extended passage entitled *Antoniettus, Dux Corsorum, Clarissimo Pasquillo Romae Censori*. In the recension, the heading *Editor Lectori* is omitted, but the introductory paragraph is printed as a note near to the beginning of the text of the poem. The substance of the second prose passage appears at the end of the work under the title *Antoniettus Clarissimo Pasquillo, Romano Censori*. There is a certain amount of rewording in the later version, and some topical references are added. The original text of the poem contains 229 lines; the *Opera* revision 228. The precise date of the first appearance of this work cannot now be determined, but it must have been shortly before April 24; on that date King wrote to Lord Orrery:

> I have just now published the Corsican Epistle. I think no party can be angry with it. And yet it may so happen, that as I have been formerly deemed a Jacobite, I may now be called a Republican. The Leaden Man, you may be sure, will criticize me with all his might - but not in Latin. 15

In the *Editor Lectori* the author praises the Corsicans and, in effect, indicates that they represent the British people:

> Quae sit bellicosissima illa Corsorum natio, jam norunt omnes; eique favit omnes, qui patriam amant, et colunt libertatem; omnes nimium, qui sunt bona ac sanae mentis. Si tu, Lector, es ex iis, si Britannus homo es, si vir es; totum hujus fabulae argumentum tibi satis placebit.

The literary device of using the term *Corsi* for the British was not entirely inappropriate from the Jacobite point of view. The island of Corsica was then administered by the Genoese who, since 1729, had had to

---

deal with a series of rebellions led by nationalist subversives. The Holy Roman Emperor, Charles VI, had patched up a temporary peace in 1732, but by 1734 the island had been declared independent by two of the principal seditionists, Luigi Giafferi and Giacinto Paoli. Corsica had its counterpart to the Old Chevalier: Theodore Stephen, Baron von Neuhof, a German aristocrat who persuaded the illegal Corsican leaders to crown him king at Cervione, as Theodore I, in 1736. Running short of money, he was forced to leave the island later in the year. With French help the authorities in Genoa had re-established order by 1740. Giafferi and Paoli were driven into exile, and though Theodore returned on a British ship in 1743, he was given only a lukewarm welcome before again departing. The analogy between the Corsican rebels and the Jacobites is, of course, far from exact, a truth which King must have realized, but the fact that the British government was aiding both the rebels and Charles Emmanuel III, Duke of Savoy-Sardinia, against Genoa about the time that King was actually writing presumably helped to give the Antonietti Epistola ad Corsos an extra immediacy.

In discussing the poem itself, I am assuming that the text in the Opera is the author's final version, and that when he had finished with the text, he wished the prose letter to Pasquillus to follow the verse letter to the Corsi. The first page of the Opera version contains two copperplate engravings. Their messages are reasonably plain, but to avoid any doubt there is printed, on the facing verso, an Aenearum Tabularum Explicatio. The first engraving is thus explained:
In hac tabula regem ligneum conspiciatis in regali suo solio sive loculamento collocatum, et auro et purpura regifice ornatum; infra autem Corsorum concilium magnum de summa reipublicae deliberans.

The second engraving is a historiated initial capital N:

In hac litera initiali faber lignarius Corsorum regem fabricatur buxum artificiose sculpendo, et tornando.

From these two visual aids the general import of the poem is already clear.

The introductory sentence plunges the reader into the hostilities of the War of the Austrian Succession, with Caesar representing Charles VII, the Elector of Bavaria, and Philip V of Spain introduced under his own name:

Nobile si carmen mihi Musae, quale Maroni, Annuerent; aut, quae sibi poscunt, grandia vates Moliti, ingenii vires centenaque Phoebus Cra arguta daret; non magni Caesaris arma, Aut quae Boiorum16 nudarunt praelia campos Gallorumque acies, ingenti aperire ruinae Quae loca cuncta parant; sed nec victricia signa, Austriacosque duces, vicinaque castra Philippi, Magnaque per pelagum vecturos bella Britannos Jam canere inciperem; sed facta et fata meorum.

King then addresses the Corsicans directly:

Vosque pii cives, vos, fortia pectora, Corsi, Servitiumque pati indociles, fidosque Penates Certe equidem laudarem ultro; puerosque senesque, Qui nunc pro patria pugnant, galeisque cucullos Mutantes monachos.

A note is provided on the last two lines:

Tantum erat libertatis conservandae studium, ut monachi etiam arma caperent, et milites in aciem excirent. Valde suspicor Antoniutum meum monachumuisse.

16. i.e. of the Bavarians.
A little later King commemorates the former king of Corsica, Theodore I, who, he explains, has abdicated the throne *nescio quo malo fato*, and passes on to the subject of a monarch for the future:

Dum dubitatis enim, quoniam Theodorus in oras Ignotas abiit, quis debeat esse futurus,
Et qualis rector Cyrnaeus 17; si mea vota
Dictaque quid valeant, gentis de more vetusto Rex erit; at sancta rex majestate verendus.
Qui Veneri imbelles noces donare recuset,
Ignovosque dies Baccho: qui extendere fines Imperii nolit, bellum meditatus iniquum.

The future king will be *antiqua stirpe creatus*, but a warning is provided that he should not be made from the same stock that produced the golden bough which Aeneas plucked for the Sibyl:

Vos porro a rege cavete Iligno, ne stirpe genus deducat ab ista,
Trojano Aeneae quae ramum detulit auri.
Olli semper enim vis certe antiqua manebit:
Et quamvis sit truncus iners, se vestiet auro Corsorum spoliis. Nonne hoc Germania tota,
Gallorunque urbes, et nudus plorat Iberus?

When the new king has been fabricated, he should be given a sceptre and throne of the same material as himself - oak.

Ipse sedebit Purpuream indutus pallam; sed tempora cinget
Aut edera aut laurus, doctorum praemia vatum,
Et veterum heroum, frugique aptissima regi.
Quem nisi perjuri cives, nisi fulminisictus,
Aut subitae tulerint flammæ, decor integer illi
Gloriaque, et solidae stabunt per saecula vires.

King now demonstrates again his skill in the use of extended anaphora:

---

17. *Cynos* was the Greek name for Corsica; *Cyrnaeus* is the Latinized adjective corresponding to *Corsus*. 
Jeaque viri pietate graves, queis publica cordi
Commoda sunt, proceres centum patresque legantur.
His populi credenda salus; his templum deorum:
His pene rex arbitra belli et pacis: iniquos
Hi pellant Ligurum socios: resposta superbis
His den legatis; dent nobis jura: ministros
Hos, plebi fidos, hos solos noverit aula;
Hosce magistratus urbes; hos castra tribunos.

The change in person that follows makes for an effective rhetorical contrast:

Vos, tamen in medium quoties, proceresque patresque,
Consultis; felix vobis rex buxeus adsit:
Preseide quo rerum, quo fiant omnia coram.

The analogy of the wooden monarch to the king which Jupiter gave to the frogs, already touched upon in the earlier article in Common Sense, is here expanded at some length. The poem concludes with a reference to the vain prayer of the chiefs of the frogs:

..... frustra, rex ut sibi ligneus adsit,
Nunc optant, orantque Jovem ....

and Jove’s reply:

..... Coelestis indigna favore,
Humanae similis, gens vana, et nescia reges
Ferre bonos, discat jam saevo ferre tyrannos.

There follows the letter of Antoniettus to Pasquillus, who is described as a Roman Censor. The author makes clear in a note that Pasquillus is no ordinary example of his kind:

Pasquillus, seu Pasquinus, Italice Pasquino, nomen statuae mutilatae in urbe Roma, cui affigi solent versus atellanici, satirae breves, epigrammata et diceria procaciora in pontifices, reges, principes, cardinales et magistratus, quorum vita et mores odio et opprobriis sunt digna; digna et quae stigmate quodam notentur. Haec statua nomen sumit a cerdone quodam Romano, viro lepidissimo et cive optimo; qui

18. King’s note on Ligurum socios reads: “Germanos, Gallos, Hispanos, aut quicumque cum Liguribus sive Genuensibus faciunt contra Corsos.”
in eodem vico olim habitabat. Felix Pasquille! Cujus memoriam cives tui conservant, consecrant, immortalem reddunt, cum tot Caesares, totque pontifices suos malint quidem oblivisci.

Antoniettus explains to Pasquillus that he is seeking

... uti me, et carmen hoc meum tibi commendatissimum habeas, simul et dignitatem eximii illius regis, quem belle quidem ac diligentem hodie excogitavi ad usum civium meorum.

The writer indicates that this king is wooden, but toys with the possibility that Pasquillus might prefer a monarch of gold or marble. The disadvantages of both possibilities are outlined, and wood is found to be preferable. Antoniettus continues:

Proin tu, censor lepidissime, qui apte et praecclare potes omnia eloqui cum omnibus, benevole elabora, et tua opera vel elandiendo effice, vel minitando, ut summo pontifici rex Corsorum sit probatissimus, et imperatoriiis titulis et filiatione perhonorifica augeatur. Haud fere quisquam ex beatissimi patris filiis reperietur, (hoc fide mea spondeo) sive reges sunt, sive reguli, seu quicunque basilicum hodie tenent statum, qui eum magis lubenter omni obsequio et observantia colat, quam hic ligneus noster; quem quidem spero, et confido post centum annos canonizandum fore; si tum canonizari eos oportebit, qui bene et recte vixerint, labe omni carentes.

The letter closes with some more sentiments in favour of a wooden king, who is all that is necessary to maintain peace and preserve freedom.

On these two letters there is little that need be added to the comments already made on the article in Common Sense. The substance of what King published in 1744 is clearly based on his thinking of some seven years earlier; the later version is much expanded, but represents no fundamental advance in content. One of King's reasons for reworking his English article was probably to give it a greater permanency: he hoped that at least a few copies of the Opera would survive, but very
likely had doubts about an issue of a journal which had already been
defunct for some years. He presumably also regarded his Latin version
as having a dignity far surpassing what could be achieved in the
ephemeral pages of a vernacular periodical. Above all, in an age when
so much philosophical and political speculation was expressed in the form
of verse, King must have judged that his Latin hexameters would have a
literary value over and above that of his English prose.

One other publication merits some discussion among the events of
1744. In that year Charles Bathurst, who seven years previously had
published the first six volumes of Dr. Robert South's *Sermons Preached
Upon Several Occasions*, issued the last five, edited, according to John
Nichols, by William King. The editor's name appears nowhere in the
five volumes of the 1744 text, but in the "new edition" of the entire work,
published at the Clarendon Press in 1823, Nichols' assertion is referred to
without contradiction. I think Nichols' statement may be accepted as
reliable; no other editor of these five volumes has ever been suggested.
Furthermore South, who had lived from 1634 to 1716, was the kind of clergyman
that King could be expected to admire: in 1710 he had sided against the Whigs
in Henry Sacheverell's controversy, and until his death was decidedly Tory

and Literary Anecdotes* (2d ed., 1819) Philip Buny Duncan, quoting
Chalmers, intimates that King edited the first five volumes. This is a
mistake. The information provided by Nichols is repeated correctly by
Daniel Lysons in *The Environs of London*.

in political inclination. He was also a competent Latinist: his 
*Musica Incantans*, first published at Oxford in 1655, while he held the 
office of Public Orator of the University of Cambridge, remains one of 
the best pieces of Latin verse devoted to the subject of music. Like 
King he was a man of strong prejudices, but his sermons often reveal a 
pleasant, underlying sense of humour. It is difficult to judge how well 
the editor performed his functions, especially as the five volumes in 
question appeared without notes. The anonymous Advertisement to the 1823 
edition has this to say:

These Sermons do not appear to have been prepared or even 
intended for the press by the author, from whose rough drafts 
they were evidently printed in so careless and incorrect a manner, 
as in many passages to be absolutely unintelligible. 21

It is unlikely that King fulfilled his part unsatisfactorily, since he was 
normally painstaking in all his literary endeavours. He was probably 
anxious to preserve the *ipsissima verba* of South's manuscripts, and thus 
reproduced the infelicities noted in the Advertisement.

King published nothing in 1745. His four surviving letters of that 
year — three to Lord Orrery and one to Sanderson Miller — deal mainly 
with personal or obscure political matters. 22 Some kind compliments are 
paid on the subject of Lord Orrery's eldest son, who matriculated at St. 
Mary Hall on May 23, 1745, forecasts are made of bad news from the West

21. Ibid.
22. Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, pp.88-93; Lilian Dickins and 
Mary Stanton, *op.cit.*, p.114. In its printed version the letter to 
Sanderson Miller is abbreviated; the original is in the County Record 
Office, Shire Hall, Warwick, Miller Collection CR 125 B/159.
Indies and specifically Jamaica, and an informal cipher is provided for possible use in the future:

If I have occasion to mention ye D. of B. in a post letter, I will call him Mr. Stephens, and ye intended presentation speech, the Manuscripts, and Ld A. John Dory.

His letter to Sanderson Miller constituted a reply to a social invitation:

.... I am become so stout I can travel in any manner. Three days ago I walk'd five miles to dinner, so that you need not be concerned about providing a vehicle for me. But after all my boasting I may think it best to accept of your offer.

One of the most serious lacunae in the extant documents on King's life occurs between July 1745 and May 10, 1746, the very time when the rising led by the Young Chevalier was taking place. Charles Edward landed in Scotland in July - though news of his unwelcome arrival did not reach London until the second week of August - and seized power in Edinburgh on September 17, at Prestonpans on September 21 after a battle lasting little more than five minutes, in Carlisle on November 17, and in Derby on December 4. His suzerainty there lasted almost three days - until Black Friday, December 6. Thence his long drawn out retreat to the Scottish highlands continued until the battle of Fort Augustus in March, 1746, and the final defeat at Culloden on April 16 of the same year. What part, if any, did King play in the rising? What were his reactions to the initial victories and the later defeats? Alas, there is no documentation to answer either of these questions. All that is known for sure is that on July 8, 1745, his spirits were low, as he explained to Lord Orrery:
As to publick affairs, My Dear Lord, this is a dreadful Crisis. We have bad news from all quarters with a stinging political lie here and there intermixed in order to prevent universal panic. To what place the Genius of England is retired, I know not; but that he is departed from us is most certain. 23

With the letter of this day the Bodleian collection of King's correspondence to Lord Orrery comes to an end. Any other letters that King wrote to Lord Orrery during the period of the rising may well have been confiscated by the postal authorities, who were certainly aware of the author's political sympathies. When the silence is broken by Lady Orrery in her letter of May 10, 1746, to her husband, then a guest at St. Mary Hall, all is sweetness and light:

Pray let Dr. King know that I thank him for his Letter .... Desire the Dr. if he has any business to be done at Law, that he will employ no other Soliciter than myself .... 24

King wrote one Latin work in 1746, Hydra, which appeared in print only in the Opera. A note on the title page reads:

SCRIPTA EST HAEC SATIRA ANNO MDCCXLVI, ANTEHAC NUNQUAM EDITA.

The government was especially alert to the activities of known Jacobites for some years after 1745: King was wise not to publish this production as soon as it was written. The hydra, it is explained in the Aenearum Tabularum Explicatio, represents

.... nocentissimos civium nostrorum mores, numerosas ac detestabiles eas reipublicae pestes, quae quidem, quicquid comatur, et suis mandat Britannia omnino prosterne, vix mehercule paulisper reprimi nequeunt. Quippe alio Hydrae capite, id est, alio malo excisso, aliquid continuo renascitur.
Several variations on this Swiftian theme are elaborated during the course of the 214 dactylic hexameter verses of this poem, to say nothing of the lengthy notes which accompany the text.

King commences *Hydra* with interrogations:

Semper ego satirae scrip[tor?] Sic omnia nostros
Significant nondum pacatos laeva Penates?
Praeparat et terris infaustum Jupiter annum?
Quem agimus fatis! Cum pulsum dedecus omne,
Ac priscas patriae vires rediisse putabam;
En, male sanctum rumpit discordia foedus,
Mensque hominum perversa iterum fert omnia retro.

In a note to the first question, he provides a general justification for again adopting the role of satirist:

Quicunque artibus ingenuis est instructus, et in civitate
libera diu vixit, sane hercle ei grave est et difficile
satiram non scribere, quum adeo sunt civium corrupti mores,
ut optimas hasce artes brevi perituras, et libertatem ipsam
jam evertendam arbitretur. Quinimo talem scriptorem, animumque
talem boni omnes debent amplecti, cum hujusmodi scripta sint,
necessae est, pietatis indicia et admonitiones officii.

The rest of the work consists mainly of the author's reflections on contemporary wickedness in general, and on a number of odious individuals in particular who are identified only by classical pseudonyms. A small amount of space is devoted to the praise of a handful of men for whom King felt a special sympathy.

The favoured few may be disposed of briefly. None of their names is unexpected: they were stalwart Tories all. The Duke of Beaufort, the two Harleys (father and son) Earls of Oxford and Mortimer, the Earl of Sunderland, and the Earl of Arran are among them. The Chancellor of the University of Oxford is paid a touching tribute by his former Secretary for
his prudence as an administrator:

.... Cujus constantiam et pietatem, quum optime semper
meritus est de republica, ecquis non amat? Cujus amorem
fraternelm, et erga suos omnes liberalitatem summam ecquis
non valde laudat? Qui, cum veritatis semper fuit amicus,
bonos omnes sibi amicos faciat, necesse est: et, cum nihil
eo comitum, humanius, moderatius est, inimicum, credo, habeat
neminem.

The other persons who feature in this poem constitute collectively
a kind of rogues' gallery. The acerbity which the author infuses into his
treatment of his enemies is, in its own way, as powerful and revolting as
anything from the pen of Swift. Like the Dean, he sometimes mixes his
satire with humour. Especially venomous is the story of an Irish bishop

.... qui porcellas, ut juicundissime saperent, et suici dulcioris
essent plenae, lacte novo vescentas curbat, quo tempore homines
permulti in ea regine, proximi etiam vicini, propter summam
suam inopiam, aut caeli intemperiem, fane laborabant.

This unidentifiable prelate's argument was simple:

At quid ridiculum magis est, quam pauper obesus,
Et plebeia anima in nitida cute? Dedicus istud
Propulsant urbani homines; nec pascere vulgus
Muneris est nostri: nobis nos nascimur omnes.

He was well known, King continues, at a certain great house, where, if
anyone praised Homer or Vergil, he would say:

At nos
Versificatores vanos hercle odimus omnes,
Qui nunquam cessant mentiri. Scilicet ipsis
Legimus his oculis, ut quidam, nomine Ulysses,
Ligneo equo invectus Trojanam everterit urbem,
Et cunctos cives clava maclaverit una.
Somnia quae, et tricae! cum non fuit ullus Ulysses,
Ullus equus: sed nec de ligno animalia fiunt.
This piece of bathos is, as far as I am aware, unlike any other example of the author's burlesque Latin. Generally King used prose or some non-classical verse metre for his doggerel effects, but here he showed that the dactylic hexameter itself can be used to produce results just as facetious. At the end of this absurd tirade, the speaker is given an opportunity to proclaim his unique version of the defeat of Troy:

\[
\text{Fratrum par nobile quondam}
\]
\[
\text{(Nam pulchre memini) Fuit Hector et Hannibal: olli}
\]
\[
\text{De regno certant: cadit Hector, et Hannibal urbem}
\]
\[
\text{Vi potitur; monachasque rapi ad stuprum, monachosque}
\]
\[
\text{Imperat occidi: namque hos bonus Hannibal omnes}
\]
\[
\text{Ex Jacobitis natos cognovit, et ipsos}
\]
\[
\text{Tam patribus similes, quam lac lacti, ut Polycarpus}
\]
\[
\text{Testatur recte.}
\]

The note to Jacobitis reads:

Unum hoc verbum plurimum quidem, etiam mirum quiddam valet, atque iis, qui admirabiliter rempublicam et civitates nostras hodie administrant, non solum utile est, sed maxime necessarium; ut quod tributa et vectigalia facile augeat, milites alat, classem instruat, denique clamores, iras, plausus, risus, metus, motus excitet pro re nata, vel ad principum virorum arbitrium.

Another subject of King's mockery is Diaulus; his identity is thus alluded to in the note on his name:

\[
\text{DIAULUS sive Tartuffius, Anglice et Gallice Tartuffe, quod}
\]
\[
\text{cognomentum homini ex moribus datum est. Is vero quemadmodum}
\]
\[
\text{sacris initiatus fuerit, dein in purpuratum creverit, dein, ad}
\]
\[
\text{altissima animum adjiciens, sedes ornatissimas et lucrosissimum}
\]
\[
\text{sacerdotium obtinuerit, et quales hodie sint ejus gestus,}
\]
\[
\text{habitus, negotia, facinora, machinationes, cogitationes, ex}
\]
\[
\text{comoedia celeberrima facile perspicias. Ubi enim poeta comicus}
\]
\[
\text{Tartuffium suum suis civibus exhibet, omnes ejusdem generis}
\]
\[
\text{veteratores, ii cujuscunque sint regionis incolae, sane commode}
\]
\[
\text{depingit. Sane commode etiam et jocose satis sui et Diauli}
\]
\[
\text{nostri munus et artificium designat hoc epigrammate Martialis:}
\]

\[
\text{Nuper erat medicus, nunc est vespillo Diaulus:}
\]
\[
\text{Quod vespillo facit, fecerat et medicus.}
The author pitilessly rakes up some choice morsels of scandal to support the appellation of Tartuffius; a riddle and answer which he provides in the notes will sufficiently indicate their tone:

Cur toties intrat lenae Tartuffius aedes?
Ut doceat vetulam, quid sit amare deum.

One final character - Pothinus - is intended by King to be generic. His name is applicable, we are told, to all those who are inconstantes et venales. They are, as King indicates in various places, a not inconsiderable number. The original Pothinus was the betrayer and murderer of Pompey; it is significant that his name rather than that of Brutus or Cassius is chosen to represent those whom King considered the enemies of Britain and freedom. The author's castigation of Pothinus is thorough:

Corruptius aevum
(Quis negat?) hoc dixi nullum. Verum ecce Pothinus,
Patricios opibus magis qui adjunxit honores,
Crimine perfidiae meritus, dum cuncta gubernat
Ceu Plutus, ceu rex, aliis dans commoda vitae,
Divitias, titulos; quam sunt sua vitrea fracta!
Quam subito praeceps agitur! non fulmine coeli
Percussus rapido, non passus principis iram,
Non legum, amissis opibus, vel rebus ademptis.
Temnitur. Hinc hominem luctus cruce saevior omni
Nunc angit. Quid enim? nemo hercule, nemo salutat,
Aut illi assurgit. Vitant juvenesque senesque
Matronaeque nurusque omnes.

These thoughts are developed and lead, two pages later, to the ending of the poem:

Quorum haec? ne ignores, quam turpis distet honesto,
Laudato infamis, (quicquid male suadeat aula
Serviles animas) fas ut sit dicere, necdum
Omnis honos abiit, nec virtus nomen inane est.

Having digested the entire work, one is forced to the conclusion that
Hydra, apart from its burlesque elements, is not essentially different in character from its author's other satires in dactylic hexameter.

The year 1747 seems to have been comparatively uneventful in King's life, but during a good deal of the following twelvemonth he was again in the heat of controversy. Richard Blacow, Canon of Windsor and Master of Arts of Brasenose College was convinced that the Principal of St. Mary Hall was responsible for what he called the "treasonable riot" of February 23, 1748, the birthday of the Old Chevalier's son Prince Henry, Duke of York. Blacow eventually published his version of what happened in *A Letter to William King*, which appeared in 1755. According to this account, Blacow was in a private room at Winter's Coffee House near the High Street at about seven o'clock on the evening of February 23, 1748, when he heard several

---

gownsmen at the door shouting, "King James for ever", "Prince Charles", and other treasonable words. Upon which, wrote Blacow, "I thought myself doubly bound to take notice of the Treason: Because I had taken the Oath of Abjuration, and had been invested by the University with the authority of an Officer in that particular street." He thereupon followed the rioters down the High Street and into Saint Mary Hall Lane, where he was forced to take refuge in Oriel College. Blacow indicated that one of the leaders of the disorder was from King's institution, and quotes his own words to prove the point: "I am a man who dare say, God bless King James the Third; and tell you my name is DAWES of St. MARY HALL. I am a man of independent Fortune, and therefore afraid of no man." A Mr. Knox, Gentleman Commoner of Christ Church, was one of those who later confirmed the treasonable expressions; he had been resident at St. Mary Hall, but had left "because he was heartily tired of the Principles of the Place."

It is extremely doubtful whether King had any direct connection with this disturbance. Blacow provides no evidence apart from vague insinuations. It is quite possible that the Principal was not even in residence; Thomas Carew, writing from Lincoln's Inn Fields to Lord Orrery on February 27, 1747/48, describes King as being "in town" at the time.26 A rebuttal to Blacow's pamphlet by "A Student of Oxford" provides answers to several of his charges, as well as raising such fresh questions

as "... what has Dr. King said against you which all Men do not agree in the Truth of?" 27 Quite apart from the Jacobite issue, it is quite likely that Blacow had by now read The Toast and had not felt endeared to the author by its contents. King explains that he had presented a few copies to some friends, on giving me their honour that they would not suffer the books to go out of their hands without my consent. One of these persons, however, forfeited his honour in the basest manner, by putting his copy into the hands of BLACOW, and the rest of the Oxford informers; but as they had no key to the work, and did not understand or know how to apply the characters, they were content to call it an execrable book, and throw dirt at the author .... 28

King's controversy with Edward Bentham, tutor of Oriel College, which started a little later in 1748, helped to fan the flames of the controversy between the court party and the anti-Hanovarians in Oxford. Bentham, when he was an undergraduate at Corpus Christi College, had studied under the supervision of his cousin - and another of King's enemies - John Burton. In 1743 he had been collated to a prebendal stall in Hereford Cathedral, a promotion which was, at least in part, a reward for his known loyalty to the government. His booklet of 1748 entitled A Letter to a Young Gentleman of Oxford constitutes a veiled indictment of Oxford Jacobitism: in the initial Advertisement the author emphasises that "the Occasion of putting together these Reflections .... was entirely distinct from the late treasonable Disturbance in Oxford", but adds that they will provide "some Antidote for the Use of his Pupils,


whenever an Attempt should be made to tamper with their Principles, and withdraw them from their Obedience to the Laws of the Land." The young gentlemen to whom this work is addressed are exhorted to ponder the words of the oaths of allegiance and abjuration, both of which are printed in full, and to reverence kings, even though they are but men. "Their Province has Difficulties of a peculiar Kind", the author assures his readers. He praises the Revolution of 1688 and comments that those in favour of the principle of indefeasible hereditary right founded in lineal succession ought to search for evidence to support their opinions among the records of the Saxons and the natives of Wales and Cornwall, the "original Proprietors of this our Soil". He discouragingly adds, ".... this Enquiry is beyond the Reach of Your Abilities." Towards the conclusion of his argument, the writer returns again to the subject of the troubles of the previous February:

It is to be hoped, that the late Treasonable Disturbance will at least have this good Effect, that it will excite those Persons, whose only Ambition it hath been hitherto to mind the proper Business of their private Stations and be quiet, to answer the loud Demands, and earnest Expectations of the World; and wipe off, from themselves at least, that Scandal of Disaffection to his Majesty's Person and Government, which at present indiscriminately affects the whole University....

The first version of A Letter to a Young Gentleman of Oxford seems to have been privately issued. In a letter of May 27, 1748, addressed from Oriel College, Bentham refers to his pamphlet written "under a sense of duty both to the Government and to the University", and provides the information that 200 copies had been printed. In a subsequent letter to

Lord Hardwicke, Visitor of Oriel College and Lord Chancellor, dated June 24, 1748, he writes:

The Bishop of Oxford having done me the honour to lay before Your Lordship the Letter to a Young Gentleman as I had printed it off for private use, I beg leave to present my Duty to Your Lordship with a copy of it as it is now revised and published. 30

King must have started composing his first reply shortly after acquiring a copy of the booklet. He was possibly engaged on this task when Lord Orrery wrote to Alexander Forrester on June 13:

I have not heard from our friend [Dr. King] these many months. I have scarce heard of him, so that I can only guess he is in his Cell. I imagine his thoughts are taken up in preparations for the troublesome consequences that are likely to attend the late uproars and misconduct at Oxford. 31

Among the consequences was a rash of attacks by anti-Jacobite scribes on those guilty of "disloyalty". One of these, under the nom de plume of "Loyal Oxonian", argued that Oxford had since the time of Wycliffe been in the forefront of reform, and that

when some of the junior students shall be better informed, when his EMINENCE the very learned C/ardina/1 KING, the CICERO of the present age, shall have published his eloquent orations in defence of the Protestant Royal Family: and his Phillipicks (divinae famae) against a Popish pretender .... that learned Society will make full amends for the temerity and indiscretion of some of their rash and inconsiderate members, and no longer suffer themselves to be misled by some persons of anti-revolutional and anti-constitutional principles. 32

30. British Museum, Add.MSS. 35590, fo.75.
32. An Epistolary Conference...between a Reverend Non-juror and a Loyal Oxonian (London, n.d.).
As far as is known King did not answer this polite attack; instead, he published at some time in the latter half of 1748 *A Proposal for Publishing a Poetical Translation, Both in Latin and English, of the Reverend Mr. Tutor Bentham's Letter to a Young Gentleman of Oxford.* A second edition appeared in 1749: there are only minor variations between the two. This brief work is in the nature of a prodrome to King's second reply to Bentham, *A Poetical Abridgement, Both in Latin and English, of the Reverend Mr. Tutor Bentham's Letter to a Young Gentleman of Oxford,* of which two editions appeared in 1749. The author's original intention was to issue the poetical abridgement "in six or seven numbers"; he changed his mind before publishing and put the entire work of sixty-one pages between two covers. A knowledge of King's initial intention explains the fact that this latter book is actually a collection of several separate elements.

*A Proposal,* like its sequel, is waspish and spiteful, but amusing in a rather malicious manner. King announces that he intends to put Bentham's Letter into Latin and English poetry, and suggests, with stinging irony, that these two versions "will sufficiently dilucidate my AUTHOR'S Meaning in those Places, where he seems most obscure." In addition, he promises,

.... I shall illustrate the whole Work with critical Notes and Observations, reconcile many seeming Contradictions, and answer all those impertinent Objections, which have been offered against Mr. B's Style, and Manner of Expression. For, (would you believe it?) notwithstanding our AUTHOR may justly claim a Rank among the English Classics, yet some of his Adversaries have been so foolish and impudent as to give out, that in this his incomparable Discourse there is scarce one Page of Sense ....

33. The page numbering of the second edition jumps from 24 to 33, and all subsequent page numbers are erroneous.
King insinuates that several satirical pieces relating to Bentham's Letter were circulating when he was writing: the following (no doubt composed by himself) is one of two examples which he provides of these "childish things":

The political Letter, which lately you sent me,
Give me leave, Sir, to say, doth in no wise content me.
But alas! would you send such a Piece to the Printer?
You, my Tutor! who did so much better last Winter.
Very true, my good Sir, and there-fore you did better.

To illustrate his intentions, King provides two versified specimens of the initial part of Bentham's Advertisement; the Latin version, he indicates, may be sung to the tune of An Old Woman Cloathed in Grey, or the first song in The Beggar's Opera, and, as to the English version, "I will speak to my Friend HAYES to set it to Music." The first two stanzas will manifest the consciously banal quality of the writing:

1. Men of Oxford, I tell you, (and faith! it is true)
Not a Page of this Work did I write with a View
To inflame our great Folk, or to hurt one of you.

2. But howe'er, to cajole my good Friends at Whitehall,
And to find out the Way to some pretty, neat Stall,
Let me loudly declare, Ye are JACOBITES all!

The same stanzas in Latin appear thus:

1. Non haec exaravi per fidem,
   Ut principes hos inflammarem;
   At nec, ACADEMICI, quidem
   Ut pueros hos pessundarem;

34. King provides a note to this line: "The Reverend Mr. B. is one of the Whitehall Preachers."
Sed aulicos viros & nurus
Benevolos reddat ut quis mi:
Ut sim praebendarius futurus,
Incusem vos JACOBITISMI.

A comparable level of doggerel rhyme, but expanded to greater length, is to be found in A Poetical Abridgement:

LITTLE B ——, who writes (and who doubts his Ability?)
Latin, English, and Greek, all with equal Facility,
Now collects his whole Force on a weighty Occasion,
And bestows on our ALMA a quaint Dissertation:
Reprimands the hot Youth, who so wilful is grown,
That surveying all Parties he sticks to his own;
Unreclaimed by his Tutor's Advise, is so steady,
That he fancies his Father, as honest as NEDDY. 35

The Latin version is headed:

EPISTOLAE BENTHAMICAE SUMMARIIUM POETICUM,
RHYTHMICUM, MONACHICUM.

The stanzas corresponding to the eight English lines just quoted read:

GRABEC loqui, & Latine,
Angliceque sine fine,
Aeque calles, (quis est, qui ne —
sciat tete?) EDOARDE:

Utque, qui vir nunc sis, data
Occasione insperata,
Constet; das consilia cata
ALMAE nostrae, EDOARDE.

Culpas puerum, qui morum
Imitator haud tuorum
Doctus, amat meliorum
Partium esse, EDOARDE.

Nec te audiens, pervicax est,
Et propositi tenax est.
Quid? quod probior evax! est
Pater ejus, EDOARDE.

35. King's note to this line reads: "Our Author through his whole Discourse insinuates, that the young Gentleman's Principles are hereditary, and derived from the Prejudices of his Family."
The versified forms of Bentham's Letter, together with the promised notes and observations, are followed by a further collection of Latin doggerel stanzas under the title Monitor Monitori. This lampoon takes the form of counsel offered to Bentham by an anonymous junior:

Hac mente, BENTHAME,
Oportuit qua me,
Epistolam tuam legisse,
Nae mihi pergratum'st;
Et sat tibi datum'st,
Hanc tales pol me perpendisse.

Sed seriam, amabo,
Quam tibi narrabo,
Vicissim nunc tu audito rem:
Ni tibi sit places,
Ut mihi non vaces,
Nec feras me si juniorem.

The advice that follows, like the verse in which it is couched, is nugatory, though it may have had some ephemeral influence as satire. An English translation of Monitor Monitori occurs immediately afterwards, during the course of which Bentham is described as

Half a Casuist, half Lawyer, half Courtier, half Cit,
Half a Tory, half Whig (may I add, half a Wit?)

The next ten pages are devoted to a Postscript on the subject of Bentham's Letter to a Fellow of a College, which presumably appeared while King was working on the earlier part of A Poetical Abridgement. This second Letter is dated October 24, 1748; the date that appears on the title page is 1749. It would be wearisome to analyse this rather pedestrian disquisition which is drawn out to seventy-two pages: it is essentially an apology for the court party, laboriously compiled and well integrated, but exhibiting no special originality. King's rebuttals are in places amusing,
but have no more value than the arguments which they are intended to
demolish. They lead to "an approved RECEIPT, for composing a truly-
loyal-political-rhetorical Discourse" in the manner of Bentham. From a
list of ninety-eight nouns, the would-be writer is urged to take ten or a
dozen handfuls, "fairly written on square or oblong Pieces of white Paper",
and then to add

.... a proportionable Quantity of VERBS and ADJECTIVES,
selected from the best English Classics, and among the latter
as many COMPOUNDS and DECOMPOUNDS, as you can possible
procure. Then throw in your PRONOUNS and PARTICLES, about
two Ounces and a half. Let the whole be well mixed, and
shaken together in a large green Bag (such as is usually carried
after our great Lawyers) and then let each Paper be drawn out,
only one at a Time, by any handy Servant .... Be very careful to
write down every Word in the exact Order, in which it comes
forth. And as soon as your Work is finished, send it to the
Press, and serve it up to the Public.

King provided a similar recipe later for writing Greek in the style of John
Burton: this second - and better - piece, which appears in the Elogium
Famae of 1750, is obviously modelled on the original "receipt".

The last element in A Poetical Abridgement is a Latin prose paragraph
headed Academiae Oxoniensi. Here King is serious again:

Ignosce mihi, VENERANDA MATER, quod causam tuam hic jocosius
leviusque agere institui, quam aut studiis meis, aut adversissimo
tuo tempori conveniat; quam & ipse philosophus haberi velim, &
tota tua domus fama ac fortunis suis jam periclitetur.

He laments once more the activities of those whom he considers are damaging
the university's reputation, commenting

.... audivimus iterum iterumque, (quod cum meminerim, horreo
animo) DELENDA EST OXONIA.

And the conclusion is devoted to a further indirect attack on those whom
he considered the enemies of Oxford:
One other humorous diatribe against Bentham remains to be mentioned, *A Certain Proposal of a Certain Little Tutor for making Certain Reformations in a Certain Method of Education most certainly practis'd in a Certain University.* It bears no author and no date. However, it is possibly by King and seems to have been issued about the same time as *A Poetical Abridgement* or shortly afterwards. One reason for not pressing the claim of King's authorship too hard is that the syntax is nebulous in places: in all of King's known works, even when they are written in burlesque style, the constructions are, as a rule, scrupulously clear. There is also, by comparison with the authenticated poems, an unusually high proportion of imperfect rhymes (e.g. that - educate; moon - known; good - allow'd), though these could have been introduced deliberately. *A Certain Proposal* is supposed to be by Bentham himself, but he was not such a fool as to write this kind of verse:

What all concerns I advertise,  
Whether they foolish are or wise;  
All Fathers, Mothers, Guardians that  
Have Sons or Wards to educate:  
I E.B, long since known  
A mighty Tutor in the Town  
Hight [Oxford] and in [Oriel College],  
Exposé to Sale a Stock of Knowledge  
Of ev'ry Kind and ev'ry Price,  
Each Chap to please, however nice:  
And all is good, I will be bold  
To say, and new as e'er was sold.

36. The ascription of the authorship of this pamphlet to Bentham in Halkett and Laing's Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature is certainly mistaken.
Among the subjects for sale are Logic, Rhetoric, Ethics, Civil Law, and Theology. Part of the tuition in Theology, according to the author, consists of instruction in praying to the monarch:

For George I teach my Lads to pray,
And to him likewise, — that's the Way —
To pray to him, sure there's no Harm in't,
From whom we hope to get Preferment.
And, as the Catholics, they say,
Ten times unto the Virgin pray
For once they pray unto their God, —
(The Thing indeed is somewhat odd)
So we ten Pray'rs to George direct,
For once to God we pay Respect.

The intimation at the end of the poem is that respect for the House of Hanover is a matter of religious faith:

In this Religion I agree
T'instruct your Sons, if sent to me;
A Tutor qualify'd for any
Or all of these Points, besides many
Others, which I could eas'ly mention,
Did not you plain see my Intention:
Viz. To declare, how much I'd do,
That I might serve myself and you.

Whether or not the Principal of St. Mary Hall wrote this stuff, it does express his known feelings towards the much maligned Bentham. But soon King's controversy with the court party was to increase in scope, the casus belli being his celebrated speech in the Sheldonian Theatre at the opening of the Radcliffe Camera.
Ten years were needed for the erection of the Radcliffe Camera, named after its principal benefactor, Dr. John Radcliffe, who had died in 1714. After much initial discussion, the design of James Gibbs was decided upon, being preferred to that of Nicholas Hawesmoor, and the building was begun in 1737. It was completed in 1747 and formally dedicated on April 13, 1749.\(^1\) The fullest accounts of the ceremonies are provided in a pair of letters written shortly after the event by two Whigs of Exeter College: Benjamin Kennicott, the distinguished Hebrew scholar, and Thomas Bray, who later became Rector.\(^2\) One gains the impression from both letters that King intended this to be his last

---

1. Some comments on the preliminary activities are provided in a letter written, with obvious haste, to Lady Newdigate, almost certainly by Sir Roger Newdigate, now in the County Record Office, Shire Hall, Warwick, Newdigate Letters, MS. B. 1999.

2. Both letters are transcribed in full in "The Opening of the Radcliffe Library in 1749", Bodleian Quarterly Record, Vol. I, No. 6 (Second Quarter, 1915), pp. 165 - 172. Kennicott's letter is also printed S.G. Gillam, The Building Accounts of the Radcliffe Camera (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1958), pp.xxii - xxv. Both letters indicate that King was in favour of awarding the degree of Doctor of Physick to the three Scottish doctors Pitcairne, Conyers, and Kennedy, whereas Thomas Taylor of All Souls was opposed. King's point of view prevailed, and the degrees were granted.
oration, though in fact it was certainly not. Bray explains that the audience at the opening solemnities in the Sheldonian Theatre was anxious to hear King declaim even during the previous speaker's oration:

"... Dr Lewis from one of the Rostrums made an Incomparable Speech in praise of Dr Radcliffe of half an Hour long during which time the Audience grew tired not through any defect of the Orator but out of Impatience to hear Dr King. When Dr Lewis ended a fine piece of Musick was play'd off. Dr King arose in all the Majesty of Ancient Eloquence. Bless'd the Day in which he had the Honour to Speak before that Illustrious Assembly. Blessed himself that neither ye Infirmites of Age nor an ill state of Health deprived him of that opportunity of taking his final Leave of the Publick as an Orator .... Upon the whole the speech was very inflaming ...."

Kennicott's description is in some respects less flattering but not essentially different:

"... amidst the Thunder of the Sheldonian Theatre, rose the great Oxford Orator, & Patriot, Dr King, to deliver, as he said, his last Speech to the University. He spoke near an hour, seemingly Memorialis, but, tis said his Son sat behind him to prompt him, & to hold his Lemon. Strangers and Oxonians all agreed to give the Doctor the greatest of Characters, as an orator for his manner, but the Matter of his Oration was not so universally agreeable. 'Tis said, that the Doctor had been previously desired to be decent in his political Reflections. But - he was resolved to go off gloriously, & to speak, this once, with all the Spirit of a Dying Patriot."

Of all King's Latin speeches, this made by far the strongest impression. A model of ornate, neo-classical Latinity, it may be compared favorably with the most mature orations of such continental latinists as Pieter Burmann,

3. Bodleian Quarterly Record, Vo. I, No. 6 (Second Quarter, 1915), pp.166f.

4. Ibid., p.170. There is no genuine evidence that King was in any way prompted during his speech.
Jacopo Facciolati, and Johann Ernesti. In it King adheres, consciously
or not, to the general principles of classical compositio and declamatio
laid down by Quintilian in his Institutio Oratoria. In only a very few
respects does King fall short of Quintilian's standards, for example in
his disregard for the injunction Male etiam dictitur, quod in plures
convent, si aut nationes totae incessantur aut ordines aut condicio aut
studia multorum. 5 This matter is referred to again in the critical
assessment of King's works which is attempted in Chapter IX.

King commenced his oration in the Sheldonian Theatre on a disarming
note, describing himself in the opening sentences as an "infirm and forget-
ful old man, and already exceeding the climacteric year" (i.e. 63):

Delegatum hoc mihi officium quam minime suscipientum esse
putarem, quippe verebar infirmus et obliviosus senex, et
climactericum jam excedens annum, ut quid dignum aut judicio
vestro, ACADEMICI, aut elegantia illustrissimi hujus coetus
proferrem; sane quidem adductus sum ea. qua vos me semper
prosequuti estis benevolentia, et amplissimorum virorum et
optimorum civium admonitu, qui semper mihi pro ratione sufficiet,
ut nequa hodie aut valetudinis aut aetatis meae excusatione
vellem uti.

Special praise was then lavished on John Radcliffe, the celebrated
physician, most of whose funds, after his death, were left to the University.

Describing his liberality and piety King proclaimed, although without demo-
graphic justification:

".... vir qualis semel anno centesimo nascitur: et, si privatus
esse debeat, semel sexcentesimo."

The lofty grandeur of King's eulogies of Radcliffe may be fairly estimated
from the elaborate construction and even flow of the following single

5. Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, Book VI, iii, 34.
sentence, written in a polished style reminiscent of that of Cicero, and consistently rising in tension, with striking use of syncrisis, to a climax in the words deo auctori consecratam esse voluerunt:

Quinetiam hanc, et alias omnes RADCLIVIANAS donationes ideo vobis gratiores fore existimo, quod pecunia omnis, quae erogata est (erogata est autem non temere, aut impetu quodam, sed optimo animi judicio) in istas sumptuosas aedes, in collegium Universitatis, in aliments Academicorum, qui quinquennium in nobili peregrinatione consumere jumentur, haud quidem constructa et coacervata fuerat furtis et dolis, aut turpissimis venditionibus, aut iniquissimo foenore, aut haeredipetarum artificiis, sedum rapinis, et bello piratico; sed bene et honeste parta, laboribus et vigiliosis, virtute et doctrina, et ea gloriosa arte exercenda, quae morbis et incommodis hominum medetur, et quam propter beneficium et excellentiam omnes gentes, reges, nationes deo auctori consecratam esse voluerunt.

Further encomiastic compliments were paid to Radclivius noster, until King offered Radcliffe the supreme and certainly exaggerated compliment of placing his fame above that of all other British doctors of both the past, the present, and the future:

..... quanquam in Britannia nostra semper floruerunt, et nunc florent medici peritissimi doctissimique, concessum tamen ab omnibus arbitror, neminem quemquam ad RADCLIVII famam olim processisse, aut posthaec processurum. 6

Briefer commendations were then accorded to the Trustees qui res RADCLIVIANAS nunc administrant, et RADCLIVIANAM bibliothecam exaedificandam, atque hodie dedicandam curarunt. They were all men close to King's heart:

6. If one were to take King at his word, Radcliffe might well appear to be a second Hippocrates. But, as Munk remarks in the Roll of the College of Physicians, it is difficult to form a correct estimate of Radcliffe's skill as a doctor. He was not strictly a scholar, but he was "an acute observer of symptoms, and in many cases was peculiarly happy in the treatment of disease."

"I dare not, while they are present at my speech, offend their modesty by repeating their surpassing virtues before them," proclaimed the speaker, and then continued:

Pertinet autem ad exemplum dicere; siqui, praestantissimis hisce viris similes, excellentem animum omni liberali doctrina excoluerint, cui etiam accesserit summa vitae integritas et elegantia, mira comitas suavitasque morum, et, quod caput est omnium, singularis in patriam amor, et perpetua in hanc Academiam benevolentia; ii sibi concilient necesse est eam dignitatem, quae est maxime expetenda, gratiamque bonorum omnium, non modo civium suorum eorumque, quibuscum necessitudinem conjunxerint, sed quibus nomine et fama noti fuerint.

The one criticism that King made of Radcliffe related to the great benefactor's decision not to allow the Trustees to choose the Librarian:

MIRUM est igitur, ni indoluerint Academici nostri, prudentissimis hisce et integerrimis RADCLIVIANI testamenti curatoribus haud concedi potestatem eligendi bibliothecarium suum. De hac re aut male judicasse, aut plane errasse videtur RADCLIVIUS noster. Quid enim? Quibus tot possessiones, tanta pecunia ac tota haereditas credebatur, nonne iis alia omnia essent concredenda?

King did not answer his own question, and intimated that he would not say a word more on so invidious a subject.

7. Before King had prepared the text of his oration for the printer, Sir Watkin Williams-Wynn had been killed. An ornate Latin tribute to his memory appears in the published version in the form of a long footnote. King's letters to Sir Watkin no longer survive: they were possibly destroyed, together with other Jacobite records, during the fire of 1858 at Wynnstary, the ancestral home of the family. The remaining papers of the third baronet are in the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth.
The designer of the Camera, James Gibbs, was then lauded for the "superb and splendid library" which he had provided in Oxford, and also for his other sumptuous edifices in London, Cambridge, and other parts of Great Britain. King's declamations were no mere impersonal flattery, for he was intimately acquainted with the greatest architect that eighteenth century England produced:

Ego vero, sicut meretur, hominem amo veterem meum hospitem, quem humanissimum et amicissimum cognovi, et non modo architecturae, sed omnis vetustatis et multarum rerum bene peritum.

Further gratitude was bestowed on the learned and munificent men of the past who had spent so much labour and money in founding universities and building libraries. King pointed out that one of these ancients was Asinius Pollio, who dedicated the first public library among the Romans. It was built in the porch of the temple of Liberty, and dedicated on the Ides of April, the same day on which the Radcliffe Library was formally opened.

From personalities King turned to the troubles besetting contemporary society. He inveighed with especial vehemence against those "who delight in the slaughter of men and the destruction of cities, and cruelly contrive the ruin of those they govern as well as of others." No doubt he was thinking of the miseries of the recently concluded War of the Austrian Succession, but he proceeded to establish a general maxim:
Like most of the contemporary Tories, King looked back wistfully to the days of Queen Anne:

There had been a time, he assured his audience, when Britons had retained their ancient frugality and strictness of manners, together with a glowing zeal for the support of liberty. Their representatives had been chosen with the utmost care and foresight. No candidate could then be elected who was susceptible to bribery or the threats of ministers. But now everything was changed! The people had grown completely corrupt. They showed no signs of shame or sense of their pristine majesty. Their voting practices were especially deplorable: they set up their votes for sale in as public and open a manner as the vendors of meat or fish in a market. There was only one cause for the national degeneracy:

Si quae rerum, quid sit causae, quamobrem plebs nostra ita turpiter se inverterit, usque adeo degeneraverit ab institutis et gloria majorum, uno verbo respondeam, LUXURI 

Further comments followed on the politica calliditas of the time, including some sharp criticisms of the Whig informers within the university. For withstanding the pressures of the Whig dons, the Vice-Chancellor,
Dr. John Purnell of New College, was accorded particular praise:

Videtur enim fortuna hunc excellentem hominem ab initio
tot malis exercuisse, ut virtutes ejus spectatiores forent.
Si quae enim res aliae, certe equidem adversae virum magnum
faciunt, ostenduntque.

A promise was given that the speaker's political enemies would be dealt
with at greater length in forthcoming books which would vindicate the
university. In the meantime, it was indicated, the position was so serious
that only God could rescue the nation from the calamity and ruin to come.
The orator therefore said that he would end his discourse with prayers.

There were five prayers altogether, each opening with the word REDEAT,
in obvious reference to the King over the Water, though he was not mentioned
by name. Some idea of the magniloquence of this part of the speech may be
 gained from the second Redeat paragraph, spoilt though it perhaps is by the
personal antipathy against the Whig delators and informers implied in the
phrase infames delatores:

REDEAT simul magnus ille Genius Britanniae, (sive is sit
muncius, sive sit ipse spiritus dei) firmissimum libertatis
et religionis praesidium; amandetque procul (o procul!) a
civibus nostris grasationes, caedes, rapinas, pestilentes
annos, superbas dominationes, infames delatores, et mala omnia!
The final prayer constituted a kind of litany of supplications, that the
young men of Oxford might be modest, frugal, and studious; that the old men
might be learned, grave, and honest; that neither young nor old might be
corrupted by false tenets or the love of riches or honours and so on. The
concluding petition was

Ut nequis denique ambiat, aut assequatur Academicos honores,
nisi qui fidem, disciplinam, liberalitatem, literas et literatos
diligentissime colat; nisi qui, cum optime consulat, navetque
operam reipublicae, tum praecipue Oxoniam nostram officiis et
beneficiis omnibus augere, et ornare studeat!

And with these words the orator resumed his seat amidst ovations of applause.

Shortly after its delivery, King's oration was printed under the title Oratio in Theatro Sheldoniano Habita Idibus Aprilibus MDCCXLIX. Die Dedicatis Bibliothecae Radclivianae. On April 24, 1750, King wrote to Lord Orrery that his political adversaries had "sold off (for I will attribute nothing to the merit of the Performance) the whole impression of my Speech, tho' it was the largest of any Latin Work which has ever been printed in England: and next week I shall publish a 2d Edition." He must here be referring to the editio altera which presumably appeared towards the end of April, 1750. There are no essential differences between the two editions: some pages are reset in the later version, and there are a few extra notes. King gave away a number of copies of the first edition as presents to fellow-Jacobites; one of the best preserved of these is at present in the private collection of the Warden of All Souls' College. The recipient, Sir Edward O'Brien, Bart., has thus inscribed it:

This Oration was a Present from the Author My old Worthy Friend; the Great and Good Doct' WM King; Head of St Mary Hall Oxford: to his Admirer and Faithfull Humble Serv't

Edw'd O: Brien

Near the front of both editions there appears the following admonition in block capital letters:

SPERO ME IMPETRARE POSSE AB ERUDITORUM
OMNIUM AEOQUITATE, UT NEQUIS, ME INVITO,
HANC ORATIONEM IN SERMONEM PATRIM VERTAT.

Despite this warning, two English versions of the speech were in fact published, neither written by King or issued with his approval. The first appeared in 1750 under the title of A Translation of a Late Celebrated Oration, and the second in 1755 entitled A Satire Upon Physicians. In addition, a short extract appeared in English in The Monthly Review for November 1749. These renderings will be discussed later.

King's speech gave rise to both praise and protest for a considerable time to come. Thomas Warton, in his poem The Triumph of Isis, thus eulogizes King's oratorical powers:

But lo! at once the pealing concerts cease,
And crowded theatres are hush'd in peace.
See, on yon Sage how all attentive stand,
To catch his darting eye, and waving hand.
Hark! he begins, with all a Tully's art,
To pour the dictates of a Cato's heart:
Skill'd to pronounce what noblest thoughts inspire,
He blends the speaker's with the patriot's fire;
Bold to conceive, nor timorous to conceal,
What Britons dare to think, he dares to tell.
Tis his alike the ear and eye to charm,
To win with action, and with sense to warm;
Untaught in flowery periods to dispense
The lulling sounds of sweet impertinence!

---

9. In the Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, Vol. II, p.320, Sir Harold Williams wrote that the Radclivian oration was "Englished, not by King" in the translation of 1750. The Bodleian Library possesses three copies of this translation: G. Pamph. 204 (8), Gough Oxf. 120 (1), and a variant, G.A. Oxon. 8°. 63 (3).
In frowns or smiles he gains an equal prize,
Nor meanly fears to fall, nor creeps to rise;
Bids happier days to Albion be restored,
Bids ancient Justice rear her radiant sword;
From me, as from my country, claims applause,
And makes an Oxford's, a Britannia's cause.

Another bard, calling himself simply DEVANUS, produced a poem in a
similar strain entitled To Dr. King. If the internal evidence is
reliable, it was written in gratitude for a printed version of the speech
sent to the author. It is certainly no masterpiece, but since only one
copy of it seems to have survived, there is perhaps justification for
reproducing the first - and the best - stanza:

Accept, O KING! an humble Muse's Lay,
Nor scorn the Tribute which she seeks to pay;
Her slender Strains, tho' unadorn'd with Art,
Convey the Dictates of a grateful Heart,
And say, that all respectful Thanks are meant,
For that most perfect Piece you lately sent;
What nervous Sense in each pathetick Line!
How the Whole glows with Energy divine!
Soon may thine ev'ry REDEAT - Wish prevail,
And Right and Justice hold again the Scale!

The Earl of Shelburne wrote that, on King's introductions of the word
Redeat, "the most unbounded applause shook the theatre, which was filled
with a vast body of Peers, members of Parliament, and men of

G.G.J. and J. Robinson, 1791), pp. 7f. This poem was written in the
author's twenty-first year. Richard Mant, in his "Memoirs of the Life
and Writings of Thomas Warton" prefixed to the fifth edition of The
Poetical Works of the Late Thomas Warton, B.D. (1802), relates an
anecdote told by Mr. Prince, the Oxford bookseller: " .... Dr. King came
into his shop soon after the publication, and having enquired whether
five guineas would be of any service to the young man, who was the
author of the poem, desired Prince to give him that sum."

Lord Orrery, in his letter from his Irish estate of Caledon of May 2, 1749, remarked: "Your new acquisitions of Fame may please me, they cannot surprize me. Fame, if a shadow, must naturally follow such a Sun."  

When he acquired a copy of the printed text, he was particularly impressed with the tribute to the memory of Sir Watkin Williams Wynn. "It is a felicity to dye esteemed, regreted, and sung by Dr. King", he observed, "because it argues the honour and happiness of having enjoyed his friendship durante vita." The published speech itself he described as "a learned present which must prove an honour to any Library where it is placed."  

John Cleland, writing in The Monthly Review, commented on the beauties of King's Latin, "beauties which, even were we abler than we presume to be, are incommunicable in our language."

12. Lord Fitzmaurice, Life of William Earl of Shelburne (Second edition; London: Macmillan, 1912), Vol.I, p.27. Though the quoted observation which occurs in an imperfect autobiographical fragment left by Lord Shelburne is essentially accurate, as can be corroborated from other sources, His Lordship's information is sometimes erroneous. Thus he gives the date of this speech of King as 1754 and intimates that King introduced the word Redeat three times only. These lapses are undoubtedly due to what Lord Fitzmaurice, in his Preface, calls "a complete absence of all revision."


Other commentators were less kind. On the day following King's speech, Henry Brooke, Fellow of All Souls and Regius Professor of Civil Law, offered his sincerely expressed sympathies to Convocation, saying, according to Benjamin Kennicott, that he hoped

that such a Concourse of Venerable persons had been now assembled, not from a political principle but the Love of Learning, & therefore was sorry their Ears had been so abused with Reflections on the Misery of the Nation - That the Man who endeavour'd to rouse the Spirit of Discontent by Insinuations against the Peace of his Country, (& by the Country must be meant the Laws, the Constitution & the King of it) took the ready way to undermine those Laws and that Constitution, which alone could support both the University and Great Britain. And as he wouldn't scruple to pronounce such a Man the greatest Enemy to his Country, & to the University, so his Prayer shou'd be, Absit ut Tempora sint iniqua Academiae, vel Academia Temporibus. 16

Horace Walpole writing from Strawberry Hill to Horace Mann on May 3, 1749, indicated obscurely that the prevailingly Whig government of Henry Pelham intended for a short time to discipline the Oxford opposition:

We were to have had some chastisement for Oxford, where, besides the late riots, the famous Dr. King, the Pretender's great agent, made a most violent speech at the opening of the Ratcliffe Library. The ministry denounced judgement, but, in their old style, have grown frightened, and dropped it. 17

And even as late as the 1760's, the echoes of King's speech were still ringing in the ears of John Wilkes when he was engaged in criticizing the University of Oxford:

Methinks I still hear the seditious shouts of applause given to the pestilent harangue of the late Dr. King, when he vilified our great deliverer, the Duke of Cumberland, and repeated with such energy the treasonable redeat. Was the conduct of the University at the opening of the Radcliffe Library, by their behaviour to the known enemies of the Brunswick line, and their approbation of every thing hateful to liberty and her friends, worthy of imitation? 18

True it was that King had not mentioned the Duke of Cumberland by name, but many Whigs had always felt sure that he had been implied. Thus Bray, without indicating which of King's words he had in mind, wrote that the speaker

Drew y e character of military Hero's & without mentioning the Duke of Cumberland, cast Reflections that without any Violence might be apply'd to him. 19

Several of King's critics rushed into print, for the most part under pseudonyms. One writer, calling himself "a Lover of Honest Men" produced a booklet, which ran into three editions before the end of 1749, entitled Oxford Honesty: or, A Case of Conscience. King's name is nowhere mentioned, but the title page clearly indicates that this performance was "Occasioned by the Oxford SPEECH, and Oxford BEHAVIOUR, at the Opening of Radcliffe's LIBRARY, April 13, 1749. It is addressed to the "Club of Patriots Meeting at the Cocoa-Tree", a designation which carried political significance. The Cocoa Tree Chocolate House had been established in Pall Mall probably in the 1690's, but about 1745 had been converted into a private club for the use of its members, most of whom were Jacobites or

their sympathizers. During the rebellion of 1745 it had apparently been regarded as the headquarters of the Jacobites. King certainly knew the place and was very probably a member. The "Lover of Honest Men"—in all likelihood a Whig of Exeter College—referred unmistakably to King under the appellation of Cataline, with his "mighty Rumble, and sonorous Nothings:

... an Assembly is called to dedicate the Temple of Vanity; at which Assembly Cataline harangues, and was so approved, that the Speech of one became the Act of all, and was as much as if they had said, one by one, "So we believe, and so we teach."

The author proceeds to paint a rather unflattering picture of the orator who caused the "horrid Din", noting his "daring Eye", "perilous Look", "Gestures fierce", "mad Demeanour", and "big Voice''. With what any impartial critic would regard as excessive harshness, he inveighs against King's latinity:

His Prose would Cicero be amazed at, as he would at the Ease therewith he gabbles it: And Latin Verse (for Verses does he make as well as Speeches) is so peculiarly his own, that he writes it prohibente Musa, invita Minerva, Apolline nullo.

In a subsequent note the Templum Libertatis is described as "A String of Latin Verses, which the Speech-maker's self did spin, and eke did weave, without the help of Pallas."

Another unsympathetic observer in An Epistle to Florio at Oxford, published in London in 1749, made a captious reference in verse to King under the name of Mezentius, the tyrant whom Vergil in the Aeneid referred to as asper Mezentius, contemtor divum, and in the form of several other

20. For corroboration see Bryant Lillywhite's London Coffee Houses, p.164.
uncomplimentary epithets. An Epistle to Florio at Oxford is generally attributed to Thomas Tyrwhitt, though King himself indicated in 1750 that he had "some Reason to believe" that this piece was written by a certain Sir Fitz, who was formerly a lawyer's clerk. King provides in his Elogium Famae two characters of Sir Fitz, one in Latin and the other in English. Neither fits the nineteen-year old Tyrwhitt. But whoever the author was, certain similarities between his work and Warton's The Triumph of Isis will be immediately obvious. The author of An Epistle to Florio at Oxford tells his readers that foul faction knows how to play the part of a patriot, often to win the brave, unwary heart, and then continues:

'Tis thus Mezentius, haughty, bold, and loud,
With stoic raptures awes the admiring crowd.
Virtue and Britain are his pompous themes, —
Revenge, just Jove! the violated names.
What? was it virtue arm'd thy daring hand,
To deal rebellious slander through the land?
Was it thy boasted zeal for Britain's cause,
Reviled her monarch and despised her laws?
In tender minds perverted growing truth,
And fill'd her prisons with corrupted youth?
If such thy merit, who can grudge thy praise?
Go on, vain man, thy empty trophies raise;
Still in a schoolboy's labours waste thine age,
In fulsome flattery or in pointless rage.
Still talk of virtue which you never knew,
Still slander all to her and Freedom true —
Though crowded Theatres with Iö's shock,
And shouting Faction hail'd her Hero's Joke,
Who but must scorn Applause, which X — receives?
Who but must laugh at Praise, which Oxford gives?

---

21. See King's Elogium Famae, pp. 44 and 56 ff. An Epistle to Florio at Oxford was reprinted as the work of Thomas Tyrwhitt in The Gentleman's Magazine, Vol. IV, New Series, (December, 1835), pp. 595 - 600. According to Lord FitzMaurice, op.cit., p.15, King was first given the name of Mezentius by his son-in-law, William Melmoth the Younger. Melmoth's Mezentius is discussed in Chapter IX.
Applied to King, as the author quite clearly intended them to be, many of these verses are quite unjust. There is no evidence that King's words had filled British prisons with corrupted youth, and to regard the preparation of Latin speeches as "schoolboy's labours" was paying scant respect to the long tradition of academic oratory, to which, at Oxford, both Whig and Tory dons had contributed. It was certainly unfair to suggest that the Principal of St. Mary Hall had never known virtue.

The unidentifiable Sir Fitz was also, according to *Blogium Famae*, the author of two volumes written on purpose to defame King. It is now impossible to verify King's contention or to ascertain which volumes he had in mind. The allusions in them were apparently obscure even to contemporary readers. Discussing these volumes of Sir Fitz, King observed that "because his several Descriptions of the DOCTOR (all under feigned Names) might, with as much Truth and Propriety, be applied to any other Man in England, his Bookseller was instructed, in a Whisper to his Customers, to decypher the Libel and explain the Characters."

Especially hostile to the Radclivian oration was the author of *A Letter to the Oxford Tories*, who calls himself simply "an Englishman" and signs his Letter "MIDDLE-TEMPLE, Jan. 1. 1750." He is usually taken to be Henry Brooke, who had already taken verbal issue with King. He remarks that he has recently read the published version of King's speech, and adds, I have, I say, afforded a due Attention to this Astonishing Performance; am vain enough to think Myself Master of the whole Purport of every Period in the Composition; of every reported Pause in the Action, and cannot withhold an Intimation of my Concern that Prevalent Parts and masterly Talents should, at any Time, or on any Occasion, be disgraced by the Society [i.e. the University of Oxford] of Slander, Obloquy, Faction, Sedition; and
that a Head, well-instructed, is not always attended by a benevolent Heart.

The author comments that spleen and malevolence in an able writer and an admired speaker are to be lamented as a public misfortune. He then proceeds to warn any future translator of King's speech with the words Caveat Interpres, and implies that such an individual could lay himself open to prosecution for libel.

Of the various Whigs who assailed King's speech in print, one alone made no attempt to disguise his authorship. He was John Burton, Fellow of Corpus Christi College and Eton College, in addition to being Vicar of Mapledurham. Burton was influential in Oxford both as a theologian and classical scholar and as the protagonist of the move to introduce the study of Locke's philosophy into the curriculum. As the cousin and patron of Edward Bentham, he naturally felt indignant at King's attacks of 1748 and gave expression to his wrath in his Latin work Epistola ad Edw. Bentham, S.T.P. At the conclusion the date is given as September 28, 1749, though the title page contains MDCCCL as part of the imprint. Burton's Epistola is a spirited and acrimonious piece of denigration, exhibiting a constantly dyslogistic tone towards King and void of any tincture of impartiality. The Principal of

---

22. As well as helping to inaugurate the SPCK and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Ports, Burton is also regarded as one of the founders of the state of Georgia. See H.B. Fant, "John Burton, D.D., one of the Founders of the Colony of Georgia", Oxoniensia, Vol.VI (1941), pp.70-83. This article includes the fullest available bibliography of Burton's works, though a few listings are erroneous. Fant comments, "In his career Burton fell just short of real greatness", an opinion which would have amused King. See also Edward Bentham, De Vita et Moribus J. Burton, S.T.P., Etonensis (Oxford,1771) and A.H. Cooke, The Early History of Mapledurham (Oxford: Oxfordshire Record Society, 1925), pp. 172ff.

St. Mary Hall is referred to as *civis factiosus*, *graviter impudens*, *praevaricans*, *praeco*, *levis et malignus*, *senex querulus et iracundus*, *intemperans*, *audax*, *fraudulentus*, *petulans*, *licentiosus*, *temerarius*, *sediciosus*, *arrogans*, *ineptus*, and by a host of similar descriptions. He is in addition *senex delirans*, in *republica literaria novus homo*, *inter factiosos orator*, *Latinitatis impurae scriptor*, *turbulentus et petulans civis*, and a good deal more.

Towards the middle of this work, shortly after commenting, "Arrogantiam hominis intolerabilem!", Burton provides a proopopoeia supposedly spoken by *Alma Mater*. It is preceded by this explanation:

*Quoniam vero ille Almam matrem Academiam non importune minus quam familiariter compellare solet, nunc vicissim ea quae non vult, audiat quae vicissim respondeat Mater illa, sic cum senex filio injuriam hanc expostulans.*

She then proceeds to spume for almost the next eleven pages at her highly objectionable and unruly sexagenarian son. For a mother figure, she certainly exhibits a very dyspeptic kind of maternalism:

*Nae tu nimium tibi arrogas, qui injussus causae meae defensionem suscipis, levis et iracundus orator. Quid tibi nomen praetendis meum, quod factis dedecoras tuis? quid, libidines profundens tuas, ad mea provocas judicia? Ego, illa ingenuarum artium, verecundiae, severitatis & decori nutrix, Egon'ut sim petulantiae faatrix atque adjutrix tuae?*

She finds him quite unfit for the company of the orators of Greece and Rome; in fact, he is comparable only to the worthless monks of the middle ages:

Sed heus! quid tu tibi tantum arrogas, tu, in republica literaria novus homo, cujus ego ne nomen quidem ante paucos annos audieram ... Tu, nullius inter literatos notae, nisi forte illos sequioris aevi Monachos, homines ingenio sterilis misere abusos: horum nempe tu fames invides, pseudo-rhythmorum consarcinator, eadem pariter experturus fata, brevis aevi scriptor; cujus laus omnis cum ipso risu plausuque, quem forsan ad tempus excitare potueris, illico extinguitur.

She keeps up this matriarchal bluster to her last indignant warning:

Scias igitur me pro amicis meis atque defensoribus habere, non illos, qui aetatem consumunt ignaviae aut luxui dediti, aut qui male officiosi rebus politicis se ingerunt, & dum factiones, nesquo quas, quas, se rerum omnium primos esse volunt; sed illos, qui quicquid habent ingenii & industriae rebus impendunt meis, qui omni opera Religionis & literarum studia promoveat praeceptionibus, autoritate, exemplo, pristinae illius meae disciplinae salvuberrimae vindices, in qua unice incolumitatem meam atque gloriem contineri sentio.

At the end of the Epistola, Burton appends a postscript on the subject of the printed version of King's speech at the opening of the Radcliffe Camera. "Do you ask what I feel about it?" Burton questions. He indicates that he recognizes the elegance of the type, the neat appearance of the pages, the art of the engraver, and everything that embellishes the work - except the natural capacities and the latinity of the author. In this vein he comments:

Quod ad mentionem praefixam attinet - miror sane hominis magnificientiam, & de re tantilla tantam sollicitudinem.

Postulationi tam modestae utro favebit eruditi cujuscunque Lectoris sive Aequitas sive Prudentia; neminem enim arbitror ita opera abusurum sua. Ipse sibi hanc laudem integram sine invidia server, idem Scriptor & Interpres: ea sane quae sermone patris potius quam Romano prius cogitata fuerint, forsan & scripta, ea facili negotio in eundem relabi haud invita docebit ille mirus styli artifex. Quod si porro me Autore uti velit, admoneo, ut id
One can only wonder on what evidence Burton based this assumption: the existence of an original version _sermone patrico_, either in King's mind or on paper, is not demonstrable from the Latin text. But without providing any corroboration, he thus concludes the work:

Video equidem quam periculosum sit expectationem magnam excitare, cum tam difficile fuerit eandem cum dignitate sustinere. Lubenter profiteor nunquam me de Oratore isto Oxoniensi magnifice sensisse: atque adeo, si suorum vota & spem segerit, at meam certe opinionem adeo non segetur, ut etiam judicia confirmaverit.

In his _Anecdotes_ King described his earlier treatment at Burton's hands as "rude and dirty". Determined to avenge himself, he produced three separate publications, all intended to reply to the _Epistola ad Edw. Bentham S.T.P._ Chronologically the first of these answers was a broadsheet, probably produced in the early months of 1750, entitled _The Wonder of Wonders or Fresh Intelligence from Eton_. Two enlarged editions were soon afterwards issued under the title _An Answer to Dr. King's Speech: By the Rev. Mr. John Burton, Batchelor in Divinity, and Fellow of Eton College_, and essentially the same material was reprinted as an appendix to King's third reply, _Elogium Famae Inserviens Jacci Etonensis, sive Gigantis_. The third edition of the broadsheet is the fullest. In it King translated freely the abusive names which Burton had previously called him in the _Epistola ad Edw. Bentham S.T.P._, and also the flattering appellations which its author had used to describe himself. In the _Anecdotes_ King subsequently wrote:
I printed the whole catalogue on a large sheet of course paper, such as Grub-street ballads are printed on, and delivered the impression, which was a very large one, to a scavenger, to be cried about the streets of Oxford, Windsor, and Eton. And, in truth, this is the only proper answer that can be made to a work of this kind; for foul language and hard names, when a man does not deserve them, like an overcharged gun, will always recoil on the author. 24

It is questionable whether this curious and vindictive production does King any justice. The satire is strained and unsubtle. On the left side of the sheet King provides free translations of the Latin descriptions that Burton used of him, formulated in such a way as to make Burton look ridiculous. Some examples will indicate how King translated his adversary's insults:

Spurcus: "A filthy, sorry, rascally, bloody dishonest Fellow."
Nullius inter literatos notae: "A Man of no Note among us learned."
Rabula: "A wrangling Pettyfogger and Glutton."
Affecla: "A Spunger, Hanger-on or Footman."
Ardelio: "An impertinent Medler or Busy-Body."

An Errata at the foot of the sheet relating to these last two descriptions reads: "Not applied to Dr. King, but to the Vice-Chancellor, the Radcliffe Trustees, many others of the Nobility and Gentry, and nine-tenths of the University." The phrase Et adolescentes ex stultis insanos facit is followed by the italicized words This Snee I borrow'd from Terence and is translated "And Dr. King endeavours to make all the young Gentlemen of the University MAD, who, between Friends, are FOOLS already."

On the right side of the sheet King provides equally free translations of the descriptions which Burton used of himself, preceded by the capitalized words "I JOHN BURTON AM." For example:

**Ingemuus & benignus:** "A Man of good Extraction, ingenuous, honest courteous and good natured."

**Judex vere Romanus:** "The only true Judge of the Latin Tongue."

**Vir sapiens atque cordatus:** "Judicious, prudent, discreet, and full of Wisdom."

In the version of Burton's supposed Answer which appears as an appendix to King's *Elogium Famae Inserviens Jacci Etonensis, sive Gigantis*, King translates Burton's words *apta responsio* as "What a pat, clever answer's this to the old Doctor's speech!" Reading these "translations", one may reasonably question how many readers would have been deceived by the ascription to Burton, and how much King helped his own cause by making his opponent's phraseology bear far more innuendo than the original Latin will support.

King's next answer to Burton took the form of a translation of Alma Mater's speech in the *Epistola ad Edw. Bentham S.T.P.* published under the title *The Old Lady in her Tantarums: or Mother Oxford Ranting at her Eldest Son K- ng.* Eighteen appendices are annexed to the translation. Only one edition of this work ever appeared: copies are now very scarce. The translator, indicated on the title page as "a school-boy at Eton", first provides a brief Advertisement which is transparently apologetic. He quite misleadingly represents his work as a very close translation, and adds:
As it is but a School-Boy’s Attempt it will be worth no Man’s while to play the Critick with it. If it yields the Reader no Edification, he may thank the Author of the Latin; if the Translation gives him any Mirth, the Tribute then I claim as my Own.

The Advertisement is dated Eton, Feb. 1, 1750.

The translation makes Mother Oxford appear at least as rumbustious as she was in Burton’s Latin original. A comparison between an extract from the Latin text and King’s free translation of it – in places more like a loose paraphrase – will illustrate how the bravura of the original is preserved, while at the same time the speaker, Alma Mater, is made to look like a haranguing termagant. First, here is a portion of the maternal diatribe as Burton composed it:

O, Ld ergo tu quæta turbas? quid suspiciones, odia, & dissidii materiem foveas? quid abalienare cupim aetas, quos utilitatum communium cognatione oportet esse conjunctissimos? Siccine vero me defendis, ut Defensoribus meis invisas me, vel suspectam reddas?

King’s translation reads:

Pray let me ask you one civil Question, what is the Meaning that you are always disturbing and breaking in upon the Quiet of me and my Family? Why are you ever raising Jealousies, and, by blowing up the Coals of Contention, bringing an Odium upon us? I am amazed that you should endeavour to make young Men run resty, whose Minds ought to be firmly ty’d together by the Cognition of common Utilities. A very pretty Manner indeed of defending Me, exposing me to the Hatred and Suspicion of Those who would be my Friends!

In the second appendix the translator provides an observation on the phrase Cognition of common utilities:
A most uncommon Thought, dish'd out in as uncommon Expression. I don't remember it either in Tully or any Author of Credit but B—— n. However the Translation is literal, lest I should lose one Grain of it's Beauty by Deviation.

The liberal number of interjections (e.g. vah, heus) with which Alma Mater's expostulations are sprinkled are variously translated "Marry Muss", "O, fye upon it", "Upon my soul", "Come, hang it", and by other such expletives. The general effect is so raucous that one is not surprised to find the translator commenting in the third appendix:

.... I am afraid Scolding and Ranting are no recommending Qualities. If I had been Fellow of E--on, as I am only a School Boy, I would not have painted Alma Mater in such a filthy, Billingsgate Dress, but instead of an old scolding Vixen, I would have reduced her into a more mild Mood and Figure, and represented her as pitying her Children's Weakness, instead of whipping their Posteriors or boxing their Ears.

Nor does one feel inclined to criticize the appropriateness of the quotation from Proverbs XXV, 24, which is printed on the title page:

"It is better to dwell in a Corner of the House Top, than with a brawling Woman in a wide House."

The Elogium Famae Inserviens Jacci Etonensis, sive Gigantis constituted King's final reprise against Burton's Epistola ad Edw. Bentham S.T.P., of which it was intended, in the author's own words, to be a "faithful abstract". It is actually a piece of defamatory, macaronic persiflage, mainly in doggerel verse. On its title page, the "praises of Jack of Eton, commonly called Jack the Giant" are described as being "collected into Latin and English Metre, after the manner of THOMAS STERNHOLD, JOHN HOPKINS, JOHN BURTON, and Others", but no author's or editor's name appears. The book
is indicated only as being "By a Master of Arts". According to the note to stanza VI of the Prologue, it was written in December 1750.

The first element of this production is an Advertisement which covers some eight pages. It is largely devoted to a mock-panegyric of the titanic characteristics of Dr. John Burton. He is called Jack the Giant "not on account of his Stature or the Bulk of his Body, but in Consideration of his great Talents and the extraordinary Endowments of his Mind." He is the best Greek and Latin scholar that ever flourished in any age of the world, a most able divine and a profound philosopher, a most eloquent orator, an excellent poet, a most elegant writer of letters, memoirs, and travels, and a judicious and skilful critic in all parts of polite literature. The author explains that this is not his own judgement, but the opinion of the Giant himself, "whose Testimony, as he seems to be sufficiently acquainted with his own Abilities, and fully conscious of his great Merit, is certainly superior to all others". Not surprisingly, the Giant has constituted himself "the Censor General and sole Judge of all Latin Compositions", and promptly took offence when King made the Radclivian oration in the Sheldonian Theatre without paying proper regard to his censorial dignity. King thus explains the steps taken by the Giant after the oration:

He immediately composed a Counter-Speech, as it was called, full of Fire and Attic Salt; which was read in the same Theatre by a learned P——, and with the best grace imaginable. And yet it so happened, that it was not well understood; and consequently had not that Effect on the Audience, which might reasonably have been expected from so much Wit and Eloquence. Our GIANT, thus disappointed, was not however discouraged. He resolved to achieve a nobler Work, and advance into the Public with greater Abilities, than he had ever yet discovered.
This nobler work was the *Epistola ad Edw. Bentham S.T.P.* The purpose of *Elogium Famae* is to give a "faithful abstract" of the *Epistola*.

The main part of *Elogium Famae* follows: The style is deliberately jejune and banausic throughout the thirty-six stanzas of the Prologue, the forty-five stanzas of the main body of the work, and the two postscripts. At the end of the text properly so-called, the anonymous editor of the poem (King himself) provides fifteen pages of Notes and Observations, written mostly in English. These are followed by an essay in four chapters entitled "A Dissertation on the Burtonic Style" and an appendix containing the substance of the earlier broadsheet.

The verses of the poem are written in both English and Latin: the English text appears on the verso and the Latin on the recto. In the first stanza of the Prologue, King invokes the spirit of Thomas Sternhold, the early sixteenth century versifier of the Psalms:

SPIRIT of STERNHOLD me inspire,
And hither deign to bring
Not David's, but thy own sweet lyre,
While GIANT JACK I sing!

The stanzas that follow are deliberately trite and pitilessly sarcastic. The satire as a whole is too drawn out and patronizing to be wholly effective: if Burton's mind were really as pigmy as King suggests, it seems curious that so many of his voluminous writings were published by Typographeo Clarendoniano, and that he was awarded the degree of Doctor of Divinity only two years later. Furthermore, it is difficult to know which work or works King is satirizing. Most of Burton's verse, including his *Sacerdos Paroecialis Rusticus* and the selections in the better known *Opuscula*
Miscellanea Metrico-Prosaica were published later than 1750. Perhaps King had in mind either a lost work or a set of exercises which Burton used to give to the undergraduate students of Corpus Christi College for employment during the summer vacation, and which was printed in polyglot form in 1736 under the title Sacrae Scripturae Locorum Quorundam Versio Metrica.

Whether King had a specific model or not, the Elogium Famae has significance of a peculiar kind in that it is the only example in English literature of a polyglot satire in which the subject is made to look ridiculous by having his own purported style imitated in both Latin and English pari passu. It is somewhat different in aim from A Proposal of 1748 and A Poetical Abridgement of the following year: these works, though macaronic like Elogium Famae and intended to pillory one particular individual, were not intended to be written in the style of Edward Bentham. Two not untypical examples will indicate both King's satiric method in Elogium Famae, and the inane, jingling character of both the Latin and English versions. Stanza 6 of the main body of the work, which represents Burton as addressing Edward Bentham, reads in Latin:

Praestans ceteris incedis.
Quur non quoque tu mitratus?
Nam cum literas tot edis,
Sane vir es literatus.

The English version reads:

Thus - Neddy you deserve a Mitre
Much better than your Betters:
For, since you are a LETTER-WRITER,
You are a Man of LETTERS.

In stanza 3 of the first postscript King puts into verse one of Burton's arguments against the latinity of the Radcliffean oration:
This stanza appears in a more uncharitable form on the verso:

Next, tho' to some he doth appear
to use a Latin style;
The Blockhead writes, as I can swear,
In English all the while.

Though John Burton is the main object of King's satire, a few other persons are criticized incidentally. Of these perhaps the most unexpected is the learned printer William Bowyer the Younger, who sympathized in his quiet way with Tory political aspirations and fostered in his heart a not uncritical admiration for King's achievements. It appears that Bowyer had in good faith passed some comments on the Doctor's latinity, after the Radclivian oration, which had put King on the defensive. His lines in Elogium Famae manifest an acrid, vitriolic quality:

Some, loudly as the Nightbird's screech,  
Profess Dislike; some hint it;  
Ev'n little Bowyer damns the Speech,  
Because he did not print it.

It is a credit to Bowyer that he accepted this jibe with comparative equanimity. In a letter quoted by John Nichols he wrote:

Be it known that, for having hesitated in private conversation, and with the greatest deference, some doubt concerning the Latinity of an eminent Orator and Poet, I have felt the effects of his double talent of fiction and colouring, and have been thus figured and disfigured by his magisterial hand .... 25

If Bowyer's words are true, King's criticisms of him would appear to be unduly severe and perhaps disingenuous.

The Notes and Observations which follow the poem contain a number of references to corresponding passages in Burton's Epistola and miscellaneous droll comments on the same work, such as that of some of Burton's friends that he should light his pipe with it. This advice, we are assured, lessened the regard that Burton had for their judgement, but not the high opinion which he entertained of his own performance.

Rather more ironic in conception is "A Dissertation on the Burtonic Style", which follows the Notes and Observations. It is divided into four chapters which are entitled "An Excellent Greek Mixture to be Used upon Any Occasion", "How to Make the Best Sort of Latin", "How to Make an English Ode in the Burtonic Sublime", and "Of the Burtonic Style in Satire".

In the first chapter, King utilizes the "recipe" method of satire which he had already employed against Bentham in A Poetical Abridgement. Take as many Verses as you please out of Homer. Turn them into Prose by changing the Order of the Words: And be particularly careful, that none of your Sentences conclude with a Dactyl and Spondee; for this neglect may betray your Plagiarism. Then select a large Quantity of Phrases from Lucian, and a few sentences from St. Paul's Epistles; shake them well together, and mix them with your Homeric Prose. This MIXTURE will serve you for any Subject you think proper to handle ..... Specific examples follow: King's comments on them are facetious and amusing. Similar advice, which is at the same time both caustic and genial, is provided in the following chapter on the writing of Latin in the Burtonic style. Here King deals in some detail with the kind of Latin vocabulary to be employed.
Thus our HERO, perceiving that the Classic Authors had no one Word to express GRATITUDE, and that Cicero always used GRATUS ANIMUS (an unpardonable Periphrasis!) hath boldly introduced GRATITUDO in the Dedication of his Latin Sermon to Dr. GODOLPHIN, omni honoris & GRATITUDINIS officio devinctissimus .... Moreover, after the Example of this illustrious Modern in his Epistle to EDW. BENTHAM, you may freely use any barbarous Words, that are sonorous and give a Grace to your Periods, such as DERISIONES, CONSARCINATOR, FAMIGERATISSIMA, SUBSANNATIO, &c. provided always, that in the same Discourse you exclaim vehemently against all Writers of impure and barbarous Latin.

In order to illustrate his directions to the would-be writer of an English ode in the "Burtonic Sublime", King suggests that he should be well read in Sternhold and Hopkins, and have studied their version of the psalms with as much application as a parish clerk. Some examples from Burton's Sacrae Scripturae Locorum Quorundam Versio Metrica are used to corroborate his proposals. King's comments on the poetry of the Vicar of Mapledurham can be withering. Thus he quotes two verses from Burton's version of Psalm 137:

In Babylon, near proud Euphrates Stream,
Silent in melancholy Thought we sat;
And there with many a Tear bewail'd thy Fate,
Lovely, unfortunate Jerusalem!

Musick, farewell! our HARPS no longer please:
They, like our heavy HEARTS, untun'd, unstrung,
Motionless, useless, on the neighbouring Trees,
In mournful sympathetic Silence, hung.

King describes these stanzas as "inimitable" and far excelling the Latin translation of Buchanan. He continues:

But what I chiefly here admire is a Discovery made by our great AUTHOR, which had escaped the Observation of all former Translators, Commentators, &c. For it seems, the Jews, during their Babylonish Captivity, were used to hang their HEARTS upon the neighbouring Trees, as well as their HARPS. 'Tis no wonder, after such a painful Operation, if the poor Men sate in mournful Silence.
A Dissertation on the Burtonic Style concludes with a chapter of observations on the steps to be taken if one wishes to be a satirist in the manner of Burton: "make a large Collection of Ribaldry, and of all the scurrilous Terms and Appellations, which are in daily use among the lowest of the People, when they are well heated with Gin and begin to quarrel;" "converse, for at least six Months together, with Tinkers, and Coblers, and Barge-men, and Car-men, and Herb-women, and Oyster-women, and Cinder-women, &c.;" and "preface your Satire with a pompous Declaration and strong Protest against all kind of Invective."

Before leaving the subject of Elogium Famae, I think it is germane to suggest the possible influence of Swift, even though the likelihood is less than in some of King's other works. In a copy of Dr. James Gibbs' The First Fifteen Psalms of David Translated into Lyric Verse, which was published in 1701, Swift wrote some parodies of the author's efforts which are similar to King's English verses in Elogium Famae. Thus wrote the Dean:

Poor David never could acquit
A criminal like thee,
Against his Psalms who couldst commit
Such wicked poetry.

---

26. On the rather obscure history of the text of these marginalia see Temple Scott (ed.), The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift, D.D. (12 vols.; London: George Bell and Sons, 1907 - 1908), Vol.IV, p.232 and Harold Williams, Dean Swift's Library (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932), pp.41f. Both Scott and Sir Harold Williams indicate that a manuscript copy made in 1745 of these marginalia is in the library of Trinity College, Dublin. Frequent searches in recent years have not brought it to light.
"Tis wonderful that Providence
Should save thee from the halter,
Who hast in numbers without sense
Burlesqued the holy Psalter.

These marginalia were unpublished in King's own day, but it is possible
that, through his acquaintance with Swift in Dublin, he knew of these
parodies and allowed himself to be influenced by them. It would not be
justifiable to put the case more strongly than that.

One other Whig pamphleteer should be noticed in the post-oration
babel: his nom de plume was Phileleutherus Londinensis; his treatise was
entitled Remarks on Dr. K—'s Speech. Published early in January
1749/50, it constitutes a paragraph by paragraph critique of the pub-
lished version of King's speech together with some slanted observations
of a more general nature. During the course of this vitriolic publication
the Principal of St. Mary Hall is accused, rather unjustly, of indecency,
scurrility, insincerity, lack of good sense, madness, and a host of other
shortcomings. In the past this work has usually been credited to John
Burton, an attribution which was first made by John Nichols and seems to
me to be quite erroneous. 27 On the available evidence a far stronger

27. See, for example, John Nichols, op. cit. Vol.II, p.223, and Illustrations
of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century (8 vols.; London:
Printed for the Author, 1817-1858) Vol.I, p.767; Gordon Goodwin's
article on King and W.P. Courtney's on Burton in the Dictionary of
National Biography; Halkett and Laing's Dictionary of Anonymous and
Pseudonymous English Literature, Vol.V, p.68; H.B. Fant, op. cit.,
p.83; Harold Williams, "The Old Trumpeter of Liberty Hall", The Book-
A review of Remarks on Dr. K—'s Speech appeared in The Monthly Review,
Vol.II (January, 1750), pp.229 - 235. Benjamin Nangle (op. cit.) has
assigned this article to William Bewley and Ralph Griffiths. No
suggestion is made by the reviewers as to the identity of Phileleutherus
Londinensis.
case can be made that the author was another Whig clergyman, Samuel Squire, chaplain to the Duke of Newcastle, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and later Bishop of St. David's. This claim I shall attempt to substantiate.

The two most important pieces of evidence in support of Squire's authorship are from the pen of King himself. Perhaps the more significant consists of his comments in the Anecdotes:

When I published the oration, which I pronounced at the opening of the Radcliffe library, I was immediately attacked by one SQUIRE of Cambridge, who hath since been greatly promoted in the church, and is, I think, Clerk of the Closet to the Prince of Wales. He asserted that six or seven expressions in this speech are barbarous Latin, though they are all to be found in the best Latin authors, as Terence, Tully, Caesar, Sallust, &c. He was particularly so unfortunate as to usher in his criticisms with condemning the phrase fortiter & constanter sentire, and to spend three or four whole pages to prove that this is neither Latin nor sense: that is, that CICERO could neither write one nor the other; for this is CICERO'S Latin, and not mine. See the third book of his Tusculan Questions, and his oration for SULLA. 28

And in Elogium Famae, King, commenting on his critics, wrote:

See in this Train PHIL-LONDINENSIS!
Who proves by solid Reason,
Nor Latin in the SPEECH, nor Sense is,
And if there be, 'tis Treason.

28. Political and Literary Anecdotes (2d ed., 1819), pp.153-155. King was correct about Squire's appointment as Clerk of the Closet to the Prince of Wales; it dated from 1756. Essentially the same accusation is levelled much more briefly against Squire — under the name of Samuel Squib — in Chapter IV of King's A Key to the Fragment, published in 1751.
His note to this section of the text indicates:

This Gentleman, who calls himself PHILELEUTHERUS LONDINENSIS, is the GIANT'S ARCH-SQUIRE. SOON after his Master's Latin Work appeared, the SQUIRE published a Volume in English replete with the same kind of Satire, for which the Burtonic EPISTLE is so justly celebrated.

A sub-note to the last sentence provides the information that this volume was Remarks on Dr. K—'s Speech. There is no doubt that King himself considered that Samuel Squire was the author.

It is highly unlikely that King was mistaken. He knew personally many of the Cambridge dons who were in touch with Squire. He expresses the attribution without doubt or qualification. Nichols' attribution of Remarks on Dr. K—'s Speech to Burton was not made until well over half a century later, and then without evidence or corroboration. In any case, why should Burton wish to conceal himself under a pseudonym, when at about the same time not hesitating to expostulate with greater vehemence against King under his own name? The customary accreditation of Remarks on Dr. K—'s Speech to Burton should surely be abandoned.

As regards the merits of the arguments presented by Phileleutherus Londinensis there is not much to be said. He lacks Burton's sheer gusto and confines himself a good deal of the time to quibbles over matters of phraseology. One of these was King's use, alluded to in the Anecdotes, of the phrase fortiter & constanter sentire. Cicero in the third book of the Tusculanae Disputationes had written

Non et dicamus hoc melius, et constantius sentiems?
And in the Oratio pro Sulla he questioned

Quis non de communi salute fortissime, quis non constantissime sensit?

And yet in the Remarks on Dr. K——'s Speech we read:

.... neither Poet, Orator, nor Historian, ever said fortiter & constantiter SENTIRE. All these Kinds of Writers have said fortiter & constantiter AGERE, fortiter & constantiter DICERE, and fortiter & constantiter DISPUTARE; but our Speechmaker is the first Writer I have met with, who has dared to say, fortiter & constantiter SENTIRE; the first, who had not Discernment enough to see, that FORTITUDE and CONSTANCY are attributes of the WILL, and not of the UNDERSTANDING, and that whenever they are joined with any Verb that is applicable to the Will and the Understanding (as in the Verbs DICERE and DISPUTARE) they necessarily restrain their Application to the Will only: Which cannot be done here in regard to the Verb SENTIRE, because that is only capable of being applied to the Senses or the Understanding, and can no more be predicated of the Will, than the ADVERBS fortiter and constantiter can of the Understanding. The Blunder arose from our Speech-maker's not comprehending the Difference between fortiter & constantiter SENTIRE, and SENTIRE cum fortitudine & constantia: The former of which Phrases ascribes Fortitude and Constancy to an Act of the Understanding; and the latter only expresses an Act of the Understanding accompanied with the Attributes of the Will, Fortitude and Constancy.

One may reasonably wonder whether arguments of this nature should not be allowed to pass into oblivion.

Remarks on Dr. K——'s Speech occasioned a letter to The London Evening Post which deserves mention. It was addressed from Westminster School on January 12, 1750. The author, signing himself Phileleutherus Westmonasteriensis and claiming to be a sixth-former, sharply criticized the strictures on King's latinity which he had found in the work of Phileleutherus Londinensis. The popularity of the writer in The London Evening Post is questionable and may be an epistolary disguise. The
device of posing in print as a school-boy was occasionally used by literary gentlemen of the period: King himself claimed to be a school-boy in The Old Lady in her Tantarums. "The REMARKER hath made several Criticisms on Dr. KING's Latin", the writer enucleates, "in every one of which I will venture to say he is mistaken". One particular example is selected

.... on which the REMARKER lays the greatest Stress; for he says, 'That Testamentum quo decestit, is such Latin as would not save a School-Boy from Whipping': And I say, that the REMARKER ought to be whipp'd for not knowing that this is good Latin, and for being unacquainted with the elegant Writer who uses this Expression. If, therefore, the sagacious Phileleutherus Londoniensis will not take it amiss to be instructed by a Boy in the sixth Form at Westminster-School, I refer him to Pliny, Book 5, Epist. 5, where he will find Decessit veteri testamento; and Book 7, Epist. 24, where he will find Decessit honestissimo testamento. The rest of the REMARKER's Criticisms, and all his Translations .... are of the same Kind, and shew his Skill in the Latin tongue to be equal to his Judgment in Politicks. 29

This correspondent, whoever he is, propounds a perfectly valid counter-objection to one of the censures in the Remarks: indeed, quotations from the standard classical authors could be produced to invalidate most, if not all, of the author's trifling hermeneutics.

Very shortly after the publication of the work of Phileleutherus Londoniensis, there appeared A Translation of a Late Celebrated Oration, occasioned, as the title page indicates, "by a Lible, entitled, Remarks on Doctor K——'s Speech". Prefixed to the translation is a "seasonable Introduction", which is dated January 15, 1749/50. This publication must have been produced and

29. The London Evening Post, No. 3464 (January 11 - 13, 1750). Another letter relevant to Remarks on Dr. K——'s Speech on the matter of the Radcliffe librarianship appears in No. 3465 (January 13 - 16, 1750). It is undated and signed simply "A.B."
circulated in a hurry: a brief notice regarding it appears in the issue of The Monthly Review for January 1750 immediately after the article on Remarks on Doctor K——'s Speech. The identity of the translator remains unknown, but he gives every impression of being a convinced admirer of King. At the very end of his rendition, after having interpreted REDDEAT, efficiatque in the three final paragraphs as "Restore and prosper him", he adds a further aspiration of his own in the same vein:

RESTORE and prosper him, that it may be no Crime to have translated this forbidden Oration; and that our great Author may have the Pleasure of forgiving his disobedient, yet honest, Translator.

In his Introduction, the translator waxes with a certain eloquence on the general subject of freedom, and while doing so refers to King as "the Favorite of the Muses, the Graces, the Virtues", and "the Darling of Liberty, and all the Sons of Liberty". He has no doubt that "our great Orator" is a model of patriotism:

For while he hopes and pants for Freedom himself, he pours the same Spirit by his Eloquence into others; and whenever he makes a Friend to his Country, he makes a Friend to himself. If we admire the Knowledge of Books, accompanied with that of Men; the finest Learning, adorned with the brightest Genius and perfect Politeness; if we admire any human Excellence, how shall we esteem the Man who possesses them all? How shall we love the Man who devotes them all to his Country? What an antient Roman in Sense, as well as in Sound! What an antient Briton! What an Oxonian!

More thoughts follow in like manner; we are told that "if Eloquence ever preserved a Nation; if Tully vanquished a Cataline; if Demosthenes withstood the Power and Fortune of Philip; surely, in these Times, our British Orator must be dear to every Briton." Only one fault is ascribed to him; namely, that of discouraging unauthorized translations of his oration. "In this our great
Patriot certainly judged wrong, or committed an Error", the writer observes. "For why indeed should he refuse those any thing, for whom only he bears to live, for whom he would dare to die?" It is then pointed out that the great orator has many enemies: "every temporizing Dunce presumes to scribble at him." Amongst the works of King's adversaries is "that doughty Performance, entitled, Remarks on Doctor K—g's Speech, which misrepresents every noble Paragraph, and degrades the Stile of that excellent Oration, down to its own most wretched Dialect." In order to offset this piece of misrepresentation, the translator explains, this English version of the speech has been published. Now every Briton may understand "this noble Defence of public Virtue, and may have the Satisfaction of worshipping Liberty, in a known Tongue." Ladies in general should be especially grateful, he declares, "since, in translating Doctor King, I have gratified the reigning Passion of their Sex, which is universally allowed to be The Love of Oratory." The Introduction concludes with a simile which is apologetic yet, despite its imperfect expression, disarming:

After all, it may, perhaps, afford some Entertainment to take a View of Truth, as she appears in a simple Dress, and unattended with the Blaze and Lustre of Roman Oratory: As the Sun over-powers the Eye, if we look at it in the Heavens, while its Image in a River may be contemplated for ever.

With the exception of a few lapses, this translation, though stylistically inferior to the Latin original, gives a fairly faithful reproduction of the speaker's meaning. The same cannot be said of the English metrical version which appeared five years later under the title of A Satire Upon Physicians. This anonymous piece of doggerel is described as a "heroic
paraphrase": it bears as much relationship to King's oration as Henri de Picou's travesty L'Odyssée d'Homère does to the original which inspired it. King's words

.... quippe verebar infirmus & obliviosus senex, & climactericum jam excedens annum ....

appear as

In me, ah! pity to behold!
A Wretch quite wither'd, weak' and old;
Who now has pass'd, by heaven's decree,
The dangerous year of Sixty-three ....

An example of his forgetfulness (not in the original) is gratuitously provided:

My memory oft mistaking names,
For G—RGE, I often think of J—MES;
Am grown so feeble frail a Thing,
I scarce remember who is King;
Th' imperial purple which does wear,
A lawful or a lawless Heir!

It is only fair to add that A Satire Upon Physicians, considered as a piece of pure mockery, shows intermittently a certain cleverness. For example, King, in describing the virtues of Radcliffe as a physician, had proclaimed:

.... tam simplici et aperto erat pectore, ut, abhorrens ab aliorum consuetudine, nihil simularet aut dissimularet, nihil aegrotantisbus sycophantiose faceret, aut diceret, ad captandum favorem, ne regibus quidem; sed ex animo omnia, planissime verissimeque.

The version of 1755 reads (in part):

Whene'er he took a patient's Fee,
He chose the open way and free;
(Unlike those Sycophants, who tell
A gasping wretch, he'd soon be well)
Told rich and poor, both low and high,
That kings, like slaves, were born to die;
Nor whisper'd it, but spoke aloud-
"- Dear friend, prepare to buy your Shroud! ..."
That Hectic Cough you'll quickly rue,
Which soon will split your lungs in two.
You sigh so deep, and heave and pant,
A coffin, Sir, is all you want.
Think on your Parson and your Text,
You'll want 'em both by Sunday next;
Your sins and failings, great and small,
E'er 'tis too late, repent of all;
No julep, potion, dose, or pill,
Could ever cure a man so ill;
Then send for wax, and sign your will."

In his speech King had continued:

Ex quo illud assequebatur, ut fides sua et integritas
esset spectatissima; utque ii, quibus remedia adhibebat,
res familiares et domesticas placide et ordinate
disponerent; liberis, propinquis, amicis bene consulerent;
et sive convalescerent, sive mortem obirent, summa gratia
illustri medico haberetur.

In the 1755 version Dr. Radcliffe is made to continue his mock-lugubrious advice to his patients:

And e'er you leave the world, provide
For your next heir, and weeping Bride;
Fixing what Portions you think due
To Jack and Harry, Kate and Sue.

The doctor's recommendations are followed, but the disjunct sive convalescerent is quietly suppressed:

Such counsel, kindly thus exprest,
Was welcome to the patient's breast:
With whose advice the wretch complied,
Paid him his usual Fee - and died.

Perhaps the best method of demonstrating how the Anglicized versions of King's speech differ from their original is to select one portion from the Latin text and compare it to its English counterparts. The third
Redeem paragraph, which consists of one sentence only,

will serve well enough for this purpose:

RETURN, with effect return! that the national
good may re-flourish, faith be restored, peace con-

firmed; that just, honourable, salutary, useful
laws may be enacted: Laws which may discourage the
wicked, keep the military within due bounds, favour
learning, forgive the imprudent, relieve the indigent,
and give general satisfaction; especially in a
general deliverance of all from the dangers of law-

oppression, insomuch that no free-born subject,
unattainted, and without legal condemnation, shall
be harassed, fined, and plundered. 31

The next English version to be offered to the public is to be found in the anonymous translation of 1750:

RESTORE and prosper him, that the Common-wealth may revive, Faith be recall'd, Peace established, Laws ordained, just, honest, salutary, useful Laws, to deter the Abandoned, restrain Armies, favour the Learned, spare the Imprudent, relieve the Poor, delight all; by delivering all at length from the Perils of Law, that no ingenuous Subject, innocent, uncondemned, may ever more be tormented, fined, plundered.

Already one of the effects of King's studied ambiguity is apparent. In the original Latin, the subject of REDEAT could be, if the text is taken literally, either Astrea nostra, aut quocunque nomine malit vocari ipsa Justitia (in the first paragraph of the peroration) or magnus ille Genius Britanniae (in the subsequent paragraph). In the 1749 translation the matter is left open; in that of 1750 the Genius Britanniae is implied. Both translations allow for the innuendo which the audience understood, as evidenced by their applause. And even in that matter there is room for more than one interpretation: I assume that King's aspiration was the return of James III, though he could be referring to Prince Charles, who was by this time the individual in whom the Jacobites placed their greatest hopes. On the whole there is not a great deal to choose between these two Englished versions: both adhere closely to the form and structure of the original, while at the same time exhibiting small liberties in vocabulary and syntax. The metrical version of 1755 is nothing more than a free parody. Here the writer assumes that the subject of REDEAT is Astrea, but proceeds to call her a "sacred goddess", despite the fact that the orator has already called her Christianissima virgo.
Once more, Astraea! visit earth,
A sacred goddess by thy birth!
Thy antient seat once more regain,
Preside in courts, in senates reign;
Thou Goddess, thou, ah! clip the claws,
Of all our cruel harpy laws;
That people may enjoy their ease,
And use their inkhorns, as they please;
Let not the guiltless feel thy strokes,
For a few harmless merry Jokes;
Unheard their cause, be sent to jail,
For healths, when overcome with ale;
Who ne'er were known once to commit
Such frolics in a sober fit;
In every college, every hall,
Good, loyal, serious subjects all:
And zealous for the royal line,
In none more zealous than in mine.
To me who pay a just regard;
Who often pray, and study hard;
Fond of the precepts I instil,
Nor ever act against my will.

It is worth remarking that during the period of literary contention
immediately following the speech, Lord Orrery actively exerted his in-
fluence on King's side. On January 23, 1749/50 he wrote from Dublin to
Theobald Russell:

His [i.e. King's] friendship to you is an instance of the
excellence of his heart, which I have always observed to be
entirely equal to the excellence of his head: each superior
to the common run of mankind. He blooms and becomes splendid
at a time of life when other men wither and grow dim. His
lustre is the same if not greater in his evening than in the
noontide of his day. Worship him, if you will oblige me. He
desires, He expects, He will receive no other adoration than that
of sincerity and honour. 32

The spectacle of the controversy between King and his Whig antagonists
seemed to Orrery comparable to an eagle against an army of frogs. He
used the same simile nine days later in a letter to William Cowper. There

he commented, with regard to a now unidentifiable publication:

A virulent paper or pamphlet against Dr. King has been shown to me lately. I know not the Author, but he seems almost as severe upon Dr. Ratcliffe and the Trustees as upon Dr. King. He is very dull, and yet his scurrility is of a kind that ought to be answered. In the mean time the Doctor appears to me like a noble Eagle flying high in the air and basking himself in the Sun, while his enemies are like so many frogs croaking in a dirty pool, and constantly pelted, whenever they thrust up their heads thro' the scum of the water. 33

And to King himself on the following April 7 he remarked:

When I find you engaged against low adversaries, and see you smiting every impertinent Insect that crawls upon your Skirts, you appear to me, like Hercules stooping to brush off flies. Victory must attend you every where; whether you think fit to combat with Giants, and Hydras, or amuse yourself, in destroying moths and woodlice. 34

For Orrery's moral support, the Principal of St. Mary Hall was duly grateful:

.... your approbation of my Speech has given me great pleasure, especially at this juncture, when I am attacked by all Orders and Professions, by all Sects and religions and No-religions, by Giants and Knights, Squires and Dwarfs, Women and Children. These new Criticks will allow me no more learning than Melmoth will allow me morals. .... But under all these persecutions .... I am conscious to myself that I have done my duty in that station in which I have been placed to the best of my skill and judgement. 35

King produced one further work on the subject of the attacks made on his speech of April 13, 1749. This was an eristic dialogue in Latin verse entitled Monitor, which was never actually published. Nowadays it is to

33. Ibid., pp. 67f.
34. The Houghton Library, Harvard University, MS. Eng.218.2 (v.5), p.41.
be found only in the Opera. According to the title page, this work was written in 1749 (SCRIPTUS EST HIC DIALOGUS ANNO MDCCXLIX) and had not been in print before the final compilation of the Opera (NUMQUAM ANTEHAC EDITUS). Parts of the notes must have been written later than 1749 as their content clearly shows. Though it seems to have been generally unknown in King's own lifetime, this poem provides valuable insights into the trend of his thinking subsequent to his celebrated speech. Once again, the comprehension of the modern reader is hampered by the absence of a key: Aulus is clearly King and Aulicus is his friend, but many of the other names cannot be attributed to particular individuals with any degree of certainty.

The occasion for writing Monitor is explained by King in his footnote to the first line of the poem:

Incredible est dictu, postquam orationem habui in theatro Sheldoniano, die dedicationis bibliothecae Radcliviannaec, quanta in offensa fuerim apud eos omnes, qui aulae deserviunt, consiliarios, milites, medicos, causidicos, lenones, mimos, parasitos, delatores, maxime vero sacerdotes purpuratos, et non purpuratos; qui quidem, quisque suo more ac tempore, me petebant, et maledictis insectabantur. Ex iis insigniores quosdam notavi, graviore fortassi animadversione posthoc coercendos.

Monitor commences with an address by Aulicus to Aulus:

Vane senex, frustra contendis rhetor haberi,
Si laudare parum est, ni tu dicteria fundas,
Et regum offendas socios. Commendat amicum
Vir catus experiensque? haud dulcis acris miscet,
Auditorum animos irritans. Nesciat uti
Fortuna rebusque suis, qui Temporal clamat,
Et procerum mores, propiusque inquirit in aulam.
Nil te commoneat Libertas vincit catenis,
Arcesque inviae, et rabidi perjuria Byrrhi,
Et Taurus judex, comitumque exempla tuorum,
At this point Aulius is interrupted by Aulus who asks complainingly:

Aulice, quo properas, horrenda, extrema minatus
Indigno? quid enim peccavi, ut publica verba
Sermoneque pios sceleris tu nomine damnes?

A good deal of the rest of the poem is an attempt by Aulicus to answer these questions. He argues that Aulus should stop praising liberty and attacking the court. Aulus naturally refuses to take this advice, implying that if he were to do so, men could write of him in the future (in capitals):

VENDIDIT HIC AURO PATRIAM.

Aulicus considers the arguments of Aulus to be worthless, and comments:

Ah! somnia narras,

Thence he enlarges on his objections for three and a half pages, to be answered by Aulus, who argues against his standpoint for another two.

Aulicus then coolly tells Aulus, "Re tota errasti." The dialogue ends in an impasse six pages later, without any definite conclusions having been reached on either side. Aulus, for his part, is unruffled, and the poem concludes with his saying:

36. Byrrhus and Taurus are only two of the unidentifiable designations in this poem. A deliberately vague paragraph is provided on Byrrhus in the notes; of Taurus King writes merely: Ut tuto sim, de Tauri judicio, quisquis ille, et id quaecunque, tali tempore sileatur.
Attamen aequo animo, non ullis rebus egenus,
Non inhononatus vixi: neque gratius usquam
Dii munus dederunt, cui se favisse patentur.

There is a certain stale quality about the argumentation in Monitor. The poet presents very few, if any, ideas which he had not already used or implied in his earlier works of the same decade. The principal value of this poem - apart from its Latinity, which is comparable to that of the author's other serious poems - lies in the incidental light which it sheds on King himself and persons known to him. In this respect the notes, which are very full and detailed, are often more interesting than the 216 verses of the text. Thus one long footnote deals splenetically with GIGANTA, who can hardly be anyone other than John Burton. King explains that on the day of the Radcliffe oration, there was present by chance a certain S.T.B. ex grammaticistarum grege. Scarcely had the oration finished,

... cum homo incenditur, furit, cursitat huc et illuc, me calumniatur, horribiles strages mihi minatur. Itaque postquam secessit, se ad scribendum comparat, librum conficit, orationi meae respondet, singula refutat; deinde librum, quem imprimendum curat, magnifice ostentat, ingenium suum venditat, se victorem appellat, triumphum canit.

The book in question can only be the Epistola ad Edw. Bentham S.T.P.

As King intimated elsewhere, it was published against the advice of his friends, and only after some hesitation on the writer's part:

Dehortantibus vero amicis, ne librum edat, quum nulla ei a me orta fuisset injuria, primum repugnat; deinde labascit, mitescit, librum tandem indignatus abjicit, quasi facti ipsius eum puderet. Aliquot post menses iterum vehementissime commovetur grammaticista noster, ne tum quidem aut verboullo, aut scripto a me violatus; disputat, clamat, latrat, in me bacchatur in circulis omnium, doctorum, indoctorum, bonorum, malorum, puerorum, puerarum. Quam abjecerat libellum,
retrahit, recognoscit, emendat, auget, et, spretis demum amicorum consiliis, emittit.

The opinion that King here expresses on Burton’s Epistola is what one would expect:

Qualem vero, dii boni, libellum! in quo nihil inest ingenii, aut doctrinae, ne quidem criticae, quam mehercule artem homo opiniosissimus totam vult esse suam. Qualem vero! non modo sacerdote Christiano, sed homine ingenuo, sed quovis homine indignum: quandoquidem nulla est hujus pars opusculi summae expers turpitudinis, cum propter maledicta, quae ex trivio et miserae plebeculae convitiis scriptor arripuit, mihique ultro ingessit, tum propter miras sane et numerosas laudes, quae quum de uno nemine haberi possint, eas sibi arrogat, et nomini suo libat gloriosus.

Later on, so King alleges, Burton underwent a softening of heart, a condition which the author of Monitor associates with mental sickness. Curiously, he does not allude to this particular development in any other place:

Ex quo fit, ut, cum aliis ludibrio, aliis contemptui, aliis odio, suis omnibus sit dedecori, magnum quidem mini misericordiam commoveat. Quippe qui plane ea aegritudine et agrotatione mentis, in quam incidere solent invidi et malevoli omnes, usque adeo opprimitur, ut indies ingravescente morbo, caput insanabile, vel Hippocrate nostro judice, esse videatur.

When Aulus speaks of the stolidi Armigeri convicia he can be referring only to Samuel Squire. In a note King refers his readers to a verse in Hydra containing the phrase Bellulus hic Abbas. His explanation of the phrase leaves no room for doubt concerning the identity of the Abbas:

In carminibus meis Gaurus, sive Armiger appellatur; in scriptis suis Archimagirus, Archimimus, Phileleutherus, alisique polysyllabis titulis insignitur; a Cantabrigiensibus vero plane rustice vocatur Fax, et Faex, quae quidem nomina ei addita sunt, et imposita tum a vitae et generis conditione, tum a studiis et facinoribus suis.
In Monitor King provides additional corroboration for this identification. When writing of the Giant's Squire he comments:

\[\text{\ldots si eum penitus perspicere velis, et cognoscere, qualis sit criticus, sacerdos, philosophus, medicus, \&c. consule Elogium \text{i.e. Elogium Famae}, et libellos eos jocosiores nuper editos, in quibus academicici Cantabrigienses de nova et ignominiosa dominatione cum praefectis suis expostulant.}\]

This note must have been written later than the main part of the text. The libellos jocosiores here referred to are presumably The Fragment and A Key to the Fragment, which were published in 1750 and 1751 respectively. It is only in Monitor that King admits the relationship between his Armiger and Dr. Squirt of the Fragment who becomes Samuel Squib in the Key.

Another note refers to Ascalaphus, who is designated B—delator insignis. There is no reason for more than one interpretation of this description: nobody fits it better (from King's point of view) than Richard Blacow of Brasenose. He figures more prominently in King's writings during the period following the Oxfordshire county election of 1754, but had been mistrusted by the Principal of St. Mary Hall as a Whig informer long beforehand. King's opinions about Blacow are usually expressed in English — the language of the election controversy — but in Monitor King could make statements of a kind which would not have been suitable for popular consumption. Here Blacow is described as

\[\text{\ldots fraudum, calumniarum et machinarum omnium inventor, quae ad famam meam laedendam adhibebantur. Hic est iste delator, qui aditum habuit facillimum ad regni praefectos, et ipse perjurissimus, et cujusdam impurissimae lenae perjuriiq adjus tus, Academiam OXONIENSEM vehementer accusavit, et in odiosum laesae majestatis crimen vocare potuit.}\]
Towards the end of Monitor, the author has composed what is, for him, an unusually personal footnote. Here he provides an intimate and almost naive piece of self-justification which has no comparison in any of his other Latin works:

Velim, mi lector, mihi ignoscas, quod in libris meis aliquid de meipso gloriari videor; atque hoc totum, quicquid est, ascribas, attribuasque malevolentissimis inimicorum meorum obtrectationibus, quos nisi quodammodo redarguissim te docendo, ipse qui sim, et quae vitae meae consuetudo, et ii cujusmodi, et omnino quales fuerint eorum mores, non modo me nimis patientem, sed plane inertem et infantissimum existimares; non modo non primariorum virorum et optimorum civium, sed neminis cujusquam hominis ingenii liberique amicitia me putares dignum.

This piece may have little value as explanation, but it manifests one of King's principal shortcomings, his tendency to blame others for real or imagined faults in himself. He never completely overcame this failing: it will appear again in the epitaph which he wrote for himself in the final years of his life.
The fact that King arrived at a disinterested conclusion in *Monitor* is significant. Perhaps he was already starting to lose faith in the Jacobitism which he would formally abjure in twelve years' time. Even if this was not the case, King's meeting with Charles Edward, the Young Chevalier, in the following year, definitely caused him to feel grave doubts as to the calibre of the second Jacobite claimant to the throne. This encounter is usually regarded as the terminus a quo of the Elibank Plot, the last and most obscure attempt to restore the Stuarts to the throne of Great Britain by means of a rising within the country.

The small amount of evidence on the subject has been presented most recently by Sir Charles Petrie, and there is now little new to add to the existing knowledge of the purely military aspects of the plot. The precise contribution made by King to this affair is difficult to determine:

all the available information on his role is contained in his Political and Literary Anecdotes, and these are understandably devoid of details of the proposed coup d'etat. An insurrection had originally been planned in 1747, which was to have had its beginning in September at Lichfield races. It was later postponed, despite the fact that the English Jacobites sent over £15,000 to the prince, who was now being described as "Charles III". As late as September of 1749 King attended Lichfield races in person and drew up a list of 275 loyal gentlemen who were present. Charles Edward's whereabouts and immediate intentions were at this juncture a mystery to most English and continental Jacobites - even to their principal protagonist in Oxford. The prince was rumoured to be in Poland: only the entourage of Pope Benedict XIV and a few other intimates knew that he was really in France, despite the fact that he had been officially expelled from that country in 1748 under the terms of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. King seems to have been completely unprepared for the appearance of Prince Charles in London during September of 1750.

In that month the Principal of St. Mary Hall received a note from Lady Primrose in which she indicated that she desired to see him immediately at her home in Essex Street, off the Strand. This communication eventually led to a complete volte-face in his political outlook. When he had reached Lady Primrose, she led him into her dressing room, and presented him to the Young Chevalier in person. On the circumstances of their meeting King wrote:
If I was surprised to find him there, I was still more astonished when he acquainted me with the motives which had induced him to hazard a journey to England at this juncture. The impatience of his friends who were in exile had formed a scheme which was impracticable; but although it had been as feasible as they had represented it to him, yet no preparation had been made, nor was anything ready to carry it into execution. He was soon convinced that he had been deceived, and therefore, after a stay in London of five days only, he returned to the place from whence he came.  

King relates later that, before leaving England, the Pretender came to his lodgings and drank tea with him. For some years afterwards they corresponded constantly, and during this period King informed himself of all particulars relating to Charles Edward both in public and private life.

The assessment of the Young Chevalier which appears in the Anecdotes is especially interesting in view of King's earlier pronouncements on the desirability of restoring the House of Stuart. After paying tribute to his "tall and well-made" person, his "handsome face," and his "good eyes," King continues:

... but in a polite company he would not pass for a genteel man. He hath a quick apprehension, and speaks French, Italian, and English, the last with a little of a foreign accent. As to the rest, very little care seems to have been taken of his education. He had not made the belles lettres or any of the finer arts in his study, which surprised me much, considering his preceptors, and the noble opportunities he must have always had in that nursery of all the elegant and liberal arts and science \[i.e. Rome\]. But I was still more astonished, when I found him unacquainted with the history and constitution of England, in which he ought to have been very early instructed. I never heard him express any noble or benevolent sentiments, the certain indications of a great soul and good heart; or discover any sorrow or compassion for the misfortunes of so many worthy men who had suffered in his cause. But the most odious part of his character is his love of money, a vice which I do not remember to have been imputed by our historians to any of his ancestors, and is the certain index of a base and little mind.

3. Ibid., pp. 200 ff.
King further discusses the Chevalier's religious duplicity ("With the catholics he is a catholic; with the protestants he is a protestant...") , his insolent manner of treating his immediate dependants, and his drunken quarrels with his Scottish mistress, Clementina Walkinshaw. It is hardly surprising to find that King attributes to this man alone, rightly or wrongly, the ruin of the Jacobite cause.

King's role in the Elibank Plot seems to have been essentially negative. He was informed initially by the prince himself of the details of the proposed rising. From the Stuart Papers in the Royal Library at Windsor Castle, the Rome and Tuscany State Papers in the Public Record Office, and other sources, it is possible to form a rather vague conception of the initial phase of the plot. During his five day visit to London, Charles met the Duke of Beaufort, the Earl of Westmoreland, and about fifty other Jacobites at a house in Pall Mall, and offered to lead a rebellion if 4000 men could be mustered. He had already asked George Dormer, his agent in Antwerp, to procure 26,000 muskets for the same purpose. He hoped to seize the Tower of London during the course of the revolt, and contemplated blowing up one of the gates with a petard. The military details of the scheme he discussed with Colonel Brett, the Jacobite agent who had been secretary to the Duchess of Buckingham, the daughter of James II by Catherine Sedley.

In order to gain greater public confidence, he renounced the Roman Church, and was admitted to the Church of England in St. Mary-le-Strand, as he himself subsequently announced in a draft proclamation of 1759:
In order to make my renunciation of the Church of Rome the most authentick, and the less liable afterwards to malitious interpretations, I went to London in the year 1750; and in that capital did then make a solemn abjuration of the Romish religion, and did embrace that of the Church of England as by Law established in the 39 Articles in which I hope to live and die.

I doubt if King discouraged Charles' entry to the Anglican Communion, but he presumably poured cold water on all the prince's military projects, which he personally believed others had instigated, and desisted himself from being associated with them. He seems to have taken no active part in the melancholy attempts to organize the rising which were made subsequently, and which led to the execution on June 7, 1753, of Colonel Archibald Cameron, the last Jacobite to suffer the death penalty.

The Young Chevalier made another clandestine journey to England in September 1752, when! he again stayed at the home of Lady Primrose. His presence in the country was certainly known to the Secretary of State, Lord Holdernesse, who reported it to George II. On being asked what he wished to be done, the King is reported to have answered, "I shall do nothing at all, and when he is tired of England he will go abroad again."

To commemorate this visit, which lasted for some weeks, a silver medal was struck on the continent. The exergue on the reverse contains the

4. Relevant background information is to be found in the Introduction to Sir Walter Scott's Redgauntlet and in Andrew Lang's Pickle the Spy and The Companions of Pickle.

5. A formal description of this medal appears in Edward Hawkins, op.cit., Vol.II, p.670. A reproduction of both sides is provided in R.W.Cochran - Patrick, op.cit., plate XIV, figure 5. This medal is unsigned. Its execution has been attributed to Thomas Pingo (e.g.in L.Forrer's Biographical Dictionary of Medallists, Vol.IV, p.558), but Joseph Kirk, in one of his sales lists reprinted by William Till in 1838, claims it as being by himself. As the medal is dated, it was probably not issued until after the Prince's arrival in England. Specimens are preserved in the British Museum and the Heberden Coin Room of the Ashmolean.
The bust of Prince Charles is shown on the obverse, together with the legend

REDEAT MAGNUS ILLE GENIUS BRITANNIAE.

The influence of King's Radclivian oration is also manifest on some drinking glasses which date from about the same time and which have survived to the present day in the hands of private collectors. They have the word REDEAT engraved close to the rim.

King may have continued for a little while longer to play a purely advisory role in continental political intrigues, though the evidence is far from conclusive. In a letter written from Paris on May 7, 1753, to Frederick the Great, the Earl Marischal refers obscurely to a military scheme to aid the Jacobites in England, and comments:

Il me paraît que le mécontentement en Angleterre est si grand à l'heure qu'il est que peu de chose renverserait le gouvernement; mais ce peu de chose n'est pas facile à ajuster.

The Earl then refers to un certain projet and continues:

Les deux principales personnes en Angleterre dans le secret, outre Dawkins, sont le docteur King, homme d'esprit, vif, agissant, et milord Westmoreland, homme sage, prudent, d'une bonne tête, bon citoyen, respecté et respectable. Vous pourrez toujours vous fier à leurs sentiments, comme ils se fieront aux vôtres; mais ils ne se confieraient pas aisément à ceux d'aucun prince. S'ils avaient quelque chose à communiquer à Votre Majesté dans la suite, ils enverront un homme de confiance ou

6. Grant R. Francis, "Jacobite Drinking Glasses and their Relation to the Jacobite Medals", British Numismatic Journal. Vol.XVI (Second Series, Vol. VI, 1921-22), pp.268ff. An indeterminate number of these glasses are earlier in date than King's oration, but the word REDEAT was engraved on them subsequently.
There is no reason for believing that either Frederick the Great or
the Earl Marischal persevered in their plans once the Elibank Plot
had definitely collapsed, and none that the Principal of St. Mary Hall,
though he was acquainted with the Earl, had any intercourse with the
King of Prussia.

While the Elibank Plot was spluttering indecisively in 1751, King
produced *A Key to the Fragment* under the name of Amias Riddinge, B.D.,
with a Preface "by Peregrine Smyth, Esq." The entire publication has
always been credited to him, and there is no reason for doubting this
 attribution. *A Key to the Fragment* is incomprehensible without a know-
ledge of the work it purports to explain, *A Fragment*, which appeared
anonymously in 1750. Commentators on *A Fragment* have been very rare:
the only one to provide an interpretation was Christopher Wordsworth in
1874. No solution has been reached in the problem of the authorship
of *A Fragment*. At different times it has been variously attributed to
three writers in the University of Cambridge: Dr. Henry Stebbing, James
Bickham, and Francis Coventry. It had two sequels: *Another Fragment*
and *Fragmentum Est Pars Rei Fractae*, both of which were also issued

7. Politische Correspondenz Friedrich's des Grossen (46 vols.; Berlin:
8. Christopher Wordsworth, Social Life at the English Universities in
the Eighteenth Century (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1874),
pp. 621-624.
anonymously in the same year. The principal of St. Mary Hall probably acquired his knowledge of the controversy which is the subject of the fragments during the visits which he is known to have made to Cambridge about this time.9

A Fragment starts during the course of Chapter IX and concludes abruptly before the end of Chapter XI. Rows of asterisks indicate lacunae within the printed text. No information is provided on the missing portions: probably the author assumed that the readers for whom the book was primarily intended would readily see through the entire hoax. These portions of an imaginary larger work in fact constitute an allegory of the Duke of Newcastle's Chancellorship of Cambridge University, which had commenced with his election on December 14, 1748. He is represented in the guise of Tom Standish, who, the reader is told, is clerk to a Justice of the Peace in his neighbourhood. At the beginning of the fragment, Mr. Standish is anxious to wed an old gentlewoman who has a numerous family of sons and has had in the past a great many husbands. She owns several manors and many dependants, and Mr. Standish, who loves power, thinks that such a match will add greatly to his importance. So as soon as her ailing husband dies, Tom Standish and the old lady are married. Their story is then related from the time of the nuptials to the occasion when the old gentlewoman swallows twenty pills prescribed by a group of learned doctors. From Wordsworth's commentary, King's Key, and the glosses written into several of the

surviving copies, it is possible to interpret most of the allusions. The Justice of the Peace is George II, the marriage of Tom Standish represents the installation of the Duke of Newcastle as Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, the old lady is Alma Mater Cantabrigiensis, and the twenty pills represent the set of regulations which, having been rejected on May 11, 1750, were passed, against the inclination of a good proportion of the resident members of the university, on the following June 26. The learned doctors presumably represent the Whig bishops and others who were in favour of the new regulations and recommended their acceptance.

A perusal of the text of these regulations may cause a modern commentator to wonder why King should be interested in them to the extent of writing a book to discredit them. They cover, for the most part, such conventional matters of university discipline as residence, attire, attendance at St. Mary's Church, and the keeping of servants, guns, and sporting dogs. Games of dice are forbidden within the precincts of the university, and playing at cards is permitted only under stipulated conditions. The most obnoxious regulation was withdrawn: it had required that an annual account of the character and behaviour of every person in the university was to be transmitted to the Chancellor. King was not

directly affected by these regulations, but he heartily objected to the Whig policies which the Duke of Newcastle was pursuing in the larger political sphere at Westminster, and probably saw the Chancellor's activities as a potential threat to Oxford.

There is no real doubt as to the historical personages who are represented by most of the other characters in A Fragment. The old lady's former husband is the Duke of Somerset, who was Chancellor of the University of Cambridge immediately prior to the Duke of Newcastle. The Justice's eldest son represents the Prince of Wales. Mun is Dr. Edmund Keene of Peterhouse; Tom is Dr. Thomas Chapman, a former Vice-Chancellor. Tom Standish gained their good graces by talking to them of a jaunt to town and showing them Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's Cathedral: an obvious hint at Newcastle's encouragement of their preferment within the Church. Both Mun and Tom were pleased with the arrival of the box of pills which was brought by Tom Standish's own apothecary, Dr. Squirt, who represents Dr. Samuel Squire, chaplain to the Duke of Newcastle. A good deal of rather petty disagreement follows, during which time the reader is introduced to several of the leading figures in the controversy over the regulations, all under disguised names. Parts of the description of the old lady's illness and its treatment show a coarseness not unlike that in Swift's Tale of a Tub. In the end the old lady resigns herself to the pills, and Mun forces his "quakeries" down her throat.

The importance of King's A Key to the Fragment is that its author clarifies the purport of the allegorical names in A Fragment by giving
others which are still fictitious but considerably closer to the real ones. Thus he explains that the old lady and her numerous sons live in a manor named Bridgetown. Tom Standish, he writes, is really meant to be Sir Thomas Duke, Mun is Edmund Sharp, and Tom is Thomas Forward. Dr. Squirt is given the unmistakable name of Samuel Squib, and, in case any reader should still miss the allusion, is described as Sir Thomas Duke's chaplain. Several of the other characters are given new names over which there could be little margin for misinterpretation; thus Dr. George Rooke of Christ's College, who previously was given the appellation of Dr. Rock, is now rechristened George Crow. King must have realized that his work was bordering on libel. Probably for this reason he claimed in his Preface, signed by "Peregrine Smyth" that a Fragment, which had been published only the year before, was actually a reprint of a pamphlet which had first been issued in October 1658, and that shortly afterwards A Key to the Fragment, written by Amias Riddinge, B.D., had appeared. Peregrine Smyth was now taking the opportunity of reissuing the key of the long dead Amias Riddinge for the benefit of those readers who had completely misinterpreted A Fragment by applying the allegory to the business of the new regulations in Cambridge. "This Mistake", observes Smyth, "was very excusable, and the most sagacious Critic, or expert Decypherer, would probably have fallen in with the common Opinion, if they had never had an Opportunity of perusing the KEY."

The name of Peregrine Smyth is purely fictitious, but Amias Riddinge (or Ridding) was a real person. His dates were 1587 to 1661, and he is
listed as a Bachelor of Divinity in *Alumni Cantabrigienses*. It is not difficult to see why King chose the name of this particular individual: he was a Fellow of St. John's College who had been ejected in accordance with a writ of the Puritan Earl of Manchester on September 16, 1644, and restored to his Fellowship on August 1, 1660. Smyth's preface explains that Riddinge was

.... a noted *Cavalier*, who had been ruined in his Fortune by the Civil War; and 'tis no wonder therefore, that he explained the *Fragment* agreeably to his own Principles, and the Prejudices of his Company and Education; that he painted the Characters of his Adversaries in odious Colours, and perhaps, instead of his Author's Meaning, imposed on us his own.

These prefactory observations continue to the effect that if a roundhead had interpreted *A Fragment*, he would have done so in a manner contrary to that of Riddinge, and would have adapted it to the purposes of his own party. A disinterested individual would not have suspected anything mysterious in the narrative and would have interpreted it in its literal sense. The supposititious Smyth comes to the conclusion that Riddinge's *Key* cannot be presented as altogether clear and unexceptionable. He concludes, with an ingenuousness which is patently intended to be transparent:

I deliver it out of my Hands, just as I found it in the *Harleyan Collection*; and, except a few immaterial Alterations in the Style, I have reprinted it *Verbatim*. If any one should be so ill-natured as to doubt my Sincerity, or so suspicious as to question the Age and Antiquity of this *Tract*, I refer him to Mr OSBORNE, of whom I purchased it, at an high Price, upon his assuring me, (and I had good Reason to believe him) that there was not another Copy of the same Book in *England*.

Smyth's preface includes parenthetically a story which is in all probability a true recollection of an incident in King's own life. This
is the only place in his writings where it is recounted:

I remember, in the Year 1745, an old Acquaintance came into my Chamber, just as I had transcribed an Inscription out of Gruter, in which were these three Letters, C.E.C. a compendious way of writing among the Old Romans, to signify Cives Ejus Coloniae, and generally used in their monumental Inscriptions. My Friend having cast his Eye on the Paper, which lay wet on my Table, shook his Head, and said, That he wondered I would venture to write a treasonable Song at such a critical Juncture. For although, added he, you have disguised the rest in Latin, yet those three Capital Letters, which I suppose are the Burden of the Song, must be understood by the meanest Capacity, and can only signify, CHARLES, EDWARD, COME!

The preface also contains what may reasonably be taken as confirmation that King himself was not the author of A Fragment. "I cannot affirm", he writes, "in Truth I cannot, that the Fragment and the Key were written by the same Hand."

In the text of A Key to the Fragment, the Principal of St. Mary Hall (under the guise of Amias Riddinge) provides many animadversions on the Whig Fellows of the University of Cambridge. The first is called Nehemiah Broomstick, "tho' his true name is THOMAS BISHOP." According to Wordsworth, Bishop Sir Thomas Gooch is intended. Successively the Ordinary of the dioceses of Bristol, Norwich, and Ely, Gooch had in 1751 succeeded to the baronetcy at the death of his brother William, Governor of Virginia. King's character of him in A Key to the Fragment is thoroughly biased: he was indeed a convinced Whig and attentive to the cause of his party in parliament, but he was also charitable, courteous, dignified, and punctilious in his prelatical duties, qualities for which the Principal of St. Mary Hall gave him no credit. According to the Key, Thomas Bishop named himself Nehemiah Broomstick, "NEHEMIAH, because it is a Name of the
Times, and BROOMSTICK, because he hath often declared, that if a Broomstick were Governor of this Realm, he would swear to the Broomstick, he would pray for the Broomstick, and preach for the Broomstick, and vote for the Broomstick, and scold for the Broomstick, and do anything but fight for the Broomstick." Ridding is then made to add an autobiographical reminiscence:

I remember this Man in very mean Circumstances; but he is now in Possession of a vast Estate in Bishops Lands, which he acquired chiefly by the Favour and Interest of the present Lord of the Manour. He has therefore hung up Sir THOMAS DUKE's Picture at one end of his great Hall, with a Map of his own Estate at the other, with this Inscription under it, DEUS nobis haec otia fecit.

Other Cambridge subjects of King's ridicule include (according to Wordsworth's key) Dr. John Newcome, Master of St. John's College, who is called John Comus or Belshazzar "because he polluted the holy Vessels, and took the Plate, which had been consecrated for the Service of the Altar, to adorn his own Table"; Dr. Roger Long of Pembroke College, who appears as Roger Newton; and William Richardson and Henry Hubbard of Emmanuel College, who bear the easily identifiable names of William FitzRichards and Henry Hobbes. The latter had appeared in A Fragment as Boy Harry. He was, according to King, so well esteemed in the country that people thought him a cavalier at heart. Then he was seduced by a steward named Edmund Sharp, who invited him to dinner. The author provides the details on the hospitality of Sharp, who, "at that very instant when he had loaded poor HAL'S Plate with fat Venison, or as others affirm, with excellent Plumb Pie, obtained a Promise of his Vote, in favour of the new Laws which were to be proposed at the next general Court."
A key to the Fragment is full of this kind of trite academic scandal: it was presumably entertaining at one time, at least to the sympathetic cognoscenti, but like so much gossip in writing is too lightweight to be of any permanent value.

King's one attempt to influence the trend of events at Cambridge was neither constructive nor positive. But at the same time he was engaged rather more fruitfully in activities at Oxford, one of which was his participation in the business of drawing up a body of statutes for the Radcliffe Library. In April 1750 Charles Pryor, clerk to the Trustees, had been told to ask King about the statutes. Presumably the Principal of St. Mary Hall started on their preparation, for on August 18, 1753, Dr. Richard Rawlinson wrote to George Ballard: "I hope dr King, who I am told has the care of a body of Statutes for dr Radcliffe's Library will take care to fix residence and attendance." There is no evidence that the statutes were produced with any immediacy: the Librarian, Francis Wise, was not an especially easy man to deal with and had his own ideas on what the statutes should contain. It is not surprising to read in an undated letter which he penned to Lord Guilford:

"... I had the misfortune to be under the D. of Beau — t's displeasure, (which indeed would have been the case, with any body, who was put in against his will.)" There is no evidence to support Wise's

11. Minutes of the Trustees, April 9, 1750.
rationalization of the Duke's displeasure, but a good deal which manifests his own cantankerousness. As S.G. Gillam has shown, Wise did little to promote the interests of the almost bookless library, and "tended to treat the position of Librarian as a sinecure, a position, moreover, made more difficult by his own failure to co-operate with the University authorities." 14 In a letter to Rawlinson, dated August 23, 1753, King is quite openly apologetic about an earlier communication written by Wise:

I defer'd answering your Letter, till I had an opportunity of communicating it to some of the Radcliffe Trustees. This morning I waited on the Duke of Beaufort and at the same time I saw Sir Walter Bagot. They were both greatly surprised, when they were informed of ye manner, in which Mr. Wise had wrote to you. They accept books of any kind. 15

The likelihood is that King and Wise were at variance over the content of the statutes for some considerable time; as late as December 1755 the Vice-Chancellor was still being requested to "direct some person to form a Body of Statutes." 16 Eventually a code of statutes was drawn up based on that of the Bodleian Library: a draft of it is in the University Archives, but it is undated. 17 The compiler (if there was only one) is unknown, but he may well have been King. It is also possible that the final code was a composite work: in this case King could have been one of those who performed the compilation.

16. Minutes of the Trustees, December 11, 1755.
17. Oxford University Archives, W.P. ∞ S7(6).
While the discussions over the statutes for the Radcliffe Library were in progress, the Principal of St. Mary Hall was putting together the *Opera Guilielmi King*: the volume of his serious Latin works which was completed only in 1760 and never actually published. This collected edition was a long time in preparation. The earliest surviving evidence relating to King's intention of compiling a collection of his Latin productions occurs in a letter from Lord Orrery of November 30, 1746. "You design of publishing your works together," His Lordship declared, "must give pleasure to your friends in general and to me in particular." 18 Evidently King's original expectation was to issue his Latin works in one volume, but his plan was temporarily modified with a view to printing two, one of poetry and the other of "orations, etc.", and subsequently altered to producing two volumes with his Latin pieces in chronological order. This sequence of prognostications is implicit in his letter to Orrery of September 30, 1747:

I have made great progress in preparing my Latin works for the press, having all the copper plates ready for the first volume. For, contrary to my expectation, I shall not be able to comprehend the whole in one volume. I had once resolved to print all the poetical pieces in one volume, and the orations, etc., in another. But, I have since considered it best, to observe the order of time, by which means, the whole will be better understood, as there are frequent references, not only in the satires, but likewise in the prose works, to something that was published before. I compute that what I have already published will be sufficient to complete the first volume: so that the second will consist of things entirely new. The Head-pieces and Tail-pieces, as well as the initial letters I have designed myself. For the Head-pieces of the presentation Speeches, I propose the several coats of arms, of those I presented. If you have any curiosity to see a specimen of the engraving, I will enclose two or three in my next letter. 19

19. The Houghton Library, Harvard University, MS. Eng. 218.2(v.5), pp.64f.
More information on King's plans for selling the proposed two-volume edition of his collected Latin works is provided retrospectively in *Doctor King's Apology*, which appeared in 1755. He speaks of these matters as relating to seven or eight years beforehand, thus implying that they took shape in 1747 or 1748:

Seven or eight years ago I advertised my friends, that I intended to publish my LATIN works in two volumes in Quarto, and desired, that those Gentlemen, who were inclined to purchase the books, would be pleased to leave, or send their names to the COCO TREE in PALL MALL. I fixed the price at two guineas, TO BE PAID WHEN THE BOOKS WERE DELIVERED. In a short time, with the names left at the COCO TREE, and others sent to me, I had about 450 subscribers, when I closed my subscription; having determined from the beginning to print no more than 500 books in that form. According to my proposals I neither required, nor received any part of the subscription money from any one of my subscribers, tho' many of them were so kind, as to offer me the whole .... I would not oblige myself to fix a certain time for the publication, but be left to my own liberty and leisure.

The projected two volume edition never in fact appeared. At an unascertainable time after 1748 King must have become convinced that two volumes were not called for and decided on one. The final compilation of the *Opera* will be discussed in Chapter VIII, but it is relevant to notice here that, at some time during the first half of the 1750's, five of King's Latin poems were entirely reset with a view to inclusion in the collected edition, while *Hydra* and *Monitor* were set in print for the first time. 20

The text of all these works was embellished with historiated

20. The works reset (and in varying degrees rewritten) during this period were Miltonis Epistola ad Pollionem; Sermo Pedestris; Scannum, Ecloga; Templum Libertatis; and Antonietti, Ducis Corsorum, Epistola ad Corsos. This last poem acquired the revised title of Antonietti, Corsorum Ducis, Epistola ad Corsos.
initials and other copper plate engravings. By way of introduction to his Opera King wrote a new Latin prose preface of some eight pages headed Praesidibus Supremi Galliae Senatus, which never appeared separately. It is dated MAII CALENDIS, MDCCLIV.

There are various pieces of evidence which demonstrate the preparation of the collected edition during the early 1750's. Thus in Doctor King's Apology of 1755 we read that the author had been "for some years out of pocket in a large sum for paper, print, copper plates, etc."

In the note to line 193 of Hydra Lord Arran is said to have lived to the age of eighty years (Ad octogesimum annum vixit) in contradistinction to the information on the title page to the effect that the work was written in 1746. Arran was born on September 4, 1671, and so King's note (at least in its present form) must have been composed on or at some time after September 4, 1751, that is to say some five years subsequent to the writing of the rest of the text. Several emendations to the existing editions of the Latin poems reveal King's gradual disenchantment with Jacobitism. For example, in the original text of Templum Libertatis, King refers flatteringly to the King over the Water, James III, during a note to verse 8 of Book Two:

Britanniae vero Regnum legitimo & sacratu jure continetur: & Rex ipse ita est, ut Phoenix, avis magna, admiranda, unica.

The revised version of this note in the Opera contains no reference of any kind to the Jacobite monarch:

Quot, quales, quantas terrae regiones ita hodie regnari nobis constat? sed enimvero mira sunt, ni principes isti, qui in pueritia bonis artibus et disciplinis haud liberaliter fuerint instituti, in proiectore aetate vitis obruantur;
quique sola spe imperii fuerint educati, non modo injusta ea novam sibi dominationem comparandi, sed rerum omnium cupiditate incendantur.

Perhaps most significant of all King's emendations are those in which he eradicates his references to Lord Orrery under the name of Laelius. In the Opera version of Scamnum the substitution is Carolus, and in the revision of Templum Libertatis it is Cademus. The most likely explanation of these changes is that King, like many other of Swift's admirers, was ill-pleased with the publication in November 1751 of Orrery's Remarks on the Life and Writings of Dr. Jonathan Swift. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine how King, who had referred to Swift as amicissimus Cademus, could have reacted other than unfavourably to such observations as these which fell from Orrery's pen: ".... it is certain, from SWIFT's settlement in Dublin as Dean of St. Patrick's, his choice of companions in general shewed him of a very depraved taste .... Idleness and trifles engrossed too many of his hours: fools and sycophants too much of his conversation .... his pride was so great as scarce to admit any body to the least share of his friendship, except such who could amuse him, or such who could do him honour." No correspondence between King and Orrery survives after 1750, and there are no further references to His Lordship in any work which King subsequently wrote. The speech on Orrery in Tres Oratiunculae of 1743 was included in the Opera, but does not seem to have been reset. For this portion of the collected edition King simply incorporated remainders, a fact which is demonstrably clear from the non-sequential pagination.

21. The date of publication on the title page was 1752.
Some discussion of the prose preface *Preaeidibus Supremi Galliae* is relevant here since it throws light on King's political thinking in the spring of 1754. This piece of writing is highly deferential to the contemporary *parlement* of Paris. In the controversies between the Catholic Church and the Jansenists, Louis XV had taken the side of the bishops while many of the leaders of France's principal *parlement* supported the Jansenists. King, who was in ideological conflict with the English Whig bishops, could hardly help feeling a certain sympathy with the position of the Parisian *parlement*. The opening sentence of the preface refers to "these distinguished names", though in fact no names appear:

*Quandoquidem praeclara haec nomina, pro immortalibus vestris in patriam meritis, cum civitatis vestrae, tum gentium omnium consensu assecuti estis, jam diu est, cum ipse quidem, vir peregrinus, ut virtutibus vestris debitum cepisse testimonium, et quodammodo tribuisse videar, me et hoc opus meum vobis dicatum volo.*

There is another reference later to the now non-existent names:

*...in fronte operis mei nomina tam venerabilia curavi inscribenda ...*

King presumably intended that a list of the French statesmen to whom he had dedicated his *Opera* should appear near the beginning of the volume. The most probable reason for its absence in the remaining copies is that it was removed before he finally prepared the sheets for binding. The declaration in 1756 of what subsequently became known as the Seven Years' War made France once more a formal enemy: King could hardly have wished towards the end of the war to perpetuate the names of the hostile leaders to whom he had earlier, and without any degree of foresight,
dedicated a considerable portion of his life’s work. His political outlook changed radically with the enthronement of George III, the rise of a Tory Prime-Minister in the person of Lord Bute, and the end of the period of Whig oligarchy. In 1754 King had regarded the French as friends; by the early 1760’s he no longer felt this sense of camaraderie.

Nevertheless, when he was composing the preface, King felt confident that his volume would be acceptable to the dedicatees, since it was devoted to the cause of liberty:

Porro autem totem hujus libri argumentum optimis civibus judicibusque integerrimis idcirco per gratum fore confido, quia libertatis causam complectitur, pro qua cum vobis semper fuit omnis contentio summa cum vestra laude, tum vero non commisistis, ut potentium minis, aut blanditiis malitiosis (in quibus ipsi se peccasse noverint) potius, quam sententia et consilia vestris religionis antiquitas, populi jus, et senatus auctoritas retineantur.

He refers to the French hierarchy in much the same tone as he habitually used when writing of the Whig bishops, and regards the Parisian parlement as being composed of custodians of justice and liberty and as constituting the only protection of the people:

Sed tamen id esse satis causae censent quidam, homines gratiosi, ex optimatibus et proceribus sacerdotum (at qui sacerdotes!) quare vos in suspicionem veniatis regni appetendi, aut, nescio cujus, conjurationis et maleficii; quum nihil est, quod mavultis, quam earum civitatum negotii praeesse, quae legibus aequissimis contineantur, quaeque vos justitiae et libertatis custodes et unicum populi praesidium, contra gratiam aequae atque contra vim, esse sentient.

He declares that it is not for him to undertake a defence of the innocence of the parlement, since the members have already demonstrated their eloquence in the cause of freedom, and then proceeds to warn them of the
possibility of corruption of a kind which he sees all round him in Britain:

Atqui (fatendum est enim) quum video mores civium nostrorum omnium, praeter perpaucos majoribus suis et vetere Britannia dignos, adeo esse corruptos ac depravatos, uti prae lucro nullam, non dico reipublicae, aut posterorum, sed sui habeant rationem, mira hercle sunt, ni id quidem quosdam e civibus vestris, leves ac numnarios homines, (hodie enim late manat hujus sceleris contagio) ab integritate et fide sua deduxerit.

Immediately afterwards he offers his intended readers, whom he regards as the protectors of freedom in France, solace in their dealings with possible deserters to the cause of the purple-clad pontiffs:

Si qui sunt hujuscemodi, qui cum conjunctissimi cum vobis esse debeant communi patriae vinculo, ab ea tamen descivere, et pontificibus purpuratis ad vos opprimendos se adjutores praebuerunt, non possunt, ut non sibi statuant publici odii monimenta, vobis publici amoris, sempterna.

He sees the motives of the French bishops as being essentially no different from those of their Whig counterparts in the Church of England, and expresses the wish that everyone will praise the piety, prudence, patience, and mildness of the members of the Parisian parliament, envisioned by the writer as being in some measure the Gallic equivalent of the English Tory party:

Quinetiam si horum hominum perfidia, aut aulicorum vis, aut pontificalis authoritas, quae eo crevit, ut jam caeremoniis et religione laboret sua, acta et iudicia vestra rescindere potuerit (pontifices enim et publicae religionis magistri, quantum de majestate et amplitudine vestra diminuerint, tantum gloriae et praesidii ad facultates et dominationes suas se adjecisse sperant) adversos eos casus, aut mala quaecunque fortuna curiae sanctissimae invenierit, si non vitare, aut sanare, at apte et sapienter ferre vos posse palam est. Enimvero facitis, ut cum pietatem et prudentiam vestram, tum patientiam et lenitatem laudent omnes, ament, admirentur.
A little later he implies that there may be difficulties ahead, but observes that strength of mind is especially perceptible in rebus asperis et adversis, in aerumnis, in periculis, in naufragis, in exiliis, in vinculis, in perpessione denique malorum omnium.

At this point the author digresses to pass an animadversion on the emperor Trajan:

Quapropter inclyto illi Romano imperatori Trajano, cui senatus nomen OPTIME decreverat, unum hoc defuisse arbitror, conversionem rerum et iniquam aliquando vitae conditionem. Res secundissimas pulchre et moderate tulisse magnae quidem ei (quis negat?) fuit laudi: Quo autem animo casus gravissimos et insignes calamitates tulisset, quum summa et perpetua usus est felicitate, plane nescitur.

He then continues to expatiate on the greatness of mind which, with other virtues, produces heroes and demigods:

Haec est ea animi magnitudo, quae cum ceteris virtutibus conjuncta, justitia, prudentia, temperantia, mansuetudine et liberalitate, heroas et semideos facit, sequid facit: qua qui sit praeditus nihil molitur, aut omnino cogitat, nisi quod sit decorum et honestum; nihil falsi, neque parum considerate loquitur, sed aperte, et ad veritatem omnia; nec vero amicis modo et sociis suis, sed cunctis civibus optime consulit; neque tam uni genti et regioni, quam hominum universo generi prodesse cupit.

After these noble sentiments have been briefly developed, the writer returns to the present problems of the parlement of Paris. He expresses the hope that the authority of the French parliamentarians will eventually be restored, presumably trusting that that of the Tories will likewise be resuscitated in the British Isles. He adds some advice in case matters should turn out otherwise on account of the iniquity of the times:
Sin autem aliter aliquando evenerit viris probatissimis propter temporum iniquitatem, atque adeo omnia jam vobis eveniant contra, ac quae boni omnes vehementer expetiverint, nos tamen persuasum habeamus, quo ea quidem aqueiore animo sint ferenda, deum nihil facere, imperare, permettere, nisi summa ratione, et causam esse occultam, sed justissimam, quare providentiae suae cursum ipse aliquando impedire videatur.

His motives in addressing the members of the Parisian parlement are outlined in a manner both flattering and gracious: he is writing willingly and out of admiration towards them:

.... Incorruptos libertatis custodes et vindices quaerebam: reperi, perspexi, cognovi, colui, atque ea observantia ac religione, qua vos ipsam illam libertatem et patriae jura usque coluistis. Nam cum ego is sum, qui haud sane in animum inducerem, etiam si vos essetis omnium mortalium beatissimi, ut ob eam causam, venalium scriptorum more, vos adularer; tum vero si miserrimi, si regni finibus in exilium infelicius pulsi essetis, neutiquam ita me pigeret consilii et constantiae meae, ut virtutes vestras, suppliciis nullis deformandas, studiis et sermonibus meis celebrare unquam desinerem.

Thence he draws to a conclusion which puts the dedicatees into almost the same favored category as he had placed Dean Swift:

Ubicunque terrarum eritis (pace theologorum sacerdotumque omnium ordinum dixerim) ibi erunt non modo GALLIAE vestrae, sed huic seculi, sed humani generis decora et ornamenta.

The Latinity of King's preface is on the same level as that of his published speeches: lapidary and stylized, yet imbued with a considerable degree of animation. In King's handling of the Latin language lies the whole success of his preface. The persons for whom it was intended probably never saw it. The political conditions which spurred him to write it evaporated not long after its composition. The author himself could hardly have subscribed to some of the sentiments contained in it
for long after its completion. Above all, the cause of Jansenism, entirely different though it was from Jacobitism, was in the last analysis just as doomed: King’s pejorative observations on the French hierarchy and his magnanimous expressions of encouragement intended for the men who opposed them, for all their non-academic worth, might just as well have been inscribed in the water of the Isis.

King wrote no more with regard to the French political scene. He was now involved in the more proximate problems stemming from the parliamentary election for the county of Oxfordshire, which had taken place between April 17 and 23, 1754. This was the last British General Election in which Jacobitism exercised any real influence: together with the undistinguished Rag Plot and Watch Plot it had repercussions far outside the boundaries of the county. Despite the accusations which filled the air during and after the election, the Tory supporters in the Oxfordshire countryside were in fact not Jacobite in any active sense, however strong Stuart sentiment may have been in the university. The failures of 1715 and 1745 had had their psychological effect. The

22. By the "Rag Plot" is understood the business involving the discovery on July 17, 1754, by Mrs. Carnall, wife of a Carfax grocer, of some "treasonable verses" in a bundle of rags outside her husband’s shop. The rags belonged to one Maria Duke, who had left them there to run an errand. The Tory claim that Horner, the butler of Exeter College, had, in the closing months of 1754, inserted a portrait of Prince Charles Edward in the back of the watch of a Tory elector in order to compromise him constitutes the sole evidence in support of the "Watch Plot". In a note in Monitor, which must have been composed in 1754 or later, King gives his opinion of the Rag Plot when he writes of a certain judge qui Academiam Oxon. gravissime apud Cantabrigienses accusavit de ficta et ridicula ea conjuratione.
charge of Jacobitism was used for the most part as a kind of election "scare" by the two Whig or "New Interest" candidates, Lord Parker and Sir Edward Turner, and usually ignored or circumvented by their Tory or "Old Interest" opponents, Lord Wenman and Sir James Dashwood. After a warmly contested election the Whigs were defeated at the poll, but finally elected on a scrutiny by petition. The story of the election itself and its bellicose aftermath has been well told in R.J. Robson's The Oxfordshire Election of 1754, and valuable shorter surveys have been provided in W.R. Ward's Georgian Oxford and Sir Charles Petrie's The Jacobite Movement.

The account that follows will therefore not be comprehensive, but merely sufficient to illustrate the role played by William King.

At the outset it should be emphasized that King had no official connection with the proceedings: his contribution consisted in his influence with the university authorities and his skill as a polemicist. But he did attend several meetings of Tory supporters to lend encouragement to the cause of Lord Wenman and Sir James Dashwood: the earliest of these took place in May 1753 when the Old Interest Society convened at the Crown and Anchor in the Strand. Here the election campaign was planned. An irreverently burlesque account of this meeting was published in the second issue of Jackson's Oxford Journal: for this libel William Jackson was compelled to apologize to King. Various authors have stated that King

24. See Jackson's Oxford Journal, No. 2 (May 12, 1753) and No. 3 (May 19, 1753). In this latter issue, Jackson declared that the authorship of the account published in the previous week was unknown to him and confessed, "I do hereby acknowledge my offence, and humbly beg Dr. King's Pardon. And as he has been so good as to forgive me, I promise never to offend in the same manner again, or suffer my Paper to be the Canal of private Scandal or personal Abuse."
later contributed to Jackson's Oxford Journal, but I have been unable to find evidence in support of this assertion. Jackson occasionally included a brief quotation from King's works, but, as far as I am aware, nothing that could be regarded as specially written for his journal.

On January 15, 1754, King published a collection of fanciful essays entitled The Dreamer. The date of publication is provided in an advertisement which appeared in Number 4081 of The London Evening Post, January 5 - 8, 1754. When charged by the Whig dons of Oxford as being the author, King was careful not to reply in the form of a denial. At the end of the book is a purported "Advertisement by the Bookseller," which was undoubtedly written by King himself. This Advertisement explains that the manuscript was given to the bookseller "by a dwarfish old man, whom I since recollected to have seen in Drury Lane, in the train of Oberon, the king of the Fairies."

Included in this Advertisement is an interpretation of the entire series of dreams, written for the bookseller by "an eminent mathematician who is well skilled in judicial astrology." According to this interpretation, the essays in The Dreamer were intended as a satire on popery and some of the contemporary policies of the Vatican. They could indeed be thus interpreted, but in view of the political circumstances under which they were published, their author's immediate intention was no doubt to ridicule the Whigs and to expose further the venality which he saw all round him.

25. For example, see Jackson's Oxford Journal, No. 112 (June 21, 1755), where a note is reproduced from the third edition of Doctor King's Apology. Robson, op.cit., p.72, styles this a "contribution". Its date is given as June 1753.
key to the book was ever published, but a partial key has been inserted in a copy in the Bodleian Library, which is very probably in the hand of Horace Walpole. This, incidentally, is one of King’s longer works: the text proper runs to 240 pages, not including an unusually complete index of twenty-eight pages and the Advertisement, which fills a further fourteen.

At the time of publication of The Dreamer, or perhaps soon afterwards, there appeared A Translation of the Latin Epistle in the Dreamer: it gives every impression of having proceeded from the pen of King himself. In some surviving copies of The Dreamer this translation of the Latin epistle is bound with the main work. The translation contains a preface which manifests its publication shortly before the general election of the same year:

An important conjuncture is now approaching, which will furnish an ordinary capacity with the power of distinguishing truth from falsehood, and a real man from a counterfeit. For, whoever shall receive a bribe, or by any corrupt influence be induced to give his vote in any county, city, or borough, at the next general election, who has no checks within, and whose spirit is never disturbed by the breach of his honour, or his oath; such a creature, we may conclude, is descended from some species of the brute creation. And let me add with an honest boldness, that every new member, from the son of a peer down to an attorney, or stock-jobber, who shall be elected by BRIBERY, or by any other base and dishonourable practices, with a design to sell himself and his country, ought to be placed in the same rank with his electors. We may with great justice deny his HUMANITY, and be assured, that altho' he may acquire the highest honours in the state, he can never arrive to the dignity of a MAN.

26. Bodleian Library 270. f. 62. A transcription of this key has been made in another copy of The Dreamer in the Victoria and Albert Museum, Forster Collection, 4832. 8. M. 28.
To this paragraph is added a footnote indicating that the ——— of ——— had told some foreigners of distinction who had recently been in England that the ——— shire election would cost him twenty thousand pounds. It is not clear who was intended or which shire was involved, but King quotes the occurrence as an instance of "the present corrupt state of this country."

In the Introduction to The Dreamer the author announced what he considers the unprecedented nature of his intention:

.... to trace out for myself a path, which has never been trod before — Nullius ante — Trita solo .... What I contend for is, that no man hath ever published a regular series of his dreams, or described the variety of objects, which from time to time have presented themselves to him in the realms of MORPHEUS. This is the singularity, which I claim, and the scheme which I have pursued in these sheets, which I now offer to my honest countrymen.

Actually he had been anticipated by several medieval authors of regular series of dreams, of whom William Langland was the greatest, but their works were neither in print nor easily accessible when King was writing. Furthermore, the author unwittingly represented his dreams as being in the nature of those experienced by Piers Plowman: their significance is clearly intended to be allegorical rather than literal or prophetic. The allegorical papers in The Spectator, though not constituting a regular series of dreams, are in other respects roughly comparable.

The events in The Dreamer are related in the first person, and are supposed to take place in a country inhabited by the Papyropolites. The author indicates that he has no idea of the situation of the country, nor of the exact nature of the government, since it was represented to him at various times as a duumvirate, a triumvirate, an aristocracy, an oligarchy, and a theocracy. He is certain, however, of what country it is not. It
is not Plato's Republic, nor Sir Thomas More's Utopia, nor Gulliver's Brobdingnag, nor his land of the Houyhnhms. He comments that it may be a part of New Holland, or it may be an island in the Pacific Ocean. The author mentions that he has since communicated his memoirs to a learned rabbi, "who corresponds in all parts of the world," and that the rabbi has assured him that the Papyropolites are a nation of uncircumcised Philistines.

During the course of his dreams about the Papyropolites, the nameless dreamer visits a number of fantastic places. Perhaps the most extraordinary is a paper mill, where the paper is made from a mixture of linen rags, "the most rare and valuable vegetables," barley, hops, apples, Arabian berries, American nuts, dried leaves from a "curious Chinese shrub," tobacco, raw silk and cotton, cochineal, indigo, soap, tallow, bees-wax, "large shreds and pieces of all sorts of leather," and many other ingredients with "barbarous names" such as addaties, alliballies, baftaes, bendamnoes, chowtars, doozooties, goskees, gurrahs, humhums, mulmuls, peniascoes, sannoes, peerbands, seerbettles, seerhaudconnaes, tanjeebs, terridaes, and tincal. The finest loaf sugar and salt must be added with all kinds of spices to season the paper and give it colour. Finally the whole mixture is moistened with the choicest wines, especially those of France. When the paper has been made, a quantity of it is put into a weird machine, and revolved in a hollow wheel, while the operator, Moses Monceca, beats time "as exactly as HANDEL would do during the performance of an oratorio."

When the wheel starts to emit a rattling noise it is stopped and opened. There, in place of the paper, are pounds of gold dust which are immediately sent away to be melted into ingots. In the Advertisement at the end of the
book the following interpretation is given:

The PAPER MILL is the OFFICE or OFFICES in ROME, from whence the POPE'S BULLS, BRIEFS, INDULGENCES, DISPENSATIONS, and PARDONS are issued, which produce yearly such an immense sum, and in so easy a manner, that it may properly be called a quick TRANSMUTATION of PAPER into GOLD.

Other places visited by the dreamer include the College of the Rosicrucians, the Temple of Mercury, the Temple of Health, Pallantis or the City of Pallas, and the Temple of Hercules. Among the singular beings whom he meets are the Onocentaurs, who are obnoxious animals with some human characteristics, not unlike Swift's Yahoos. The Advertisement provides a deliberately misleading interpretation of most of these allegories: Hercules is the Pope, and the wealthy and elegant Temple of Hercules is the Court of Rome. The human sacrifices which are described as being offered on the altar of Hercules represent the cruelties of the Inquisition. The Rosicrucians are the monks, who have departed from the rules of their primitive institution, and manifest a large number of vices which the author rehearses in detail. The City of Pallas represents the universities of Europe, and the Palladians, who are perpetually quarrelling with one another, represent the scholars in those universities. The Onocentaurs are the officers of the Inquisition. The Temple of Mercury represents the legal profession, and the Temple of Health the medical profession, both of which exhibit many abuses within their ranks.

The mere fact that King was attacked by Whig politicians as the writer of The Dreamer indicates that the religious interpretation of the allegory provided in the Advertisement was not credible to all his readers. However, in any attempt to interpret this work politically, one is faced with much the same difficulties as in the case of Gulliver's Travels: the general
lines of the allegory are tolerably clear, but at this distance in time it is impossible to have any degree of certainty with regard to many of the allusions. Some were intended to be obscure, others could only have had significance to those readers who were intimately acquainted with academic politics in Oxford and the intricate historical relationship between the two parties. The brief and necessarily incomplete political interpretation that follows takes into account only those allusions that do not leave any significant latitude for doubt.

The country of the Papyropolites represents England under the government of the Whigs. The dreamer first visits the Temple of Mnemosyne in company with a band of four hundred, "some being embroidered all over, others with the air of fribbles, some appearing to be very polite, others to be very clowns .... all of the same trade": these represent the members of the House of Commons. The Intendants, who are in white satin with hats of the same colour, are the Duke of Newcastle and Henry Pelham. They constitute a duumvirate and employ the four hundred in the manufacture of paper "of such an excellent sort, that it is the most valuable commodity in the land: which from hence is named the LAND of the PAPYROPOLITES." The manufacture of this commodity had been improved when a knight adventurer, styled the Colossus, built a new and capacious paper mill. The Colossus represents Sir Robert Walpole; his mill is now administered by the two Intendants or "White Hats".

The present INTENDANTS give their workmen great wages, and yet the latter have seldom thought themselves sufficiently rewarded. Even the Colossus was at last undone by refusing his BAND of workmen a largess over and above their salaries. When he thought himself most secure, they mutinied, and losing all respect for his person, they tumbled him headlong into his own MILL-POND; and, though he escaped with his life, yet he was compelled in his old age to quit his business, and abdicate...
his MILL. The WHITE-HATS, who have succeeded to him, were obliged to temporize, cajole the mutineers, raise their wages, and use many stratagems, before they could get into possession. And ever since that time they have managed their affairs with some difficulty .... They have been forced to take in many new hands, and yet not suffered to discharge any of those, who were grown old and useless.

The Intendants have lately presented a quantity of their paper to some distinguished foreigners: British subsidies to friendly foreign nations are here implied.

The mill itself seems to represent the contemporary chamber of the House of Commons. The dreamer is taken inside it, but

.... the roaring of the water, the noise of the pounders, and the loud voices of the BAND of Four Hundred, who were all at work, talked all at once, and immediately forgot what they said, and repeated the same things again and again, almost stunned me; so that I imagined myself to be in the same Bedlam, where my old friend SWIFT had formerly placed his Legion Club. Wherefore I retreated as hastily as I could, without asking a single question.

The various commodities in the store room of the mill constitute articles on which taxes were levied and commercial profits made. It is hardly surprising that the teetotal author "particularly observed vast heaps of barley, hops and apples." Arabian berries and American nuts are presumably coffee and chocolate, and the "small dried leaves plucked from a curious Chinese shrub" are no doubt those of the tea plant.

Having left the mill, the dreamer is taken to the College of the Rosicrucians: the bishops are here intended, or rather less likely the clergy of the Establishment as a whole. Both the hierarchy and the lower clergy were canonically bound to obedience to the Hanoverian monarch in virtue of their Oath of Allegiance, but King seems most of the time to be alluding to the prelates. The dreamer comments that they had been greatly respected
when they strictly observed the statutes of their founder: they were enjoined to be meek, humble, charitable, and hospitable, and indeed the primitive Rosicrucians had employed all their revenues in entertaining pilgrims and strangers and feeding the poor and hungry. As long as they practised these virtues they preserved their independence, but

"... as they have now entirely departed from all the rules of their institution, and are become proud and luxurious, covetous and ambitious, they are likewise the most corrupt and servile crew in all the land of the PAPYROPOLITI. Some years have past, since they renounced the independency of their order, both for themselves and their successors, by a formal act, and agreed to obey implicitly all the commands, which from time to time they should receive from the INTENDANTS of the MILL. ... while the ROSICRUCIANS are the most abject flatterers of men in power, they treat their inferiors, especially their younger brothers, of which there is a numerous tribe, with the greatest insolence and contempt, and suffer the latter, in violation of the most sacred injunctions of their common parent, to languish in poverty, and want even the common necessaries of life.

The dreamer adds that they are "neither trained to arms, nor acquainted with those maxims of honour and gallantry, which form a modern hero. In case of a foreign, or domestick war, they rather chuse by their harangues to inspire their neighbours with courage, than give any proofs of it themselves." This observation is followed by an indubitable allusion to Dr. Thomas Herring, the then Archbishop of Canterbury:

However, there are some among them, who have been so bold as to gird their loins with the sword: and their present great master is as full of martial ardour, as he is of piety and devotion; and is ever prepared, in time of danger, both to pray and to fight for his friends and his country.

But the dreamer does not wish to appear prejudiced: he comments, "I have known as excellent men of this order, as are to be found in the whole
The Temple of Mercury or Court of Judicature represents the legal profession and the Temple of Health the profession of medicine. The dreamer is taken to both of them. His accounts contain no criticism of a specifically religious or political nature, so there is no attempt to disguise their real purport. The Advertisement indicates that the satire in them is directed against those great cities in Europe where the legal and medical abuses which the dreamer ridicules are tolerated: in fact, the author was no doubt thinking mainly of the practice of these professions in the British Isles. The patron of laws was in classical tradition Apollo: the fact that King places the lawyers of the Papyropolites in a building dedicated to Mercury illustrates his general attitude towards them. The description of the Temple of Health gives King an opportunity to repeat what he considered to be the constituents of good health: cleanness, good hours, moderate exercise, temperance, and abstinence. The goddess of health calls these "the only infallible rules, which can be given for the attainment and preservation of health and long life." The dreamer adds his own observations on cleanness:

It is, according to my sentiments, the greatest beauty in a man or woman: and the simplex munditiis of HORACE, by which he has distinguished, and characterized PYRRHA, at the same time, that it gives us an example of the neatness and elegance of the poet's taste and style, hath made his mistress immortal. ... were I the governor of a kingdom, it should be my first law or ordinance, that every master of a family should be clean himself, and take especial care, that his house and his wife, his man servant, and his maid servant, and even his ox and his ass, and every creature, and every thing about him should be in the same condition; unless when by his trade or occupation he was necessarily employed in dirty work. But dirty work, or dirty hands should be no excuse for any persons above the degree of mechanics, especially for those, who make profession of the
liberal arts, who serve at the altar of the gods, or form any part of the legislature.

Some of King's animadversions on the medical profession, put into the mouth of one of the priests of the Temple of Health, are highly unflattering. They might have been extended, but "the good priests were called away to attend a person of distinction, who, having been perfectly cured of a most inveterate distemper by abstinence only, was come hither with an heart full of gratitude, to pay his devotions, and perform his vows to the goddess of HEALTH." The dreamer corroborates his report of the priest's observations with a story of his own which he inserts without comment:

When my old acquaintance, Dr. FRAMPTON of OXFORD, who had acquired a large fortune by the practice of physic, was dying, all the physicians in the city attended him. They consulted, they prescribed, and out of respect to a learned brother, they waited to see their medicines administered. But when they were offered to FRAMPTON, he rejected them with a half smile, and with this expression: TAKE THEM AWAY: YOU KNOW, IT IS ALL A FARCE!

Pallantis or the city of Pallas, the place next visited by the dreamer, represents Oxford. It is a city "of no great extent, but beautifully situated near the conflux of two rivers, and has the benefit of a wholesome and temperate air." Formerly it had great privileges, was free from all tributes and taxations, and was governed by its own magistrates, "as it is in some measure at this day". The ancestors of the Palladians were Greeks:

The citizens boast themselves to be descended from a colony of the ATHENIANS, who left their native country, when the liberties of GREECE were destroyed, and settled in ITALY. They urge, as an argument to prove the antiquity of their descent, and the truth of this tradition, that, as they have preserved the GREEK language in its ATTIC purity to this day, so they both speak, and write the LATIN of the AUGUSTAN age; and moreover, that they cultivate all the liberal arts and sciences with unwearied application.
A few years previously Pallas had been attacked by the Onocentaur,
who represent the Whigs. The dreamer speaks of "the baseness and
malignity of their nature" and describes them as "noxious animals" who
are "little superior to any part of the brute-creation." Their great
idol is the golden calf. They and the Palladians have engaged for a
number of years in a political struggle, the historical origins of which
are described in some detail.

The ultimate cause of the controversy, we are told, resides in the
fact that the Papyropolitan government, which was once free, has now
become an oligarchy: the few nobles who govern it cannot brook the exist-
ence in their dominions of a city founded upon maxims so different from
their own. They therefore supplied the Onocentauris with money, arms,
and all kinds of warlike stores, and incited them to invade the city with
a view to settling in it. The Palladians withstood their attacks with
courage, but were at length obliged to give way to their superior numbers
and, by a formal treaty, to cede to them that quarter of the city which
they now possess. The Onocentauris could hardly have failed in their
attack for they were well supported and the city was unfortified. How
much longer Pallantis can survive is questionable: the only recourse left
to the inhabitants is prayer to their goddess.

While the dreamer is listening to a Palladian’s explanation of these
matters, a messenger arrives to announce that a whole legion of Onocentauris
is marching to the attack led by their commander or bray, an obvious
allusion to Thomas Bray of Exeter College. They are supported by all the
Palladian deserters with Cornix (King’s name for Sir Edward Turner) at
their head. The loyal Palladians march out to meet them under the command of the count who had been the dreamer's guide. As soon as the enemy forces catch sight of the count, they are seized with panic and flee without striking a blow. They escape "with the loss of a few prisoners, and one standard, which was taken from the deserters, together with the standard bearer, called PORCUS, who being covered over with brass from head to foot, and having besides a protuberance of paunch, was an overload for his horse." Porcus, who represents Lord Parker, and Vespa, who is described as "a little fellow" but is not definitely identifiable, are referred to as "the chief authors and promoters of the present war."

The last place visited by the dreamer is the Temple of Hercules. This section of the work seems to be a general attack on the power of money in contemporary society, but the allegory is even vaguer than in the rest of the book. The Advertisement provides no interpretation; the annotated copy in the Bodleian Library indicates that Hercules is George II and the temple his court. If these equations are correct, then the Anti-Herculaeans, according to Robson, may plausibly be identified with the Jacobites. The fact that King criticizes the Anti-Herculaeans for their factiousness provides corroboration for this interpretation: when he was writing The Dreamer there already existed a widening gulf between those Jacobites who desired political action and those whose attachment to the cause was almost entirely sentimental.

A qualified similarity between The Dreamer and Gulliver's Travels has already been implied: King perhaps acquired the general notion of his

work from Swift's more famous story, though there are no unquestionable signs of direct indebtedness. King's style in The Dreamer is not reminiscent of the Dean's: it is, like that of his Latin orations, polished, elegant, and formal. The Dreamer is essentially the product of a writer whose prose reaches its highest perfection in the form of Latin academic oratory, and whose English style was formed to a considerable degree by his reading of the classical authors. It is, in some respects, a typically Augustan piece of prose, exhibiting an attrited quality, together with a certain magisterial stiffness which permeates the whole work and constitutes its principal strength. Like Gulliver's Travels its content is in places repulsive, especially in those passages relating to the Onocentaurs, but there is no attempt to reproduce the verisimilitude of Swift's work. The author makes it clear that he dreamed most of what he relates. Despite the fact that The Dreamer gives the impression of having been carefully written, it manifests neither Swift's depth, nor his sad ingenuousness, nor his ability to communicate a sense of intimacy to the reader. It exhibits a greater degree of internal consistency than Gulliver's Travels, but in the final analysis is a comparatively inferior piece of writing.

Critical pronouncements on The Dreamer in the author's own lifetime seem to have been coloured largely by the political bias of the writer. The most unsympathetic was made by Richard Blacow. In A Letter to William King, LL.D. he commented: "... a worse book than the Dreamer, both as to the shameless Abuses it is filled with, the principles it is calculated to
recommend; and for poverty of composition, I think not easy to be found."

After the Whig attacks had subsided, the book was generally forgotten.

It is not included in any of the standard bibliographies of Utopian literature, where one would most expect to find it, and, probably due to its anonymity, is not even included in some bibliographies of King himself.

Curiously, its principal interest to literary scholars has consisted in the fact that it incidentally contains, in a long footnote, the text of Paulus, by Mr. L—— with The Answer, by Dr. Swift, neither of which was published by the Dean himself. In preserving these two poems of 1728, King performed a service to the cause of English literature which his contemporary critics seem to have ignored.

Whatever the reader may feel about the many vagueries which any interpretation of The Dreamer must necessarily leave undecided, there are good grounds for speculating on the author's reason for publishing when he did. The book appeared just a few months before the county election was held, and King probably hoped that during the intervening period The Dreamer would have some effect in influencing uncommitted voters against the Whigs. To judge from the later complaints in the press from outraged Whig correspondents it may have done so. But it would be as difficult to form a precise estimate of King's influence on this election as it would be to assess that of Sir Walter Scott on the American Civil War.

From the Tory point of view the most disturbing factor in the election itself was the conduct of the Fellows of Exeter College, and especially of their Rector, Francis Webber. Like all the other colleges, Exeter had been
urged in a Programma from the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. George Huddesford of Trinity College, dated April 15, 1754, to observe political neutrality during the week of the poll. His position was unquestionably sound: this was a county, not a university election. The gates of all the colleges were to remain shut and all the occupants in statu pupillari not possessing a vote were forbidden to leave, except with permission. Dr. Huddesford forbade all of the students without exception "to appear abroad without their respective Academical Habits; or bearing Clubs, Sticks, or any other Weapon whatsoever during the Days of the Poll; and This under the Penalty of having their Names put in the Black Register, and being farther proceeded against with the Utmost Severity." Polling began on the afternoon of April 17 at the specially erected booths in Broad Street against the north side of Exeter College. A mob of Old Interest supporters had that morning established themselves in front of the booths, and so to protect the Whig voters (or to provide them with refreshment) the Rector of Exeter, in disobedience to the Programma, had admitted a party of them into his college. That afternoon he let them out of the back door of Exeter College so that they could approach the polling area from the rear. Protests by Sir James Dashwood were unavailing, and the door remained open. The Vice-Chancellor realized that the level of discipline implicit in the Programma could not be maintained, so on April 20 the demands were relaxed and the gates of all the colleges were reopened.

In this matter, as in several others occurring during this period, King's confidential advice to the authorities was doubtless influential.
The original owner of the Bodleian copy of Jackson's Poll-Book describes Huddesford in a note on the fly-leaf as "an humble toadeater at the time of the Oxfordshire election to William King L.L.D." Euseby Isham, commenting on Lord Arran's recent nomination of the Tory Earl of Westmoreland to the position of High Steward of the university, remarked, "Dr. King is supposed to have been admitted into a great share of confidence with both the Earls, which may easily account for the nomination." A certain amount of his influence seems to have been exerted socially. Thus the following July he entertained the Earl of Westmoreland, in company with Euseby Isham and some other guests in his lodgings at St. Mary Hall, and, wrote Isham, "Dr. King gave us a proper dinner for him." 

While the Principal of St. Mary Hall was helping behind the scenes to further the cause of the Old Interest, it was clear to everybody that the Rector and Fellows of Exeter College had actively assisted the Whig voters, a fact which led to a good deal of adverse comment from the Tories, and some curiously disarming admissions from the Whig leaders. Thus on April 30 Lord Harcourt wrote to Bray:

All the Gentlemen that I have seen declare that we would not have polled a hundred votes, without the assistance of your College. But however we may be indebted to your Society, we are undoubtedly more so to you, than to allmost any other person of the Party. It is a piece of justice I shall allways do you to acknowledge it, wherever I have an opportunity of mentioning Mr. Brays name.  

30. Exeter College MSS., Harcourt to Bray, April 30, 1754.
On the following July 5, when King presented some gentlemen for their degrees in the Convocation House, he alluded to the alleged revelry of the Whig voters in Exeter College and urged his listeners to observe the university statutes, nisi nos facimus aedes nostras, ubi ingenuae artes florere debent, Ambulaiaurarum et Bacchantium collegia. 31

Meanwhile King had added more fuel to the flames in his speech delivered at the Commemoration of 1754. Speaking in the Sheldonian Theatre on July 2, he demonstrated "his usual Spirit and Eloquence, and gained, as he always doth, the universal Applause of his audience." 32

A few portions of this Latin presentation - speech are included in Doctor King's Apology of 1755, but the only account to have survived in any degree of detail is contained in a highly prejudiced letter written from Exeter College by Benjamin Kennicott to Samuel Richardson. 33 Kennicott explains that, after the long procession had entered the theatre, Dr. King stood at the Vice-Chancellor's right hand, "and, as it soon appeared, not improperly: for the Vice-Chancellor was not very ready at the names of some of the now first-heard-of gentlemen intended to be Doctor'd - a difficulty, which (you may be sure) was not owing to Mr. Vice-Chancellor's want of apprehension, but to the badness of the writing." The account of King's speech

31. The text of the speech of July 5, 1754, is not preserved in its entirety: this extract is reproduced in Doctor King's Apology.
commences a little later in Kennicott's letter:

Dr. King begun with telling us - he never intended to have turned orator again; but the insults of his enemies, the entreaties of his honest friends, and the commands of Mr. Vice-Chancellor, had prevailed. Then, his compliments to the High Steward, and the new Doctors - then the wickedness and corruption of the times - times so irreligious (he said) that we were lately about to sell the birth-right of British Christians even to the Jews! - Times, so horribly corrupt, that we had agreed to sell our daughters by the late Marriage Act! Sweet creatures! (as the orator said) it was a thousand pities such fine girls as then filled the Theatre should be sold by their unnatural parents, and, perhaps, (dreadful thought!) even to Whig husbands!

There are variations between Kennicott’s version of what followed and the very brief portions of the speech which King quoted in Doctor King’s Apology. First, here are Kennicott’s words:

But so beautiful, so elegant, were the ladies there assembled, he was sure they were of the right side; and he advised them, as the fair friends of liberty, to wear upon their rings, and embroider upon their garments, this sound maxim - The man who sells his country, will sell his wife or his daughter. (Upon which there was loud applause, the ladies clapping their wings, as well as the gentlemen; which the orator called ominous.)

King’s account of the same part of the speech is somewhat different. According to Doctor King’s Apology these tributes to the ladies came at the close of the speech rather than in the middle, and were followed by applause and some further remarks which had been completely misinterpreted by the "Informers", by which the author meant principally the Whig dons of Exeter College, together with Richard Blacow of Brasenose. Thus wrote King:

In the close of this Speech I made a compliment to the Ladies, who were present, which I concluded with the following address, or exhortation: Addam tria verba, quae vos, lectissimae matronae, vos, castissimae puellae, figite in mentibus, habete in annulis, acu pingite in vestibus: QUICUNQUE SEIPSUM VENDIT, IS HERCLE CERTE HAUD DUBITABIT UXOREM, ET FILIAM VENDERE. This was
received with a shout of applause; of which I took the advantage, and proceeded in this manner: Plausum hunc, Academici, accipio in omen bona praemuntians, saltem nos commonefaciens officii & virtutis nostrae, utque caveamus, &c. How do you think the INFORMERS interpreted this expression? They said, that I was so indiscreet, as to pronounce the applause, which was bestowed on me, to be OMINOUS, or a BAD OMEN.

The ending of the speech is reported by Kennicott in this wise:

Having done with the ladies, the old gentleman paid his compliments to our High Sheriff, that unjust Judge; - concluding, that if the good old cause should have no more justice elsewhere, farewell to British liberty.

It is a pity that King did not arrange for the printing of this oration: Kennicott's carping and partisan attitude does little to stimulate confidence in the fidelity of his summary. In reply to Kennicott, Richardson passed some comments on King which are quite unjust but which constitute a little-known literary curiosity:

What strange people are some of your leading ones at Oxford! If your occasional orator were to choose his supreme governor, he would not find a Dr. King permitted to arraign the justice of his government, and to reflect on laws actually passed, and in force. There cannot be a greater instance of the lenity of the government he abuses, than his pestilent harangues, so publicly made with impunity, furnish all his readers with. I know not the gentleman. He is old, you say. Old, yet so abandoned of decency! So much a reviler of the powers that be! Such a rebel, as I may call him, to the doctrines of Christianity, and so great a stranger to that meekness and submission which are its characteristics! What encouragement to parents and guardians to send their youth to a seminary so governed! 34

The generally unsatisfactory conduct of the county election created a backwash of litigation at Westminster and domestic dissension at Oxford.

The literary manifestation of the general ill-feeling took the form of a

34. Ibid., pp.197f.
prolonged pamphlet war, the accumulated remains of which constitute a kind of farrago of very uneven quality. There is no necessity to elaborate on all of the publications emanating from the post-electoral controversy. The casus belli was the Vice-Chancellor's speech to Convocation on October 8, 1754, when, according to The London Evening Post, he commented on "the infamous behaviour of one College, which despight of all decency, opened its gates, and its cellars to the Refuse of Mankind, to be the shop of Corruption, and the factory of Perjury." There could be no doubt in anyone's mind as to which college was implied. About November 20 there appeared A Defence of the Rector and Fellows of Exeter College, issued anonymously but usually attributed to the Rector himself. The Vice-Chancellor during the following January responded in A Proper Reply to a Pamphlet entitled A Defence of the Rector and Fellows of Exeter College, and another Tory - it is impossible now to say who -


36. The London Evening Post, No. 4218 (October 11-13, 1754). No copy of the complete Latin text of the speech is now available, but an extract appeared in the Vice-Chancellor's (i.e. George Huddesford's) A Proper Reply to a Pamphlet Entitled A Defence of the Rector and Fellows of Exeter College. The Latin excerpts that the Vice-Chancellor published gives a slightly milder impression than the English quotation in The London Evening Post. King later published some brief remarks on the speech in The Last Blow.
joined in with A Letter to the Author of the Defence of Exeter College.

At about the same time there were more charges and countercharges: it is in some cases difficult or impossible to determine the chronological order of the publications containing them. An Address to Dr. Huddesford Occasioned by his Proper Reply was perhaps the work of Benjamin Kennicott, while an unidentifiable Tory writer, using the pseudonym of Cantabrigiensis, was the author of the amusing piece entitled The Conduct of Exeter College Considered. This latter production contains a number of adverse reflections on Webber's Defence, but the writer's criticisms of the Exeter Whigs are mild compared to those of the Principal of St. Mary Hall in Doctor King's Apology.

This work appeared in February 1755, and had run through three editions before the end of the year. While it was being printed, the Vice-Chancellor excluded all Masters of Arts from the university printing-house on the top floor of the Sheldonian Theatre: even though he lamented the lack of political impartiality in Exeter College, there was no doubt in which direction his own political preference lay. Doctor King's Apology was intended, so the initial Advertisement to the second and third editions explains, to answer the accusations of the "Society of Informers", including his foremost antagonists in Exeter College: Francis Webber, Benjamin Kennicott, and Thomas Bray. The individual whom the author styles "the Grand Informer" was Richard Blacow of Brasenose, who had become editor of The Evening Advertiser in October 1754, and was using this paper to attack the Tories in general and the Jacobites in particular.
Blacow's record for passing on information concerning anti-government activities to the Whig authorities had been impressive, a fact which becomes warrantably clear in the light of some of his confidential correspondence which has remained so far unpublished. It was he who had been responsible for bringing the principal miscreants in the Jacobite disturbance of February 23, 1747, to the Court of King's Bench. He knew about the Tory journal The Protester before it had even been published, and passed his intelligence on to the Duke of Newcastle in his letter written on May 31, 1753, from Johnson's Court, Charing Cross:

The following I have just received as private intelligence, and I think it my duty as soon as possible to communicate it to Your Grace.

"You will see on Saturday a new Anti-ministerial Paper under the title of Protester, which is supported by a powerful set of Noblemen and Gentlemen, who, I am told, are determined to hunt down the Minister and render him odious to the People."

The person who wrote me this is a Printer, whom I have employed to print many of the papers on the New Interest side in the Oxfordshire Election. This I mention to satisfy Your Grace that I know him to be a trusty man and a fast friend to the Government, and that more material Intelligence concerning this base combination may therefore possibly be come at thro' his means.

On July 23, 1754, Blacow had published a notice of the Rag Plot in The Evening Advertiser, and had thus brought the matter to the attention of official circles in London before it had gained any circulation in

37. British Museum, Add. MSS. 32731, fol.583. Later Blacow communicated to the Duke the names of the editor and some of the financial backers of The Protester (British Museum, Add. MSS. 32732, fo.80). This periodical survived for 24 issues (June 2 - Nov. 10, 1753).
Oxford. In the following October he wrote to Thomas Bray asking for information "in order that I may draw up a sort of History or connected account of this whole affair." In the margin of this letter Blacow has written, "Secrecy, Secrecy, Secrecy!" He even descended to a mild form of blackmail after the Vice-Chancellor had written to him on the subject of the notice in The London Evening Post. Pledged Huddesford, quoting in part from Blacow's own words, "I desire you will, as a common Piece of Humanity & Justice to the University of Oxford, send me a true list of the names of that Certain Number of Loyal Subjects - Members of the said University - who authoriz'd you to insert in the Publick Papers an Advertisement so malevolent to the Generality of this Place - so regardless of Truth - and so Injurious to the real Character and deserved Credit of this University." Replied Blacow (with rather careless penmanship), "...... unless you can think yourself at liberty .... to oblige me with a

38. Informations and Other Papers Relating to the Treasonable Verses found at Oxford July 17th 1754 (Oxford, 1755), p.6. Several letters on the subject appeared in The London Evening Post, see especially Nos. 4167 (July 25-27, 1754) signed BRITANNICUS, 4169 (July 30 - August 1, 1754) "from a Gentleman at Oxford to his friend in London", 4173 (August 8 - 10, 1754) from "OXONIAE AMICUS", 4177 (August 17-20, 1754) signed "A.E.", and 4184 (September 3-5, 1754) from "B.C." A ballad entitled The Rag Plot was published in No. 4178 (August 20-22, 1754), and "an excellent new song" called The Oxford Rag Plot in No. 4195 (September 28 - October 1, 1754). The Evening Advertiser, according to The British Union — Catalogue of Periodicals, ran for 641 issues between March 1754 and April 1758. Very few numbers have survived.

39. Exeter College MSS., Blacow to Bray, October 1754.

40. Exeter College MSS., Huddesford to Blacow, October 7, 1754.
copy of everything sworn against me .... and transmitted to you, this
whole affair between us must be brought before the Tribunal of the
Publick, as that is the only Court you cannot hinder from being open to,
Sir, Your Humble Servant, Richd. Blacow." 41

Not unnaturally Blacow expected to be rewarded for his pains, and
ecclesiastical preferment from the Duke of Newcastle was the form he
wanted. On December 12, 1748, he had sent the Duke a "Humble Memorial";
on October 18, 1751, he had written, "there cannot live a person to whom
it would be more agreeable to me to owe my fortune to"; and on April 22
of the following year, "there is now vacant a Prebend in the Church of
Canterbury, which would make me extremely happy after above four years
waiting." 42 His loyalty to the Duke was eventually recognized when he
was appointed to a canonry at Windsor. King was certain that this pre-
erment was the result of his ability as an informer, and was equally
sure that Blacow hoped to attain greater dignities by exposing the Tory
villains involved in the Rag Plot. In The London Evening Post King
expressed these sentiments by means of an epigram, and took the opportunity
to rake up the fact that Blacow had at one time helped to promote his
father's brewery:

From selling bad ale which he found a poor trade
Oates the second informed and a canon was made.
But to show his new art, his reverence now brags
He will pick out lawn sleeves from a heap of old rags. 43

41. Exeter College MSS., Blacow to Huddesford, November 2, 1754.
42. British Museum, Add.MSS., 32717, fol.427; 32725, fol.309; 32726, fol.
491.
43. The London Evening Post, No. 4187 (September 12-14, 1754). Other
verses on Canon Blacow appeared in Nos. 4189-4194, 4196, 4199-4201,
and in several subsequent issues. There are also some criticisms in
prose of "the Dignified Informer".
It is hardly any wonder that when King wrote his _Anecdotes_, his sentiments towards Blacow and his like-minded colleagues had not mellowed. The Society of Informers became the _Blacones_, but King’s attitude to them remained essentially what it had been before:

**BLACONES apud Anglos sunt infames delatores, gigantum filii; quos natura malevolos spes praemii induxit in summum scelus: qui quum castos et integerrimos viros accusare soleant, omnia constringunt, et non modo perjuria sua vendunt, verum etiam alios impellunt ad pejerandum. Nomen sumunt a BLACOW quodam sacerdote, qui ob nefarias suas delationes donatus est canoniciatu Windsoriensi a regni præfecto D. de N. Quanta heu, heu, illo tempore fuerunt scelerum praemia!**

The style of Doctor King’s _Apology_ is vituperative and setigerous, but the author does provide some well turned rebuttals to the invectives which his Whig adversaries had at various times hurled against him. The accusations of the Society of Informers, which King deals with one by one, are as follow:

1. That he was an Irishman.
2. That he had defrauded subscribers to an unpublished book or books to the extent of 3000 guineas.
3. That he wrote the Jacobite _London Evening Post_.
4. That he had written a book entitled _Political Considerations_ in 1710, a work containing false English.
5. That he offered himself to sale both in England and Ireland, but was not found worth the purchase.
6. That he was the author of a book entitled _The Dreamer_.

First, King makes it clear that since he had been born in Middlesex he could not possibly be an Irishman. But even if he had been an Irishman, this fact would be no crime. In support of his contention he lauds the

---

44. _Political and Literary Anecdotes_ (2d ed., 1819), p. 216.
cultural standing of Ireland, alluding specifically to Dean Swift and quoting, en passant, from one of Swift's most distinguished readers on the continent, Cardinal Polignac, the Archbishop of Auch, whom King had met in 1737:

... as to the liberal arts and sciences the Irish people is in no respect inferior to ours, witness the immortal works of the late Dean of St. Patrick's, of whom Cardinal Polignac, who was himself one of the poltest scholars in Europe, said to me, IL A L'ESPRIT CREATEUR; an elogy, in my judgment, preferable to all the monumental inscriptions in Westminster Abbey.

To answer the charge of fraud implied by his accusers, King explained the intentions which he had had in mind seven or eight years earlier for the two volume collection of his Latin works. The author then proceeds to disclaim authorship of The London Evening Post, a trifle regretfully, since he acknowledges that many essays, letters, and political paragraphs in it are "the productions of an excellent wit, and full of good sense; and prove the author to be well skilled in all the branches of our trade and commerce, and to have acquired a perfect knowledge of the English constitution." He then points out that the book entitled Political Considerations was not his work at all. Actually his enemies had confused him with Dr. William King of Christ Church (1662-1712), a homonymous mistake which has been perpetuated passim by librarians and bibliographers ever since. The accusation that King had offered himself to sale in England and Ireland was, he said, equally untrue, for at no time in his life, either in England or Ireland, had he asked, or endeavoured by any means to obtain employment of any kind from the present or any former government. Indeed, he had, so far, never even been once at court, either in England or Ireland.
With regard to the charge of being the author of *The Dreamer*, King is unusually evasive. This part of King's Apology is the least satisfactory, since he does not really answer the accusation at all.

He writes:

**Now, as to an open acknowledgement, whether I am, or am not the author of this book, I do not conceive, it is of any concernment to the reader, or of any consequence to my own vindication; nor do I believe the equity and candor of the public will expect it from me. It will be sufficient, if I can free THE DREAMER from all unjust and malicious imputations...**

This argument clearly circumvents the charge. If he were not the author of *The Dreamer*, King would certainly have denied authorship, as he did in the case of *Political Considerations*.

Some of Blacow's accusations were, according to King, presented in *The Evening Advertiser* "in wretched English metre." He explains that the Grand Informer generally distinguished St. Mary Hall as *Aula Libertatis*, and adds:

**Under this title of AULAE LIBERTATIS PRINCIPALIS the same INFORMER hath bespattered me in some doggrel verses; in which, according to his manner, there is not a line of truth, or sense. So that I can now honestly boast, that I have been libelled by the worst, and celebrated by the best poet in England.**

The verses of Blacow to which King refers have not survived, so there is now no record to corroborate the charge that he was the worst poet in England. But since King immediately afterwards refers the reader to *The Triumph of Isis*, he evidently considered that in 1754 Thomas Warton was the best.

The Apology concludes with some rather unkind references which are undoubtedly to Blacow. King describes him as being "a fitter person to
fill a sentry box, than a cannon's stall," and "a snake or adder which was found in the highway perishing with cold and hunger." He concludes the work with some general exhortations, among them a suggestion to the heads and fellows of colleges to use great care and caution in admitting "the sons of low mechanics." In a footnote he answers one final charge:

"... there is one CRIME, charged on me by the INFORMERS, which I must acknowledge to be true: tho' it will admit of some alleviation, as I could not prevent it, nor can I mend it. It is my AGE. I am an OLD SENSUALIST, an OLD TRUMPETER, or designed [i.e. designated] by some other elegant and severe Apellative, to which the Epithet, OLD, may be properly prefixed, to add a poignancy to the Satire .... I am willing on this occasion to return good for evil, and do most heartily wish, that this CRIME may never be imputed to any member of the SOCIETY OF INFORMERS.

There appear to have been at least two replies to King's Apology, both of which appeared shortly after the work which they were intended to answer. The first, A Letter to Doctor King, Occasioned by his Late Apology, is described on the title page as being by "a friend to Mr. Kennicott". It is sometimes regarded as being the work of Kennicott himself. If it is, it does little justice to one of the great Hebrew scholars of the eighteenth century. As a piece of pamphleteering this work is superficial and periphrastic, and much of it never rises above the level of anti-Jacobite propaganda. It contains a number of invective observations on The Toast and The Dreamer, together with much irrelevant personal abuse of King and several mistakes both logical and factual. For example, it is taken for granted that King must be an Irishman because O Donald, the supposititious translator of The Toast, calls Ireland "his own country"; the Principal of St. Mary Hall is confused more than once
with the other William of Christ Church; and it is implied that King knew no Greek, whereas he shows himself a very competent writer of Greek in several places, especially in the third book of *The Toast*. However, it is significant that even this work contains one flattering reference to King's ability as an orator, an indication that even his enemies were impressed by his expertise:

One thing, which the world is generally agreed in, is your just fame, as an Orator .... How masterly your ELOCUTION! What a graceful propriety of ACTION! Action; that essential part of true Oratory, however unfortunately discontinued by the Readers (for one cannot call them Speakers) of the languid and unanimated Discourses in modern times.

The other reply was Blacow's *A Letter to William King*, in which the author attempted to prove that the Principal of St. Mary Hall was responsible for the disturbance of February 23, 1747. Even though three editions of this pamphlet appeared in 1755, it exerted no special influence, a fact which is hardly surprising: Blacow's case against King rested on what was essentially a minor undergraduate disturbance which had taken place some eight years previously.

Meanwhile the flood of pamphlets and booklets continued unabated, many of their writers repeating arguments which had already been used again and again. Of these publications, the only one which is definitely attributable to King is *The Last Blow*, described on its title page as "An Unanswerable Vindication of the Society of Exeter College. In Reply to the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. King, and the Writers of the London Evening Post."

At least two editions were published dated MDCCLV. This "vindication" is actually an attack on the dons of Exeter College ingeniously presented in
the guise of a defence, and yet another example of its author's facility for arguing one case while seeming to argue its opposite. In common with many of King's other writings, this brief work requires a key for the reader's full comprehension. A partial key is provided by Stride, but some allusions remain unclear.45

There is nothing especially new about the content of The Last Blow, and a good deal of it is no more than chaff. A few pieces of information are given on the Rag Plot and the Watch Plot which are not provided anywhere else, and there are some additional comments on the Vice-Chancellor's speech of October 8, 1754. Thomas Bray is ridiculed under the name of Boots, and Benjamin Kennicott under almost no disguise at all:

But hic vir! hic est! here comes the man, here comes the glory of the tribe, Little BENJAMIN their Ruler, or in simple terms the Rev. Mr. K-N-N-O-T! This gentleman has entirely exploded the old axiom in philosophy, ex nihilo nihil fit: for though he came from nothing, his very enemies are now obliged to acknowledge him to be something of consequence. Indeed these very enemies were the people that made him so. They lifted him from the dirt in which he lay groveling in obscurity, and added splendor to his character by an University Degree.

Other Whigs coming under King's lash include Francis Webber, James Cosserat, and Richard Blacow. The observations made on these gentlemen are sometimes marred by coarseness: again, the reader is conscious of the probable influence of Swift. Perhaps the most noteworthy feature of this pamphlet, if it is judged as a historical document, is the remarkable accuracy of its prophecies. Thus King wrote of Francis Webber, "we make no doubt but he will be shortly advanced to some high dignity in the Church." Sure enough, in the next year, Webber was made Dean of Hereford. Of Thomas Bray, King prognosticated:

A little over two decades later Bray became Dean of Raphoe in Ireland.

And of Benjamin Kennicott, the reader is assured:

Although .... this fellow came originally from the cobler's stall, it is by no means fit that he should be sent thither again. Nor, we trust, will he; he will rather rise on account of his extraordinary merits by gradual promotions, till he fills a nobler STALL .... "

This nobler stall turned out to be at Westminster Abbey, where Kennicott was appointed to a canonry in July 1770. Some five months later he resigned this position for the fourth stall at Christ Church, Oxford.

The Last Blow was King's final contribution to the literature of the county election of 1754. Perhaps it is not too much to say that this small work was the last blow of any significance to be struck for the old Tory Party which had made as great a contribution as the Whigs to the settlement of 1689, but which had kept alive in the minds of all politically interested citizens of the British Isles the consciousness that, even though the law upheld the constitutional position of the de facto monarchs, there was another royal family, with a better hereditary claim to the throne, ready to assume power whenever the right opportunity should present itself. It is difficult to gauge the precise extent to which King himself could still be called a Jacobite at this time, but to judge from The Last Blow, the charge of Jacobitism was still being bandied with frequency:
How disaffected a place is Oxford! The Vice-Chancellor is a Jacobite. Why? because he reprimanded Our College. In the dutiful expressions of his attachment to the King and Royal Family he certainly meant the Pretender; at least we represented his words so to ourselves in English. Every minute circumstance in this place is an evidence of jacobitism. The picture-shops are stuck full of prints of Mr. Rowney, with a Latin motto under them, Pro Patria; which means the Pretender. One of the principal coffee-houses in the Highstreet is called James’s coffee-house. Can any thing be more flagrantly jacobitical? There is also an inn in the Highstreet called The King’s Head; and whose Head is it? Not King GEORGE’s, no, King CHARLES’s. Besides all this, one of the chief Old Interest inns is the Flower de Luce, which, by a very slight knowledge of Inuendo, may denote the connexions and attachment of that party.

It may be assumed that King’s criticisms of the dons of Exeter College were completely sincere, even though they were expressed in an exaggerated and far from disinterested fashion. What the Principal of St. Mary Hall could not have foreseen in 1755 was the speed with which the entire issue would become, for all practical purposes, completely moribund.
Even though in the mid-1750's he was engaged in more or less constant personal dispute, King was not neglecting his academic duties. Of special interest is the fact that in February 1755, he gave Dr. Samuel Johnson his diploma of M.A., which had been awarded by decree in the same month. Boswell in his *Life of Johnson* commented of this event: "We may conceive what a high gratification it must have been to Johnson to receive his diploma from the hands of the great Dr. KING, whose principles were so congenial with his own." The author of the text of the diploma is not known, but he was quite possibly King himself.

On March 10, 1755, a collection of some 130 statues and other antiquities was presented to the University by Henrietta Louisa, Countess Dowager of Pomfret. As one of the several gestures of thanks made to her on the part of the authorities, King composed an inscription to be exhibited with them. This collection has been moved on more than one occasion: today

---
it is in the Ashmolean Museum, together with the inscription. King
commemorates in two sentences both the donation by the Countess and the
fact that William Fermor, Baron of Lempster, had originally purchased
the collection:

MARMORA HAEC SPIRANTIA, ET EXIMIAS GRAECIAE ET
ROMAE ANTiquAE RELIQUITAS, AB EXERIS REGIoNIBUS
UNDIQUE SUMMA CURA ATQUE DILIGENTIA CONQUISITAS
MAGNO SUMPTU COMPARAVIT SOLERTISSIMUS RERUM
ANTiquARUM AESTIMATOR GULIELMUS BARO DE LEMSTER.
HUIC ACADEMIAE DONAVIT, EX VOLUNTATE ET CONSilIO
CHARISSIMI ET SPECTATISSIMI CONJUGIS MUNIFICENTISSIMA
LITERARUM PATRONA HENRIETTA LOUISA COMITISSA DE
POMFRET ANNO DOMINO MILLESIMO SEPTINGENTESIMO
QUINQUAGESIMO QUINTO. 2

King's estate at Ealing was also receiving his attention. On August
25, 1755, he leased nine acres of the glebe land of the rectory of Ealing
known as Parson's Hault. 3 Three deeds now among the records of the Church
Commissioners, dated in 1755 and 1756, show King making considerable changes
in the arrangements under which he and the other persons mentioned in these
documents held the leasehold of the rectorial property. The ultimate
ownership of the rectory and its estate remained, as it had been for a
considerable length of time before, in the hands of the Chancellor of

2. A printed version of the text appears in John Gutch's edition of Antony
Wood, The History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford (2 vols.;
March 10, 1755, was the date of the indenture which effected the legal
transfer of the collection. The name of Lempster sometimes appears as
Leominster; the alternate form of Pomfret is Pontefract.

3. Greater London Record Office (Middlesex Records), Acc. 112/5.
St. Paul’s Cathedral. The signature of the then Chancellor, Dr. Peniston Booth, is on all three documents.  

In the following year King engaged in his last significant controversy. His opponent this time was the recently appointed Regius Professor of Civil Law, Robert Jenner of Trinity College. During the Commemoration of July 1756, Jenner had delivered a Latin speech, in the course of which he had slighted the Principal of St. Mary Hall. According to Jenner, the remarks against King took the form only of an "oblique lash or two", but his adversary's sensitivity was evidently stung. On the following October 27 King spoke in Convocation and made a contumelious Latin reply to Jenner's previous assault. Jenner shortly afterwards published his English version of King's short oration accompanied with introductory material and sixteen pages of notes under the title A New Speech from the Old Trumpeter of Liberty Hall. This pamphlet was signed OXONIENSIS and dated November 18, 1756. Early in 1757 King published his Latin version of the speech, ostensibly edited by Jenner, though really intended as a parody on his Latinity. Such are the basic facts of this rather petty dispute: the two short publications which it engendered.

4. Church Commissioners Records, Deeds No. 1537-1539, dated respectively March 19, 1755; March 12, 1756; and May 28, 1756. In the case of the first two of these documents, William King's signature appears on the counterpart.

5. According to The Oxford English Dictionary, the earliest known instance of the phrase "Liberty Hall" occurs in Goldsmith's She Stoops to Conquer, written in 1773. In point of fact, it is quoted on page 16 of Doctor King's Apology.
alone constitute whatever interest in it still remains.

The content of both published versions of King's speech in Convocation is roughly similar, though the order of the material is rearranged in Jenner's edition, perhaps because he was writing from memory, and presented to the reader in such a way as to show the speaker in as unfavourable a light as possible. There is little point in rehearsing all of King's accusations: their full significance is now impossible to assess since most of them were intended primarily as rebuttals to Jenner's Commemoration speech, no text of which is today extant. In *A New Speech from the Old Trumpeter of Liberty Hall* King's banter on the subject of Jenner is Englished in this tone:

How ridiculously did he exhibit himself, like a public Fool, or rather as frantic in his fury, vomiting forth whatever abuse came uppermost, foaming at the mouth, brandishing his cane, menacing the young men, and applauding himself! I heard, with fix'd attention, the raging of his voice; and I saw him leave the Sheldonian Theatre, as a vile actor quits the Stage, amidst the hisses of the whole assembly .... Fie upon it! - the King's Professor to act the Part of a Terrae Filius! .... And then, how ridiculously absurd the man was, with his little scraps of Latin; fond of shewing some of the common-place Sentences he had noted down in his younger days, and now us'd without either Rhyme or Reason. (*Populus me sibilat, at mihi plaudo.*)

King's edition of his speech - what Jenner calls "this last of all his last speeches" - is only a little more dignified. From the Latin text of the piece just quoted, it will be clear that Jenner took considerable liberties in his version.
.... Sed, quanquam huic calumniatori sive insipientiam, sive amentiam, sive malignitatem suam, ego adducor, ut ignoscam; dehinc tamen his omnibus ita occurrencium esse arbitror, ita consulendum Academiae dignitati, ut homo iste ne quidem eodem modo iterum bacchari, ac furere permittatur, usq; adeo, donec odio et strepitu juvenum nostrorum e loco coactus sit excedere. Atqui hoc ipsum illi vitio dari possit: Qui excessit, immo vero erupit e venerabili coetu, tanquam ex histrionum scena; tanquam si morionis, aut quod ipse de se nunc affirmat, TERRAE FILII ageret partes (pro pudor! PROFESSOR REGIUS TERRAE FILII ageret partes!) ore spumans, baculum quassans, puérils minitans, sibi plaudens:

Populus me sibilat, at mihi plaudo
Ipse domi.

Jenner’s pamphlet incidentally contains a curious anecdote relating to a satirical work on the plan of Alain Le Sage’s Le Diable Boiteaux entitled The Devil Upon Crutches, which was published in London in 1755 and whose author remains undetermined. Soon after its appearance, there was printed in a newspaper A letter to the old Trumpeter at Liberty Hall, occasion’d by his Devil upon crutches &c. According to Jenner, King was highly indignant:

And now, what truly does the peevish old man, but advertise immediately, in one of the daily papers, with his own name (I mean the name he has gone by since his arrival from Ireland) and with the name of his Hall, as follows; Whereas a scandalous advertisement has appear’d, declaring that I (that I!?) am the author of a book, entitled The Devil &c. so that he takes to himself (you see) the Fool’s Cap, the title of the old Trumpeter without the least ceremony and with the greatest promptitude; as if, in all the fitness of things, it could possibly fit no pate but his own. Wherefore, for fear of offending against the old Trumpeter’s own proclamation, this must be henceforth the name, the name of his own public adoption.

However justified Jenner considered his case to be, he demonstrates that he was one of those who was ready to taunt the Principal of St. Mary Hall with
the aspersion of being an Irishman. "Cork was the real place of his birth", he proclaims in the notes, "and his first name Peregrine O Donald (near relation to Peregrine Pickle) ...." Somehow or other Jenner had secured a copy of The Toast - he quotes from it and calls it "that most infamous of all books" - and based his opinions on the information that he found therein. It is quite possible that Blacow's copy fell into his hands. He had either not read or not been convinced by the refutation which had been set out in Doctor King's Apology of the statements made by the Principal's enemies relating to his supposed Hibernian origin.

Even though his view is constantly coloured by personal antipathy, Jenner can occasionally provide a glimpse of his adversary which shows a certain descriptive talent, as in his picture of King entering Convocation ...

... most elegantly bepowder'd, and strutting beneath the pomp of scarlet, yet with infinite obsequiousness bowing to the first, nodding to the second, smiling on the third, and whispering to the fourth; whilst his eyes darted every way at once, to discover who and who and who was arriv'd, and whether he was likely to have a full house - now fear damping his hope, now hope getting the better of his fear - in short, with every symptom of that anxiety, with which a third-rate player is seen peeping thro' the curtain, about the second music, upon his own Benefit-night.

Jenner is not known to have published anything else besides A New Speech from the Old Trumpeter of Liberty Hall, despite the fact that he held the Regius Professorship of Civil Law until 1767. Whatever the merits of their dispute, King seems to have been instrumental in inspiring his legal colleague's one appearance in print.

The Latin text of King's speech, professedly edited by the Regius
Professor of Civil Law, was published under the title Oratiuncula Habita in Domo Convocationis, Oxon. Die Oct. 27. 1756. It is preceded by an introductory Epistola Dedicatoria ad Honoratissimum Dominum, the Dominus in this case being the Chancellor, Lord Arran. This letter, dated February 1, 1757, ex mea domo in Sancto Puteo (Holywell), is comparable in style and satirical intention to the Epistola Canonici of 1744. Jenner’s Latin is represented as being no better than that of Bishop Gilbert, very shortly to become Archbishop of York, as may easily be seen in the opening sentence of the Epistola Dedicatoria:

Post commendationem mei ipsius vestrae DOMINATIONI, dedico vobis hoc meum primum opus, ut ego debo, quia honorabilem locum, quem ego nunc teneo in hac Universitate, teneo a vestro favore, praeter multas alias benignitates, quae mihi significantur a VESTRA DOMINATIONE de tempore in tempus.

The entire Epistola, covering some thirteen pages, is deliberately intended to make Jenner look a fool. For example, he is made to claim that corroboration for his arguments may be found in uno magno et divino Poeta, Tertulliano. At the bottom of the page there is a footnote: Ego nondum legi hunc Poetam. He is also represented as behaving in a ridiculous manner when he was listening to the speech which he is now editing:

.... Tum unus Bedellorum, qui stabat proxime mihi, et qui solet ambulare ante me, quando ego eo in solemni pompa ad juridicas disputationes, dicerat mihi in aures, Fuge, fuge; nunc est vestrum tempus fugere. Quare ego fugi, metuens aliquid malum ulterius. Sed postquam eram ex Theatro, et recuperavi meum halitum, unus amicus veniebat mihi dicens, quod non erat bonum consilium fugere, et quod iste Bedellus est male versutus homo, et deridebat me. Tum ego commovebar ira ita magna, ut meum caput videbatur vertere circum et circum, et jeci meum corpus super pavimentum in Schola Divinitatis, et spumabam, et clamabam vehementer. Tum servus meus portabat me domi, ubi non potui dormire tribus totis noctibus.
The text of King's speech follows the Epistola Dedicatoria; at the end of it, there are almost sixteen pages of Notae et Observationes, an Avisamentum Lectori, and a list of Errata, all of which are written to show Jenner as a laughing stock. In the Errata, for example, this note appears:

Pag. 9 Not. 3.

Pro coepit bene aliquis contendit, quod debemus legere
bene coepit. Sed haec alteratio, sive transpositio verborum
non videtur necessaria; quia non facit ullam alterationem,
aut ullam minimum differentiam in sensu.

As in the Epistola Canonici, there is a skit on the antiquated logical methodology of the schoolmen. This one occurs as a note to King's opening sentence:

Peto jus dicendi, pauca dicturus, qua ad Academiae
dignitatem spectant.

In the note, Jenner is made to resort to a sorites of a kind:

Valde ominosum est Principali ita cespitare in limine
sui operis, ut is plane appareat omnibus esse malus homo,
et iniquus sua ipsius confessione; quod ego vero sic probo
logicatn et syllogistice:

Qui petit jus, petit bonum et aequum:
Principalis petit jus;
Ergo Principalis petit bonum et aequum.
Qui petit bonum et aequum, petit quia id
non habet in seipso:
Principalis petit bonum et aequum;
Ergo petit, quia id non habet in seipso.
Probatur Major; Quia nemo petit id, quod habet.

The mock apparatus criticus contained in King's edition of his Oratiuncula is wittily written but extremely spiteful. Reading it, one is tempted to wonder whether King would not have achieved his purpose just as well by ignoring Jenner's animadversions altogether. By this time, the
Principal of St. Mary Hall was capable of exerting an influence in Oxford almost as formidable as that of the Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellor, and certainly greater than that of the Public Orator, the comparatively colourless Roger Mather of Brasenose College. Jenner had held his appointment for a little over two years; King had held his for more than thirty-seven. It is difficult to imagine that the reputation of so senior a member of the university was enhanced, even in his own day, by an extended piece of highly unsympathetic mimicry, avowedly intended to make the comparatively young holder of one of the most important chairs in the university appear completely asinine.

On October 28, 1756, the day after King's oratiuncle against Jenner, the senior Trustee of the Radcliffe Library, the fourth Duke of Beaufort, passed away and was buried in Badminton Church, Gloucestershire. King composed the Latin epitaph for the Duke's tomb: it is the earliest of his known surviving compositions in this genre. The virtues attributed to the Duke in this respectfully phrased tribute were among those which King most admired:

Patriae fuit amantissimus,
Verae religionis cultor assiduus,
Libertatis publicae vindex indefessus,
Et, nisi procerum invidia, aut temporum iniquitas
Tantum virum a reipublicae muneribus exclusisset,
Britanniae nostrae caput et lumen futurum.
Dum vero boni omnes
Principem hunc excellentissimum
Regni negotiis praesesse frustra optant,
Eum maxime sunt admirati,
Et observantia summa coluerunt
Privatum:
Quippe cujus otium
Omni imperio aut regum favore fuit honoratius.
He discharged well the duties of his state in life:

Maritus fidelissimus,  
Fater optimus,  
Amicus certus et constans,  
Hospes munificentus et jucundus  
Academiae suae Oxoniensis praesidium,  
Et eruditorum omnium patronus  
Ipse eruditissimus.

His only enemies were those of his country:

Inimicum habuit neminem  
Nisi qui patriae et reipublicae suae inimicus.  
Etenim is illi erat vultus decor, is animi candor,  
Et in laudabili severitate tam come ingenium,  
Ut hominibus demerendis natus videretur.

The epitaph closes with some noble aspirations on the subject of his son and heir, Henry, who became the fifth Duke at the age of thirteen:

.... unicum filium,  
Summae spei puerum optimaeque indolis;  
Quem incolarem servet Deus,  
Ut nobilissimam domum,  
Principis hujus illustrissimi,  
Immatura morte labefactatam  
Avitis virtutibus restituat, sustineat, et eornet  
Filius patri quam simillimus.

A little over two years later, there occurred the death of the aged Earl of Arran, Chancellor of Oxford University. He was buried at St. Margaret's, Westminster, on December 23, 1758, and with his passing the dukedom and marquessate of Ormonde became extinct. His possible successors in the cancellariate were three in number: the Earl of Westmoreland, the Earl of Litchfield, and the Bishop of Durham. Westmoreland had the blessing of the Principal of St. Mary Hall, who had described him as "learned himself .... a lover of learned men, and a steady asserter of the
liberties of his country." In due course King's candidate was elected.

His installation ceremonies took place in July 1759, the earlier part of which is thus described in The Gentlemen's Magazine:

"... the ceremony began with a grand procession of noblemen, doctors, &c., in their proper habits, which pass'd through St. Mary's, and was there joined by the masters of arts in their proper habits; and from thence proceeded to the great gate of the Sheldonian theatre, in which the most numerous and brilliant assembly of persons of quality and distinction were seated, that had ever been seen there on any occasion.

The arrangements for seating in the Sheldonian theatre during this festivity are described in a set of Orders issued by the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Thomas Randolph, on the previous June 27:

The rising Semicircle of the Theatre is reserved for the Noblemen and Doctors. The Enclosure within the Rail is the Place for Masters of Arts. The Gallery behind the Doctors in the circular Part of the Theatre and the East and Westward Side-Galleries are reserved for Ladies and Strangers, among whom all Gownsmen are forbid to intermix. The upper Gallery above the Noblemen and Doctors is appointed for Gentlemen-Commoners and Bachelors; and the upper Galleries East and Westward are for Undergraduate Scholars of Houses and Commoners. The rest of the Area for Battlers and Servitors.

6. Doctor King's Apology, pp. 36-37. King wrote a letter to William Huddesford, Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, dated February 9, 1758, to which he added this postscript: "If you give yourself the trouble to write to me again, direct under cover to my Lord Westmoreland. I am now with him in Hanover Square." (Bodleian Library, MS. Ashmole 1822).

Dr. Johnson was in Oxford for the solemnity and wrote some relevant comments which were later quoted by Boswell:

I have been in my gown ever since I came here. It was at my first coming quite new and handsome. I have swum thrice, which I had disused for many years. I have proposed to Vansittart climbing over the wall, but he has refused me. And I have clapped my hands till they are sore, at Dr. King's speech. 8

The speech to which Johnson refers was delivered on Friday, July 6; it came at the close of four days of Latin oratory interspersed with musical events and other festivities. 9

It is a pity that we possess no copy of the speech at which Johnson demonstrated such plauditory enthusiasm. The entry in the Register of Convocation for July 9 contains only the statement that King comitia clausit oratione Latina copiosa et perpolita. According to the diary of Sir Roger Newdigate, the Principal of St. Mary Hall spoke for fifty minutes. 10 A brief report which was printed in Jackson's Oxford Journal the day after the event declares:


9. A complete list of the speakers on all four days appears in The London Evening Post, No. 4938 (June 28-30, 1759). The actual installation of the Chancellor took place on the first day, Tuesday, July 3.

10. County Record Office, Shire Hall, Warwick, Diary of Sir Roger Newdigate, July 5, 1759.
Then the Solemnity of the Installation and Commemoration was closed by Dr. King, Principal of St. Mary Hall, who in a spirited and eloquent Oration, delivered with his usual Grace and Dignity, enlarged on the Propriety of the Choice the University had made; displayed his Lordship's eminent Abilities; introduced Lady Pomfret's and Mr. Dawkin's late Benefactions; and concluded with an exhortation to the Youth of this Place, and his ardent Wishes for the perpetual Peace and Prosperity of the University.11

One sentence, claimed by Charles Churchill to be taken from this speech, is used as the motto on the title page of The Prophecy of Famine, published in 1763. It reads

Carmina tum melius, cum venerit IPSE, canemus. 12

These shreds of evidence constitute all that remains of what was in all likelihood one of the Old Trumpeter's great solos.13

King had one new work printed in 1760, Aviti Epistola ad Perillam, Virginem Scotam. This was never published, but is sometimes included in the collected Opera. No author's name appears, but the work is described as EDITORIS ECPHRASI ET ANNOTATIONIBUS ILLUSTRATA, a reference to the ecphrasis (a short preface) and the twelve pages of notes by the supposititious editor.

---


In the ecphrasis, addressed to a nameless Viro Illustriissimo, etc., the "editor" (King himself) explains that these small verses (versiculos) were written by a certain young Italian pretending to be an elderly Englishman (scriptos fuisse ab Italo quodam juene, quamquam se hominem Anglum simulat esse, et senem). The reason for the anonymity of the writer is then explained:

Etenenim ita libere locutus est, et jocatus de re severissima, de religione et cultu Romano, ut siqui ex Pontificiis expiscarentur, qui, et cujas sit, omnia mehercule ei essent pertimescenda.

The editor then injects some views of his own on life in Rome. It seems highly likely, on the basis of King's known views about Catholicism in general, as distinct from his attitude towards individual Catholics, that the opinions expressed are King's own. What he says is unflattering, especially on the monks who preach poverty while acquiring riches for themselves, but it is consistent with his general attitude of hostility towards clerical acquisitiveness and secular ambition.

Several of the mysteries concerning this work, which the reader might have hoped to find solved in the ecphrasis, remained unexplained. Who was Perilla? Is Avitus to be taken as a proper name or as meaning a grandfather? What significance is to be attached to the notation at the end of the ecphrasis ROMAE Calendis Januariis MDCCLX? Was King really writing this work in Rome or merely pretending to be? The author explains at the beginning:

MINUS decennium est, quod Londini sex fere menses ego commoratus, dulci tuo colloquo saepissime fruebar, (neque spero te cepisse oblivionem consuetudinis nostrae) quo ingenium tuum, et liber spiritus, et animi candor satis mihi esset perspectus.
When was this period during which King sojourned for almost six months in London? Why was he away from St. Mary Hall for so long? Who was the vir illustriissimus to whom the work is dedicated? Of Perilla, the editor is made to say merely:

DE PERILLA (et hoc fortasse fictum est nomen) nihil compertum habeo. Scoti nobiles, hospites tui, de virgine ea, siqua est, formosa et erudita te certiorem faciant. Certe equidem tam rarae animi dotes prohibeant eam latere.

And on the matter of his obtaining the text of the poem, he added in a rather cavalier manner,

QUO casu carmen hoc in manus meas pervenerit, haud operae pretium est referre.

In short, the ecphrasis is yet another example of King's exercises in studied ambiguity.

The actual poem is written in elegiac couplets, and extends to 190 verses. It commences with a brief description of the conditions under which it is being written:

DUM tristi frangor morbo, longaque senecta,
Et mea vix calamum sustinet aegra manus ....

The poet is delighted that Perilla is skilful in the Latin language, and enquires about the effects on her of the classical authors. For him they have always been the masters of life and manners:

Hi mihi semper erant vitae morumque magistri,
Quos juvenis colui, quo sequor usque senex.

Furthermore they teach the hoarse pulpits what they are unable to preach:

Qui, quo te melius noscas, et vivere quid fit,
Pulpita quod nequeunt rauca docere, docent.
Passing from the classics to contemporary Europe in the midst of the
Seven Years' War, the poet finds a lamentable situation:

Vastantur terrae, urbes incenduntur, et ignes
Qui modo vitabant, heu! periere fame.
En quoque, ne rabidi desint ursique lupique,
Omnia qui lacerent, Russicus hostis adest.

In a footnote he describes the Muscovites as "that enormous and barbaric
people," and indicates that those who seek their help, and invite the army
of the Sarmatae into Germany, will feel remorse for their plan (eos consilii
sui olim poenitebit). 14 The present ruin, he continues in the text, could
scarcely be worse if Etna were to extend its flaming forces to the whole
world:

Vix quidum, Aetna suas si toto extenderet orbe
Flammiferas vires, tanta ruina foret.

But who would believe such things to be the work of Christians?

At quis Christicolum talia credat opus?
Mitis erat CHRISTUS, praeceptaque mitia CHRISTI:
Ille hominem, ille aliae pacis amator erat.

However, when war ceases, the condition of religion continues to exhibit
shortcomings:

Ast ubi non bellum est, neque gloria queritur armis,
Religio voluit cuncta licere sibi.
Ecce igne, aut ferro tolli, quicunque negarint,
Quod non credibile est, credere, saeva jubet;
Et scelere immanes superans Busiridis aras,
Innocuos cives immolat illa suit.

14. The Sarmatae were described by Herodotus as being beyond the Don.
Aut credo, aut simul vestros renuisse penates,
Judaeae, ut tandem sit tibi salva domus.
Semideus vanos stimulat dum Loiola reges,
Plena ferae caedis Gallica regna vides.
Regibus Austriacis, mihi dic, insignior ecquis
Cum clade infanda, tum pietate fuit?
Quas vastas subigit, gentes exterminat omnes,
Et raptas populi tollit Iberus opes:
Haec quia non coluit CHRISTUM pars altera mundi,
Cui CHRISTUS nullo nomine notus erat.

In case any reader should miss the point, the footnotes provide generous amplifications of the principal ideas which are versified in the text.

For example,

Religio Christiana pacem amat, cupit, conciliat, servat.
Principes Christiani, etiam Christianissimi pacem aversantur,
aspernantur, indignantur, finitimis et vicinis caedes et excidia utique meditantur.

Or again,

Ea scilicet superstitione qua imbuitur maxima pars Europae,

A good deal of the invective that follows in the text is directed against the Roman Church, in particular the monks (in tunicis foedisque cucullis) and continental mariolatry. Speaking of the city of Rome he writes:

Reginam coeli, mutato nomine, adorat,
Junoisque locum Virgo Maria tenet:

Not content with criticizing Rome, he turns, in an acid footnote, to Loreto:
A brief comparison is made between Rome and Scotland. Although King is a little less protracted on the subject of Scottish religion, he is scarcely more charitable:

Roma colit quaecunque, ea numina Scotia damnat;
Romaque quae damnat, Scotia cuncta colit:
Templis inque suis, si fas ea templo vocare,
Si decoris quidquam est, id putat esse nefas.
Rusticitas nam sola placet; reverentia hic est,
Debita siqua homini, debita nulla deo.

Turning to the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, he proceeds to put into verse one of the standard theological objections against it:

Nam magnum faciunt coeli implacabile numen,
Humano generi quod nocuisse juvat:
Totum perque diem dum supplice voce precantur,
Posse preces ulla vincere fata negant.
Fata trahunt omnes: cedamus et omnia fatis:
Libera nec cuiquam mens animusque datur.
Cantantes eadem quo tu discrimine noris,
Seu CHRISTI, flamen sive Dialis erit?
De grege Calvini rigido nisi jure timerem,
Ne tibi quis noceat, plura monenda forent.

The conclusion of the poem consists in an exhortation to Perilla not to marry:

At neque conjucium tibi suadeo. Virgo maneres,
Tu poteris Musis aptior ire comes.

But whether she marries or not, the author, in the final couplet, wishes her all prosperity:

Sive autem mater, seu mavis virgo vocari,
Eventura tibi prospera cuncta precor.
This unusual performance, considered as a whole, is hardly great poetry. It contains some fine single lines, and exhibits the careful use of *figurae etymologicae* and other devices of the classical poets. But it lacks the sophistication of King's earlier works, especially of *The Toast* and *Templum Libertatis*, and in its place one finds a caustic shrillness which does not always seem to blend appropriately with the benign and endearing terms which are used in profusion to describe the Scottish maiden. The attack on the Roman Church immediately reminds one of the *Franciscanus* and its companion work, *Fratres Fraterrimi*, of George Buchanan, though the *Aviti Epistola* does not exhibit their author's particular kind of virile pungency. Indeed, it is difficult to avoid the feeling that King's increased aversion to certain forms of religion is due, to a considerable degree, to his lack of political sympathy for large numbers of persons calling themselves Christians.

The choice of the elegiac distich, a metre not usually employed by King, was made in all probability to add an extra overtone of plaintive mournfulness. Sidney, in the *Defence of Poesie*, had written of the lamenting elegiac "who bewayleth .... the weakness of mankinde", and King presumably saw himself as fulfilling some such role in *Aviti Epistola*. But I question the extent to which this poem could be called an elegy in the classical sense of the word. In places it is not so much a lamentation on certain aspects of the times as an indictment of them. Perhaps for this reason King was content to use the term *Epistola*. 
Despite its denunciatory power and breadth of coverage, Aviti Epistola exhibits several examples of one of King's most irritating mannerisms, namely his habit of making sweeping generalizations without bothering to qualify or to substantiate them. Thus in the notes we read:

Scoti minus reverenter Deum colunt, quam regni satrapas, vel etiam aequales suos. Gentis hujus religio in una hac re posita videtur, ut quam longissime absit ab institutis, ritibus, et caeremoniis Ecclesiae Romanae, nec non et Anglicanae.

Admittedly, it is not entirely clear who is meant by the term regni satrapas, but whoever he and his equals were, it is hardly fair to generalize on their collective piety to the detriment of the Scots as a whole. And the author's comments on the contemporary Scottish religious position vis-à-vis that of the Roman and Anglican churches were not equally true of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, which officially recognized the Stuart monarchs until 1788, the Moderate Presbyterians, and the Popular Presbyterians. King's descriptions of Catholicism and Calvinism exhibit the same lack of precision, as well as a considerable degree of bias.

Nevertheless, Aviti Epistola contains portions of incidental interest which have no precise counterparts in King's other poems. One of these is a long Elogium, placed among the editoris annotationes, which, the supposititious editor claims, had been fastened to the door of a noble Swedish senator. Which dignitary is its subject remains undetermined, but it seems most likely that King intended this Elogium to commemorate Count Carl Gyllenborg, who had been the Swedish ambassador to Great Britain in
1715, and had been imprisoned for several months as a result of his becoming too intimately involved in Jacobite activities. He became President of the Chancery (i.e. Premier) and Chancellor of the University of Uppsala in 1739, prior to launching the Swedish campaign against Russia in 1741. This was a complete fiasco: military preparations were inadequate and the Swedish army suffered from bureaucratic corruption among the officers. Two years later Gyllenborg was forced to make peace with Russia under the terms of the Treaty of Abo. I assume that this is the treaty to which King refers in the preamble to the Elogium:

At vero per mihi visum est mirum, Sueciae optimates foedus cum Muscovitis fecisse, qui amplissimas et fructuosissimas Suedorum provincias occuparunt, et sub imperium ditionemque suam subjunixerunt, caeteras omnes mox devoraturi. Aut senatores Suecici largitione turpissima corrumpuntur, aut in maximarum rerum ignorance versantur.

Though most of the Elogium is critical of the senator, it commences with a passage of praise with reservations:

HIC SITUS EST
SENATUS PRINCEPS, ET REGNI PRAEFECTUS;
Vir nobilis, splendidus, affabilis, blandus,
At animo non magno, nec magna corporis dEDITate, 15
cujus nomen et laudes tota jamdui celebrat Academia; Quem sacerdotes aulici omnes imprimis observant;
Quem reverendissimi Praesules, ut Deum colunt.

The qualified flattery over, King proceeds to expatiate at some length on what he regards as the senator's many shortcomings: the subject appears in some respects remarkably like a Swedish version of a Whig prime-minister as seen by one of his political enemies.

15. In a footnote King implies that Academia is to be taken as the University of Uppsala.
Indeed, these lines could be applied just as appropriately to the image in their author's mind of the Duke of Newcastle:

Semper vehementissime occupatus,  
Ac res per magnas visus agere,  
Omnino nihil agit.  
Semper festinans, properansque,  
Atque ad metam tendere prorsum simulans,  
Nunquam pervenit.

The Elogium concludes with eight lines which may possibly have been influenced by the celebrated epitaph of Swift which today hangs on the south wall, above the door of the vestries, in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin:

Haec fortassis, Viator, rides:  
Sta vero, et tristem lege Epilogum:  
Hujus unius hominis inscitia  
Tantum impressit dedecus,  
Tantum attulit detrimentum reipublicae,  
Ut omnibus appareat,  
Misi SUECIAE Genius, siquis est, sese interponat,  
SUECIAH futuram non esse.

The incidental comments provided in this Elogium and its preamble on the contemporary Swedish political situation under the rule of the Hats are unnecessarily carping. King's prophecy that the provinces remaining in Swedish hands would soon be devoured by the Russians was not fulfilled. Furthermore, one wonders how reliable King's comments are on the senator himself: though the Old Trumpeter was in all probability involved in the earlier Jacobite intrigues with the Swedes and Russians, there is no evidence that he was as intimately connected with the secrets of the Riddarhus as this Elogium would seem to imply. It is also arguable that he may have been unconsciously jealous of the wide following which his subject had enjoyed.
among the clergy, an advantage which the English Tories had not experienced since 1714. At best, King’s observations on Sweden and her nameless senator are those of a remote foreign observer, given to strong but not always consistent political partialities, whose sources of information may or may not have been dependable.

A further item hidden away in the annotationes is a short, untitled poem in hendecasyllabics, another metre which King seldom used. It is introduced by this preamble:

Quos dies festos nos agimus, et celebramus, Scoti nefastos ducunt, et lugubria, puto, canunt. Quam in hac boreali Britanniae parte olim peregrinabar, hospitis mei vicinus (ex iis unus, quos ministros appellant) in judicium fuit vocatus, et damnatus sceleris, quia anserem ausus est prandere natali Christi, aut festo die Michaelis Archangeli. Nam eo die Anglus est patrius mensas suas assis anseribus extruere, haud quidem religione obstrictis; sed quia, circiter id anni tempus anseres sunt pinguissimi, et jucundi saporis. Nonne autem hic reus judicium subit iniquissimum? Quid si improbum hunc Anglorum morem ignorabat? Quid si ignorabat, cujus praecepta dies esset, siquidem in Scotorum calendario Archangelus, nullum, nisi fallor, locum obtinuit? Quid denique si vir bonus nihil praeter unum anserem habebat, quod ederet?

The poem follows immediately afterwards. The influences of Petronius, Catullus, and Presbyterianism are all, in their different ways, in evidence. The result is a pleasantly facetious jeu d’esprit:

Tres Encolpius anseres necavit
Ut nos Arbiter ille fabulator
Jucundus docuit, sacros Priapo.
Id propter vetulae crucem minatur. 16
Quid vero meus ille Scotus hospes,
Unum cum necat anserem profanum,
Quo natos aleret puellulasque,
Nunc in judicium reus vocatur?

16. The vetulae are the priestesses of Priapus.
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Utrum sit sacer anser, an profanus,
Nil refert: sed inexpiaibile hoc est,
Si quis Scotus homo die nefasto
Convivis jubet anserem parari.
Si, sic nota tibi Dei voluntas,
Qui sint, dic bone vir, dies nefasti,
Ut prandentibus error absit omnis.
Omnem credideris diem nefastum,
Inque ipso ansere daemonem latere,
Angli quem celebrant ineptiores,
Festum coelicolis suis dicatum.
At ut, praecipue, valere si vis,
Festum, Scote, caveto Michaelis.

Though they are comparatively brief, perhaps the most revealing parts of *Aviti Epistola* are those praising the status of Britain in 1760 under the House of Hanover. Having spent most of his life preaching the doctrine that true British liberty would return only with the restoration of the Stuart monarchy, King now saw fit to adopt a more optimistic tone:

*Quod tantum potuit, quod nunc majora facesit,*
*Et solis nixa est viribus ipsa suis;*
*Insula, et extremi sit quamvis angulus orbis;*
*Sedem hic Libertas maluit esse suam.*

And in the footnote to these lines, the reader is assured:

*Populi Britann/ propria est ea perfectae libertatis,*
*et reipublicae species, qua nihil dulcius, et homine dignius:*
*et quae quidem nunquam amitti potest, nisi eam vendat ipse senatus.*

In a fuller development of his political position, the author not only justifies the King's war, but for perhaps the first time in his life pens some sentiments complimentary to the existing British government:

*Bellum justissimum (siquod est justissimum) a populo Britanno cum Gallis hodie geritur. Cum hujus belli initia prospera essent Gallis, et rempublicam nostram administrarent quidam purpurati, in quibus neque quid scientiae militaris,*
*aut consili, aut dignitatis, fuit, omnia sibi promittebat gens inimica, etiam opes et possessiones nostras omnes, et totius oceani imperium. Simul autem ac novi homines singulari prudentia, alta mente, et authoritate praediti ad capessendam*
These passages reveal that King's political outlook had been undergoing a profound change, the course of which deserves discussion. Gradually his trust in the Stuart claimants had been waning, while at the same time he was becoming much better disposed than ever before towards at least some of the Whig members of the administration. Horace Walpole, in a letter to George Montagu of May 4, 1758, provides evidence that King's antipathy towards the long deceased Sir Robert Walpole had already somewhat mellowed. In his book entitled A Catalogue of the Royal and Noble Authors of England, Horace Walpole had written of his father, "Sir Robert Walpole, Earl of Orford, is only mentioned in this place in his quality of author: it is not proper nor necessary for me to touch his character here - sixteen unfortunate and inglorious years since his removal have already written his eulogy!" Of this passage, King commented (according to Horace Walpole) "It is very modest, very genteel, and very true." Walpole described this remark as the most extraordinary thing he had heard about his book. 17 Though King was later, in his Anecdotes, to make some trenchant criticisms of Sir Robert's administration, he seems to have felt some sympathy for the retired Prime-Minister, admitting that "my Lord ORFORD was consulted by the ministers to the last day of his life." 18

The fact that King was increasing his contacts with a few of the aristocratic Whigs, and notably the Earl of Shelburne, is balanced by the fact that at the same time his confidence in his fellow-Tories was being put to a severe test. On September 15, 1759, General Robert Clerk wrote to Lord FitzMaurice with reference to a recent visit to Oxford:

I had a tête à tête for six hours with old Doctor King where we talked a great deal of you. He says the Tories have not one man amongst them at present capable to be put at their head. 19

With the death of George II, and the commencement of the new reign on October 25, 1760, the exclusive royal patronage of the Whig party came to an end. A hearty pledge of loyalty was offered to the new monarch by the University of Oxford, and the old barriers between the two principal parties gradually weakened in a new spirit of rapprochement. The motivation behind the Jacobite movement was gradually dissipated, as the now seriously ailing James III relinquished hope of ever recovering the crown for himself. Though Pope Benedict XIV had ordered in 1756 that all James's subjects should style him king of England, the number of persons who regarded themselves as his subjects had become in fact so small that even the Italians would jestingly refer to him as "the local king".

After the accession of George III, King seems to have lost all interest in the cause of the Catholic claimant. Shortly after Sir Francis Dashwood was appointed Treasurer of the Chamber in March 1761, the Old Trumpeter sounded his felicitations to a new tune:

Amongst the congratulations of your great friends accept the sincere compliments of an old Recluse, who loves and honours you; and who without the gift of prophecy can foretell, that a few gentlemen of your character, placed about a young King, will make him as well as his people easy and happy. 20

King’s formal abandonment of Jacobitism may be said to date from September 16, 1761, when he accompanied a delegation representing the University of Oxford to present George III with a congratulatory address on his recent marriage to Princess Charlotte Sophia of Mecklenburg-Strelitz. At the Court of St. James, he was personally introduced to the King by the young Lord Shelburne. 21 When he was an undergraduate at Oxford, Shelburne, in his own words, “fell into habits with Dr. King”, whom he describes as “a Tory and Jacobite, but a gentleman and an orator.” 22 On August 4, 1761, Sir William Blackstone had assured him of King’s complete renunciation of the Jacobite cause:

I yesterday saw our Friend Dr. King, & discoursed with him on the Subject which Your Lordship gave me in Charge. The Doctor desired me to assure You, upon his Word and Honour, that he had no Attachments whatever, either public or secret, to that Cause in which the Sentiment of the World has usually ranked him as a Principal:— That he honours and sincerely loves the Character of that most respectable Person, to whom Your Lordship is with Justice so warmly and affectionately attached; and has no Scruples about

20. British Museum, MS. Eg. 2136. f.66.
21. Reports of the occasion, with the text of the addresses to the King and Queen, and Their Majesties’ gracious answers, appeared in The London Evening Post, No. 5288 (September 19–22, 1761); The London Gazette, No. 10140 (September 15–19, 1761); The St. James’s Chronicle, No. 83 (September 19–22, 1761); and The Public Advertiser, No. 8386 (September 21, 1761).
waiting on him, together with the rest of the University. But he thinks that, at his time of Life, a special and particular Introduction, to a Place where he has never before been, might occasion more Talk & Banter than his Spirits & Infirmities might now perhaps support; and it therefore requires some little Consideration on his part, before he takes & executes a Resolution so entirely new. He added, that in a short time he intends to wait on Your Lordship, at either Hanover Square, Whitton, or Wycombe; & will there discourse with You upon this Subject more at large. 23

On the following August 18, Shelburne wrote to the de facto Prime-Minister, Lord Bute, explaining that the Principal of St. Mary Hall intended going to court to kiss the King's hand:

In consequence of .... the respect he thinks due to the present King and Government, he takes the opportunity of going with the Address. I take the liberty to mention it to Your Lordship, that if the King does not think a man who has indulged himself in Republican Sentiments worse than a Jacobite, he may oblige an old, and I have reason to think, a good man, consequently a vain one, who has nothing left to ask but an exception from absolute insignificance at the end of his days. 24

After the presentation, King's relations with Shelburne remained excellent. His Lordship wrote a highly complimentary letter to the Principal of St. Mary Hall, and received the following reply, dated October 22, 1761:

You have done me great honour by yf letter, which you have been pleased to write to me, and I have had some thoughts of depositing it in yf Archives of the University as yf best testimonial I need ever desire to receive. To be praised a laudato viro is the best and truest kind of praise, and will always give a man of sense a real pleasure. I persuade my self, that I know you perfectly well, & therefore I am not insensible, how great a portion of esteem a man must necessarily derive from

23. Shelburne MSS. at Bowood, Blackstone to Shelburne, August 4, 1761.
24. Shelburne MSS. at Bowood, Shelburne to Bute, August 18, 1761.
your good opinion, especially if you are pleased to honour him with your friendship. 25

It is hardly surprising that King's presentation at court met with a certain amount of censure. In November 1761 a newspaper advertisement appeared, written by the last non-juring bishop of the regular succession, Robert Gordon, who used to reside next to his oratory on Theobald's Road, near Gray's Inn. From the small amount of contemporary evidence, it is clear that his congregation was dwindling rapidly: it is not altogether surprising that he expressed a considerable sense of anguish when King defected to the Hanoverian monarchy. The Old Trumpeter waxed angry at his words:

QUUM A POTENTISSIMIS illis viris, qui hujus Imperii res et rationes procurant, et gubernant, nulla praemia aut munera mihi petii, aut fortasse unquam exoptavi, sane quidem miror, quo malo fato natus tot inimicitias ego contraxerim, aut quae sit causa, quamobrem viri nequissimi me praecipue ex omnibus elegerint, in quem inveherentur; etiam quem accusarent graviorum criminum, et eorumdem flagitiorum, quae insani, quae perjuri, atque ut uno verbo omnia dicam, quae ipsi fecerunt et prope quotidie faciunt; ut haur suam profecto, an malus iste Deus horum hominum et calumniatorum omnium princeps et magister usque adeo maledicere et mentiri auderet. 26

25. Shelburne MSS. at Bowood, King to Shelburne, Oct. 22, 1761. Whether or not King deposited His Lordship's previous letter in the university archives, no such document survives today.

He called the advertisement infamous and inserted on purpose to defame him for no other reason "but because as a member of the University I attended my brethren, when with the whole body (our chancellor at their head) they waited on the King with an address of congratulation on his Majesty's marriage with the Princess of Mecklenburgh. I have been reviled hitherto as a Jacobite, and now I am censured for going to court." His attendance on the monarch he describes as "an act of duty, which was required from me by the body corporate of which I am a member." The appearance of the newspaper notice came as a complete surprise to him, for "it never entered into my thoughts that a nonjuring clergyman, who values himself much upon the sanctity of his manners, and with whom I had once lived in some degree of friendship, should conspire with two or three villainous attorneys, who for a small bribe would swear away any man's life, to traduce me by a public advertisement." In disparaging Bishop Gordon, King manifests the complete reversal which his political outlook had undergone. He complains that this Non-Juror would be "content to see the nation involved in a general ruin, and the extirpation of three or four millions of our people, if by that means the House of Stuart might be restored." To these remarks he adds that "the nonjurors are now become a very insignificant and contemptible party" and apropos of the gradual weakening of the barriers between Whig and Tory observes that the combination of a series of military victories and the successful conduct of public affairs "may justly be alleged as one of the principal causes of uniting many of those (however they have been distinguished by party) who are real lovers of their country."

27. Ibid., p. 190 ff.
The Principal of St. Mary Hall has sometimes been criticized by historians of the Jacobite movement for defecting from the cause, but it is only fair to admit that he remained loyal to the King over the Water for as long as, if not longer than, there was any reasonable prospect of his being restored to the throne in London. After two generations of Stuart loyalists had attempted to assert the principle of legitimate monarchy, the chances of success in 1761 were dimmer than ever before. At home, the outstanding competence of Pitt and Lord Bute was allowed by men of all political persuasions; abroad, the brilliant victories of 1759 at Lagos, Quiberon Bay, Masulipatam, and Quebec had raised even King’s confidence in the abilities of Britain’s rulers. The attitude of George III towards the Tories was far more conciliatory than that of either of his Hanoverian predecessors, and as a result Tory statesmen began to exercise a much larger influence both at court and in the affairs of parliament. The Tory leaders could hardly have felt displeased as some of the greatest Whig magnates, including the Duke of Newcastle, were obliged to resign from their offices in the household or their lord-lieutenancies in the counties. The twenty-two year old monarch was also thoroughly Anglicized: having been born and educated, for the most part, in London, he was far more British than either of the two Pretenders. While the steadily ailing King over the Water continued to hold "court" at the Palazzo Muti in Rome’s Piazza Santi Apostoli, he was not only losing the interest of many of his former supporters in the British Isles, but failing to provide adequately for the displaced aristocrats who, as expatriates, still remained part of his entourage. His heir had by this time declined, through chronic and prolonged
demoralization, into a drunken reprobate: his public altercations with
Clementina Walkinshaw, before she left him in 1760, had stimulated court
gossip throughout Europe. The only political attachment that many Tories
felt towards the end of the 1750's was for Pitt, and even King had admitted
that the party had no acknowledged leader. Under these circumstances his
tergiversation is at least understandable.

King was by no means the only personage in Oxford whose political out-
look underwent a change about this time, but he was the most conspicuous
example among the wave of political converts. The situation in the autumn
of 1762 was described succinctly in a letter by Samuel Horne of University
College in these terms:

Such a tumble of parties was surely never known before! Only
imagine to yourself Bilstone and Jenkinson, Allen and Bray united
together in support of the same interest!! As for old King, He
wonder'd what people meant by opposing the Court when such fair
advances had been made to us, and said with a grave face that He
could account for it no otherwise than by supposing that they were
Jacobites. 28

One might add that Oxford has never seen a comparable tumble of parties
since Horne wrote. The two years between 1760 and 1762 constitute the
last time in the history of the university when unanimous — or practically
unanimous — loyalty to the monarch in London could be regarded as un-
customary. The reconciliation between Oxford and the court, which took
place, broadly speaking, between 1768 and 1780, was a logical consequence

291, attributes this letter to George Horne, the Hutchinsonian. The
signature seems to me to read "S. Horne", and the heading is "Univ.
Coll. Oct. 6, 1762." On this date George Horne, Samuel's brother, was
residing at Magdalen College.
of the new fidelity to the crown implicit in Aviti Epistola.

King's other noteworthy literary endeavour of 1760 was the final compilation of his Opera. In Chapter VII the long history of the preparation of the author's collected works was traced to 1754: it now remains to complete the story. The sheets of the entire Opera, except those of Aviti Epistola ad Perillam, Virginem Scotam, were in print by that year, and yet King appears to have made no attempt to publish or to distribute the collection. The various elements of the Opera seem not to have been bound into one volume for at least another six years. The most likely reason why he continued to hesitate is to be found in the anti-Jacobite sympathies of the government. In 1754, the Eltham Plot was not far behind, and the decline of the Whig ascendancy was still some seven years in the future. King was a marked man, whose identity was well known to the authorities. The Prime-Minister was the Duke of Newcastle, whom King had ridiculed in A Key to the Fragment. Many of the other Whigs whom King had satirized in his works, in either Latin or English, held high positions in Church and State. He was demonstrating a very reasonable prudence in not publicly attaching his name to a group of works, parts of which could have been established at law to be subversive, treasonous or libellous.

The Opera was never published. A few copies may have been bound in 1760 or during the period before King's death, but it seems most likely that the majority, if not all of the surviving copies were bound after he had passed away. There are two reasons for making this postulation.
First, there is to be found in most of the surviving copies a title page which reads in part:

**OPERA**

**GUL. KING, LL.D.**

**AULAE B.M.V. APUD OXONIENSES**

**OLIM PRINCIP.**

Since King was Principal of St. Mary Hall until his death, the most likely explanation of the phrase **OLIM PRINCIP.** is that this page was not printed during his lifetime. Secondly, there is an account of the arrangements made for binding the volume provided in a letter of King's executor, Richard Bullock, dated December 18, 1799, and preserved in a copy of the Opera in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library of Yale University.

Bullock writes on the subject of the Opera:

Dr. King left 500 of this collection ready for binding; but understanding, from good authority, that he was sensible before his death of the severity (not to say more) with which he had treated most of his subjects, when they fell into my hands I resisted the temptations of Dr. King's bookseller (to whom he had devised the copy-right when this impression should have been sold) and, preserving only fifty, committed the rest to the flames. These 50 were almost immediately dispersed amongst Dr. King's old friends, with the reservation of a very few for myself and friends; so that the book, such as it is, may be deemed scarce. 30

Bullock's observation on the scarcity of this handsome quarto volume is truer today than in 1799. As far as it is possible to form an estimate, there are at the present time in various libraries and private collections

29. Where this title page occurs it is always in the form of an unsigned leaf.

30. The Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, I k 1589 + B760 Cop.1.
approximately twenty surviving copies, at least five of which are in the United States. The sequence of the contents is not always consistent. In all the copies which I have seen, the five poems which King specially revised for his proposed collected edition (Miltonis Epistola ad Pollionem; Sermo Pedestris; Scamnum, Ecloga; Templum Libertatis; and Antonietti, Corsorum Ducis, Epistola ad Corsos) come first, followed by Hydra and Monitor which were never printed separately. At the conclusion of Monitor the sequential pagination ceases. The rest of the collection consists of remainders. There is some variation of items from volume to volume, but The Toast, with or without the author's handwritten alterations, is always placed last. Some volumes also include the errata slip for the 1736 edition of The Toast and a manuscript key to the characters. Many of the head- and tail-piece illustrations were devised by William Green the Younger and engraved on copper plates by Fourdrinier. There is usually a frontispiece by Hubert Gravelot. Owing to the variations among the separate volumes of the Opera there would be little value in formulating a bibliographical description of the whole.

The surviving evidence does not by any means solve all the unanswered questions relating to the Opera. Why did King not have his speeches reset as he did in the case of his Latin poems? Why were some of his major

31. One of these is defective (Yale University, Lk K589 + B760 Cop.2).
32. Information on these continental designers and engravers may be found in Thiem and Becker's Allgemeines Lexikon Der Bildenden Künstler (Leipzig, 1912). The details are not always reliable.
speeches never printed at all? What right had Bullock to burn a very few copies short of 450, when the author had already stipulated that the copyright should be reserved for his bookseller? To these and several similar problems scholarship will probably never discover the solutions.

The fact that King had determined on the final form which his collected Latin works should take did not terminate his literary career. The Opera makes no claim to be complete. In 1761 he printed two more short Latin works: the *Elogium* on Dr. John Taylor, the oculist, and the *Epitaphium* Richardi Nash. These pieces are both remarkable in their separate ways.

King had met Taylor at Tunbridge Wells in 1758. It is indeed interesting to peruse King's character of this extraordinary individual who liked to be addressed as "Chevalier", and whom Johnson regarded as "an instance of how far impudence will carry ignorance." Perhaps he is most often remembered nowadays (if he is remembered at all) for his habit of making inflated speeches before his treatments, starting each sentence with the genitive case, and concluding with the main verb. This singular kind of therapeutic oratory he described as "the true Ciceronian, prodigiously difficult and never attempted in our language before". Despite many of the characteristics of a pompous mountebank, he possessed a not inconsiderable degree of medical expertise, as is evidenced from time to time in his publications. Among those who consulted him were many of the more prominent members of the continental aristocracy, and at home he counted Edward Gibbon and King's second cousin, Sir William Smyth of Warden, Bedfordshire, among his patients. In his *Anecdotes*, King remarked:
He seems to understand the anatomy of the eye perfectly well; he has a fine hand and good instruments, and performs all his operations with great dexterity; for the rest, Ellum homo confidens! who undertakes any thing (even impossible cases) and promises every thing. No charlatan ever appeared with fitter and more excellent talents, or to a greater advantage "34

The Elogium was probably penned in 1761, and is a curious mixture of genuine praise and compliments of a distinctly dubious nature. The earliest form of it appears in the Anecdotes, but King improved this version with some new features, and printed a few copies to oblige his friends. It appears on a folio sheet folded. In it, Taylor is described as

Caecigenorum, caecorum & caecutientium
Quotquot sunt ubique,
Spes unica, solamen, salus.

His travels in Europe are alluded to sympathetically together with his skill in languages. While many commentators regarded his "true Ciceronian" orations as sheer bombast, King described him as

Orator summus non factus, sed natus.

But immediately afterwards, there follows an odd and perhaps purposely obscure reference to his activities in the field of amatory endeavour:

Vultu compto, corpore procero, fronte urbana gloriosus,
Ingenioque praeeditus prope singulare,
Artem amandi, et amoris remedium
Plenius et melius Nasone ipso
Edidicit, docuit, exercuit.

Sometimes it is difficult to tell whether King is sincere or not. Statements of the following kind seem to me to have a definite tongue-in-cheek

quality:

Mirificus fabulator, magnificus promissor,
Rerum copia, artiumque varietate abundans,
Sese exhibet, effert, praedicit
In gymnasiis, in gynaeceis, in conviviis, in triviis;
Philosophando gloriam magnam adeptus,
Maximam saltando.

Or again, on the subject of Taylor's wealth, King seems purposely to leave ample opportunity for differences of interpretation:

Praemia, dona, permulta, amplissima acceptit;
Permulta corrasit, pecuniae appetentior:
Et nundum, eheu! locupletatur.

The statement made by King in the Anecdotes that Taylor entreated him to publish this effort, conceiving that it would do him honour, could at least cause some eyebrow raising. Did Taylor realize that some of King's flattery was written with a double entendre? Or did he feel that a certain notoriety would promote his fame? It is possible that, having been the subject of many satires, including the ballad opera The Operator of 1740, he may have decided to turn a blind eye to a few more mild jibes in Latin. But at least King's opinion of Taylor was higher than Johnson's.

Though the Principal of St. Mary Hall had mixed feelings on the subject of the oculist chevalier, the same is certainly not true in the case of his attitude to Beau Nash. I do not know of any derogatory comment that King ever made concerning the Monarch of Bath and Tunbridge Wells, bar one or two brief allusions to what he regarded as pardonable faults. The earliest reference to Nash in King's writings occurs in The Dreamer, where he is called "the greatest monarch in Europe". The author thus expatiates on this appellation:
For, although he is possessed of absolute power, he governs with universal esteem, and by the unanimous consent of a warlike and opulent nation. During the course of a long reign (of more than forty years) he has convinced the whole world, that he would have been worthy of empire, si non imperasset. He has never committed any acts of violence or oppression. His taxations have been very moderate, and he has required no other subsidies, than what have been just necessary for the service of his government. He has promulgated no laws or ordinances, but such, as are evidently calculated to promote the welfare and happiness of his people, maintain decency and order, and encrease all innocent diversions. I must further add, that this excellent monarch hath greatly embellished his seat of empire with many magnificent monuments, erected at his own expence. His citizens have followed his example. Several new streets have been lately built; and this place is at present one of the most beautiful cities in EUROPE. So that Mr. NASH may say of BATH, what AUGUSTUS said of ROME, a little before his death, Lateritiam invenii; marmoream reliqui. When he shall have finished his last act, he may likewise demand a PLAUDITOS; but with much more reason and justice, than the ROMAN Emperor.

These were King's opinions in 1754, and they did not alter.

Richard Nash died on February 3, 1761, at the age of eighty-seven. King must have composed his Epitaphium shortly afterwards, for it seems to have been in print by the following April 2. On that day he wrote to Sir Francis Dashwood, in language that implies that a copy is enclosed with his letter:

35. The Dictionary of National Biography gives the date of his death as February 3, 1762: this is a mistake. It is repeated in the Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, where Sir Harold Williams postulated that Nash's epitaph was printed in the year before his death. On the details of Nash's burial see Willard Connely, Beau Nash (London: Werner Laurie, 1955), pp. 170ff.
Some years ago I promised Nash, that if I survived him, I would write his Epitaph. If he had died sooner, before my own faculties were so much impaired, the picture would probably have been better drawn. 36

Two settings of the Epitaphium were printed under King's purview: both are now rare. One is on a folio sheet folded: the text covers three unnumbered pages and the last page is blank. There is no imprint. The other setting is in the form of a booklet: it contains eight pages, of which the last is blank, and bears the imprint of C. Pope and J. Leake in Bath. 37 There are no essential differences in the text of the two settings. The Epitaphium was reprinted by Oliver Goldsmith in his biography, The Life of Richard Nash, which appeared in 1762, again twelve years later in Edward Popham's Selecta Poemata Anglorum Latina, and once more by Richard Warner in his Modern History of Bath of 1801. In addition to the Latin text, Goldsmith also provided his readers with a more or less literal translation: he did not indicate whether or not this vernacular rendering was his own.

In an age when florid Latin epithalamia were almost de rigeur for the mighty and the prominent, King's elaborate tribute to Nash, a hundred lines in length, excelled in grandeur many which had been composed in memory of sovereign rulers. Judged as a piece of literature, it exhibits a degree

36. British Museum, MS. Eg. 2136. f.66.

37. An example of the text in three pages is in the Bodleian Library, MS. D.D. Dashwood (Bucks), J. 6/2. Two of the best preserved copies of the seven page text are in the Bath Municipal Library, Bath Pamphlets B 920, NAS No. 2343, and the Library of the State University of Iowa, f. CT788. N33K5.
of elegance which, within its compass, would be difficult to surpass.

Even though Nash had been born obscuro loco (actually Swansea) and of mean ancestors (nullis ortus majoribus), he was exalted by his epitaphist as an example to kings and, as a lawmaker, superior to Solon and Lycurgus. Besides endowing Bath with incomparable benefits, he also ordered well his "celebrated province" of Tunbridge Wells:

Quam admirabili consilio et ratione
Per se, non unquam per legatos, administravit;
Eam quotannis invisere dignatus,
Et apud provinciales, quod necesse fuit,
Solitus manere.

He was not personally a seeker of regal splendour; instead of wearing a crown, he was content to be distinguished by a large, white hat:

In tanta fortuna
Neque fastu turgidus Rex incessu patuit,
Neque, tyrannorum more, se jussit coli;
Aut amplos honores, titulosque sibi arrogavit;
Sed cuncta insignia, etiam regium diadema rejiciens,
Caput contentus fuit ornare
GALERO ALBO,
Manifesto animi sui candoris signo. 38

Nash's other generally accepted virtues are alluded to with deference: though he was a provider of pleasures, he conducted them with gravity and decorum, repressing licentiousness severely, and preventing obscenity from

38. The Intendants in The Dreamer wear white hats. Though King's feelings towards them were far from sympathetic, he may have been influenced by the headgear of Nash. William Hoare's portrait of Nash galero albo hangs at present in the Pump Room at Bath. It is reproduced as the frontispiece of A. Barbeau, Life and Letters at Bath in the Eighteenth Century (London: William Heinemann, 1904) and in the Book of Bath (1925), p. 68.
offending the modesty of the fair sex. With no enemies of any significance, he was a friend to rich and poor alike. He possessed the happy secret of uniting the vulgar and the great, the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant. Despite the fact that his power was limitless, liberty never flourished more than under his rule. He had faults, but they were venial:

QUICQUID peccaverit,
(Nam peccamus omnes)
In seipsum magis, quam in alios,
Et errore, et imprudentia magis quam scelere, aut improbitate,
Peccavit;
Nusquam vero ignoratione decori, aut honesti,
Neque ita quidem usquam,
Ut non veniam ab humanis omnibus
Facile impetrari.

The final section constitutes a graceful threnody in melopoeic periods. It also provides a fitting climax to a work generously studded with rhetorical ornaments. In the finale, it may be noticed that anaphora occurs in the second, third, and fourth lines, and that the second and third lines also constitute isocolon. The seventh line is an example of brachylogia.

TALEM virum, tantumque ademptum
Lugeant Musae, Charitesque!
Lugeant Veneres, Cupidinesque!
Lugeant omnes juvenum et nympharum chori!
Tu vero, O BATHONIA,
Ne cesses tuum lugere
Principem, praecptorem, amicum, patronum;
Heu, heu, nunquam posthac
Habitura parem!

Whether or not this extended eulogy was justifiable depends largely on the degree of greatness which can reasonably be attributed to Beau Nash.
In this matter one should not be misled by the hosts of obituary writers who produced "characters" of Nash during the year or so after his death, many of whom were hoping principally to distinguish themselves in the reflected glory of this particular arbiter elegantiarum. On the whole, the sentiments contained in King's epitaph seem to be those of the majority of persons who knew Nash in life, though even some of his most ardent admirers might well have felt reservations about this lofty proposal:

Hujus vitae morumque exemplar
Si caeteri reges, regulique,
Et quotquot sunt regnorum praefecti,
Imitarentur;
(Utiam! iterumque utinam!)
Et ipsi essent beati,
Et cunctae orbis regiones beatissimae.

Goldsmith, in The Life of Richard Nash, provided the most influential answer to King's suggestion: "To set him up, as some do, for a pattern of imitation, is wrong, since all his virtues received a tincture from the neighbouring folly; to denounce peculiar judgements against him is equally unjust, as his faults raise rather our mirth than our detestation. He was fitted for the station in which fortune placed him." Goldsmith considered that no great abilities were needed to fill this station; King felt the opposite.

In attempting to determine whether King or Goldsmith was nearer to the truth, the literary historian should take into account the qualifications which both of these writers possessed in relation to their common subject. King had visited Bath intermittently over a long period of time, and could draw on a considerable fund of personal knowledge concerning his subject. Goldsmith, on the other hand, probably never set eyes on Nash, and wrote his biography primarily to pay for his expenses in the city, which he visited
for the first time in 1762. The Life of Richard Nash was essentially a piece of hackwork produced for John Newbery, the bookseller, in return for which the thirty-three year old author received fourteen guineas. King's epitaph was clearly a labour of love. If the Old Trumpeter's estimate appears unduly sympathetic, Goldsmith's is, in places, disagreeably condescending, as in his description of Nash as "a weak man governing weaker subjects". Neither writer was impartial, but it would be difficult to deny convincingly that King wrote with the greater authority.

Some time after Nash had been buried beneath the south nave of Bath Abbey, King's epitaph to him, engraved on a large slab of marble, was laid on the floor over the coffin. It is not normally visible today, for when the whole of the nave was fitted with permanent pews and wooden flooring, most of the memorials on the nave floor were covered over. There is on the south aisle wall not far from the tomb an epitaph to Nash composed in the early 1790's by Dr. Henry Haringten: compared to King's composition, it is of pygmy proportions. When King came to compose the introduction to his own epitaph, he commented of the one to Nash:

I promised NASH, a few years before he died, that if I survived him, I would write his epitaph. I performed my promise, and in my description of this extraordinary phenomenon, I think I have written nothing but the truth; one thing I omitted, which I did not reflect on until after the epitaph was printed, that a statue had been erected to him whilst he was living; and this great honour had been conferred on him with more justice than to any other of his contemporaries or brother kings. 39

After 1761 the Principal of St. Mary Hall published nothing. But during the infirmities of his seventy-sixth year, to beguile the languor of the sickroom, he wrote his last book, which did not appear in print until 1818, sixty-five years after his death. It was then issued by the house of John Murray under the title *Political and Literary Anecdotes of His Own Times*, edited by Philip Bury Duncan. A second edition, the most recent, appeared in 1819, and is completely reset. This short work, covering a little over 250 pages, consists of detached pieces of table-talk, on the whole pleasantly written. Its special significance consists in the fact that it contains stories and opinions about prominent figures of King's own time which are not found in the works of any other author, and also some original criticisms of the Latin poets. Most of the anecdotes are written in English, but there is also an engaging trifle in Latin entitled *Somnium Academici Alterum*.

The character of the Young Chevalier provided by King in this book has already been discussed. Another anecdote, with Pope as the subject, has a peculiar value, since it is not referred to or mentioned in any of the published biographies of that poet. King writes:

POPE and I, with my Lord ORRERY and Sir HARRY BEDINGFIELD, dined with the late Earl of BURLINGTON. After the first course POPE grew sick, and went out of the room. When dinner was ended, and the cloth removed, my Lord BURLINGTON said he would go out, and see what was become of POPE. And soon after they returned together. But POPE, who had been casting up his dinner, looked very pale, and complained much. My Lord asked him if he would have some mulled wine or a glass of old sack, which Pope refused. I told my Lord BURLINGTON that he wanted a dram. Upon which the little man expressed some resentment against me, and said he would not taste any spirits, and that he abhorred drams as much as I did. However I persisted, and assured my Lord BURLINGTON that he could not oblige our friend more at that instant than by
ordering a large glass of cherry-brandy to be set up before him. This was done, and in less than half an hour, while my Lord was acquainting us with an affair which engaged our attention, POPE had sipped up all the brandy. POPE's frame of body did not promise long life; but he certainly hastened his death feeding much on high-seasoned dishes, and drinking spirits. 40

Having put forward the suggestion, which is neither provable nor disprovable, that POPE's early death was caused partly by alcohol, the teetotal author proceeds a few pages further on to suggest that SWIFT's troubles in his later years were not improved by the same addiction. The events which King describes presumably took place in the Deanery of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, and its garden:

The last time I dined with Dean SWIFT, which was about three years before he fell into that distemper which totally deprived him of his understanding, I observed, that he was affected by the wine which he drank, about a pint of claret. The next morning, as we were walking together in his garden, he complained much of his head, when I took the liberty to tell him (for I most sincerely loved him) that I was afraid he drank too much wine. He was a little startled, and answered, "that as to his drinking he had always looked on himself as a very temperate man; for he never exceeded the quantity which his physician allowed and prescribed him." Now his physician never drank less than two bottles of claret after his dinner. 41

Scattered throughout the book are anecdotes relating to the Earl of Chesterfield, the Duke of Wharton, Lord Bath, Lord Gower, the Duke of Buckingham, Bishop Butler of Durham, Bishop Burnett of Salisbury, and many other prominent contemporaries. Some of the most mordant sentiments in the book are reserved for Sir Robert Walpole:

40. Ibid., p. 12f.

41. Ibid., p. 16.
He unhinged all the principles and morals of our people, and changed the government into a system of corruption. He openly ridiculed virtue and merit, and promoted no man to any employment of profit or honour, who had scruples of conscience, or refused implicitly to obey his commands ..... 42

One anecdote provides an interesting, though perhaps exaggerated, side-light on the problem of tipping servants:

The CUSTOM of giving money to servants is now become such a grievance, that it seems to demand the interposition of the legislature to abolish it. How much are foreigners astonished, when they observe that a man cannot dine at any house in England, not even with his father or his brother, or with any other of his nearest relations, or most intimate friends and companions, unless he pay for his dinner! But how can they behold without indignation or contempt a man of quality standing by his guests, while they are distributing money to a double row of his servants? If, when I am invited to dine with any of my acquaintance, I were to send the master of the house a sirloin of beef for a present, it would be considered as a gross affront; and yet as soon as I shall have dined, or before I leave the house, I must be obliged to pay for the sirloin, which was brought to his table, or placed on the sideboard ..... Suppose there were written in large gold letters over the door of every man of rank: THE FEES FOR DINING HERE ARE THREE HALF CROWNS OR TEN SHILLINGS TO BE PAID TO THE PORTER ON ENTERING THE HOUSE: PEERS OR PEERESSES TO PAY WHAT MORE THEY THINK PROPER. By this regulation two inconveniences would be avoided: first, the difficulty of distinguishing amongst a great number, the quality of the servants. I, who am near-sighted, have sometimes given the footman what I designed for the butler, and the butler has had only the footman's fee: for which the butler treated me with no small contempt, until an opportunity offered of correcting my error. But secondly, this method would prevent the shame which every master of a family cannot help feeling whilst he sees his guests giving about their shillings and half-crowns to the servants ..... 43

The small details which emerge in connection with the author's own personality help the reader to form a clearer idea of the man himself. He

42. Ibid., pp. 39f.
43. Ibid., pp. 50-55.
had appeared in The Toast to be interested in lesbianism and at the same
time repulsed by it, but in the Anecdotes he not inconsistently expressed
his admiration for clerical celibacy. "I have often wished that the
canons which forbid priests to marry were still in force", he wrote.
"Chastity certainly adds a grace and dignity to their function ... To the
celibacy of the bishops we owe almost all those noble foundations which are
established in both our Universities." And his extraordinary sensitivity
to the Latin authors is revealed especially clearly in his disarming
admissions of his own responses to them. Thus in regard to Horace he
confessed, "I could never read the first stanza in the Carmen Seculare
without falling into a fit of devotion", and the story of Ceyx and Halcyone
in Ovid's Metamorphoses, he disclosed, "I never read without weeping."
In view of such acknowledgements, one can fully accept the ingenuousness of
his declaration: "I have a veneration for VIRGIL: I admire HORACE: but I
love OVID." 45

While Wink was recording these confessions of his literary partialities,
the consciousness of his own approaching death was impinging upon him. His
son, Charles, had already been buried. His daughter, Dorothy, died on
June 21, 1761, and was interred five days later in Ealing churchyard. 46
Ill health continued to plague him. He took no official part in the
installation of the Earl of Litchfield as the new Chancellor of the Univer-

44. Ibid., pp. 186f.
45. Ibid., p. 30
46. The date of her interment is given as June 26, 1761, in the Register of
Burials of the parish church of St. Mary, Ealing. She is described
simply as "wife of William Melmoth, Esqr."
sity of Oxford on October 5, 1762. On the following April 1, he
wrote to Sir Francis Dashwood in a quavering hand:

I have been confined for three months past to my chambers & chiefly to my bed by a fever, tormented during the same time by fits of stone & gravel. I am now slowly recovering, and 'tis only within a few days past, that I have endeavoured to use my pen. 47

The Principal of St. Mary Hall delivered his last oration on July 8, 1763, at the conclusion of that year's Encaenia. As usual, the four festal days in the Sheldonian Theatre had been replete with music and Latin declamations. On the morning that King spoke, Handel's anthem Zadok the Priest had been performed, and the Old Trumpeter could at last associate himself fully with its iterations of "God Save the King". Two brief accounts of the speech survive. One is in Jackson's Oxford Journal, couched in a manner similar to that of the 1759 oration:

... the whole Solemnity of this Grand Encaenia was closed by Dr. King, Principal of St. Mary Hall, who in a most spirited and elegant Oration, delivered with a Grace and Dignity, which notwithstanding his acknowledged Powers, could scarce be expected from a Gentleman in his 79th Year, enlarged on the salutary Effects arising from a general Peace; complimented his Majesty for his particular Regard to Arts, to Literature, and to the University of Oxford; and, after taking a most affectionate Farewell of the Youth of this Place, concluded with a polite Address to the Chancellor. 48

The other account is contained in a letter written from Balliol College on the following August 1 by Charles Godwyn to John Hutchins.

47. Bodleian Library, MS. D.D. Dashwood (Bucks.), B. 11/10/7.
48. Jackson's Oxford Journal, No. 532 (July 9, 1763). The mention of "a general Peace" refers to the conclusion of the Seven Years' War with the Treaty of Paris.
Dr. King spoke in a strain very different from anything which we had heard from him before: but his strength and memory, and the applause which he received, were just the same as usual. The purport of his Speech was this: 'that we had gained great honour by acting with steadiness and integrity in a time of general corruption: and that now, without any alteration in our conduct, we had the happiness of being in some degree of favour with a Prince, who is one of the best that ever lived.' He said, 'it was his happiness that he was born an Englishman; and he reckoned it an additional circumstance of happiness that he was Oxoniensis.' That we may not grow vain upon these compliments, Churchill [i.e. Charles Churchill] is to apply, by way of remedy, a little cooling satire. A large dose of it is prepared for the Chancellor, and Lord Despenser, and Sir John Phillips, and Jack Burton. How Dr. King is to escape, I don't know. Churchill expressed great approbation for his manner of speaking; but from the notes which were taken down in writing, we apprehend, that there is a great deal laid up in store, and to be applied by way of correction. 49

The "little cooling satire" appeared in Churchill's poem The Candidate, published in the same year. It was little enough: two lines only, addressed to the actor Garrick:

King shall arise, and, bursting from the dead,  
Shall hurl his piebald Latin at thy head. 50

King's last surviving letter, dated September 7, 1763, is largely an endorsement of the policy of George III. It constitutes an answer to an earlier letter from Sir Francis Dashwood, in which King had been told of the severe demands which a group of politicians close to the monarch were making in opposition to the terms of the Treaty of Paris. The reply from St. Mary Hall could hardly have been more indulgent to the reigning Hanoverian:


If his M. should not have firmitude enough to
reject these demands, he would hereafter have no
more power than a Doge of Venice, and the people
would be governed by an oligarchy, which history &
our own experience have taught us, is ye worst species
of tyranny. 51

In the same letter King offered his hopes to Sir Francis that they
would meet again, "before I go to Bath". His health continued to
deteriorate, though he decided to undertake the journey. Despite the
fact that he had earlier in his life expressed doubts on the medical
efficacy of the spa waters, he presumably still felt that he could obtain
some therapeutic benefit from another visit. In this respect his
attitude towards taking the waters was no different from that of Pope and
a hundred other distinguished visitors: grumbling could well have had
cathartic benefits. Whether he should have made the journey across
England in the depth of winter is more problematical. He left St. Mary
Hall after the Christmas Gaudy (or so the Butterly Book entries would seem
to indicate) and died at Bath, at the age of seventy-eight, on December
30, 1763. During the following days his body was carried back
by coach to Ealing, where his funeral took place, in St. Mary's Church,
six days after his death. 52

The obituary which appeared

51. British Museum, MS. Eg. 2136, f.67. This opposition was quite futile:
    the treaty had already been signed by Great Britain and France on the
    previous February 10.

52. According to the Register of Burials of St. Mary's Church, Ealing, the
date was January 5, 1764. Most of the eighteenth century tombstones
in the churchyard are now defaced or have been moved. Only a small
number of memorials from the interior of the church which was opened
for divine service on Trinity Sunday, 1740, were incorporated into the
present building, the greater part of which dates from 1866. Today
there is no tombstone or memorial to King at Ealing.
in Jackson's Oxford Journal was brief but dignified. King was "the oldest Head of a House in Oxford", and, the writer continued, "a Gentleman whose Character in the polite and literary World is too well known to need any Encomium; and who was universally allowed to be the most celebrated Orator in all Europe." 53

Shortly after King's demise, the lease of Ealing Rectory was purchased from his estate manager by Thomas Bramley of East Acton and Thomas Harrington of Old Brentford. 54 It is perhaps appropriate to add that this edifice, of which King for most of his life had been the lessee, was subsequently to have an extraordinary history as the principal building of Great Ealing School. Under the former rectory roof, at various times, such diverse figures as John Henry Newman and his brother Francis, Thackeray, Sir William Gilbert (who rose to be head boy), Captain Marryat, Thomas Huxley (whose father was a member of the staff), Bishop Selwyn, Sir Henry Rawlinson, Lord Lawrence, Sir Henry Lawrence, Lord Truro, Richard Westmacott, Sir Robert Sale, William Hicks Pasha, and dozens of lesser lights, all received part of their education. Today, thanks to the activities of the death watch beetle, there remains of Ealing rectory not a stone upon a stone.


54. Thomas Faulkner, op. cit., p. 177. Edith Jackson, op. cit., gives the name of the second purchaser as Thomas Harrison.
In addition to the enemies whom King acquired during his lifetime, one other person was made indignant by the announcement of his decease. He was Charles Jennens of Gopsall in Leicestershire. Thereby hangs a tale. Exactly seventeen years to the day before King's expiration, on December 30, 1746, Edward Holdsworth, Jacobite, neo-Latin poet, classical scholar, and designer of the New Buildings in the Palladian style at Magdalen College, Oxford, had passed away, and a few days later was buried in the parish church of Coleshill in Warwickshire. Charles Jennens, another Oxford Jacobite, friend of Handel and patron of the arts, one whose grand style of living caused him to be known as "Solyman the Magnificent", was so much an admirer of Holdsworth that he erected an Ionic temple to his memory in the grounds of Gopsall Hall, and had his exhumed body brought there from Coleshill. In this small building he decided to place a cenotaph with a Latin inscription extolling the not inconsiderable virtues of his departed hero. Who better to write the inscription than William King? Jennens, since his undergraduate days at Balliol, had been acquainted with the Doctor, and not long after Holdsworth's death approached him with a view to obtaining a suitable epitaph. For some reason which cannot now be ascertained, King did not comply with this request, but promised, or so Jennens afterwards maintained, that he would compose an appropriate inscription in the future. For over a decade and a half Jennens waited, with growing impatience, but King's Latin sentiments on Holdsworth were never forthcoming. After the Doctor had died, the now thoroughly disgruntled Jennens was forced to write the inscription himself, but to prove to his temple pilgrims that the long delay was none of his
fault, he added, lower on the cenotaph beneath a bust of Holdsworth, a second inscription of an explanatory nature. King is not named, but Jennens's despair at his long procrastination is made amply evident:

E. HOLDSWORTH, natus 1684, mortuus 1746. Inscriptio nem praestolatus usque ad 1764. Miraris forsan, Lector, nec immerito, hunc omni laude dignissimum virum sine saxo et sine nomine corpus jamdiu jacuisse!

Verum iste Regulus, qui Eloquium pollicebatur, dum per plures annos Oratibus vel Oratiunculis et Versibus Satyrico-Politicis, scribendi, dicendi, et agendi, suo denique suapisius Elogio inanem sibi gloriam aucupatur, Famae interim melioris oblitus, amicis quam dederat fidem feellit. Quod Genius diu solictatus negavit, promissit enim, nec tamen praestitit, id demum impar quidem conatui, sed indignata praestat Amicitia. 55

The temple collapsed in 1835 and Gopsall Hall was demolished in 1947, but the cenotaph, with its twin inscriptions to honour Holdsworth and to dishonour King, still stands in the grounds.

Before the interment at Ealing, King's heart, at his own request, was taken from his body, enclosed in a marble vase, and returned to St. Mary Hall. Later, the vase was set in the north wall of the chapel, over

55. The text is printed in John Nichols, op.cit.ult., Vol.III, pp. 69f. Additional relevant information appears on p.126. Jennens's present reputation in the musical world is due largely to his being the author of the words of Handel's oratorios Saul and Belshazzar, and the compiler of the scriptural passages in the Messiah.
the epitaph which he had composed for himself. The engraving of this epitaph could not have been carried out with any great urgency, for on April 2, 1764, Charles Godwyn wrote again to John Hutchins,

Dr. King's picture is just put up in the Picture-galley, and placed, by his desire, next to Butler's. His heart is to be lodged in the Chapel at St. Mary Hall, with an inscription which he drew up himself. The most remarkable part of it is this: Persmultos habui amicos, at veros, stabiles, gratos (quae fortasse est gentis culpa) perpaucissimos. Plures habui inimicos, sed invidios, sed improbos, sed inhumanos. This, and the whole of it, might, I think, very well have been omitted.

The exact date of the erection of this monument is now unascertainable.

The text of King's epitaph was published first by Edward Popham, and has since been reprinted several times. The monument itself remained in the chapel until the merger with Oriel College took place on the death, in the summer vacation of 1902, of the last Principal of the Hall, Dr. Drummond Chase. It was then taken down and reset in the west wall of the

56. Some authors (e.g., John Nichols) have written of a "silver case", though there is no evidence that King's heart ever rested in any receptacle other than the closed marble urn which may still be seen at the present time. The date of composition, pridie Nonas Junii, die natali Georgii III, MDCCCLXXII, is given on the actual inscription.


chapel of Oriel College. There are slight variations in the printed versions of the epitaph; the text in the Anecdotes reads thus:

FUI
GUILIELMUS KING, LL.D.
Ab Anno MDCCXIX ad annum MDCCCLX
Aulae B.M.V. in Academia Oxon. Praefectus.
Literis humanioribus a puerro deditus,
Eas usque ad supremum vitae diem colui.
Neque vitiis carui, neque virtutibus,
Imprudens et improvidus, comis et benevolus;
Saepe aequo iracundior,
Haud unquam, ut essem implacabilis.
A luxuria pariter ac avaritia
(Quam non tam vitium,
Quam mentis insanitatem esse duxi)
Prorsus abhorreens,
Cives, hospites, peregrinos
Omnino liberaliter accepi;
ipse et cibi abstinentior, et vini abstinentissimus.
Cum magnis vixi, cum plebeiis, cum omnibus,
Ut homines noscerem, ut meipsum imprimis:
Neque, eheu, novi!
Permultos habui amicos,
At veros, stabiles, gratos
(Quae fortasse est gentis culpa)
Perpaucissimos.
Plures habui inimicos,
Sed invidos, sed improbos, sed inhumanos:
Quorum nullis tamen injurialis
Perinde commotus fui,
Quam deliquis meis.
Summam, quam adeptus sum, senectutem
Neque optavi, neque accusavi.
Vitae incommoda neque immediate ferens,
Neque commodis nimium contentus:
Mortem neque contempsi,
Neque metui.

DEUS OPTIME,
Qui hunc orbem et humanas res curas,
Miserere animae meae!

On the actual monument, the third line of the epitaph appears as

Ab anno MDCCXIX ad annum MDCCCLXIV.
No satisfactory explanation can at present be offered for the discrepancies in the date of King's terminating the principalship of St. Mary Hall. He was still Principal when he died: the correct date of termination should therefore be 1763. The dates 1760 and 1764 are both impossible.

In comparison to the amorphous and flattering generalities in which most epitaphs of the time were couched, King's is unusually frank and self-critical. It gives the impression of being phrased in terms as candid as its maker could formulate. From 1722, when he had rashly contested the university seat in Parliament with his senior colleague Sir George Clark, he had on various occasions shown signs of the side of his nature which was *imprudens et improvidus*, witness especially the long lawsuit in Ireland which led him to write *The Toast*. The fact that he was also *saepe aequo iracundior* almost inevitably led him into a long series of controversies which continued despite the fact that he was *haud unquam implacabilis*. To these personal shortcomings should be added his tendency to blame others on questionable premisses, illustrated by his lamenting that his very small number of *amicos veros*, *stabiles*, *gratos* was *fortasse gentis culpa*. That he could claim not to have despised or feared death may well be a reflection of what he wrote in 1755 among the concluding lines of his Apology:

\[
\text{Attamen aequo animo, non ullis rebus egens,} \\
\text{Non inhonoratus vixi} \ldots .
\]

With his heart in its marble urn and his epitaph engraved and erected, the career of William King was, properly speaking, ended. But it had a
strange and prolonged epilogue. For well nigh a century and a half
afterwards, in fact until St. Mary Hall ceased to exist as an institution,
gentlemen whose rooms were close to the chapel would sometimes be woken up
during the night by the eerie sound of beating which came from the
direction of the marble urn in the chapel. Writers on the subject offered
various explanations of this bizarre phenomenon, but none with more
authority than Dr. Lancelot Phelps, who was Provost of Oriel College from
1914 to 1929. In a letter to John McGrath, Provost of Queen's College,
of February 15, 1916, Phelps discusses the marble vase, and then continues:

As to the heart, let me add a reminiscence. It was always
held that so restless and so turbulent was King's life that
after his death the heart went on beating in its vase. Now
it so happened that when I lived in St. Mary Hall the head of
my bed abutted on the wall in a recess in which the vase stood.
Rarely, if ever, did I go to bed without hearing a sound as of
tapping on the wall, the origin of which I could find nothing to
explain, except the action of the heart. More than that,
shortly after I had left the rooms, I met my successor in them
and expressed the hope that he was comfortable. "Yes," he said,
in every way - but did you ever hear a curious kind of tapping
on the wall near your bedhead?"
"But", I said, "you know what that is?"
"Indeed, I do not, and cannot imagine."
"That is the heart of Dr. King."
Can further proof be needed of the truth of the tradition?59

The Reverend Dr. Phelps, in his day an acknowledged expert on the history
of poor law administration, was not regarded as a superstitious man, or
as one given to credulity. When he died in 1936, his opinion on the
subject of the heart in the urn was still unchanged. The question of
whether he was right or wrong is best left to historians of psychic
phenomena, for now that St. Mary Hall is no more, the Old Trumpeter's heart
has finally ceased to beat.

Oxford, it has sometimes been said, is the home of lost causes.

William King was one of those persons who have contributed to whatever truth this aphorism possesses. Through no fault of his own, he devoted most of his energies for the greater part of his life to a political cause which proved to be a failure and which he himself finally came to abandon. It does not by any means follow that his life’s work may therefore be dismissed as of no consequence. His writings exerted at least some influence in learned circles in his own time, and would probably be more widely read today, were it not for the decline in the educational importance of the classics.¹ His significance would seem to be fourfold. First, he was by general consent the leader of the Jacobite party in Oxford and England’s most forceful literary polemicist for the Jacobite viewpoint. Secondly, he was one of the most artistically competent writers of Latin in the eighteenth century, a language which he could wield with an

exceptional degree of grace, clarity, and fluency. Thirdly, he is noteworthy as a humorist, satirist, and allegorist, in both the Latin and English languages, and Fourthly, through his connections with such figures as Swift and Pope, he is memorable for the minor, though not wholly unimportant part which he played in the history of English literature.

Vigorous and dedicated though they were, his purely political activities have now only a historical interest. If the cause of Jacobitism were ever to be revived in the future, his efforts on its behalf would perhaps be reassessed in a more favourable light, but since none of the Stuart claimants since the theoretical accession of Charles Emmanuel IV of Sardinia in 1807 has made any attempt to regain the power to which, it could be argued, he is de jure entitled, the possibility that King's thinking will ever again be politically important seems remote. The present Stuart claimant, His Royal Highness Duke Albert of Bavaria, who was staunchly anti-Nazi and spent most of the Second World War in Ravensbrück concentration camp, has indicated that he is not interested in reviving the Jacobite cause. His predecessor, Crown Prince Rupert of Bavaria, was visited shortly after the First World War by Lieutenant-Colonel Stewart Roddie, and showed himself to be of a similar mind. Said Roddie:

"You - you are the direct heir through the Stuarts to the throne of England. You are the 'King across the Water'."

"How did you know?" he asked with some interest.

"Because I heard no less a person than His Majesty King George of England himself say so," I said.

"Oh! He knows? ... Well," he added laughingly, "if you have the opportunity, please assure His Majesty from me that I have no intention of pressing my claim." 2

King's principal achievement was literary, and his best work was written in Latin. The English works are either too slight or too ephemeral to lend themselves to serious literary criticism, and the smaller macaronic productions are more in the nature of oddities, entertaining in themselves, but not especially rewarding to the critic. The Toast, though also an oddity, is in a class by itself: it cannot appropriately be considered with any of the author's other works, but invites separate treatment.

Very little modern criticism applied to neo-Latin poetry and prose has appeared in print. Even today, there is no treatment of Latin and neo-Latin literature comparable to David Daiches's Critical History of English Literature. A.E. Housman remarked in 1892 that no rightminded man would go to a classical scholar for judgements on literature: the kind of academic mentality which led him to make that comment has by no means disappeared.

But an evaluative approach to the works of William King or any comparable Anglo-Latin writer is surely possible, and it seems to me that the critic may proceed in two different ways. One method is to judge the author's output by classical standards of criticism, using the principles of such authorities as Cicero, the anonymous author of the Rhetorica ad C. Herennium, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Quintillian, and Longinus, and he may augment these with the kind of theory to be found in the works of Renaissance scholars such as Erasmus, Petrus Mosellanus, Melanchthon, Juan Luis de Vives, and Daniel and Nicolaus Heinsius. That is to say, he may regard his subject's product as an extension of the Latin language into the modern period, bearing constantly in mind the fact that criticism of Latin literature is relevant only if measured against what the best writers of that language were intent to put
into their literature, and not against what modern vernacular authors strive to put into theirs. His procedure will be essentially that of the classical critics, who regarded good style, in its broadest sense, as the touchstone of the literary artist. The second method available to the modern critic consists in the evaluation of neo-Latin poetry and prose as a part of the literature of England, reflecting strongly the conditions of the age in which it was produced, and showing the influence of other authors who wrote entirely or mainly in the vernacular. Since these two procedures are to some extent complementary, it is appropriate first to comment on the purely stylistic aspects of King's Latin works before the second and broader approach is discussed.

William King was a consummate Latinist. Probably the most conspicuous characteristic of his latinity, despite the objections of John Burton and his ilk, is the purity of his classical diction. True, he exhibits the kinds of shortcomings that were the result of imperfect scholarship in his own day: there are occasional examples of unclassical orthography, and, like most other neo-Latinists, he invents questionable neologisms now and again. But these cases are exceptional. On the whole, King's grammatical, syntactical, and metrical correctness are remarkable, and they still remain so when his prosody is considered in the light of the work of modern theorists. 3 A few of the prosodical

devices which he employed have been indicated with examples: anaphora, asyndeton, and isocolon amongst them. These and similar embellishments are used by the poet with some frequency: they add considerably to the elegant and elaborate character of his high style. In keeping with practically all writers of neo-Latin in his time, King regarded such ornaments as far more integral than most modern authors conceive them to be. In this respect he was in the tradition of the humanists who conceived of Latin style largely in terms of the traditional figures of speech. Of these, approximately two hundred were recognized at the time when the Renaissance critics were writing, though individual authorities differed among themselves as to the scope and number of the figures, their relative importance, and the manner of their division into tropes and schemes.

Perhaps the most pervasive of the figures used by King is the species of hyperbaton known as anastrophe: there are examples of it throughout his Latin poetry and prose. Examples could be given ad nauseam, most of which would merely corroborate the fact that his word order is as a rule more artistically effective than the normal order would be. Very rightly, King's usual tendency is to put his strongest words at the end of the sentence, but he does not invariably employ this procedure. Metrical convenience sometimes
appears to have been a determinant, and, in a few other instances, the reader is deliberately surprised. Thus in Monitor, after Aulicus has been lecturing Aulus for some time with considerable severity, the reader is pleasantly jolted by this example of apoplectic:

Si modo desieris, monitusque HEROA, DUCEMQUE —
AUL. Aulice, quo properas, horrenda, extrema minatus
Indigno?

Parallelism of expression is in King's verse, as in that of Vergil, one of the principal means of obtaining a heightened and sonorous quality. This effect is achieved with an especial degree of leisurely lucidity in the poet's descriptive passages. Thus in Scannum, Ecloga he writes:

Huc veniunt pueri, & tenerae per prata puellae:
Huc satyri veniunt, Faunique. Mic Naiades inter
Nunc Galatea suos, nunc Aegle narrat amores.

In Templum Libertatis there are likewise many excellently balanced lines, for example:

Hi pomis gaudent variis, hi floribus halant.
Perque informe Chaos, perque aspera viscera terrae.
Certa deum mens est: certo regit omnia fine.

Sometimes symmetry is accomplished between lines as well as within them. Again, these examples come from Templum Libertatis:

Tuque ingeniosa
Dum lustras, hospes, lautae miracula villae,
Alcinoique solo lucos & culta vireta
Dum Vari praefers; tamen hic potes hospita sacra,
Hic potes Alcinoi faciles cognoscere mores.

Nec licet, aut fas est coelum incusare querelis:
Nec potis, aut fas est scrutari arcana deorum.
Queis modo tot comites, queis primos emergat aulæ,
Queis sibi tot servos, queis primos emergat urbis ....

The fourfold repetition of queis in the last example is especially felicitous.
Dozens of examples could be quoted from King's poetry of the threefold repetition in a couplet which is so marked a characteristic of Vergilian style, but it is worthwhile quoting a sevenfold repetition from Milton's Epistola ad Pollionem as an example of how he can use the hexameter in a manner which is as oratorical as it is poetic:

At quid tu possis? quid pars sincera senatus?
Quid socii proceres? quid virtus dura Catonis?
Quid Bruti? Si vel totum Cicerona sonares,
Quid tibi, quid patriae divina Philippica prosit?

King occasionally achieves symmetry by the simultaneous use of isocolon and homoeoteleuta, as in this couplet in Templum Libertatis:

Haec etenim rapuit, qui possidet omnia, Cyclops.
Haec etiam vendit, qui vendidit omnia, Cyclops.

The use of vendit with vendidit is an added embellishment. Though homoeoteleuta is sometimes regarded as a device to be generally avoided, the repetition of Cyclops is clearly intentional. Vergil had occasionally employed repetitions of a comparable nature, apparently for rhetorical effect:

*Transfossi ligvo veniunt. Vix unus Helenor*  
*Et Lycus elapsi: quorum primaeus Helenor,*

for example. 4

There are several instances in Templum Libertatis and elsewhere of parallel effects worked out within a larger parallelism. This kind of

counterpoint manifests a considerable degree of artistic and technical expertise:

Hic est, hic ille est, cujus nunc dicitur orbis
Librari ingenio; cui nunc sua prospera Plutus,
Cui rerum summam, cui se quoque tradit: & omnis
Hic opifex infandi operis, celer itque reeditque
Nuntius huc, illuc; & praemia magna reportat.

Templum Libertatis also contains many excellent examples of the symmetry that can be achieved by the judicious placing of light and heavy sense pauses. In the following period, the sense-pauses have, with one exception, been placed within the separate verses, so as to allow for the elasticity and easy flow from line to line which is one of the charms of developed hexameter composition.

Illa artém docuit Batavos, qua stagna colantur,
Qua vada, qua rupes; sterilis qua reddat arena
Frugiæras messes; qua dulcia praebet arbos
Poma, vel invita terra; qua cuique colono
Fiant magna satis sua, quamvis parvula, rura.

There are occasions, however, when the author, for the sake of metrical variety, may achieve equally artistic symmetrical effects with the use of verses ending in heavy sense-pauses. In the period from Templum Libertatis which follows, King exhibits this kind of paratactical symmetry, with the additional embellishments of isocolon and two instances of anaphora:

5. I am of the opinion that a comma in King's Latin poetry is generally to be taken as indicating a light sense-pause. Referring to classical elegiac verse, Maurice Platnauer does not regard the comma as a sense-pause; see his Latin Elegiac Verse (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1951), p.24. For a different division of pauses as applied to hexameter verse see S.E. Winbolt, op.cit., pp. 1 - 69.
Qualia vix quisquam sine divum numine speret;
Qualia vix reges, vix poscat regia pellex;
Vix aut Socraticae chartae, vel pagina Tulli,
Vix aut carminibus vates meruere priores.

King's subtle manipulation of different rhythmical patterns is an essential ingredient of his art and of the musical quality perceptible in a good deal of his Latin verse. His metre rarely, if ever, becomes monotonous, thanks largely to the constantly changing variety of verse patterns which he exhibits, and to his judicious interplay of dactyls and spondees. Two short examples must suffice to illustrate the manner in which the poet manipulates the possible combinations of metra. The first example comes from Templum Libertatis:

Ausus opus cum sim tantum, tu, diva, canenti
Ingenium uberius, magnas & suffice vires,
Atque animos, quibus ipsa cales, viridemque senectatem.
Et potes haec; & cuncta potes. Nec te sine quicquam
Sublime exoritur; neque sit vel amabile quicquam,
Vel sine te laetum. Quin tu, si numine dextro
Munc adsis, faveasque; aderit mihi magnus Apollo,
(Quo venias, venias) faciles aderuntque Camoenae.
Et nitor, & numeris accedant pondera nostris;
Atque aliquem hoc vati praestet quoque carmen honorem.

The combinations of dactyls and spondees in the first four feet of the individual verses are as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It will be noticed that here, as in Vergil's poetry, there is a predominance of dactylic first feet. The structure of feet in the first and sixth verses

\[ DS\text{ SS} \]

is that which is most commonly found in Vergil: it is used by King with frequency. The structure of feet in the second and ninth verses

\[ D\text{ DS} S \]

is the second most commonly used by Vergil. The combination

\[ D\text{ DDD} D \]

occurs twice, but neither the two cases of this structure nor any other two similar arrangements are consecutive. There is a notable predominance in this passage, as in King's poetry as a whole, of the strong caesura. It is also noteworthy that the poet makes use of elisions, of which there are five in these ten lines, in a proportion similar to that of the Aeneid.

The second example is taken from the commencement of Aviti Epistola ad Perillam, Virginen Scotam, and is in elegiac distichs. 6

6. In this metre, each dactylic hexameter verse is followed by a pentameter, which is historically a defective hexameter. The pentameter is divided into two hemistichs which are alike in that each is a catalectic dactylic trimeter, but different in that only the first admits the substitution of a spondee for a dactyl. Thus the dactylic pentameter verse calls for an unvarying sum of four short syllables in the second hemistich, while allowing a variation of four, two, or no short syllables in the first. The last syllable of the line is technically anceps. For some doubts on the generally accepted theory of the pentameter see L.P. Wilkinson, Golden Latin Artistry (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1963), pp. 227 ff.
The variety of rhythmical patterns employed eliminates the dullness that this metre, in the hands of less skilled writers, sometimes acquires from repetitive smoothness. This variety is best illustrated by scansion:

```
Dum tris-/ti fran-/gor // mor-/bo, lon-/gaque se-/necta,
Et mea/vix cala-/mum // sustinet/aegra ma-/nus:
```

```
Qua non/ipse fru-/or // tibi/mitto, PE-/RILLA, sa-/lutem,
Pignus a-/miciti-/ae, // chara pu-/ella, me/ae.
```

```
Scotus ad-/est hos-/pes, // qui/de te/multa ro-/gatus,
Nil, ait,/ingeni-/o // pulchrius/ esse tu-/o,
Teque, quod/ opta-/ bam, // lin-/guam cal/lere La-/tinam,
Oreque/Roma-/no // jam didi-/cisse lo-/qui.
```

Several observations on the rhythmic subtleties in these verses are apposite. The first line contains as many spondees as it is possible for the dactylic pentameter to incorporate: the resulting impression of ponderous sadness is highly appropriate to the admission of sickness and old age conveyed by the words. In the third line, mitto exhibits, metri gratia, an example of shortening. Following the custom of Augustan poets, the author has used mostly end-stopped couplets throughout this work, but the comma at the end of the sixth verse creates one of several enjambments. By way of counterbalance, the pauses in the seventh verse break the flow in a pleasing manner. Perhaps it is also germane to add that,
in the fourth and sixth lines, the poet has successfully followed the Ovidian tendency to end the two hemistichs of the pentameter with a rhyming noun and adjective.

The artistic use of repetition, especially in the form of epanalepsis, constitutes another method by which King achieves his musical effects. Many of the best instances are to be found in Templum Libertatis, for example,

Ut ne quis vir sit castus, nec foemina casta.

Sacra mari seu sit, seu sacra sit insula coelo.

Tu modo da veniam; da, rex, mihi visere terras.

And there are more mechanical (but quite justifiable) instances of repetition, as in this verse also taken from Templum Libertatis:

Patriciosque senes: iterumque iterumque repulsus ....

Occasionally, King's inclination for this device takes the form of epanastrophe or anadiplosis. Thus he wrote in Templum Libertatis:

Tot mala, dix, merui? Merui: neque enim grave quicquam Conquerar ....

And the last line of this elaborately ornamented period in Miltonis Epistola ad Pollionem could be regarded as quasi-epanastrophic:

Novit Fuscus (qui omnia novit) Quo casu, quo animo infelicis carminis auctor, Qua prece, quo pretio cuncta haec memorare volebat: Et voluisse sat est: satis est voluisse videri.

The poet's use of epistrophe, though not frequent, is generally effective; he is notably competent at achieving an echoic effect in such couplets as occur in this period, taken from Antonietti, Corsorum Ducis, Epistola ad Corsos:
At vos, o cives, dum daedala prodit imago,
Dicite gratantes, Rex nobis ligneus esto!
Sylvicolae acclament, Rex nobis ligneus esto!

Very rarely King lapses into a more pedestrian style of repetition, as in Monitor:

Te tamen excepto semper, clarissime Prisci,
Te tamen excepto semper, charissime Caelei ....

But in the composition of jingling couplets, the verses of which are metrically interchangeable, King is not nearly so frequent an offender as Lucan.

A few of King's other musical devices deserve at least passing reference. He makes considerable use of the five-worded line to achieve a dignified and majestic effect: it could be argued that, like Ovid, he overdoes this technique from time to time. Occasionally he employs a four-worded line for the same purpose: one of these in Sermo Pedestris acquires added grandeur with the inclusion of Greek proper names. The line following completes the sense:

Pasiphae tauri, Pygmaei Penthesilea
Concubitu indulget, nec vult servire marito.

His tripartite lines often have an impressive ring; in Monitor he provides a few in a period which also includes asyndeton and carefully placed principal, secondary, and tertiary caesuras. Despite its large number of pauses, the fact that the separate parts of this sentence are well dovetailed prevents it from sounding disjointed and gives it organic unity:

Expers militiae, clarus tamen induperator
De portu solvit; mare transit; terret Iberas,
Gallorumque acies: quid deinde? hostibus oris
Appallit naves; expugnat, diruit, urit
Tres piscatorum casulas, urbique minatus
Excelsae horrendas strages, incendia, praesensque
Excidium, redit incolumis, poscitque triumphum.
The effect of a tripartite line with an ablative absolute is especially concinnous, as in this example taken from *Templum Libertatis*:

Additur infernus, mutato nomine, Plutus:  
Nam sibi dat Marci nomen.

Another kind of embellishment sometimes used by King is hypermetre; one finds it, for example, in Milton's *Epistola ad Pollionem*:

Servique & satrapae, gemmae, longa atria, plurisque Uxores ....

The reader is also intermittently conscious of the deliberate collocation of vowels and consonants appropriate to the mood which the author wishes to convey. Thus in *Scamnum, Ecloga*, when the poet, who is seated in Vergilian manner in the shade of a beech-tree, sees Lacon and Tityrus approaching, he captures the warm, languid atmosphere of the occasion well, with the use of the repeated sounds *u*, *m*, and *n*, in this melodious line:

Cantatum veniunt: apta est cantatibus umbra.

All the ancient critics who wrote on the subject were agreed that an excess of sibilants produced a cacophonous effect: King employs this device at the commencement of *Hydra*, where he seems to be attempting to reproduce Vergil's use of *s* to create a serpentine feeling. He augments the sibilation with the repeated employment of the appropriate vowel *i*:

Semper ego satirae scriptor? Sic omina nostros  
Significant nondum pacatos laeva Penates? 7

On the other hand, especially mellifluous are those liquid lines in which every word ending in a consonant is followed by one beginning with a vowel.

7. Compare the *Aeneid*, Book II, lines 209-212. Dionysius of Halicarnassus considered that *i* was the least sonororous of the vowels.
and every word ending in a vowel is followed by one beginning with a consonant. Curiously, the first line of *Miltonis Epistola ad Pollionem* and the last line of *Aviti Epistola ad Perillum, Virginem Scotam* both conform to this pattern. Thus their author commenced his first poem in the *Opera* with these words:

> Si vis ingenii, mihi si concessa potestas
> Carminis ....

and concluded his career as a maker with a pentameter composed in equally perfect contrapuntal fashion:

> Eventura tibi prospera cuncta precor.

Whether writing verse in hexameters or elegiac couplets, King was a scrupulously careful observer of the niceties of the best Roman metrical usage. He avoided undue coincidence of metrical ictus and word stress, and thus saved himself from the pitfalls into which some classical and neo-Latin composers had fallen, preceded by Ennius in his notorious line

> Sparsis hastis longis campus splendet et horret.

Though all his serious Latin poetry is characterized by a formal grandeur and a richly patterned texture, it is seldom merely pompous and never elephantine as are the arid stretches in the products of dozens of his contemporaries on the continent. Nor are his works centonisations: though he used phrases drawn from the Augustan poets, he developed an individual style which is not quite like that of any other Latin poet. It is, in fact, difficult to find fault with his poetry on purely technical grounds. Perhaps one may feel irritated by such prosaic,
enumerative sequences as this one in *Sermo Pedestrins*:

Nimirum emendat, regit, auget, donat & auffert
Res, urbes, gentes, commercia, foedera mundi,
Magnanimumque heroum fata ....

But these are not common, and, when they do occur, are certainly no worse
than some of the less inspired repetitive periods in Lucretius.

Only five of *King's* Latin orations have survived in their entirety,
and four of them are described by him as ora(iunculae). That so little of
his oratory remains can only be a matter of regret. It is indeed
saddening to think of the hundreds of Oxford orations which were irre-
trievably lost prior to the modern practice of reprinting them in the

*Oxford University Gazette.* But the few remnants of *King's* Latin speeches,
together with the other short examples of his prose, are sufficient to
provide evidence of the artistic ability of their author in non-poetical

The Cicero-like orations, for example, is the principal decoration in the third *Redeat* petition towards
the close of the oration of April 13, 1749:

*REDEAT, efficiatque, cum nihil hoc conventu cernere est illustrius, ut caeteri cives, et ii maxime scilicet, quibus aula et curia patet, pares sint honestissimis hisce senatoribus, pares sint vobis, ACADEMICI, si non ingenii et doctrinae gloria, at probitate et industria, at magnitudine animi, at libertatis studio! Ut foeminae omnes sint quam simillimae praestanti huic Nympharum cohorti, si non specie et pulchritudine oris, at pudicitia et sanctimonia, at corporis cultu, at morum elegantia! Ut deinde populus noster universus sit laboriosissimus ac temperantissimus, et alinquando tandem cum bonorum consiliis consentiat ad conservandam imperii majestatem: utque Britannia nostra non tam suo mari, et classibus pulcherrimis instructississime, (etsi his ipsis utinam usque valeamus!) quam incollarum robore ac virtute, et summa rerum gerendarum prudentia muniatur.
Brachylogia of a definitely Ciceronian kind occurs on a number of occasions; for example, in the ecphrasis of Aviti Epistola ad Perillam, Virginem Scotam, where one period contains two separate sequences:

Scis cuipiam licere more suo Romae vivere, si modo taceat de religione, de summi Pontificis authoritate, de praesulum superbia, de monachorum praestigiis; qui, dum paupertatem, uti summum bonum, clamant, praedicant, prae se ferunt, vigilantes et dormientes aureos montes cogitant, et reperiunt.

It is also significant that the rhythm of King's Latin prose is clearly influenced by that of Cicero: this fact is especially evident in those cadenced clausulae in which periods are concluded with a brief trochaic sequence. Even though the Ciceronian model is manifest in rhythm and diction, it is not followed slavishly: King was successful, as so many other neo-Latin orators have been, in giving his rhetoric a personal stamp, while at the same time remaining within the limits of this particular convention.

The Ciceronian archetype permits more freedom than is sometimes realized: in modern times Sir Richard Jebb, Sir Robert Tate, Cardinal Bacci, and Thomas Higham have composed many extended pieces of Latin prose, all of which could be called, in a broad sense, Ciceronian; however, their author's individuality is never completely submerged. In reading such compositions - King's included - one feels that thus Cicero might have expressed what, in many instances, he could never have felt.

The possible influence of Quintilian on King has already been indicated. Since comparatively little of King's Latin prose has been preserved, it would be unwise to draw any general conclusions, but he does conform to the recommendations of the Institutio Oratoria in such respects as these:
Quintilian also expatiates on the ancient distinction between the two kinds of prose style: "one closely welded and woven together, while the other is of a looser texture, such as is found in dialogues and letters." King's non-burlesque Latin prose is of the first kind: in its architectonics it exhibits the best qualities of order, connexion, and rhythm which are elaborated upon at some length in the *Institutio Oratoria*.

There is no reason to doubt that King was also intimately acquainted with such works of Cicero as *De Oratore*, *Partitiones Oratoriae*, *Brutus*, and *Orator*, and that their precepts affected his own practice. However, the advice given in these treatises is of such a nature as to make it difficult to point to specific examples of King's indebtedness in his speeches. Nevertheless, the reader is always more or less conscious of a richness of vocabulary, an amplitude of expression, and a lambent beauty of phrasing which constantly recall the Ciceronian prototype. King did not have the passion of a Demosthenes: his orotundity, though ingenuous and heartfelt, was consistently lapidary and formal. But his prose style is never turgid, and because his speeches were delivered on academic occasions, he could avoid the forced swagger which mars some of Cicero's orations, such as those

---


9. Ibid., Book IX, iv, 19.
delivered in 57 B.C. relating to his exile. While King's personality unfailingly radiates outwards from his prose pieces, he avoids showing the least sign of flagging or exhaustion. His rhetoric is Gorgianic and for the most part epideictic in quality, but it is not meretricious. Like Cicero, he neither shouts nor bores, and the tension in his finely moulded periods is always carefully controlled and disciplined.

Although King's technical excellence as a Latin author was admitted in his day by all but his most biased critics, this fact did not prevent William Melmoth the Younger from publishing a number of charges against neo-Latin poetry in general and, by implication, that of his father-in-law in particular. Melmoth's basic assertions were first, that "a poet who glows with the genuine fire of a warm and lively imagination will find the copiousness of his own native English scarce sufficient to convey his ideas in all their strength and energy"; and secondly, that "a pregnant imagination disdains to stint the natural growth of her thoughts to the confined standard of classical expression."

On modern poems written in Latin he comments:

The style of these performances always puts me in mind of Harlequin's snuff, which he collected by borrowing a pinch out of every man's box he could meet, and then retailed it to his customers under the pompous title of tabac de mille fleurs. Half a line from Virgil or Lucretius, pieced out with a bit from Horace or Juvenal, is generally the motley mixture which enters into compositions of this sort. 10

10. Sir Thomas Fitzosborne (i.e. William Melmoth), Letters on Several Subjects, Vol. II, Letter XLIX. The second volume appeared first in 1749, but copies of this edition are rare.
Any writer of poems of this kind, Helmoth continues, is guilty of a kind of theft:

For to express himself with propriety, he must not only be sure that every single word which he uses, is authorized by the best writers; but he must not even venture to throw them out of that particular combination in which he finds them connected: otherwise he may run into the most barbarous solecisms.

To explain my meaning by an instance from modern language: the French words amasser and rive, are both to be met with in their approved authors; and yet if a foreigner, unacquainted with the niceties of that language, should take the liberty of bringing those two words together in the following verse,

Sur la rive du fleuve amassant de l'arene;

he would be exposed to the ridicule, not only of the critics, but of the most ordinary mechanic in Paris. For the idiom of the French tongue will not admit of the expression sur la rive du fleuve, but requires the phrase sur le bord de la riviere; as they never say amasser de l'arene, but du sable. The same observation may be extended to all languages whether living or dead. But as no reasoning from analogy, can be of the least force in determining the idiomatic properties of any language whatsoever; a modern Latin poet has no other method of being sure of avoiding absurdities of this kind, than to take whole phrases as he finds them formed to his hands. Thus instead of accommodating his expression to his sentiment, (if any he should have) he must necessarily bend his sentiment to his expression, as he is not at liberty to strike out into that boldness of style, and those unexpected combinations of words, which give such grace and energy to the thoughts of every true genius. True genius indeed, is as much discovered by style, as by any other distinction; and every eminent writer, without indulging any unwarranted licences, has a language which he derives from himself, and which is peculiarly and literally his own. 11

Melmoth's criticisms contain some truth, though his clearly unsympathetic attitude towards neo-Latin poetry does nothing to strengthen his case.

To do his contention justice, it may be admitted that there is a certain imitative element in most of the best neo-Latin poetry, and that in the eighteenth century, imitation on the part of the poet was considered a literary virtue to a greater extent than either before or since. It may

11. Ibid.
also be allowed that, in any artistic endeavor, academic correctness in itself is not of overriding importance: if it were, Ebenezer Prout would be accounted one of the great composers of the nineteenth century. But Melmoth’s main charges are answerable on the principle that certain kinds of artistic anachronism are not only justifiable but indeed may be commendable. A good deal of his argument could be applied, mutatis mutandis, to the modern architect who designs a Gothic building: he also must necessarily bend his aesthetic sentiment to this particular form of architectural expression rather than vice versa. Yet no one would seriously suggest that Augustus Welby Pugin, Sir Charles Barry, or J.L. Pearson were all guilty of artistic theft and that none of them was at liberty to achieve boldness of style within the aesthetic limits which are imposed by the neo-Gothic convention. There is a place in literature, as in architecture, for pure traditionalism. In the hands of an author with the necessary degree of training, the Latin language can be as relevant to his own day as a style of architecture which became crystallized in an age which has long passed.

Melmoth was probably influenced in his objections by the products of the large number of inferior neo-Latin poets of his own time, but their failures - which are legion - do not entitle a critic to infer that every eminent writer should express himself only in the vernacular. King’s Latin works are best regarded as living literary anachronisms in the same sense that Pugin’s neo-Gothic edifices were living architectural anachronisms when they were erected. King and Pugin were both imitators, but they
possessed enough force of personality to prove that, through their art, anachronism is not incompatible with a significant degree of aesthetic achievement. There is surely no need to labour this point: in the field of modern music, the Classical Symphony of Prokofiev and the polyphonic compositions of Edmund Rubbra alike provide evidence that an anachronistic medium can actually enhance rather than detract from the expression of genuine artistry. To the age-old objection that the proportion of readers who can comprehend a non-vernacular language is always limited, one can only reply that no work of art derives its aesthetic merit from the number of persons who are in a position to understand it. In King’s favour it may also be added that the subject matter of all his Latin works was created out of the stuff of contemporary events: in this respect he was at once thoroughly modern and, at the same time, a faithful imitator of Cicero, Horace, Ovid, and Juvenal.

On quite different grounds, it is fair to criticize King’s Latin works as reflecting several of the limitations common to the literature of eighteenth-century England in general. One of these is, paradoxically, that of simplicity. Though King’s literary medium is a non-vernacular, often highly elaborate and embellished, the thought which it conveys is, as a rule, simple and confined to the notions which the average cultured gentleman of his day could appreciate without taxing his powers too heavily. King in this matter is at one with most of the other poets of his own period. The mind of the age was set firmly in the direction of the simplicity without which, as Swift expressed it, “no human performance can arrive to any great perfection.”

achieving the kind of unified simplicity which they found in architecture inspired by classical models. Thus they differed most profoundly from the Metaphysicals. Pope expressed the comparison between poetry and classical architecture well in the Essay on Criticism:

Thus when we view some well-proportion'd dome,
(The world's just wonder, and ev'n thing, O Rome!) No single parts unequally surprize; All comes united to the admiring eyes; No monstrous height, or breadth, or length appear; The whole at once is bold, and regular. 13

The cult of simplicity in poetry was, then, simply one aspect of the contemporary neo-classical preference for order and unity of design.

King's thought is simple in another sense which he shared with many of his contemporaries: the philosophy underlying it has neither complexity nor profundity. It is essentially a rather shallow combination of legitimism, laissez-faire, and the kind of Leibnitzian metaphysic that was popularized by Pope in the Essay on Man. This mixture, combined with a tendency to regard the Whig government as the source of most of the evils in Britain, was by no means unusual among the more highly cultured Jacobites. King's metaphysic is expressed briefly in his letter to Lord Orrery of September 17, 1741:

I believe, that every thing, that happens, is best. This short sentence makes the whole of my Philosophy and my religion too. 14

It is not difficult to appreciate the similarity between this outlook and the superficial theodicy implicit in Pope's epigram, "Whatever is, is right".

When writing to Lord Orrery on January 1, 1741/42, King included a few semi-facetious comments on his own philosophical outlook:

"... I am now able to resolve whatever may be called human happiness, into two Words, which is more than was ever done by all the old Sages of Greece and Rome and all the modern Philosophers. I may add the Divines likewise, of France and England. I have therefore some thoughts of setting myself up as the founder of a new sect of Philosophers, which shall be called the Laconic. My System will certainly be well received by the World, since it will be sufficiently explained in less than ten words, and yet be of ye most general use to mankind."

Unfortunately, he never divulged what the two words to explain the mystery of human happiness actually were, nor did he ever provide the explanation in less than ten words of his philosophical system. In his Anecdotes he gave insight of a somewhat more luminous nature into what might be loosely termed his philosophy of life:

"I DO NOT KNOW any better rules or maxims than the three following, which were framed by the old monk, to enable a man to pass through life with ease and security:

Nunquam male loqui de superioribus.

Fungi officio taliter qualiter.

Sinere insanum mundum vadere, quo vult; nam vult vadere, quo vult.

The first of these may be greatly improved by adding St. Paul's precept, To speak evil of no man."

These few informal comments contain virtually everything that King wrote concerning his personal philosophy.

Under the circumstances, it is hardly surprising that King's poetry is lacking in breadth, another characteristic which it shares with that of several other English Augustans. A good deal of the poet's polemical method consists of casting aspersions on his opponents: he is constantly guilty of the argumentum ad hominem. Despite his acumen in corroborating his contentions by appropriate historical parallels, his ability to formulate purely abstract premisses is limited. And in spite of his considerable powers of argumentation, the ratiocinative content in such poems as Sermo Pedestris, Hydra, and Monitor has a dialectically constricted quality: one often feels that the poet is not so much attacking evil as the people whom he considers to be committing evil. This unwillingness (or inability) on the part of many contemporary poets to envisage social evils in terms of the kind of moral abstractions to be found in the work of Shakespeare, Milton, or Wordsworth was by no means peculiar to King: it was an almost inevitable concomitant of the homocentricity of the age. Furthermore, as a satirist, he was precluded from adopting an impartial attitude: by the nature of his genre he was limited to pleading one point of view by castigating its opponents.

The personal spite and the sometimes petty vindictiveness which disfigure parts of King's work likewise have their counterparts in the poetry of his contemporaries: Pope's Dunciad immediately comes to mind: the spirited invective and carping abuse in this work, the first edition of which appeared in 1728, two years before An Ode to Mira, may have encouraged King to write likewise. But the comparison between Pope and King should

17. This observation may justifiably be applied to Swift as a poet: he did better in his sermons.
not be pressed too far: Pope's spleen has a heatless quality and is often indistinguishable from cantankerousness; King, on the other hand, can on occasions, especially in  
Templum Libertatis, project considerable warmth through his fulminations. King's Latin verses manifest a sonorous dignity which Pope could rarely attain with the English heroic couplet: King had fewer stops at his disposal, but his diapason can resound with unPopean thunder. In common with Swift, King could express his antipathies with a brutal cynicism: underneath his formalism, elegance, and polish lay a penetrating intellectual force and a ferocious ability to mangle his enemies with his words. These corrosive powers he used, like Swift, beyond the limits of polite gentility. Indeed, in his ability to combine derogation and sardonic humour he often exceeded the Dean. But King rarely uses flippancy for its own sake; he is always motivated by a serious underlying purpose. However amoral - or, at times, immoral - his work may appear on the surface, the moralist in him is seldom completely out of sight.

In this connection it is significant that the antipathy towards the contemporary love of material wealth and luxury, which figures predominantly throughout King's writings, was also a  
bête noir of the Dean of St. Patrick's. Indeed luxury, interpreted variously to mean riches, vanity, sensuality, self-indulgence, or a combination of these, became one of the favourite whipping boys of the eighteenth-century. Thomas Gray provided merely one example of the common attitude of severe moralists and those poets who shared their feelings, when he wrote his celebrated lines:

18.  
19.  
The struggling pangs of conscious truth to hide,
To quench the blushes of ingenuous shame,
Or heap the shrine of Luxury and Pride
With incense kindled at the Muse's flame. 18

Authors such as Swift and Gray could quote numerous classical precedents in support of their opinions: Herodotus had connected material wealth with moral decline, Xenophon had warned that civilizations fall through the type of luxury that results from an attitude of self-indulgent superiority, Strabo had compared the luxury of the Athenians to the ascetic poverty of the barbarians with no compliment intended to the former, and dozens of later writers, including Cato, Varro, Diodorus, Livy, Tacitus, Justin, Appian, and Florus, had expressed roughly comparable opinions. Their views were applied to English history by such men as Polydore Vergil, Samuel Daniel, Raphael Holinshed, Lord Clarendon, Gilbert Burnet, and Swift's patron, Sir William Temple. The latter, like King, was convinced that the Norman Conquest had been in certain respects a disadvantage to England: one of these, he argued, was that through the Normans luxury was first introduced into the country:

... England by the Conquest lost, in a great measure, the old Plainness and Simplicity of the Saxon Times, and Customs of Life, who were generally a People of good Meaning, plain Dealing, contented with their own, little coveting or imitating their Neighbours, and living frugally upon the Product of their own fruitful Soil: For the Profusion of Meats at our English Tables, came in with the Danes, and the Luxury of them was introduc'd first by the Normans, and after increased by the frequent Use of Wines, upon the Accession of Guienne to this Crown. 19

Swift's thinking on luxury, in its broadest sense, must have been well known to King. The sentiments of the Dean in this matter are often reflected in the poetry of the Old Trumpeter. In a letter addressed to Pope on January 10, 1721, which King would likely have read in its published form, the Dean commented:

It is true, the Romans had a custom of chusing a Dictator, during whose administration, the Power of other Magistrates was suspended; but this was done upon the greatest emergencies; a War near their doors, or some civil Dissention, for Armies must be governed by arbitrary power. But when the Virtue of that Commonwealth gave place to luxury and ambition, this very office of Dictator became perpetual in the persons of the Caesars and their Successors, the most infamous tyrants that have any where appeared in story. 20

This is essentially the historical outlook which is inherent in the arrogant speech of Plutus to the hosts of Tartarus in the second book of Templum Libertatis:

Ars siqua est, vigili siqua experientia vestro,
Dictis siqua fides; en, vestra potentia, viresque,
Armaque! (& ostendit massas, quas fecerit, auri)
Siquando terras Libertas dura petivit,
Regum saeva ultrix, & amicis par cere regum
Nescia, quos Ditis numen praefecerat orbi;
Mene ausa est contra causam contendere plebis?
Mene pati auratum potuit? Nonne ipse fugavi
Et divam, et vates divae sociosque ministroque,
His solis usus, solisque his utilis, armis?
Gaiae, divitiis & libertate potentes,
Nunc ubi sunt urbes? Ubi nunc est libera Roma,
Conscriptique patres? Neque nostram illuserit artem
Gens, hodie quae cuncte cupit respublica dici.
Quid? Veneti, Batavi, Ligures parere recusant
Unius imperio? vexantur mille tyrannis,
Sanguine quos animisque aequant, servire coacti
Civibus, ece, ecce, suis.

A letter of Swift written to William Pulteney on March 8, 1735, shows that the Dean and King were alike in their gloomy forebodings for the future: "But it is altogether impossible for any nation to preserve its liberty long under a tenth part of the present luxury, infidelity, and a million corruptions." 21

The laments on the condition of the contemporary Church, and especially the higher clergy, in several of King's writings have their parallel (and may have had their source of inspiration) in Swift's essay "Concerning That Universal Hatred Which Prevails Against the Clergy". The Dean's argument is essentially no different from that used by King and by numerous puritan moralists: the vices of ecclesiastical institutionalism had brought about the present degeneracy of the established Church:

In a very few centuries after Christianity became national in most parts of Europe, although the Church of Rome had already introduced many corruptions in religion; yet the piety of early Christians, as well as new converts, was so great, and particularly of princes, as well as noblemen and other wealthy persons, that they built many religious houses, for those who were inclined to live in a recluse or solitary manner, endowing these monasteries with land. It is true, we read of monks some ages before, who dwelt in caves and cells, in desert places. But, when public edifices were erected and endowed, they began gradually to degenerate into idleness, ignorance, avarice, ambition, and luxury, after the usual fate of all human institutions. 22

This kind of thinking underlies the whole of the preface to the Opera, that part of The Dreamer dealing with the College of Rosicrucians, and most of the Aviti Epistola ad Perillam, Virginem Scotam. It led King to declaim in the latter work:

Ecquis rite colit te, coeli magne CREATOR?
Legatus CHRISTI quaevert avarus opes.
Sacrilegum vidi, quem mitra et purpura vestit;
Vidi, eheu, doctos credulitate trahi. 23

The note to these verses is a cri de cœur which is close in spirit to Swift's contention:

To these evidences may be added King's comments in the Anecdotes on the same subject:

To speak freely, I know nothing that has brought so great a reproach on the Church of England as the avarice and ambition of our bishops. CHANDLER, Bishop of Durham, WILLIS, Bishop of Winchester, POTTER, Archbishop of Canterbury, GIBSON and SHERLOCK, Bishops of London, all died shamefully rich, some of them worth more than £100,000. I must add to these my old antagonist GILBERT, predecessor to DRUMMOND, the present Archbishop of York. Some of these prelates were esteemed great divines (and I know they were learned men), but they could not be called good Christians. The great wealth which they heaped

23. The first word of this line is printed Vide: it is corrected in the Errata.
up, the fruits of their bishoprics, and which they left to enrich their families, was not their own; it was due to God, to the church, and to their poor brethren. The history of the good Samaritan, which was so particularly explained by Christ himself to his disciples, ought to be monitory to all their successors. 24

Most of the other particulars in which King's Latin works reflect the English Augustan age have been alluded to in earlier chapters. On almost all his pages, the decorum, smoothness, perspicuity, and air of refinement common to the English Augustans in general are in evidence: like them, and in contradistinction to several of the Romantics, he regarded poetry primarily as the art of writing poems. 25 There is a rather greater proportion of censorious and comminatory material in his work than in that of most of his contemporaries: his lack of tolerance for human weakness is one of the least attractive features of his outlook. But even when he is vituperating against his adversaries, his emotion is always regulated. His severity can be trenchant, but he maintains control of his temper. On the whole, his derogations tend to be stronger than his compliments, which, like his other pleasantries, sometimes exhibit a tincture of blandness. But whether praising or blaming, he remains unquestionably sincere.

There are two respects in which, as a serious Latin poet, he is peculiar. One is that he never completely ceases to be an orator, even

when he is writing verse. Of all the significant English neo-Latin poets, he is the most declamatory in tone. To a greater degree than Vergil, he regularly applies to his poetry the ornamentation of oratorical prose: if his poetry is read aloud, the ear is seldom dissatisfied. He is one of the most perfect practitioners of the dictum enunciated by Joseph Trapp in his Praelectiones Poeticae, of 1711 that eloquence should be common to both poetry and oratory. The modern reader will inevitably notice the rhetorical deliberateness with which King set out to gain his poetical effects. Like the best formal declamation, the poetry in the Opera is not so much a free expression of personal emotion as a calculated attempt to win the approval and arouse the sympathy of its readers by the artistic use of a non-colloquial medium. In this sense, his poems are carefully wrought rhetorical artifacts: though they are invariably fluent, they seldom, if ever, sound spontaneous.

The other peculiarity was dimly perceived by Lord Orrery in his letter written to King on May 9, 1744, when Pope was slowly dying:

Poor Mr. Pope, who is so kind as to write often to me, is I fear in a declining State of Health. He can only dictate & sign his letters. When he is gone, farewell to English Poetry, & when you are gone, farewell to Latin Poetry.

To suggest that the death of Pope would mark the end of English poetry was an unpardonably pessimistic prognostication, but the prophecy regarding its Latin counterpart was nearer the truth. King was the last

26. The Houghton Library, Harvard University, MS. Eng. 218.2 (v.4), no page number.
example of a neo-Latin poet in the grand manner. Perhaps his nearest contemporary equivalent was Giovanni Volpi - his name is latinized as Joannes Vulpius - but the resemblances are not particularly close. Volpi was the editor of the poetry of Andrea Navagero and Giacopo Sannazaro, the author of a number of Latin orations, and a poet who is best known for his three books of *Carmina* which were published at Padua in 1725. By classical standards King wrote the purer Latin, but Volpi displayed in his poems a gentle charm which, of its kind, has not since been surpassed.²⁷

That King has had no rivals since his death may be unequivocally conceded. Latin poetry has continued to be written to the present day, as is made manifest by the prize poems issued from university presses and the quarterly appearances of *Latinitas*, but much of the former sublimity and spaciousness have disappeared. The most prolific of the Anglo-Latin poets since King's demise has been Walter Savage Landor, but even though not all of his Latin compositions were printed, there is ample evidence that the Muse did not often inspire him with more than a rather pedestrian competence. His elegiac epigrams constitute his best work, but his reputation as a Latinist inevitably suffers from his comparatively small amount of really excellent writing in that language.

²⁷. I deliberately exclude from consideration the slightly younger Dalmatian contemporary of King, Raymond Cunicch, who lived from 1718 to 1794. He was primarily a translator: his principal importance is that he was the last to attempt a Latin version of the *Iliad*.

²⁸. Published in Rome Typis Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae.
and from the fact that so much of his English verse is apodictically superior. Of the other modern English writers of Latin verse, Bishop Charles Wordsworth, Charles Calverley, William Cory, Lionel Johnson, Herbert Kynaston, Sir Richard Jebb, and A.B. Ramsay deserve special mention, but they confined themselves largely to occasional poems and jeux d'esprit. On the continent there have been neo-Latin poets in greater profusion: of these, Pope Leo XIII was one of the most magisterial, but the majority of his poems are brief and do not manifest any sustained flight. Antony Braus, Joseph Petrucci, Innocent Polcari, and Didacus Vitrioli, to mention only a few other poets by name, have all written competent Latin verse, but none has an artistic stature comparable to that of the leading figures of the eighteenth-century.

Of King's major works in the Opera, only The Toast remains to be treated appreciatively. As far as it can be fitted into any literary tradition, The Toast belongs to that of Menippean satire, the mélange of prose and verse invented by Menippus of Gadara three centuries before the Christian era, and developed in Rome by Varro, Petronius and others.

29. It is perhaps worthwhile recalling that Swinburne published two Latin poems: In Obitum Theophili Poetae and Ad Catullum.


31. The only reasonably comprehensive treatment of Menippean Satire is F. Giroux, La Composition de la Satire Ménippée (Laon, 1904).
The characteristic content of Menippean satire was its commentary on life and morals, together with a strong element of humour and fantasy. These ingredients are present throughout King's poem. But any attempt to argue more than a very general similarity to the other works in this tradition is doomed to failure. There are abundant evidences of the influence on King of earlier authors, both within the Menippean tradition and outside it, but none of these ever attempted to synthesize a large body of notes with his text in order to evolve a single integrated art form. One is conscious throughout *The Toast* of the indirect influence of Petronius, though the unique combination of the scholastic and the burlesque, which gives King's work its special oddness, has no place in the pages of Nero's arbiter elegantiarum. On the other hand, the sense of indefinable sorrow that haunts all human achievement, the triste post coitum, and the nostalgia of the gutter, all of which contribute towards the peculiar ironic melancholy of the *Satyricon* are absent from King's product. The Old Trumpeter has left no doubt as to his feelings towards Petronius:

A STORY TELLER is the most agreeable or disagreeable character we can meet with .... of all the ancient authors of this character, I have a partiality for PETRONIUS. There is a certain grace and pleasantry peculiar to himself in whatever he relates: his history of the EPHESIAN MATRON is allowed by all the critics to be a master-piece: it is concise and elegant; it is simple and sublime: but what distinguishes the excellent judgment of the author, there is not a circumstance which can be added to it or taken from it without lessening its value; and MONSIEUR ST. EVREMOND, though I acknowledge him to be an admirable writer, and one of the greatest geniuses which this or the last age hath produced, hath yet, in my opinion, done no honour to PETRONIUS by paraphrasing the EPHESIAN MATRON, and lengthening the narrative. 32

Whatever one may think of King's classing Saint-Evremond among the greatest geniuses of the age, his preference for the text of the *Satyricon* is admitted and is evident in *The Toast*. Both works share a kind of elegant indecency, and both presuppose in the reader a fair knowledge of the Homeric epics from which their respective themes and some of their subsidiary motifs are drawn. The theme of *The Toast* is the wrath of Apollo; that of the *Satyricon* is the wrath of Priapus; the wrath of Apollo and Poseidon in Homer's epics, however much subject to mockery, is their common archetype. But once these facts are allowed, it remains true that King was as far from his classical prototypes as Pope was when composing *The Rape of the Lock*.

Within the limits which I have suggested, *The Toast* is best regarded as *sui generis*. Despite a general indebtedness to classical precedents, King produced a work which has no real counterpart in either classical or modern literature. For this reason it is difficult, if not impossible, to trace any works in English which had any special influence on him while *The Toast* was being written. Something of the atmosphere of Swift's satires and of Pope's *Dunciad* is present, but there are no particular verbal echoes. 33 The idea of the burlesque "monkish verses" in the notes, which contain some of King's most characteristic humour, seems to have been his own.

33. Dryden's *MacFlecknoe* is in a different category: it is more in the nature of a lampoon than a satire - despite the author's describing it as a "Varroonian satire" - and was written primarily to vex Thomas Shadwell rather than to preserve a record of specific historical incidents. In any case, Dryden is the least personal of the English poets; King, on the contrary, is both personal and individualistic.
The author's description of The Toast on the title page is "an heroic poem", a term which was, for all intents and purposes, synonymous with epic, as George Puttenham makes clear:

Such therefore as gave themselves to write long histories of the noble gests of kings and great Princes entermedling the dealings of the gods, halfe gods or Heroes .... they called Poets Heroick, whereof Homer was chief and most auncient among the Greeks, Virgill among the Latines. 34

The fact that the reader very soon learns that this work is technically a parody (in the Augustan sense) does not mean that its author intended to ridicule the epic as an art form: King's intention in writing the English text of the poem was the same as that of any writer of what may be broadly termed mock-epic, namely to turn a dignified genre to witty use, principally by the device of incongruity. The main structural features of the poem are modelled on the epic: the invocation to the Muse, the introduction of Olympian divinities in a human setting, the speeches, the descriptions, the moralizing asides, the assembly of the gods presided over by Jupiter, and the combat at the conclusion all have their ironical parallels in the pages of Homer and Vergil. But the peculiarity of The Toast is that the poem itself is not intended to be read continuously: the parodistic learned apparatus was compiled to be followed pari passu with the supposititious translation. Furthermore, the story is not consistently mock-heroic. The underlying satire sometimes predominates over the parody, a feature which is especially noticeable in the

observations on the general behaviour of Mars and in the physical

descriptions of Myra. In short, The Toast does not fit perfectly

into any of the accepted literary categories.

The sheer bizarreness of this extraordinary production renders it

as unnamable to conventional literary criteria as the Alice books of

Lewis Carroll. In its favour one may state that it exhibits a type of

academic whimsy and a level of academic caprice which are never likely
to be reproduced. Judged as a satire, it is undoubtedly a powerful

piece of writing, with a structural compactness and a degree of systemat-

ization which are remarkable when one considers its length. It also

exhibits an epigenous geniality which somewhat softens the underlying

spleen. But the poet's phenomenally uncharitable attitude towards his

characters and the generally repulsive nature of its contents do nothing
to raise one's opinion of The Toast. Whether a work can be considered

aesthetically successful which derives so much of its power from its own

emetic feculence is debatable. It was a pity that King decided to in-
corporate so high a percentage of matter which, even to the strong-
stomached, can be highly objectionable.

Though the entire work is manifestly tendentious, it is not at all

clear whom King hoped it would please. At the end of the Appendix he

wrote:

.... I am sure my Friends are obliged to me who have put

myself into a very perilous Situation to afford them two

or three hours Entertainment.

One may seriously question the extent of the author's wisdom in voluntarily

placing himself in so perilous a situation. Of the few contemporary
readers of The Toast, only Swift is known to have praised it. During the frustrations resulting from his prolonged period of Irish litigation, with all its attendant delays, the composition of this work may have given its author the psychological benefits of catharsis, but, even so, the poem's sordidness is not ipso facto justifiable. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that The Toast was an original and ingenious conception which was spoilt by its author's prurience and lack of reticence.

Gilbert Highet has in recent years revived the ancient differentiation of satirists into two kinds which may be typified by their principal representatives, Horace and Juvenal. 35 Satirists of Horace's type like the subjects of their satire, but think they are rather blind and foolish. Satirists of Juvenal's type hate or despise them, their aim being not to cure, but to wound, punish, or destroy. According to this distinction The Toast would appear to have been in the tradition of Juvenal rather than of Horace. In the notes and observations to "The Author's Preface" O'Donald writes:

... there are Crimes which the Hand of Justice cannot reach, and are not otherwise to be punished, than by being exposed; and which ought to be exposed in Order to prevent honest Men from being deceived by Appearances, and circumvented under the Colour and Masque of Friendship. This in my Opinion is the best Apology for Personal Satire.

Almost certainly these words express King's own sentiments in the matter.

But in attempting to investigate further the motivation
which drove the Principal of St. Mary Hall to produce this macaronic
freak, one is reminded of the comment that Dr. Johnson made with
reference to Swift:

The greatest difficulty that occurs in analysing
his character is to discover by what depravity of
intellect he took delight in revolving ideas from which
almost every other mind shrinks with disgust. 36

These words may be applied with equal veracity to King, at least as
the progenitor of this particular work. Astute critic though he
was, Johnson never solved the difficulty which he propounded. I am
inclined to doubt if any lesser critic could solve what would appear
to be a comparable difficulty in the case of the Old Trumpeter.

Finally, it is perhaps apposite to comment briefly on King as
a person. On this subject there is little evidence of an un-
biassed nature: though his friends and enemies were not slow to pen
their views on King's writings, there were few who touched on the
more general subject of the man himself, and even then their observ-
vations were, as a rule, incidental. The only writer to discourse
at any length in this regard was William Melmoth the Younger: what
he wrote on the subject of his father-in-law was far from dis-
interested in tone. Thus he wrote of King under the name of
Mezentius:

36. Samuel Johnson: Lives of the Poets, "Jonathan Swift (1667-1745)."
Mezentius, with the designs and artifice of a Catiline, affects the integrity and patriotism of a Cato. Liberty, justice, and honour, are words which he knows perfectly well how to apply with address; and having them always ready upon proper occasions, he conceals the blackest purposes under the fairest appearances. For void, as in truth he is, of every worthy principle, he has too much policy not to pretend to the noblest; well knowing that counterfeit virtues are the most successful vices. It is by arts of this kind, that notwithstanding he has shewn himself unrestrained by the most sacred engagements of society, and uninfluenced by the most tender affections of nature, he has still been able to retain some degree of credit in the world: for he never sacrifices his honour to his interest, that he does not in some less considerable, but more open instance, make a concession of his interest to his honour; and thus, while he sinks his character on one side, very artfully raises it on the other. Accordingly, under pretence of the most scrupulous delicacy of conscience, he lately resigned a post which he held under my lord Godolphin; when at the same time he was endeavouring by the most shameful artifices and evasions, to keep a friend of mine out of the possession of an estate, to which, by all the laws of honour and honesty, he had a most indisputable right. 37

The exact circumstances that Melmoth refers to are not now ascertainable. Who was Melmoth's supposedly wronged friend? Which was the estate that, Melmoth claimed, King had sequestered? What was the post

37. Sir Thomas Fitzosborne (i.e. William Melmoth), Letters on Several Subjects, Vol. I, Letter XXIII. The first edition of Volume I was published in 1742. This letter is addressed to "Palamedes", and is dated "March 10, 1703". The date is either a deliberate attempt on Melmoth's part to shroud the real personality of Mezentius, or it may simply be an error on the part of the printer. As indicated in Chapter VI, note 21, Lord FitzMaurice is the authority for interpreting Mezentius as William King.
which King had held under Lord Godolphin? These questions cannot at present be answered. But one can say with certainty that it was grossly unfair and discourteous on Melmoth's part to assert that his father-in-law was void of every worthy principle and uninfluenced by the most tender affections of nature. I am not sure what Melmoth means when he states that King was "unrestrained by the most sacred engagements of society": he provides no verifiable corroboration, so his argument remains unproven. But Melmoth does provide a few more insulting generalizations:

But will you not suspect that I am describing a phantom of my own imagination, when I tell you after this that he has erected himself into a reformer of manners, and is so injudiciously officious as to draw the enquiry of the world upon his own morals by attempting to expose the defects of others. A man who ventures publickly to point out the blemishes of his contemporaries should at least be free from any uncommon stain himself, and have nothing remarkably dark in the complexion of his own private character. But Mezentius, not satisfied with being vitiuous, has at length determined to be ridiculous; and after having wretchedly squandered his youth and his patrimony in riot and dissoluteness, is contemptibly misspending his old age in measuring impotent syllables, and dealing out pointless abuse.

38. Presumably the first Earl of Godolphin (1645-1712) is here intended: though he went over to the Whigs towards the end of his life, he continued to maintain a correspondence with the exiled Stuarts. The second Earl of Godolphin (1678-1766) was described by Hearne as "a pitiful, mean-spirited, half-witted, whiggish, snivelling person"; even if one makes allowance for Hearne's bias, the second Earl was not the kind of individual under whom King would willingly have served. Lord Macaulay, whose political leanings were in his favour, called him "an insignificant man, of whom Lord Chesterfield said that he came to the House of Peers only to sleep, and that he might as well sleep on the right as on the left of the Woolsack."

39. Ibid.
What value can be placed in this testimony? There is no evidence that the Principal of St. Mary Hall squandered his youth wretchedly or his patrimony in rioting and dissoluteness. There is a good deal of information which suggests that King probably spent his youth studiously, and that he was given neither to rioting or dissoluteness. He was certainly a teetotaler, a fact that hardly supports his son-in-law's contentions. His Latin poetry could not justly be called impotent, even though the point of some of his abuse is not always clear to a modern reader. Whatever caused Melmoth to write this character, it is clearly warped and in several respects patently wrong. As evidence on which to form a disinterested picture of King, it is best ignored.

Probably the most impartial conceptions of King as a person are to be found in the paintings of contemporary artists. The two principal portraits of King are by John Michael Williams and Thomas Worlidge. The former was presented by the executors of King's estate to the Bodleian Library in 1764 where it hangs today; the latter is in the Upper Senior Common Room of Oriel College. Both show him as an ascetic and dignified personage, his gravity of demeanour lightened slightly by a trace of humour about the eyes and lips. This is the kind of impression

40. For descriptions see the Catalogue of Oxford Portraits, Vol. I, pp. 101, 104, and Vol. II, p. 88. A portrait similar to that of John Michael Williams was engraved by J. Faber in 1751: a copy of this engraving is in the Ealing Public Library. There is also a minute copperplate portrait of King in the historiated initial Q on the first page of the preface to the Opera. For references to other depictions see Notes and Queries, Twelfth Series, Vol. II, p. 467.
that his writings also create: a curious mixture of imperiousness and facetiousness, of severity and whimsicality. He was not a great man: he had neither the breadth of vision, nor the foresight, nor the forbearance that go with greatness. He could never have been universally popular: the promptings of his own nature and the fact that he enjoyed disputation for its own sake together formed him to be a controversialist, and at times a ruthless one. Like the exiled James III, he was destined to see the principal objects of his life's work elude him when they seemed almost within his grasp: as the twilight of Jacobitism gradually faded, and he himself ultimately abandoned the cause to which he had devoted almost his entire career, he could have felt grateful that protracted frustration had been the worst fate decreed for him by destiny.
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1730

A Deed by Mr. Grove to Paterson \\
Donald, Esq., \ \\
1730

1732

The Tomb
Subsequently reopened for the removal of 1756 and 1766.

1734

A Letter from Mr. Grove to Paterson & Donald, Esq., \\
1734

1737

February 24, 1787, in Garden Street, 26th February, 1787.

1739

Military Records of Paterson
The translation of the MS. published under the name \\
Hilton's Letter to Pallis, was here from made by King.

1740

Sereno Petreallia

1740

Reuben, Edmon

1742

Templum Libertatis: Liber Primus

1743

Templum Libertatis: Liber Secundus

Two Continuations, Notice to Some Concerned from,
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LIST OF KING'S WORKS

1730 An Ode to Mira
Myra's Answer

1732 The Toast
Subsequently expanded for the versions of 1736 and 1747.

1734 A Letter from Mr. Lewis O Neil to Peregrine O Donald, Esq.,
with Mr. O Donald's Answer

1737 Article in Common Sense, May 28, 1737

1738 Miltonis Epistola ad Pollionem
The translation of 1740, published under the title
Milton's Letter to Pollio, may have been made by King.

1739 Sermo Pedestris

1742 Templum Libertatis, Liber Primus

1743 Templum Libertatis, Liber Secundus
Tres Oratiunculæ Habitae in Domō Convocationis Oxon.
1744 Epistola Objurgatoria ad Guilielmum King
To this is annexed the Epistola Canonici Reverendi
Admodum ad Archidiaconum Reverendum Admodum.

A Letter to a Friend Occasioned by Epistola Objurgatoria

\[ ? \]

A Chiding Letter to S.P.Y.B. in Defence of Epistola
Objurgatoria

Antonietti, Ducis Corsorum, Epistola ad Corsos
The title in the Opera text is Antonietti, Corsorum Ducis,
Epistola ad Corsos.

1746 Hydra

1748 A Proposal For Publishing a Poetical Translation, Both in
Latin and English, of the Reverend Mr. Tutor Bentham's
Letter to a Young Gentleman of Oxford

1749 A Poetical Abridgment, Both in Latin and English, of the
Reverend Mr. Tutor Bentham's Letter to a Young Gentleman
of Oxford

\[ ? \]

A Certain Proposal of a Certain Little Tutor for
Making Certain Reformations in a Certain Method of Education
Most Certainly Practis'd in a Certain University

Oratio In Theatro Sheldoniano Habita Idibus Aprilibus,
MDCCXLIX. Die Dedicationis Bibliothecae Redclivianae
Monitor

1750 The Wonder of Wonders or Fresh Intelligence from Eton
Subsequently expanded under the title An Answer to Dr. King's
Speech: By the Rev. Mr. John Burton, Batchelor in Divinity,
and Fellow of Eton College. A folio half-sheet broadside
issued twice as a folio whole-sheet broadside.

The Old Lady in Her Tantarums

Elogium Famae Inserviens Jacci Etonensis, sive Gigantis

1751 A Key to the Fragment
1754 The Dreamer
\[ ? \] A Translation of the Latin Epistle in The Dreamer
Praesidibus Supremi Galliae Senatus
Intended to serve as the preface to the Opera and found only in that volume.

1755 Doctor King's Apology
The Last Blow

1756 Inscription for a collection of statues presented to the University of Oxford by the Countess Dowager of Pomfret.

1757 Oratiuncula Habitum in Domo Convocationis, Oxon. Die Oct. 27, 1756

1760 Aviti Epistola ad Perillam, Virginem Scotam
Opera Guilielmi King

1761 Elogium to John Taylor the Oculist. The date of printing is approximate only.
Epitaphium Richardi Nash

Political and Literary Anecdotes of His Own Times
Published posthumously in 1818; second edition in 1819.
The preface was written "in my seventy-sixth year."

In addition to these works, a few others have been attributed to King on very slender evidence, and without reference to stylistic criteria. I have not treated these as part of the canon. The principal cases are:
Carmen Rhythmicum Monachicum Monoe Dictum
Attributed to King by Leicester Bradner in Musae Anglicanæ, presumably on the authority of the Catalogus Bibliothecæ Bodlianae. W.R. Ward in Georgian Oxford, p. 184, indicates an anonymous author other than King. Sir Harold Williams did not regard this as one of King's authentic works.

Serious Reflections on the Dangerous Tendency of the Common Practice of Card Playing
Sir Edward Turner considered that this work was written by King, but no grounds for this unlikely attribution have ever been suggested. The author's pseudonym (or perhaps his real name) is Gyles Smith.

A New Speech from the Old Trumpeter of Liberty Hall
Though this short work is sometimes attributed to King, all the intrinsic evidence points to Robert Jenner as the author.
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## LIST OF KING'S EXTANT LETTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mrs. Correspondent</th>
<th>Date 1</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lord Arran</td>
<td>June 11, 1721</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>National Library of Ireland, Ormonde MSS., Vol. 177, p. 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Charles Halsted</td>
<td>Sept. 2, 1721</td>
<td>Baggshot</td>
<td>PRO, State Papers Domestic, 35/28, Item 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Charles Halsted</td>
<td>Oct. 24, 1721</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>PRO, State Papers Domestic, 35/28, Item 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Charles Halsted</td>
<td>Feb. 4, 1722</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>PRO, State Papers Domestic, 35/30, Item 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Swift</td>
<td>Sept. 20, 1735</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Williams, Vol. IV, p. 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Whiteway</td>
<td>Sept. 14, 1736</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Williams, Vol. IV, p. 529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Whiteway</td>
<td>Nov. 9, 1736</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Williams, Vol. IV, p. 541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Edgar</td>
<td>Nov. 24, 1736</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>The Royal Library, Windsor Castle (191/168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Whiteway</td>
<td>June 24, 1737</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Williams, Vol. V, p. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Swift</td>
<td>June 24, 1737</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Williams, Vol. V, p. 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Whiteway</td>
<td>Mar. 2, 1738</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Williams, Vol. V, p. 93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Deane Swift         | Mar. 15, 1738   | St. Mary Hall    | Williams, Vol. V, p. 99     | 3

1. For sake of convenience, the year appears consistently in New Style.
2. In the case of published letters, only the most recent source is listed. "Williams" indicates Sir Harold Williams, Correspondence of Jonathan Swift (5 vols.; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1963-1965); "Dickins and Stanton" indicates Lilian Dickins and Mary Stanton, An Eighteenth Century Correspondence (London: John Murray, 1910); "Cork and Orrery" indicates the Countess of Cork and Orrery, The Orrery Papers (2 vols.; London: Duckworth, 1903).
3. Here misdated "March 13th, 1737-8".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correspondent</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>July 8, 1738</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Whiteway</td>
<td>Mar. 6, 1739</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Williams, Vol. V, p.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>July 2, 1739</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Sept. 23, 1739</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Jan. 15, 1740</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>March 25, 1740</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>June 1, 1740</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Aug. 5, 1740</td>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Oct. 28, 1740</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Jan. 15, 1741</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>May 20, 1741</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>June 4, 1741</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>July 5, 1741</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>July 14, 1741</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Aug. 24, 1741</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Sept. 4, 1741</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Sept. 9, 1741</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Sept. 17, 1741</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Sept. 24, 1741</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Sept. 29, 1741</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng.hist. d.103, p.38b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondent</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Oct. 3, 1742</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 40 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Faulkner</td>
<td>Oct. 5, 1742</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 42 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Oct. 6, 1742</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 44 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Oct. 12, 1742</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 46 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Oct. 14, 1742</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 48 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Nov. 10, 1741</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 50 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Jan. 1, 1742</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 52 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>May 16, 1742</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 54 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Aug. 18, 1742</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 56 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Sept. 3, 1742</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 58 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Oct. 4, 1742</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 60 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Oct. 6, 1742</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 62 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Oct. 31, 1742</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 64 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Dec. 29, 1742</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 66 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Jan. 5, 1743</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 68 Faulkner's An Appeal to the Public (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Jan. 19, 1743</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS.Eng. hist. d.103, p. 70 Dickins and Stanton, p. 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Jan. 31, 1743</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 72 Dickins and Stanton, p. 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Feb. 27, 1743</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 74 Dickins and Stanton, p. 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>April, 1743</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 76 Dickins and Stanton, p. 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>April 9, 1743</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 78 Dickins and Stanton, p. 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>April 19, 1743</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 80 Dickins and Stanton, p. 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>June 6, 1743</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 80 Dickins and Stanton, p. 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Sept. 9, 1743</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 80 Dickins and Stanton, p. 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Oct. 6, 1743</td>
<td>Bagshot</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 80 Dickins and Stanton, p. 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondent</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Oct. 20, 1743</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Nov. 23, 1743</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Apr. 24, 1744</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>May 25, 1745</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>June 24, 1745</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanderson Miller</td>
<td>July, 1745</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>County Record Office, Shire Hall, Warwick, Miller Collection, CR 125B/159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>July 8, 1745</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. hist. d.103, p. 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>April 10, 1746</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Cork and Orrery, Vol. 1, p.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanderson Miller</td>
<td>May, 1747</td>
<td>? St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Dickins and Stanton, p.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Nov. 20, 1747</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>The Houghton Library, Harvard University, MS. Eng.218. 2 (v.5), p.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Feb. 6, 1750</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Cork and Orrery, Vol. II, p.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Orrery</td>
<td>Apr. 24, 1750</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>The Houghton Library, Harvard University, MS. Eng.218. 2 (v.5), p.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Richard Rawlinson</td>
<td>Aug. 23, 1753</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Rawl. Letters 114a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 30, 1757</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Add. A. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Huddesford</td>
<td>Feb. 9, 1758</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. Ashmole 1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Francis Dashwood</td>
<td>April 2, 1761</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>B M, MS. Eg. 2136.f.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Shelburne</td>
<td>Oct. 22, 1761</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Shelburne MSS. at Bowood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Francis Dashwood</td>
<td>April 1, 1763</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, MS. D.D.Dashwood (Bucks.), B. 11/10/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Francis Dashwood</td>
<td>Sept. 7, 1763</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>EM, MS. Eg. 2136. f.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Thomas Nowell</td>
<td>&quot;Tuesday Morning&quot;</td>
<td>Carey Street</td>
<td>County Record Office, Shire Hall, Warwick, Newdigate Letters, MS. B 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanderson Miller</td>
<td>&quot;Friday noon&quot;</td>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>County Record Office, Shire Hall, Warwick, Miller Collection, CR 125B/158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

King also wrote a postscript to a letter from Robert Duncan to Thomas Hearne, dated May 6, 1721.

APPENDIX III

LIST OF OTHER PRINCIPAL PRIMARY SOURCES

London:

Egerton and Add. MSS in the British Museum. Especially relevant are MS. Eg. 2136 and Add. MSS 32717, 32725, 32726, and 39311.


Records of the Diocese of London in the Guildhall Library.

Records of the Chancellors of St. Paul's Cathedral in the archives of the Church Commissioners.

Court Rolls of the Manor of Stepney, Middlesex Sessions Books, and Middlesex Sessions Papers in the Greater London Record Office, County Hall.

Wills in the Principal Probate Registry, Somerset House, Prerogative Court of Canterbury.

Licence of King's Marriage (i.e. the Allegation) in the Library of Lambeth Palace.

Parish Registers of St. Mary's Church, Ealing, and St. Dunstan's Church, Stepney.

Documents of Ealing History in Ealing Public Library.

Oxford:

Oxford University Register of Convocation and miscellaneous documents in the University Archives.

Liber Aulae B.M.V. 1764, Matriculation Register and Buttery Books of St. Mary Hall in the Muniment Room, Oriel College.

Exeter College MSS. in the Senior Common Room, Exeter College.

Archbishop Wake's MSS. in Christ Church Library.


Provinces:

Stuart Papers in the Royal Library, Windsor Castle.

Shelburne MSS. at Bowood.

Isham (Lamport) Collection in the Northamptonshire Record Office, Northampton.

Warden Documents in the County Record Office, Shire Hall, Bedford.

Newdigate Letters and the Miller Collection in the County Record Office, Shire Hall, Warwick.

Ireland:

Ormonde MSS. in the National Library of Ireland, Dublin.


Memorialls of Deeds, Conveyances and Wills in King's Inns, Dublin.

Register of St. Audoen's Church, Dublin.

Indenture Tripartite of July 13, 1730 in the Public Record Office of Northern Ireland, Belfast.

United States:

Printed Works


An Address to Dr. Huddesford Occasioned by his Proper Reply. London, 1755. Perhaps by Benjamin Kennicott.


A Fragment. London [1750]

A Friend to Mr. Kennicott: A Letter to Doctor King, Occasioned by his Late Apology. London, 1755. Perhaps by Kennicott himself.


A New Speech from the Old Trumpeter of Liberty Hall. London [1756]


A Translation of a Late Celebrated Oration. London, 1749. King's Radclivian oration in English. This translation was not made by King.


Blacow, Richard: A Letter to a Fellow of a College. n.pl., 1749.


Faulkner, George: An Appeal to the Public. Dublin, 1758.


Phileleutherus Londinensis: Remarks on Dr. K——'s Speech. London, 1750. This is usually attributed to John Burton, but is, I believe, the work of Samuel Squire.


Swift, Jonathan: The Four Last Years of the Queen. London and Dublin, 1738/39. There are textual variations between these two editions.


APPENDIX IV

SELECT LIST OF SECONDARY WORKS


APPENDIX V

EXTRACTS FROM THE EALING POOR RATE BOOK FOR 1722

It is ordered and agreed in Publick Vestry at the Cross House on Wednesday, 31st day of Oct. 1722 and we do in our own Names and in the Names of all the Inhabitants of the sd Parish of Ealing also Zealing promise and engage to indemnify the present Church Wardens and Overseers of the poor of and from all manner of Action or Actions, Suit or Suits of Law which Dr. Wm. King shall bring against them or any of them for making a Distress or Seizure of or upon his Goods & Chattells for not paying the sum or sums of money now in Arrear and charged upon him for his Tythes and parsonage of the parish aforesd towards the relief of the poor of the sd parish, provided such Churchwardens and Overseers of the poor do maintain a Lawfull warrant in the first place. Witness the Hands and Seals of His Majesties Justices of the Peace for the County & Witness of Hands the day & year above s'd.

B, the Mark of
Thomas Bishop
Daniel Dean

Maurice Boheme
Wm Lonsdale

Churchwardens

Overseers of ye poor.

Whereas by an Order of Vestry dated the 31st day of Oct b last past the present Churchwardens and Overseers of ye poor of ye sd parish of Ealing were thereby indemnified of and from all manner of Action or Actions, Suit or Suits in Law which Wm King Esq L.L.D. should bring against them or any of them for making a Distress or Seizure of or upon his Goods and Chattells for not paying the sum or sums of money now in arrear & charged upon him for his Tythes and parsonage of the said parish of Ealing towards the relief of the poor of the said Parish provided such Churchwardens & overseers of the poor did obtain warrant in the first place under the Hands and seals of his Majesties Justices of the peace for this County and was signed by the inhabitants of the sd parish who were there in Vestry present. But whereas some disputes have arisen since the said order was made whither it was sufficient security to indemnify them and sd Church wardens & overseers of the poor against the sd Wm King touching the sd Distress by reason that publick notice was not given in the Parish Church of Ealing the Sunday before the sd vestry was held as above mentioned for the making of the said order, therefore the sd Church wardens & Overseers of the poor did on Sunday last past immediately after morning service give
public notice in the sd parish Church desiring that inhabitants of the sd parish to meet at the Cross House on this day at ten of the Clock in the forenoon to make an order to indemnify them & every one of them from all charges, trouble & expenses whatsoever which the above sd William King should putt them or any of them to for or by reasons and means of making a Distress or Seizure upon his sd Goods or Chattels for his refusing to pay the sum of twenty pounds and six pounds seventeen shillings and six pence which the sd. William King now stands charged with and is in arrears being for & towards the relief of the poor of sd parish of Ealing. It is therefore ordered and agreed in Publick vestry duly called and held at the Cross House on Wednesday ye 12th day December 1722, by the sd Church wardens & Overseers of the poor and the inhabitants of ye sd parish for the sole and only purpose above mentioned. And we the said inhabitants do hereby ratify & confirm the said Order of Vestry made the 31st of Oct. last past and do further order & agree that the sd Churchwardens & Overseers of the poor & every person concerned in making a Distress upon the sd. Wm Kings Goods & Chattells shall be Reimbursted and paid All and Every Sum or Sums of Money which they or any of them shall expend & layout in defending the Suit or Suits in Law against the sd William King touching the payment out of the Monies raised for the relief of the poor whether a Verdict or Verdicts shall pass for ye Defendants in such Suit or Suits or not and in Case no sufficient Distress can or may be found and the sd Churchwardens & Overseers should obtain a Warrant to seize and secure the person of him the sd Wm King Esq. for such deficiency. We also promise, order and agree to indemnify all & every person concerned in seizing his person in the same manner and out of the sd Rates as if an Action or Actions, Suit or Suits in Law had been brought against them or any of them for making ye Distress on his Goods & Chattells as aforesaid.

In Witness whereof we have been here set our Hands ye sd day of December, 1722.

Here follow the signatures of the Churchwardens and the Overseers of the Poor. Some are only partially legible.
From the time that he was appointed Principal, King regarded St. Mary Hall, Oxford, as his normal place of residence. Very little evidence is available relating to his other domiciles. Thomas Faulkner indicates that, when King was living in Ealing, he resided on an estate called Newby, near the church. This was probably part of the rectorial estate, the lease of which he had acquired from the Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral, in leasing the rectorial property at Ealing, diverted themselves of the title of Rector. Today in the vestry of St. Mary's Church there is a list of Rectors, many of whom were also Chancellors of St. Paul's Cathedral. Three legal documents now in the possession of the Church Commissioners (Deeds 1534, 1535, 1536) provide some information on this holding. The first is a Surrender, dated November 28, 1730, of a previous lease of the rectorial estate granted to William Pope and Ambrose Adams. This Surrender significantly states that during the term of the lease to be surrendered, William King, his brother-in-law Charles Wither, and James Munro had acquired a beneficial interest in it. No definite indication is provided of the time when King first invested in the property. It is clear that the estate was extensive: pastures, woods, closes, and underwoods are included. Two days later, on November 28, 1730, a bond for the performance of convenants was signed by William King; also named are his brother John, Charles Wither, and James Munro. On the same day the new lease was signed: it was intended to run for the lives of William King, his brother John, and his son Charles. The yearly rent was
fixed at £24. This lease made William King responsible for the
maintenance of the chancel of St. Mary's Church: for this reason his
name is sometimes listed among those of the Rectors of Ealing. It is
questionable, however, to what extent successive Chancellors of St. Paul's
Cathedral, in leasing the rectorial property at Ealing, divested them-
selves of the title of Rector. Today in the vestry of St. Mary's Church
there is a list of Rectors, many of whom were also Chancellors of St.
Paul's Cathedral: Dr. Edward Jones appears as Rector from 1719 to 1733,
and Dr. Peniston Booth from 1733 to 1761. Edith Jackson in Annals of
Ealing indicates that King was Rector of Ealing from 1739 to 1761, but at
most he would have been a lay impro priator. I also question the
reliability of this author's dates. King seems to have relinquished most
of his interest in the property by the lease dated May 28, 1756, cited in
Chapter VIII.

Even though King was a Barrister-at-Law of Gray's Inn, there is no
evidence that he actually resided there. But he did maintain chambers in
the Temple. A letter from Swift to Lord Orrery of July 2, 1737, makes
this fact clear:

I have corrected the inclosed as well as my shattered
head was able; I intreat Your Lordship will please to alter
whatever you have a Mind; and please to deliver it with Your
own Hand to Doctor King at his Chambers in the Temple. 1

1. Harold Williams (ed.), The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift (5 vols.;
And on April 24, 1744, King wrote to Orrery from "London" on the subject of the rooks in the Temple:

An old friend, who frequently makes me a morning visit, and who I must tell you, is a bigotted Pythagorean, insists that these same Rooks were formerly all Preachers or other eminent Lawyers of the two Temples. Tis a matter I never dispute with him, because ye Metempsychosis is a doctrine I have never studied, and therefore I neither know nor remember any thing of what I was, before I was born. Whereas my learned friend remembers distinctly the several transmigrations of his Soul, and can tell you (as well as Pythagoras) who he was at ye time of the Trojan War. If my Soul should enter hereafter into ye body of a Rook (as my friend tells me may probably be my fate, because I have been so long an inhabitant of the Temple), I shall most certainly fly immediately to Marston and dwell in one of the old Elms in your Garden.2

No record of King's residence survives today in the archives of either the Inner Temple or the Middle Temple, but it was a not uncommon practice, then as now, for Members of Gray's Inn to have chambers in the Temple. The Temple receipt books survive, but King's name does not occur in them, probably because his fees were paid to the Head of Chambers rather than directly to the Treasury.

It is likely that he relinquished his chambers in the Temple soon after Christmas, 1747. Writing from "London" on November 20, 1747, to Lord Orrery, he confessed:

I came to this place about a month since, in order finally to settle my private affairs so that I might be in a condition to retire for the rest of my life without any disturbance or interruption to my monastery. I thank God, I have in a measure finished every thing to my satisfaction, and at my next trip to London, which will be soon after Christmas, I shall have nothing to do, but to execute some

writings, and to take my leave. I don't, however, mean by this, that I will never see London again; my friends and my country, notwithstanding my age, shall, upon any urgent occasion call me out of my cell. But I have done with ambition, and the busy world: and for the pleasure of it (I mean those which are so esteemed) I have no relish left. 3

King seems to have been as good as his word. He paid visits later to London, Bath, Ealing, and other places, perhaps including Rome, but until his death regarded St. Mary Hall as his monastery and his home.

3. The Houghton Library, Harvard University, MS. Eng. 218.2 (v.5), pp. 77f.