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Abstract

The thesis represents the most extensive study yet made of the life and works of one of the most neglected authors of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In its introduction it provides a review of King's critical reception up to the present day, beginning with the comments of some of the Scriblerians and his eighteenth-century editors and biographers. The thesis proper is divided into two sections, the first of which is concerned with King's life and opinions, and is in turn separated into two chapters. Chapter One is a biography, and not only establishes the facts of King's life, but seeks to place him firmly in his historical and ideological context. The conclusion drawn from this is that King remained committed to the high Anglican/Tory ideology of rank and authority throughout his life, and that these values had a major bearing on everything he did and wrote. The second chapter looks in more detail at King's cultural milieu and the relationship between his ideological standpoint and his views on learning, particularly in terms of the ideal of the 'gentleman scholar'. The second half of the chapter is devoted to a reconsideration of the relationship between science and Humanism and the high Anglican attitude towards Baconianism, which is aimed at dispelling the common notion that King's theo-political conservatism necessarily led him to oppose science per se. A close study of his serious, non-ironic writings, most notably the Heathen Gods and the Adversaria (a loose collection of observations which to date have been neglected) confirms that King was both a disciple of late Renaissance Christian Humanism and an advocate of the 'high' Baconianism associated with the Anglican Church.

The second part deals with King's work as a Menippean satirist, and begins with a definition and review of the chief classical and Renaissance exponents of this ancient genre (sometimes known as 'the tradition of learned wit'), before turning to the analysis of a number of King's prosimetric and poetic parodies, travesties and mock-heroics. Chapter Four looks at King's controversial writings and political pamphlets, concentrating on his use of irony and burlesque as weapons against a number of theo-political enemies. The last three chapters are devoted respectively to King's finest works - his satires on Richard Bentley, Martin Lister, and Hans Sloane - and again consider these pieces in terms of the adaptation of the Menippean genre for the purposes of elaborate parody and occasional satire. At the same time, the meaning of King's parodies is shown to extend beyond merely personal attack to a serio-comic defence of traditional values in respect of scholarship, literature and more broadly social issues. By their exceptionally witty ridicule of abuses of philological and scientific learning, they implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) endorse the intellectual and cultural ideals of late Renaissance Humanism and high Baconianism. The final contention is that while his burlesques are seriously limited by their topicality, they are sufficiently sophisticated and amusing to entitle him to an important place in the tradition of Menippean satire.

The thesis also contains four appendices dealing with King's involvement in The Examiner, the question of his authorship of A Vindication of the Reverend Dr Henry Sacheverell, some unpublished manuscripts attributed to him, and a manuscript of a nineteenth-century essay on his life and works.
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Introduction

Dr William King, it has recently been observed, 'is one of a very small number of English authors who, buried in undeserved obscurity, merit full resurrection'.¹ By birth a gentleman, by profession a civil lawyer and judge, and by faith a devout high churchman, he was by inclination a poet, a satirist, and above all, a humorist. His erudition and learning, extraordinary even by the standards of his day, were matched only by his love of good living, especially good wine. These ingredients, as well as liberal measures of irony and the odd pinch of genuine originality, have long been recognized as the basic elements of his relatively small but miscellaneous collection of writings. As Harry Solomon remarks, King's 'robust originality invigorated several comic genres at the beginning of the eighteenth century', and it is certainly 'one of the injustices of literary history that King has been almost totally obscured by blooms of which his works were the bud'. It is my intention in this study to rectify this situation and provide the most extensive account to date of the life and works of one of the period's most interesting and gifted minor writers.

Not surprisingly it was Swift who first recognized some of the most important characteristics of King's writing, ironically in response to an attack the latter made in 1704 on The Tale of a Tub. Swift's comments were made some years later, by which time the two men had no doubt already become personally acquainted. Only a few months earlier, in a letter to Ambrose Phillips, he had bothered to mention that King's Miscellanies had just been published, which prompts one to assume that the author was held in some regard by the two correspondents.² It is also significant that even in the face of King's provocation, Swift's assessment of his work as a whole is not entirely dismissive. He acknowledges that his assailant 'upon some Occasions hath discover'd
no ill Vein of Humor'; but, he continues with typical irony, 'Tis a Pity any Occasions should put him under a necessity of being so hasty in his Productions, which otherwise might be entertaining'. Swift suggests, therefore, that King possessed many of the qualities essential for the writing of witty and humorous literature similar to his own: those he lacked were dedication, discretion, and care.

A narrow sort of brilliance and a lazy facility were also the qualities of King's personality and writing identified by John Gay and Alexander Pope. In *The Present State of Wit*, Gay sums up in a sentence both the contemporary response to King's writings and that of many critics since; Dr King, he notes, 'has a World of Wit, yet it lies in one particular Way of Raillery'. Pope, it seems, was less impressed. In a letter to Burlington four years after King's death he facetiously recalls the reflection of Bernard Lintot that 'Dr King would write verses in a tavern three hours after he couldn't speak'. The fact that King is bracketed with his friend William Oldisworth (whose translations of Horace's Odes and Epodes were more remarkable for their rapidity than quality) and the infamous Sir Richard Blackmore speaks volumes. Clearly in Pope's view King was another of those gentlemen who wrote with far too much ease. It should become evident throughout the course of this study that there is much truth in what each Scriblerian observes.

King's reputation and readership were maintained throughout the first half of the eighteenth century by the appearance of his poetry in anthologies and the efforts of various biographers. A collection of previously unpublished pieces initially entitled *The Remains* went through three editions in the 1730s, though it is difficult to imagine his reputation being enhanced by such a shabby compilation. From Joseph Browne, the editor and apparently another of King's associates, we learn interesting details about his complex and attractive personality; and through the publication of some of the doctor's supposedly extensive collection of loose papers and notes, we get some insight into his
true beliefs, opinions, and tastes. Browne's critical remarks are few and, as one would expect, generally complimentary. King, he insists, is 'our English Ovid', although his 'chiefest Pleasures' lay in writing 'Trifles'. The testimonies of Browne and other witnesses were taken up by the biographers, who generally depicted King as a witty, learned gentleman scholar who wrote some amusing and clever pieces, but whose excessive conviviality and essential laziness militated against both his professional career and his literary achievement. The occasional and parodic nature of most of the writings also ensured that not everyone continued to appreciate them. While discussing the first edition of Dodsley's *A Collection of Poems, by several Hands* in a letter to Horace Walpole, Thomas Gray rated 'Mr Bramston only a step or two above Dr. King, who is as low in my estimation as in yours'. The subsequent removal of the offending poems from the anthology augered badly for the survival and continuing appreciation of King's 'Trifles'.

Yet his writings continued to be published throughout the second half of the century; and in 1776 John Nichols brought out the only edition of his complete works, including a biography in which some of Browne's factual errors are corrected. Though Nichols accepts the earlier views that King was lazy and careless so far as most things were concerned, he points out that he showed 'incredible diligence and assiduity' when it came to 'ranging freely and at large through the pleasant fields of polite learning' (p. x). Paraphrasing Browne, he notes that the doctor was 'exquisitely well read', and 'among the learned, an universal scholar and able critic' (p. xxix). Naturally his writings are highly commended, works like *Dialogues of the Dead* and *The Art of Cookery* (his 'most ingenious piece') being highlighted as prime examples of the 'admirable species of banter' that was his 'peculiar talent' (p. xiii). In his 'Additional Observations' he writes that King's 'most striking characteristicks were, an inexhaustible fund of real wit, and an irony most severely poignant', qualities which prompt a comparison with the late
eighteenth-century satirist Dr William Kenrick and, ultimately, Sterne (III, p. 308).

Possibly encouraged by the Nichols edition, within a few years other editors had included King's poetry in various series and collections, notably volume twenty of Dr Johnson's *The Works of the English Poets*. In what is one of the briefest of his Lives, Johnson particularly commends *A Voyage to Cajamai*, and finds *The Art of Love* 'remarkable, notwithstanding its title, for purity of sentiment'. What praise there is tends to be cryptic: the *Heathen Gods*, for instance, is considered 'useful; but it might have been produced without the powers of King'. The doctor, it is claimed, 'endeavoured rather to divert than astonish', and his thoughts 'seldom aspired to sublimity'. King's purpose, Johnson concludes, is to be merry; but perhaps, to enjoy his mirth, it may be sometimes necessary to think well of his opinions. Enough readers obviously enjoyed King's mirth to warrant his appearance in further collections of poetry published during the remaining decades of the century.

Early nineteenth century criticism of King is almost invariably connected with the critics' moral judgements on the author's perceived character flaws. Apart from his notorious indolence, Charles Coote detects 'a tincture of misanthropy' in King's personality, though he concedes to him 'some pretensions' to honour and integrity, and points out that 'he never lost that religious spirit which he had imbibed in his early days'. As for King's poems, they are 'of a slight texture, and display talent rather than genius'. Coote praises his 'Pantheon' (i.e., *The Heathen Gods*), correctly identifies the Lucianic nature of the *Dialogues of the Dead*, and claims that as a 'zealous Tory, Dr King delighted in attacking the Whigs with the severity of sarcasm'. With the comments two years later of the Reverend Mark Noble, King's reputation reached its nadir. King, writes Noble with an annoying mixture of condescension and contempt, 'was an example how much splendid talents may be misapplied'. Ignoring his duties and social responsibilities, he 'ingloriously gave himself up to the writing of madrigals, retirement,
and spleen', and was 'one of the Tory sycophants supported by Bolingbroke'. One suspects more than a little zeal (and perhaps a little Whig sycophancy) in the good reverend's 'Biographical History'. Fortunately Noble's silly and inaccurate article had even less effect than Gray's dismissive comments, for within the next twelve years his poetry was published in various collections and anthologies no less than five times. In 1842 he became the subject of a hitherto unnoticed 'Commeration Essay' delivered at Christ Church by a certain George Marshall, which is reviewed at some length in Appendix D.

By far the most interesting and noteworthy discussion of King in the nineteenth century is provided by Issac Disreali in his *The Calamities and Quarrels of Authors*, which, although extremely brief, it is still one of the most perceptive and appreciative accounts of King's writing. Compared with other 'men of genius' such as Gay, Farquhar, and Colley Cibber, he is described as a 'wit of a very original cast', who invented a 'new species of literary burlesque' when he transposed extracts from the works he was parodying into totally different forms and blended them with his own comic invention, dry sarcasm, and keen irony. This last assertion is erroneous; but Disreali is surely much closer to the mark in suggesting that King's 'drolleries', if small in scope and scale, are nonetheless 'exquisite', and display a 'Lucianic spirit,...flashes of Rabelais, and not seldom...the causticity of his friend Swift'. Like many of his predecessors, Disreali regrets that King wasted a 'genius capable of better' on mere parody and travesty; but perhaps only the Scriblerians and Nichols had understood as well as he had that in most cases King's exercises in these minor genres were exceptional, valid, and more to the point, often very amusing: King, he assures his readers, 'still moves the risible muscles of his readers'.

A few lines in *The Cambridge History of English Literature* set the stage for King's return to the literary scene in the twentieth century, albeit in a minor role. Though
described as a 'rambling and unequal writer', he is praised for the 'humour and goodhumour' that abounds in his work, and for his ability to 'turn little songs with a great deal of neatness'. Associations are readily drawn between him and the Scriblerians, especially Arbuthnot, and the suggestion is made that the *Useful Transactions* 'may have furnished hints to Arbuthnot when writing the *Memoirs of Scriblerus*'. *Dialogues of the Dead* is described as 'very clever', while both *A Journey to London* and *The Transactioneer* are considered 'amusing'. The editors' verdict that King's works 'deserve to be better known than they now are' was to be repeated over the following years.24

Two studies appeared in the second decade of the century which were ultimately to have a major bearing on subsequent interpretations of King's satires. The first is Carson Duncan's *The New Science and English Literature in the Classical Period*25, which lists King as one of a number of satirists of the 'New Science' who found the activities of the new group of experimenters and 'virtuosi' ridiculous. He is described as 'a writer of charming cleverness and brilliant wit' standing between the Restoration wits and those of Anne's reign. Yet his satire, writes Duncan, lacks any serious point: 'King's attitude is that of comedy....His aim is to raise a laugh, and he does it at the expense of the worthy and the unworthy'.26 According to this line of argument, King knew little and cared less about science: his ignorant mockery of the virtuosi was motivated by a simple desire to make other people laugh at what they also failed to understand.

The other book is Richard Forster Jones's *Lewis Theobald*, an important and still useful discussion of the central themes of the satires on the 'New Scholarship' of Bentley and his followers which proliferated in the early eighteenth century. Jones touches upon King's contribution to the anti-Bentley canon, and in an appendix argues convincingly for King's authorship of a particular piece of burlesque.27 The most significant aspect of his book, however, is his recognition of the 'modernity' of
Bentley's methodology, as characterized by 'its insistence on minute accuracy'. Though in this study Jones is primarily concerned with clarifying the real divisions that existed between the modern kind of scholarship and the less exacting approach of the scholars of the Renaissance Humanist tradition, his book laid the foundations for his later influential theories on the association between Bentleian scholarship and the New Science, which I shall discuss shortly.

In 1920 K.N. Colville published an anthology comprising various tracts by Arbuthnot and King's Dialogues of the Dead and A Journey to London. In the introduction he states that King was 'typical of the minor wits of the period - facile, but responding only to external stimulus and incapable of sustained creative effort'. His 'extraordinarily wide reading and acute understanding', he observes, 'were of little profit, lacking industry and purpose'. Colville's Miscellany was followed seven years later by an article from G.C. Williams, which to a large extent makes up for its lack of originality and scholarship by its enthusiastic advocacy of King's genius for humour. If an honour-roll existed for 'those geniuses whose works are dead, dry, dull, and forgotten, but whose lives served for a little while to brighten the mouldy corners of human existence or to play along its poorer arches, or to gild its more glorious friezes', then in Williams's view King's name would appear near its top. The doctor, he claims, 'was as true a humorist as ever lived - a humorist in prose, a humorist in verse, a humorist in his daily life, a humorist in his profession, a humorist in his career, and...a humorist in his attitude towards himself'. The biographical nature of Williams's criticism is plain: King's work is a reflection of a man who loved little else but 'dreams, poetry, laughter, friends, and good scholarship', and who by nature saw life, and particularly his own, as essentially ludicrous. He therefore fails to consider sufficiently the formal aspects of King's writings, and virtually ignores those works which run counter to his image of the man, in particular his controversial tracts. He
focuses instead on works like *The Art of Cookery* and *Orpheus and Eurydice*, pointing out some of the qualities in each which set King's work above that of most of his contemporaries, though failing to discuss adequately the parodic aspects of both and the real thematic significance of the former. Williams pays the ultimate accolade when he writes that some of the imagery in *Orpheus and Eurydice* is 'worthy of the imagination of the poet of the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, and far above that of the poet of *The Rape of the Lock* ' - though he also acknowledges the poem's unfortunate unevenness. King's work, he concludes, is exceptional for its spirit, singular freedom, and originality: 'in an age of much heavy prose and unspeakably deadening verse, King was the author of prose and verse, which, after more than two hundred years, is still readable and enjoyable'. If Williams's article is prone to hyperbole and in some important areas misleading, it is nevertheless a readable and inspiring introduction for those unfamiliar with King's work.

King's works were to some extent considered in relation to their genre in two studies of English burlesque published in the early thirties. George Kitchen places King's satires within the burlesque tradition which prevailed throughout the latter half of the seventeenth century and well into the following, and finds at least one of them on the whole 'rather diverting'; while Richmond Bond focuses on King's poetry in his very much better study of English burlesque poetry in the first half of the eighteenth century. Two critical biographies of figures normally closely associated with King written over the next decade and a half have also provided a few helpful biographical facts and critical remarks. In *Tom Brown of Facetious Memory*, Benjamin Boyce suggests that Brown's *Letters from the Dead to the Living* owes a debt to King's *Dialogues*, and sees a resemblance between the doctor's Lucianic attack on Bentley and the 'extravagant humour' of Rabelais. In his critical biography of Ned Ward, Howard Troyer supplies some handy leads on King's life, but precious little in the way of
criticism of his work.\textsuperscript{36}

The work of R.F. Jones and Majorie Nicolson in the thirties and forties brought a crucial shift in the interpretation of Augustan 'satires on science', which in turn has had a marked affect on King studies. As part of her article on the effects of the microscope on the English imagination, Nicolson examines the satiric response to the emergence and consolidation of the scientific revolution.\textsuperscript{37} Following on from Duncan, she places King among a group of satirists supposedly intent on mocking modern science and the Royal Society above all, an argument she was to develop further in her later article, 'The Scientific Background of Swift's \textit{Voyage to Laputa}'.\textsuperscript{38} Swift's satire, she claims, was only one of many which 'laughed at the impractical virtuosi', the most notable being Butler's \textit{Hudibras} and some of his smaller poems, Shadwell's \textit{The Virtuoso}, Ned Ward's \textit{London Spy}, Tom Brown's \textit{Amusements Serious and Comical}, and King's \textit{A Journey to London, The Transactioneer}, and \textit{Dialogues of the Dead}. In both articles, however, she stresses that not all scientists were held up for ridicule, and that those such as Newtown who could display tangible benefits from their work were not necessarily dismissed as Gimcracks and Sidrophels. The satirists, she claims, emphasized the division between pure and applied science, and judged the work of both individuals and institutions like the Royal Society according to the principle of utility.

Jones's work on the relationship between science and literature during the seventeenth century has been of immense importance to subsequent literary critics and historians of science, and though his central points are well known, their profound influence on King criticism demands that they receive a concise revision. Two key issues fall within his domain: first, the philosophical and broad ideolological divisions caused by the scientific revolution in seventeenth-century English society; and secondly, the influence of science on seventeenth-century prose style. Though Jones specifically mentions King only once (and then in passing) in the course of his books and articles on
these subjects, there is no doubt that what he has to say about Swift and other humanist satirists equally applies to him, a point not lost on subsequent critics. In essence he interprets the debate that developed in England during the middle of the century and continued into the eighteenth about the value and role of natural philosophy in terms of a fundamental clash between the adherents of traditional Humanism and Aristotelianism (the 'Ancients'), and those who had adopted empiricism and applied its methodology to all fields of learning, including classical scholarship (the 'Moderns'). What had begun in France as a literary quarrel about the relative merits of classical and modern authors thus became an epistemological conflict across the Channel. This intellectual struggle, however, was just part of a much larger historical dialectic, of which the English Civil War was merely the most violent expression. The emergence of science, he argues, was bound up with political and theological factors, as evidenced by the events in Christ Church during both the Interregnum and the Restoration. This ultra-Royalist college became the centre of a struggle between the High Anglican establishment and Puritan reformers in the last years of the Interregnum over proposed changes to the curriculum, which would have replaced some of the traditional learning with more scientific, utilitarian subjects.

This leads Jones to assert in later works that the Christ Church Wits who had attacked Bentley in the Phalaris affair had inherited 'all the old animosity aroused against the new philosophy' inside their College, and to imply that King's satires on Sloane and Lister, like those on Bentley, derived from a fundamental antipathy towards Baconian empiricism, the Royal Society, and bourgeois modernity in general. King's real literary ancestors, therefore, are men like Henry Stubbe and Meric Casaubon; the true origins of his satires lie neither in immediate circumstances nor the behaviour of certain individuals, but in immensely significant arguments and events which first emerged between twenty and forty years ago. Against Duncan's view that King's burlesques are
mere fun and show no sign of any serious concern about science, Jones implies that they are inherently serious and hostile, a conservative reaction to the tremendous changes in English society which had taken place during the century.

Jones's work on prose style is closely connected with this interpretation of the Ancients/Moderns debate. He assumes that the campaign initiated by certain prominent members of the scientific community such as Sprat and Wilkins for a plain prose style devoid of metaphor and rhetorical embellishment was the prime cause of a fundamental change in the nature of English prose. Their humanistic opponents, the lovers of belles lettres and stout defenders of the metaphor, naturally were appalled, and set about ridiculing the aims and programmes of the reformers. Style, like methodology, had thus become a matter indivisible from one's allegiance in the great disputes between ancients and moderns, theo-political conservatism and non-conformity.40

In the following decades Jones's thesis tended to assume the trappings of established authority and orthodoxy. Miriam Starkman, for instance, who touches upon King's Dialogues in her study of Swift's Tale, admits her 'great indebtedness' to Jones, before claiming that King condemns science 'for its a-social and quixotic lack of utility' at a time when 'science was being impugned for its mean and mechanick utilitarianism'.41 In their different ways Nicolson and Jones also had an undoubted influence on a series of valuable articles on King by Colin Horne. Two of these are primarily bibliographical, and very useful in establishing King's canon and publication dates.42 In another Horne notes examples of King's delight in playing with mock-scientific terminology, and suggests that 'scholars educated in an older tradition of learning were, with other objections, particularly hostile to those innovations in vocabulary which we now term scientific jargon'.43 In 1946 he published an important article on King's involvement in the Phalaris controversy, in which he praises his 'flair for banter and parody and...fertility in devising new forms of controversial wit', and
claims that to King both Bentley and the Royal Society were 'gross offenders against classical good taste and common sense'. Although in a later essay he points out correctly that the Society was in fact composed of men educated in the Humanist tradition, he reiterates the charge that wits and scholars such as Shadwell, Butler, Swift, Arbuthnot, and King 'found much of the work of the Royal Society intellectually contemptible and culturally subversive'.

Aside from Horne's articles, some remarks made by Charles Kerby-Miller in the introduction to his classic edition of the Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus probably gave King's reputation its biggest post-war boost. Perhaps prompted by the observation in The Cambridge History of English Literature, Kerby-Miller looks at the relationship between King's burlesques and the Scriblerians' satires on pedantry and virtuosity, in the process situating him between them and Butler in a line stretching back to Rabelais and Cervantes. He notes a few likely specific borrowings and even proposes the possibility of there having been some collaboration between King and Arbuthnot on the Useful Transactions in Philosophy, and other Sorts of Learning. Although he asserts the Scriblerians' superiority in the field, he acknowledges that King 'deserves credit for showing some of the possibilities of burlesque in the field of science'. While Kerby-Miller seems particularly concerned with King's connections with one of the older generation of Scriblerians, Adina Forsgren took up the same issue some years later in respect of one of the younger, John Gay. Forsgren argues that King was among the more influential wits from whom Gay learned the rudiments of burlesque poetry, a kind that belonged to 'the lower order' of the neo-classical poetic hierarchy. Along with such contemporaries as Steele and Arbuthnot, she claims, King 'nourished his [i.e. Gay's] inclination towards the "little taste"', and by his 'Trifles' encouraged the younger poet to become a master of 'Kleinkunst'.

In 1965 Hugh Williamson published a new edition of King's school textbook on the
classical gods and heroes', and Ernest Eugene Weeks submitted as his doctoral dissertation King's first modern critical biography. The thesis clarifies a number of chronological problems and introduces some fresh biographical information, but on the whole suffers from its author's uncritical use of secondary sources and tendency to interpret King's satires in the light of the prevailing theories about, for example, the late Christian Humanist/Aristotelian response to natural philosophy. Following Jones, Weeks readily assumes a fundamental connection between the anti-Royal Society rantings of Henry Stubbe, the satires of Butler, the satiric journalism of Tom Brown and Ned Ward, and King's ridicule of Martin Lister and Hans Sloane, seeing them all simply as variations on the same anti-science, anti-moderns theme. King's satire, though, was superior to all except the Scriblerians', displaying a degree of sophistication and learning lacking even in Butler's work. Weeks suggests further that the Scriblerians' debt to him was considerable, even going so far as to say that they could not have written their own scholarly kind of satire 'without the pioneering efforts of Dr King who can almost be said to have invented it' (p. 144).

Weeks's study suffers from its critical superficiality, especially in terms of King's poetry. There is virtually no close analysis of its versification, the parodic aspects of both the prose and poetry are inadequately demonstrated, and no consideration is given to King's use of genre. At the same time far too much attention is paid to matters which are irrelevant, while the real relevance of other extraneous matters remains undetected. This is best shown by comparing the four-page discussion of Animadversions, which Weeks admits is 'one of the best things he ever did' (pp. 38-41), with the six pages devoted to Shadwell and Butler (96-102), and the seven given over to the account of the Anglesea divorce trial (pp. 146-52). In the latter case he not only provides a lot of trivial information about those involved, but also fails to uncover all the details of King's contribution, which do in fact reveal several significant clues to his personality and
beliefs. Contradiction and confusion are also prevalent, notably with regard to the question of King's originality. Though he credits King with almost the invention of the sort of satire the Scriblerians were to write (p. 144), and describes one of his pieces as 'highly original' (p. 143), he later insists that he was 'never original' (p. 192), and still later, that he was 'seldom truly original' (p. 207). Aside from a few minor factual errors, he makes one major mistake when he confuses the eleventh number of The Examiner with the twelfth, and so argues on quite reasonable grounds for King's authorship of the wrong paper (pp. 229-30). Weeks's dissertation, then, is inadequate as the only full-length study of King's life and works, offering merely a few new biographical titbits in compensation for its general lack of rigorous analysis and critical insight.

Over the last two decades, however, a number of King's individual works have received much more thorough treatment in various articles, chapters, and doctoral theses. Frederick Keener devotes virtually an entire chapter to King's Dialogues of the Dead in his critical history of the genre, suggesting that 'to King belongs the credit for making this an English genre'.50 In 1982 the same work became the subject of doctoral dissertation by David Robert Lampe.51 That Lampe spends one hundred and sixty three pages discussing a work which in its original edition is only a fraction of that size would surely have tickled the satirist of Lister and Bentley; but within its overly confining ambit, the study is useful, reasonable, and convincing in its challenge of certain earlier interpretations. Besides a brief introduction, the thesis is made up of four chapters, in which are discussed the work's historical and intellectual background, its formal characteristics and literary heritage (in particular its relationship to Lucian's Dialogues of the Dead), and its place besides Swift's and Pope's contributions to the mini-tradition of anti-Bentley satire. In the second chapter Lampe effectively argues against the Jones view expressed by Weeks that the Ancients/Modemns issue lies at the heart of King's ridicule, though he does concede that King draws a connection between Bentley's kind
of scholarship and the practices of the new scientists. His main point is that King saw the Bentleian method as a threat to the late Renaissance values of England's established order, and particularly to the principle of polite learning. While my own study deviates from Lampe's at certain points, it is often indebted to it, as will appear in my later chapter on King's satires on Bentley.

King's supposed 'anti-science satires' have also come under close scrutiny of late, though in essence the criticism shows little movement away from the positions of Jones, Nicolson, Horne, and Weeks. In his impressive and in many ways valuable study of one of the period's most notorious virtuosi, Joseph Levine briefly examines King's satiric role in the controversies within the contemporary scientific and antiquarian communities, echoes earlier suggestions that his ridicule of Sloan and Lister was an important influence on the Scriblerians, and states that King was unimpressed with modern historiography and found 'the whole business of examining nature irrelevant, however it was concocted'. Levine asserts that King, 'who was 'almost as ingenious' as Swift and possessed a gift for parody that was 'unsurpassed', was opposed to the activities and institution of the Royal Society; and in his satires on Bentley displays not only a 'profound repugnance' for the great scholar 'but for all modern learning', whether scholarly or scientific. 

In his doctoral thesis, 'English Satire on Science, 1660-1750', Richard Koppel likewise considers King an opponent of Baconian empiricism, and claims that he was the 'first to write a more serious kind of anti-scientific satire'. Koppel takes the Jones and Weeks line to its limit when he links King's perceived anti-scientism, as it were, with his political conservatism, religious orthodoxy, and 'over-all intellectual outlook'. From Koppel's perspective, King's satires represent the anxious reaction of a traditionalist to the threat posed by the brave new world of science.

Two articles by Roger Lund have also looked at King's attitude towards natural philosophy and his relationship to the Scriblerians. In "More Strange than True": Sir
Hans Sloane, King's *Transactioneer*, and the Deformation of English Prose*, Lund re-examines this satiric dialogue in the light of the Royal Society's attempts to reform prose style. It is King's emphasis on the absurdities of scientific jargon and scientific writing in general, he claims, which sets his work apart from other satirists of modern science; though he confirms that the satire derives from the author's 'hostility toward modern virtuosi, Sloane in particular'. In his other article, published two years earlier, he proposes King's *Rufinus* as a major source of *The Dunciad*, and recalls previous suggestions of indebtedness to King in *Peri Bathous* and the *Essay on Criticism*.

It is a clear sign of the steady revival of King's poetic reputation in recent times that *The Art of Cookery* was the subject of John Fuller's Chatterton Lecture for 1976, 'Carving Trifles: William King's Imitation of Horace'. Fuller avoids seeing the work merely as a poem with some prose attachments, recognizing that its mock-letters and poetic parody together constitute a complete Menippean satire. Fuller's identification of King's real classical heritage, in both stylistic and thematic terms, has had a significant influence on my own thesis, and not just in terms of *The Art of Cookery*. King's poems have also been featured in a number of studies of the period's poetry of the last few years, while Peter Shackel has specified him as a significant influence on Swift's verse. King's inclusion in the recently published *New Oxford Anthology of Eighteenth Century Poetry* might be seen as the culmination of the renewed interest in his writings, though the poem selected, 'The Beggar Woman', is by no means his best. Even so, it does hint at the talents of a gifted author, and the paternalistic compassion of this enigmatic, yet typical 'gentleman'.

This relatively meagre body of work represents for all intents and purposes the sum total of King studies. In this work I have made little attempt to add much in the way of
biographical facts, preferring to concentrate my research on King's writings rather than his 'life and times'. Even so, I have devoted the first section of the thesis to a study of his life, opinions, and social and ideological milieu, in recognition of the fact that his writings are inextricably bound up with contemporary events and issues, and reflect the attitudes and dominant values of his class, Christian Humanist education, and historical period. Aside from gathering and assimilating all the available biographical data (including a few hitherto unknown and important details that have come to light), I have been especially concerned to stress the ideological significance of his upbringing and education, and to establish with as much certainty as possible the true character of his 'world view', particularly in relation to politics, learning, and literature. The first part of the thesis, then, is designed to form the foundations upon which my interpretation of the themes of his individual satires are built in the second section.

I have approached this task in two ways. First, I have treated with due scepticism some of the earlier theories concerning the intellectual and ideological background that previous critics such as Weeks have taken for granted, and made use of the latest research into such extra-literary areas as the character of Restoration science and the political history of the period. The review above has hopefully demonstrated that, for example, the idea that King was fundamentally opposed to the pursuit of scientific knowledge was not held by his contemporaries and has in fact become entrenched only relatively recently. This theory was based on certain historical interpretations of the relationship between the great social, political and epistemological revolutions of the seventeenth century which have since been either modified considerably or completely rejected; in other words, the premises upon which rests the whole Jonesian interpretation of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century satires on science are faulty, making the argument itself practically untenable. One of the main aims of this thesis is the refutation of the Jones view at least as applied to King, and its replacement with an interpretation which
accords with the most recent findings of historians of late seventeenth-century science. Central to this is a re-examination of the relationship between Humanism and Restoration natural philosophy, particularly in terms of the Baconian principles of utility and the efficient communication of knowledge. King, I shall argue, was certainly in many ways typical of the Humanist satirists identified by Nicolson, Horne and others, a lover of the classics, politically reactionary, theologically orthodox. But far from disqualifying him from a knowledge and appreciation of natural philosophy per se, this only served to determine the particular strain of seventeenth-century science he believed in, i.e. the 'High Baconianism' adopted by the dominant Anglican royalists of the Restoration period. It is this set of principles which underlies his attacks on Martin Lister, Hans Sloane, and that group of scientists to which they belonged, and which ideologically binds his satires on scientific subjects with his politico/theological works.

At the same time, I have also made a close appraisal of his non-satiric writings in order to establish King's personal and unambiguous position on the matters dealt with ironically in his burlesque tracts. In his Adversaria, for example, King makes general observations about such matters as natural philosophy, modern literature, and scholarship which indicate his true position towards them: too often in the past these have been either ignored or misunderstood by critics too ready to toe the Jones line. On some occasions similar direct statements expressed elsewhere have been taken as irony, seemingly because they run counter to what King, as a late seventeenth-century Christian Humanist should believe and say. I have deliberately adopted a method which, I suspect, King himself would have approved, one which is almost Baconian in its scepticism, empiricism, and rejection of any authority who skilfully avoids 'the facts' in order to construct ingenious but erroneous theories and schema.

The second and largest part of this study is concerned with the bulk of King's writings, his controversial prose, burlesques, and poetry. Throughout I have not lost
sight of the fact that these works are basically satirical: they are therefore rhetorical, hyperbolical, and not necessarily consistent. For these reasons it is not as easy to ascertain King's real attitude towards his subject as some of his critics have assumed. Perhaps most significant of all is the question of genre, which, as this survey has shown, has never been treated adequately. This study recognizes the vital importance of King's choice and use of genre, ultimately staking a claim for King's lodgement in the serio-comic tradition of Menippean satire. This classical literary kind - which paradoxically is as much an anti-genre - enjoyed tremendous popularity throughout the Renaissance; and its greatest exponents, most notably Lucian, Erasmus, and Rabelais, continued to serve as satiric models throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Moreover, the genre, with its characteristically sophisticated and learned parodic wit, was accepted as the natural vehicle for the satirist of intellectual folly and pretension, whatever its specific manifestation. Form itself, therefore, was utilized consciously as an expression of theme. If King's similarities with Lucian and Rabelais have occasionally been recognized, to date only Lampe has considered the real implications of this to any significant extent, though Fuller has at least noted the Menippean nature of The Art of Cookery.

An analysis of King's satires and burlesques in terms of the conventions of Menippean tradition helps to locate their essential formal and thematic unity, and reconciles their apparent classical heritage with their peculiarly modern aspects, in particular their mockery of scientific jargon. It also enables a fairer evaluation of King's satiric achievement, since it will be judged on its own terms. The attention can be turned on King's use of the Menippean genre, specifically his narrowing of its typically general field of vision to the intense focus of personal and occasional satire. This occasionality, too often ignored or played down by previous critics, is here given its proper emphasis. King's writings are therefore at once topical and general, precisely defined and yet
far-reaching in their implications; and it is this dual quality which has led me to treat those satires which deal with the basic question of the abuse of learning in chapters defined by their individual targets. A separate chapter is also given over to his political and controversial works, which have vital links with the Menippean tradition.

If King's *menippeae* are ultimately serious, they are also (as virtually everyone has remarked) in the main richly comical, and it is another of my intentions to highlight the truly humorous and playful qualities of his work. As play, King's literary games are of course highly sophisticated; to participate, one has to possess not only his ironical disposition and keen sense of the absurd, but also a degree of his erudition and linguistic learning. One of the weaknesses of this study is its author's lack of the latter at least, particularly as regards the classical languages. Future students with a greater knowledge in these areas will probably smile knowingly at jokes that I can only guess exist.

Finally, it will almost certainly be observed that this study does not devote much effort to King's relationship to the Scriblerians, and in particular to establishing direct debts and influences. This has already been done reasonably successfully by Kerby-Miller, Lampe, and to a lesser extent, Weeks and Levine, whose findings I have incorporated in this study when appropriate. My purpose is rather to study King's works for themselves, to recognize their pedigree and their literary virtues and failings, and hopefully to generate further interest in his life and writings. To do this properly it is necessary to brush aside for a moment those more brilliant blooms, and stoop to enjoy the bright, fanciful, and elaborately patterned petals just beneath.

---
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This short poem, apparently found in Dr William King's pocket book on the day of his death, has commonly been supposed to be his own final estimation of his life and literary achievement. Certainly there are good reasons for imagining that King wrote the verse, and for regarding it as a helpful guide to the character of the man and his writings. The somewhat stoical and Horatian sentiments expressed in the first and last couplets, the affection for the classics, and the confession of a facile, exuberant approach to poetic composition in the middle couplets, all accord with what is known about the author, and provide a partial explanation for much of his behaviour and uneven, predominantly occasional literary works. Yet such a brief and plainly rhetorical piece cannot of course tell the whole story. To get a clearer and more complete picture, one needs to begin by examining all the available details of King's intriguing and rather unfortunate life, and situating him within his social and historical context.

Unfortunately little is known to date about King's family background and earliest years. His great grandfather was a merchant by the name of David King, whose wife, Anne Tivelin, was a Flemish refugee whose family were probably weavers. The
marriage produced at least one son, Ezekias, who was destined to become an Anglican cleric and William's grandfather. Following her husband's early death, Anne King married another Fleming called John La Motte, a wealthy merchant in the cloth industry, whose devotion to the Protestant cause was so intense that he became active in both the Anglican parish of St. Bartholomew Exchange and the Dutch Reformed Church at Austinfriars. Presumably Ezekias King's upbringing coloured his Anglicanism, which must have stood him in good stead during the Commonwealth; and by 1656 (the year of his stepfather's death) he had been installed as the minister of Fulmore in Cambridgeshire. He too had at least one son, Ezekial, whose Old Testament name further suggests the puritan hue of Ezekias's brand of Anglicanism. What effect the Restoration had on the career and fortune of the 'pious and learned minister', and how his son came to be a 'Gentleman of London' in possession of 'a pretty paternal Estate in Middlesex and elsewhere', are questions which remain unanswered. A plausible speculation is that Ezekial enjoyed a considerable inheritance and married judiciously, though nothing is known about his wife. It was perhaps through his mother that William, born in London in 1663, was distantly related to the aristocratic and high Anglican Hyde and Harcourt families, as has been commonly supposed. In his Adversaria King remembers having seen 'my cousin Harcourt's fine pieces of Paulo Veronese' and 'Lord Clarendon's Library', and he was to have close contact with members of the Clarendon family towards the end of his life. However, examination of the Harcourt Papers and other sources has failed to confirm any connections.

While his family's immediate past was bourgeois and to some extent Puritan, William King was raised a member of the Anglican gentry during the first years of the Restoration, a time when all aspects of society were being reinterpreted in terms of an inalienable association between God and monarch. As historians of the period have observed, the ideological and political climate of Restoration England was zealously reactionary, as the restored monarchy and re-established Church sought to overturn the tremendous changes made to English society during the Interregnum, and to reassert the
legitimacy of the Stuart state. Leading poets and propagandists, notably Dryden and Cowley, played an important role in this, depicting Charles II as a new David in panegyrics and satires. But the most vital organ of the revived social and political order was the Anglican Church, which resumed its traditional place at the nation's religious head with a vigour and commitment which equalled anything displayed by the Presbyterians. Two new events of a fundamentally political nature appeared on the Church calendar: the annual remembrance on 30 January of Charles I's execution, and the celebration on 29 May of his son's birthday and restoration. As Norman Sykes writes, 'around these two new state holy days there developed a fervour of political loyalty to the royal matyr and the reigning monarch, illustrated by the revival of the practice of the royal touch for the healing of scrofula'.

The Tory doctrines of divine right, indefeasible hereditary succession, passive obedience, and non-resistance were promoted from pulpits across the country, while children learned their duties and responsibilities to the monarch from devotional manuals such as *The Whole Duty of Man*.

The prevailing idea that hierarchy and regal authority were both natural and proper - which derived from the ancient and medieval notion of the Great Chain of Being - was endorsed by the Church's teachings and used to underpin and justify the structures of Church and State. This Anglican and Tory ideology of order infused all forms of social relationship, whether between monarch and subject, squire and tenant, husband and wife. Royalist propagandists and clerics were quick to remind the people of the corruption and anarchy of the apostical Commonwealth, and to use this as evidence of the consequences awaiting any society which dared throw off the benevolent shackles of monarchical authority. The aggressive and highly organized propagation of these values by the various agencies of the dominant class was immensely effective, to the extent that even after the 'Glorious Revolution' large sections of English society, including a substantial proportion of the subaltern classes, continued to adhere to the Tory ideology of order until well into the eighteenth century. As a member of the landed gentry, King
could hardly have escaped such persistent and pervasive socialisation. The marks of his upbringing as a member of the lower section of the Restoration governing class were to remain stamped upon his consciousness for the rest of his life.

His education only served to reinforce his class consciousness and religious orthodoxy. Nothing is known about his earliest schooling; but it was surely of a reasonably high standard, for in 1678, at the age of fifteen, he was admitted as a King's Scholar to the famous Westminster School, generally regarded as the finest in seventeenth-century England.\(^8\) Among those privileged to attend it were some of the greatest and most powerful men of the age, including John Locke, Christopher Wren, Robert Hooke, John Dryden, Matthew Prior, the notorious Judge George Jeffries, and the 'snarling adversary' of the Royal Society, Henry Stubbe. The school's master for most of the century was Dr Richard Busby, who by King's time had become almost legendary.\(^9\) Busby had ruled over Westminster since 1638 when he was appointed its master provisionally, and was so highly regarded that, despite remaining a staunch royalist, he retained his position throughout the Interregnum and up until his death in 1695. His commitment to the traditional political order is evidenced by the fact that Charles I was publicly prayed for at the school on the day of his execution, an incident later proudly recalled by Robert South, who noted further that under Busby's direction his old school was one which neither disposed 'men to division in Church, nor sedition in state - a school so unattaintedly loyal, that I can truly and knowingly aver that in the very worst of times we really were King's scholars'.\(^10\) Clearly South only saw the 'state' in terms of monarchy and Anglicanism, for Dr John Owen, the Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, during the Commonwealth, felt that 'it would never be well with the nation until this school was suppressed; for that it naturally bred men up to an opposition to the Government'.\(^11\) Westminster was especially renowned for producing high-ranking, 'high-flying' Anglican clerics, and at one point in the late seventeenth century half the country's bishops were old Westminsters. Indeed, Thomas Sprat, Bishop of Rochester and the historian of the Royal Society, is reported to have once
thanked God for granting him a bishopric 'though no Westminster'. Few of the boys could resist imbibing the values and ideological presuppositions of such a daunting and domineering Master, and King was no exception. Towards the end of his life he was to acknowledge that his attitudes and beliefs owed a great deal to his Westminster education, and that Busby's memory was 'for ever sacred' to him.

Busby was also famous for his pedagogical methods, particularly for his emphasis on humanistic teaching and the enforcement of discipline. Dryden, in the dedication to The Rival Ladies, remembers that the punishment for ending two consecutive lines with verbs in his Latin exercises was a good whipping, a testimony well supported by the reflections of Roger de Coverley: 'Dr Busby, a great Man! he whipp'd my Grandfather; a very great Man! I should have gone to him myself if I had not been a Blockhead; a very great man!'

At Westminster the focus was on elementary logic, grammar and rhetoric, with subjects like maths and geometry being available to those who showed any interest in or aptitude for them. Busby himself was a noted classical grammarian, the author of Latin and Greek textbooks which became standard works, and even of an unpublished Hebrew grammar. His boys were required to read classical works and encouraged to record their thoughts and any appealing quotation in commonplace books and note-books, while extemporary composition and translation of verse also featured in the day's proceedings. One of the more enduring legacies of Busby's education is Dryden's translation of the third satire of Persius, which he recalls doing 'when a King's-Scholar at Westminster School, for a Thursday Nights Exercise'. The Westminster boys certainly impressed John Evelyn, who noted in his Diary on 13 May, 1661, that 'I heard, & saw such Exercises at the Election of Scholars at Westminster Schoole, to be sent to the Universitie, both in Lat : Gr : & Heb : Arabic &c in Theames & extemporary Verses, as wonderfully astonish'd me, in such striplings, with the readinesse & witt, some of them not above 12 or 13 years of age'. Thomas Hearne, observing that Busby taught Hebrew and Arabic, records that the master 'was for introducing also some other Languages into his school, on purpose that it might be said...
most, if not all, learned Languages were taught in it'. Steele claimed to be able to detect in a stranger a Westminster education, and praised Busby's 'Genius' for realizing the talents of any boy 'to the utmost height in what Nature designed him', adding significantly that 'it was not his Fault, but the effect of Nature, that there were no indifferent People came out his Hands: but his Scholars were the finest Gentlemen, or the greatest Pedants in the Age'.

In the Michelmas term of 1681, aged eighteen, King went up to Christ Church, Oxford, having been awarded one of the three King's Studentships offered annually to the college. The award was worth £25 per annum to the undergraduate scholar, rising to £44 for the senior 'Philosophi'; and was paid for life, provided the scholar did not withdraw from or fail his studies, or marry. It was also to be surrendered on the attainment of clerical preferment or the assumption of a professional career. Its real value, however, did not lie in its financial remuneration, which was hardly generous. A royal donation initiated by Elizabeth I in 1576, its exclusiveness and regal associations guaranteed its holders immediate distinction and great prospects. As a consequence, the 'Westminsters' tended to regard themselves as an intellectual elite, and form a close-knit circle within the college. It was therefore inevitable that once at Oxford King would gravitate towards his old school friends, among them Francis Atterbury, who had gone up the year before. Atterbury was soon to establish a reputation for his bellicose high churchmanship in a series of theological and political disputes, which earned him a place in Garth's The Dispensary, as Urim. He rose quickly through the ecclesiastical ranks to attain eventually the bishopric of Rochester, only to become embroiled in a Jacobite conspiracy which led to his deprivation and exile to France. King and he would seem to have been firm friends, if a request in a letter from Atterbury's father to be remembered to a certain King refers to Francis's old schoolmate, William. Other old schoolmates included George Smalridge, like Atterbury a future Dean of Christ Church and eventually Bishop of Bristol; Francis Gastrell, ultimately the Bishop of Chester and the Boyle Lecturer in 1697; Edward Hannes, who was to collaborate with King on his first
published work and later became an eminent doctor and Professor of Chemistry at Oxford; and Robert Freind, a future Headmaster of Westminster and intimate friend of Swift and Arbuthnot. They were later joined by Freind's brother, John, destined to become another notable physician, a Tory M.P, and, after being implicated in the Atterbury plot, a prisoner in the Tower; and Charles Boyle, later the fourth Earl of Orrery, who was elected in 1690 at the age of fifteen, and whose translation of the *Epistles of Phalaris* was one of the main causes of the controversy that inspired the *Battle of the Books.* This highly educated and talented group of young men were to become known as the 'Christ Church Wits', Swift's 'allies' of the Ancients.

Certainly nothing Busby had instilled in his boys was likely to be called into question at Christ Church, or for that matter at Oxford generally in 1681, since the universities were among the most enthusiastic proponents of political reaction during the Restoration. High church Toryism predominated in the city to which Charles II temporarily moved his Parliament during the Exclusion Crisis in the early months of that year. Anthony Wood's excitable description of Charles's entry into Oxford, and more particularly his reception at Christ Church, is surely indicative of the tenor of the city's politics:

But that which is most to be noted is that all the way the King passed were such shoutings, acclamations, and ringing of bells, made by loyal hearts and smart lads of the layetie of Oxon, that the aire was so much peiced that the clouds seemed to divide. The general cry was 'Long live King Charles', and many drawing up to the very coach window cryed 'Let the King live, and the devill hang up all roundheads': at which his majestie smiled and seemed well pleased...At the King's comming into the most spacious quadrangle of Christ Church, what by the shouts and the melodious ringing of the ten statelie bells there, the colleedge sounded and the buildings did learne from its scholars to echo forth his majesties's welcome. You might have heard it ring againe and againe: - 'Welcome! Welcome!! thrice welcome!!! Charles the great!' Of all the colleges, none was more fervently loyal and dedicated to the Tory ideology of order than Christ Church. Under its Dean, John Fell (who at the time also served as the Bishop of Oxford), the college adopted an educational policy designed specifically to rear a ruling class committed to defending the interests of the Anglican establishment. The institution itself was rigidly hierarchical and authoritarian; whereas the heads of most
colleges were elected by their own Fellows, the Deanery of Christ Church 'was in the gift of the Crown'. Even the college's canons were royal nominations, and thus open to the influence of such high Tories as Archbishop Sancroft and the Earl of Rochester.\(^{29}\) Serious opposition was simply not brooked; radical political and educational works by authors such as Milton, Hobbes, Locke, and Owen were banned and publicly burnt in the great quadrangle, and Locke himself was expelled (perhaps reluctantly) by Fell from the college in 1684 in the aftermath of the Popish Plot. At a book-burning in 1683, one of these canons, William Jane - who was to become a prominent figure on the high church side in the Convocation battles of the 1690s - is said to have led the college's undergraduates in 'several hums whilst they were burning'.\(^{30}\) It is very likely that King was among the singers.

As Dean of Christ Church, Fell would have left a similar (if less intense) impression upon the young King to that left by Busby. He himself is supposed to have gone up to Christ Church at the age of eleven, and to have obtained his Master of Arts degree at eighteen.\(^{31}\) He fought in the Civil war, naturally on the Royalist side, and remained a committed monarchist all his life. Like Busby, he was extremely devout, attending church services four times a day. After becoming Dean soon after the Restoration, he quickly revived all the old Anglican practices, including the playing of the organ. He too was a strict disciplinarian, though his famous encounter with one of his more notable and rebellious students, Tom Brown, reveals an appealing sense of humour and appreciation of wit.\(^{32}\) He showed a keen interest in architecture, and was partially responsible for the construction of the Sheldonian Theatre, which among other things soon housed the University Press, of which he was one of the founders. Harry Carter claims that Fell's aim in setting up the press was to promote scholarship which would maintain his 'particular kind of Protestant churchmanship, a blend of Anglicanism with Cavalier politics'; and his own manifesto stressed that the task of the Oxford press was the printing of 'Books of Ancient learning, and principal use in Divinity and other sciences'.\(^{33}\) It has been assumed that Fell remained 'wholly devoted to the old
philosophy' and was particularly opposed to Cartesianism; but in fact he also showed considerable interest in the new, 'natural philosophy', a subject upon which more will be said in due course.

Perhaps the most influential Christ Church figure on King, however, was Henry Aldrich. Yet another of Busby's boys, Aldrich was a high Anglican cleric whose conviviality and love of culture must have created a huge impression on the young gentlemen of the college. He possessed high ideals and a deep religious conviction, a marvellous sense of humour and exquisite taste. He displayed abilities in the fields of architecture, music, and pictorial art, as well as literature. With Christopher Wren he designed and built the splendid Peckwater Quadrangle, and as a musician is best remembered for a number of hymns and some catches, including one entitled 'A Catch on Tobacco', which was 'to be sung by 4 men smoking Pipes'. Drinking was supposedly another of Aldrich's favourite pastimes, and an amusing ditty that he translated on the subject is very similar both in form and spirit to the type of verse King himself was later to write:

If all be true that I do think,
There are five reasons we should drink:
Good Wine, a friend, or being dry,
Or lest we should be by and by,
Or any other reason why. 36

His carousing in local pubs with friends like William Jane typifies a wonderfully paradoxical personality, best depicted by one of his students, John Philips, in *The Splendid Shilling*. Aldrich is apparently the happy man who 'void of cares and strife' spends his nights (and shillings) at Juniper's Magpye, or Town-Hall,

Where, mindful of the Nymph, whose wanton Eye
Transfix'd his Soul, and kindled Amorous Flames,
Chloe, or Phillis; he each Circling Glass
Wisheth her Health, and Joy, and equal Love.
Mean while he smoaks, and laughs at merry Tale,
Or Pun ambiguous, or Conundrum quaint. 37

Aldrich was an avid collector of art and artifacts, building a collection which finally
amounted to thousands of books, pamphlets and engravings, eight thousand works of music, and which included rare woodcuts, Raphael cartoons, and the earliest English collection of Italian and French engravings. Some years after Aldrich's death, the antiquary Thomas Hearne defended him from a charge that he was 'a Despiser of Antiquities' by insisting that 'the Dean was a truly learned Man and that he must therefore be Lover of Antiquity, Learning being nothing else but Antiquity'. Hearne's opponent retorted that Aldrich was 'only for polite Learning', to which Hearne replied, 'Why,...that is Antiquity'.

King was to carry on essentially the same argument in a number of his satires over the coming years.

He duly graduated on 8 December, 1685, as a 'compounder', indicating that at the time he possessed an estate worth at least three hundred pounds a year. Having elected to follow the 'law line', he next embarked on his M.A., graduating on 6 July, 1688. He immediately followed this by beginning work on his doctorate in civil law. His choice of subject and career is illustrative of his character, for the civil law was a notoriously esoteric and conservative field, representing the last vestige of the Dutch-Roman legal tradition in England. It required extensive reading of the classical and medieval authorities on law and moral philosophy, and thus an excellent command of Latin. Destined for extinction by the mid-nineteenth century, it was by King's time already virtually redundant, its jurisdiction shrunk to the narrow confines of ecclesiastical and maritime law. Because career opportunities were correspondingly limited, there were few students willing to complete the exhaustive course of study necessary to qualify as a 'civilian'. Yet for King the civil law was in many respects ideal. Its sheer elitism must have appealed to him, and the reading requirements would only have attracted so avid a reader as he is reputed to have been. Browne insists that King read over twenty two thousand books and manuscripts during his stay at Oxford, though Johnson qualifies such an astonishing (and no doubt exaggerated) claim by noting that the 'books were certainly not very long, the manuscripts not very difficult, nor the remarks [that King made on some of them in his Adversaria] very large'.

---
His rank as a senior student of Oxford's foremost college and, more importantly, his budding literary talents, together ensured that by now he enjoyed a certain degree of prominence within the university. When the then Princess Anne was due to visit Oxford in the summer of 1688, it is reported that she was to be 'entertained with a copy of English verses, spoke by 3, made by Atterbury, and a song by King, and set by Mr Estwic'. Sometime in that year he also wrote (in collaboration with Edward Hannes) his first piece of controversial prose, *Reflections upon Mr. Varillas's History of Heresy*, a work which was to bring him great credit and praise as a brilliant young wit, as will be revealed later.

He took his D.C.L on 7 July, 1692, and after obtaining his fiat from Archbishop Tillotson, was admitted to Doctors' Commons as an advocate on 11 November of that year. The rapidity of his attaining a place in this hallowed if already somewhat archaic legal establishment surely attests to his outstanding abilities. According to Strype's edition of Stow's *Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster* (1720), the task of the lawyers of Doctors' Commons was to 'study the Civil Law, practice and decide Causes within their own Walls in the Common-Hall: for the doing Right to such as have Controversies about Ecclesiastical or Civil Matters'. Here were judged cases concerned with such issues as blasphemy, divorce, bastardy, various sexual offences, wills, piracy, and 'Mortuaries'. Within the confines of the Commons were a number of different courts, ranging from the Court of Arches, the highest court under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the High Court of Admiralty, under the Lord Admiral of England. Like the Westminsters at Christ Church, the civilians were an elite group, numbering perhaps only forty-four doctors in 1694. The deep traditionalism of the Commons and political conservatism of its civilians are attested by Strype and, more graphically, by Tom Brown in the second part of *Amusements Serious and Comical*. In his inimitable style, Brown describes Doctors' Commons as 'one of the Relicks of Popery, and the Terror of Seamen', and its members as Jacobites to a man. They were, moreover,
a drunken, roaring, nonsensical Generation, that have Abundance of zeal without a scruple of Religion. They are a pious sort of Athiests, and ignorant Professors of the Mystery of Iniquity. They are hot for High Church, tho' they never go within any. They should be Scholars, but that they find the Common Road sufficient to do their Business and get Money. They are utter Enemies to Whigs, because they would reduce them under the Law of the Nation. In short, a Doctors Commons man is a Scholar without Learning, a zealot without Religion, a Lawyer without Law, and a Medley of Popery and Reformation, without Reason or Honesty.

In fact, the civilian's social standing was high and his educational qualifications of a greater standard than those qualified to practice the Common Law; yet, as one recent authority has observed, the profession was 'not known for its financial rewards'. A civilian normally could not hope to earn the sort of incomes available to the common lawyers, particularly as the financial revolution of the 1690s and early decades of the eighteenth century gave rise to a tremendous growth in conveyancing and associated legal areas. Because the demand for his services was relatively low, a civilian was often required to extend his range of activities beyond advocacy into areas of the growing bureaucracy, becoming, as it were, a sort of governmental trouble-shooter. This meant, of course, that the profession could easily become politicized, essentially through patronage. Against this, Geoffrey Holmes points out that possibly because the Archbishop of Canterbury, rather than the Crown, held most of the patronage, 'the careers of the civilian doctors sometimes appeared more open to talents than those of the common law barristers' - though it might be added that in the 1690s the archepiscopate was to become increasingly political.

The relative financial insecurity of the profession must have been particularly acute for a young advocate in his first year, which was conventionally a 'year of silence'. Initially King may have lived off his college studentship or perhaps the family income; in any event it appears from Gregory King's records that he resided at two addresses during his first couple of years back in London. William King 'Dr of Laws, bach', is listed as having 'changed in St Benets', the parish in which the Commons were situated, apparently from an earlier address somewhere within the parish of St Gregory by St Paul's. Both places would have been within a short distance of the bookstalls of St Paul's Churchyard, which must have been some compensation for the silenced young
lawyer. By 1695, King was ensconced in apartment thirteen of Doctors' Commons.50

King rapidly found a more appealing way of earning some money and spending his time than simply by browsing through the Commons's library or the books on the nearby stalls - he began to produce his own. In 1692 he translated Dacier's *The Life of Antoninus* (which was added to the fifth edition of Meric Casaubon's *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus*); and a year later, the *New Memoirs and Characters of the Two Great Brothers, the Duke of Boullion, and Mareschal Turenne*, again from a French original. His publisher in both cases was Thomas Bennet of St Paul's Churchyard, a bookseller with close links to the high Anglican party both in the capital and in Oxford, where he had another shop. It is even possible that a deal was struck between the two men even before King came down to London, in the knowledge that the brilliant and erudite young lawyer was likely to require a supplementary income in his first few years as a civilian. Bennet's connections with King and the Oxford circle were to take a particularly interesting turn over the next few years, after he became involved in the argument with Richard Bentley that precipitated the famous Phalaris controversy. The same year also saw him playing a very minor and peripheral role in a controversy between William Sherlock, the newly appointed Dean of St Paul's, and Robert South, a canon of Christ Church; and, on a very different note, contributing two poems to the third part of Dryden's prestigious *Examen Poeticum*. In a note to the first - a translation of one of Malherbe's odes - he is described as a 'Person of Quality' who has great admiration for 'the easiness of the French Poetry';51 and it is clear from his other contribution, a neat if rather conventional love song, that he aimed for the same ease in his own English poetry, at least when writing in this genre.

In August, 1694 Bennet published King's best effort in the traditional field of controversial prose, *Animadversions on a Pretended Account of Danmark*, which was written to refute Robert Molesworth's scathing attack on Danish absolutism, *An Account of Denmark*. It was rapidly translated into several European languages, and though it failed in its objective of destroying Molesworth's *Account* once and for all, it
nonetheless pleased the Danish king so much that he had the English copies sent to him 'turn'd into French, and read to him as fast as they could be translated'. For his efforts King was honoured by the University of Copenhagen and invited to accompany Iver Brink, the pastor of the Danish Lutheran Church in London, to Lambeth Palace to present Archbishop Tillotson with various letters of gratitude from the Bishop of Copenhagen. In the following January, he was made secretary to the then Princess Anne, though the position may only have been a sinecure. How long he retained it is unknown.

*Animadversions* is first and foremost a political and ideological work, an apology for a particularly authoritarian form of constitutional monarchy if not necessarily absolutism. It reflects King's commitment to the high church Tory politics, and so it is no real surprise to discover him in 1695 meddling in the practical side of party politics. The mid-1690s were a period of considerable political instability and division, as the Tories endeavoured to come to terms with no longer being the automatic Court party, and sought the best means of ensuring the continuance of the Anglican hegemony. With the apparent failure of earlier attempts by Tory moderates to influence policy decisions by supporting low church moves towards the comprehension of the more moderate dissenters, it had become clear by 1695 to many senior high churchmen that committed opposition to the government was the only course left open to them. In early October of that year the sitting high Tory M.P. for the university, Thomas Clarges, died just prior to the upcoming elections. After much wrangling among senior Tories both within and outside the university, and in the face of strong opposition notably from Dean Aldrich, the relatively moderate William Trumbull and the Earl of Nottingham's brother, Heneage Finch, were elected as the new burgesses. It is against this background that a hitherto unknown letter sent to King from Sir Charles Hedges must be seen. At the time Hedges was one of the judges of the Admiralty Court and Vicar General to the diocese of Rochester (whose bishop was Thomas Sprat). A firm Tory, he was to become within the next five years the M.P. for Orford in Suffolk, and, through the influence of the leader
of the high Tory wing, the Earl of Rochester, a privy councillor and Secretary of State. In his letter Hedges thanks King and two colleagues for 'making an Interest for me at Reading', but declines 'such friendly offers' because of work pressures. He confesses that he 'never had thoughts of being in ye next Parliament untill I was persuaded upon ye Death of sr T. Clarges that I might be serviceable to ye University, and I have now done more for them in using ye best Interest I have for Mr SectY Trumbull'. 'I think you will do well to pursue the Encouragement you have received', he advises, 'and I beleive [sic] Mr SectY upon your application to him would willingly promote that Interest. You may easily be introduced to him by Mr Brown or ...some of our Doctors'. Whether King took the advice and played some further role in the election for the seat of Reading remains unknown. What is important to appreciate, however, is that King had by now gained valuable connections among senior members of the High Tory camp, which would have a major bearing on the course of his career.

The Hedges letter confirms that King had a genuine interest in politics, though it seems he much preferred to spend his time in a less antagonistic, more enjoyable fashion. Just as Swift loved *la bagatelle*, King, according to Joseph Brown, got his 'chiefest Pleasure' from his literary 'Trifles'. From Browne we also learn that he was an extremely sensitive and emotional man, easily hurt by 'the least slight or neglect'. Though he was apparently 'never happier, than when he thought he was hid from the World' and free to read and scribble, he also 'loved Company, provided they were such as tallied with the Humour he was in at that Nick of Time they happened to come; for it was few People that pleased him in Conversation; and it was a true Sign he liked them, if he could be tolerably agreeable.' He could be 'sullen, morose, and peevish', and would say 'a great many ill-natured Things', though never do any. Amongst his friends he was a cheerful and entertaining conversationalist, and so gentle and compassionate 'that Tears would fall from his Eyes upon the smallest Occasion'.

Browne probably came to know him from evenings spent in the Rose Tavern 'without Temple Gate', the favourite haunt of many leading Tory wits and hacks,
including Ned Ward and William Pittis, a Tory hack whose love of the grape was to earn him the appellation 'Drunken Pittis' from his journalistic rival, John Dunton.\textsuperscript{58} It is commonly assumed that King too suffered from his friends' tendency to over-indulge, and Pope's remark that King composed his poetry in taverns certainly suggests a lingering and unenvious reputation. Even so, it must be remembered that it is unlikely that Pope ever knew King personally, and that his comments are rhetorical, designed to criticize King's poetic facility, not his drinking habits.\textsuperscript{59} Unlike the Presbyterians and the more hardline dissenters, the Anglicans did not regard the love of fine wine and the enjoyment of the company of friends in a favourite pub as signs of alcoholism and moral degradation, provided some Horatian moderation was shown. Former mentors and teachers such as Aldrich and Jane had hardly insisted upon temperance, and it might not be stretching things too far to see King's tippling as another expression of his political and ideological persuasions.

Early in 1698 he published \textit{A Journey to London in the Year 1698}, his first satire on Dr Martin Lister, a famous physician and virtuoso, who had recently published \textit{A Journey to Paris in the Year 1698}. It also represents his first fully-fledged excursion in the field of Menippean satire, a move which was to prove especially fruitful over the following years. Around the same time he became embroiled in the most famous intellectual controversy of the age, the clash over the \textit{Epistles of Phalaris} between the great scholar, Richard Bentley, and the seniors and tutors of Christ Church. It was almost certainly King who wrote the parodic piece at the centre of the Wits' answer to Bentley (the so-called \textit{Boyle against Bentley}) which ensured its success with 'the Town'. It is likely that he contributed to at least one other Phalaris tract before publishing in 1699 another Menippean satire entitled \textit{Dialogues of the Dead}, in which he utilized this Lucianic form for more personal satire against Bentley (and to a lesser extent, William Wotton). In the same year he also published his first mock-heroic poem, \textit{The Furmetary}, an early imitation of Garth's \textit{The Dispensary}. In the following year he produced the third of his early prose burlesques, \textit{The Transactioneer}, the victim on this
occasion being the Secretary of the Royal Society and publisher of the *Philosophical Transactions*, Sir Hans Sloane. That these works had made some impression on London’s literary circle is evidenced by a poem, probably written by Dr Edward Baynard, which appeared in *Commendatory Verses on the Author of the Two Arthurs and the Satyr against Wit*, the wits’ ironic attack on Sir Richard Blackmore. The poem, 'Melancholy Reflections on the Deficiency of Useful Learning', uses allusions to King’s three recent burlesques to ridicule contemporary false learning:

```
Short are our Powers, tho’ infinite our Will;
What Helps to useful Knowledge want we still!
Laborious L[i][s][e][r] thirty Years employs
In painful search of Nature’s curious Toys;
Yet many a painted Shell, and Shining Fly
Must still in Dirt, and dark Oblivion lye.
Mysterious Sl[o][a]ne may yet go on to stun ye
With Cynocrambe, Poppy-pye, Bumbunny;
But from what Records can we hope to know
If poor Will Matthew’s Babes surviv’d or no?
Aeras from costly Mummeries arose,
But who th’ important Moment shall disclose
’Till B[e][n][t][l][e][y] writes of Grecian Puppet-shows?
```

Baynard’s poem provides some indication that King's reputation as a leading controversialist and satirist had already become established among his fellow wits by the turn of the century. Whether his professional reputation at this stage was equally high, however, is far less certain. Browne and Nichols disagree on his attitude towards his career and the consequent state of his practice, though the latter’s unsubstantiated claim that he had grown so tired of the Commons that he retired to Christ Church in order to ‘indulge his predominant attachment [to literature and study] at better leisure’ can safely be discounted. Though the available evidence is scanty and by no means conclusive, it at least qualifies the notion that he was habitually lazy and negligent in his duties, and lends some credence to Browne’s assertion that while he ‘naturally hated Business’, and especially advocacy, he made an excellent judge when called upon to serve on the Court of Delegates. In his few surviving letters, which are primarily concerned with various legal and bureaucratic matters, he even gives the impression of having been surprisingly
conscientious at times, and impatient about inefficiencies in the system. In a letter written on 19 November, 1698, to John Ellis, the current Under-Secretary of State, he expresses his concern that inefficient practices were causing delays in the payment of certain fees, so that 'in the mean time the persons starve'.\(^{63}\) He suggests a simpler method of payment, and apologizes for not being able to meet Ellis personally to discuss the matter 'in the midst of the term', when presumably he was very busy.

In April, 1700, he again wrote to Ellis to request that one of the Commons's senior Proctors might be made the 'Kings Proctor'.\(^{64}\) Significantly the letter begins with another apology for not having waited upon him 'in the very midst of my businesse', which perhaps refers to a recent appeal hearing in the Court of Delegates involving Thomas Watson, the Jacobite Bishop of St David's. According to a letter from Sir Nathaniel Lloyd, on 25 August King, along with two colleagues, heard an argument as to 'whether the Bsp of St Davids Cause being Simony was Appealable or not or whether they shou'd grant an Inhibition upon the Archbishop'. The three doctors, Lloyd continues, 'were of opinion an Appeal did lye butt woud grant no Inhibition till the whole processe was before them and then in a full Court abt 10 Octob.'\(^{65}\) The case inspired a number of controversial tracts, at least one of which accused King and the other judges of conspiring with the ecclesiastical and governmental authorities in what was plainly a politically motivated trial.\(^{66}\)

That he was involved during the early part of 1700 in a famous divorce trial is further proof that he was highly respected in some quarters (though it must be said that the evidence of his actual participation hardly indicates any legal genius). He was engaged by the Earl of Anglesea, a former student of Christ Church and supposedly an old friend, whose wife, the Countess of Dorchester, was seeking a legal separation on the grounds of cruelty. Because divorce was then a complex and expensive procedure requiring the passing of an special act of Parliament after a trial before the House of Lords, it was a very rare and controversial event. The Angelsea trial proved no exception, arousing great public interest and prompting several pamphlets. There remain
just three meagre references to King's part in the defence, but two quotations from his appeals to the court are especially noteworthy, in that they testify to his own devout high churchmanship and unyielding conservative values. On 13 March, 1700/01, the day of the Bill's second reading, he is reported to have expressed his hope that there will be 'a reconciliation in this business', and that its eventual outcome would be a male heir. 'I hope', he added,

this Bill will not pass, that is to dissolve a union between man and wife, which is contrary to God's law. By this Bill the lady may go where she pleases. There is no provision for her living chastely in the Bill. This is an extraordinary act, to take this lady out of my Lord's arms.67

Many today would be inclined to think that the only 'extraordinary act' is King's suggestion that the countess be returned to the very arms which had apparently beaten her. Yet in King's defence it should be pointed out that contemporary divorce laws theoretically banned remarriage; and since the couple were childless, the earl's divorce would have effectively prevented him from ever producing a natural, legal heir, a major problem for a member of the aristocracy. Even so, it is difficult to excuse the stridency with which he demanded the total subordination of all other factors to 'God's law', and his mistrust of 'the lady', which borders on misogyny. Both elements are evident in his submission on the day of the trial (1 April), in which he emphasized the 'acts of kindness of my Lord to his Lady', and reiterated his anxiety that, should the Act pass, the earl would have 'no heirs male'. Again he stressed that there was 'no provision for her living chastely'. 'This Bill ought not be passed by any spiritual judge', he concluded, 'till all means have been used for a reconciliation'.68 Not surprisingly, no reconciliation came about. The Bill granting separation was finally passed on 12 June, 1701; and King and his associates, one can only conclude, had lost the case. As for the earl, he died of consumption the following January, 'leaving no heirs male'.69

The Anglesea case was almost certainly to be King's last in an English court, for within the year he was in Ireland endeavouring to secure the position of Admiralty Judge for Ireland, which had been left vacant since the death of Sir Paul Rycaut (16 November,
1700). Widely varying explanations have been offered for why he chose to surrender the security of a practice in Doctors' Commons for an overseas posting. Browne claims that he did so on the invitation of the Earl of Pembroke, who valued his talents highly; since Pembroke was not at the time Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, however, this is unlikely. Nichols speculates that his supposed neglect of business at the Commons had ruined his legal career and prompted him to move to Ireland in the hope of reviving it, though this too can be confidently disregarded on the grounds that King had already been nominated for the position by Hedges, who recommended his 'knowledge and experience in the civil law'. It is therefore likely that he went to Ireland largely because it offered opportunities for preferment unavailable to him in London, in particular a much sought after career on the bench. But it is more than probable that there was a political factor in his posting as well. The last year of William's reign and the first years of Anne's saw a political shift towards the Tories, as a high church campaign against the removal of the Test Act, the practice of 'occasional conformity', and the printing and dissemination of unorthodox and heretical tracts gathered strength. King's appointment must been seen in this historical context. As a trusted high churchman, King could be relied upon to defend and promote Tory interests in Ireland, where both Catholics and Dissenters posed different but significant threats. Subsequent events and various letters indicate the political nature of King's work, as we shall see shortly.

The exact date of King's journey to Ireland is unknown, but it was definitely prior to 16 September, 1701, when the Earl of Rochester, the leader of the high Tory party in England, arrived to be sworn in as Lord Lieutenant. In a letter to Ellis written on 13 November, he recalls arriving before Rochester's retinue despite 'the lays of wind and weather', certain parliamentary affairs, and a bout of sickness. The letter also provides some evidence to challenge the accepted notion that King was habitually lazy and careless of his profession; indeed, it reveals an eagerness to get on with his job, and to put right the Admiralty affairs after a decade of neglect, complacency and inefficiency. Having received a disconcerting reply to an earlier letter he had sent regarding the
position promised him, he had gone to Ireland prematurely with the intention of straightening out the situation, confident of the assistance of certain senior officials. Since then, he complains, he had faced a series of problems relating to his attainment of the post, which had prevented him fulfilling his duties. He had not yet received his Patent of Commission, and so could not be sworn in. And yet, he stresses, so much needed to be done. The Admiralty Court itself had become defunct, Admiralty duties had apparently been transferred to other departments, and Admiralty jurisdiction and salvage rights were being ignored, with a consequent loss in revenue. He suggests that a 'generall enquiry round the whole coast of Ireland' be conducted to ensure that 'Admiralty jurisdiction & perquisites' were restored. 'If you please to gett me a Patent of the same nature with Sr Paul Rycauts', he pleads, '& lett it be dispatched with all speed I will take care to see what is to be dispurs'd upon that Account either returnd to England or else dischargd to any of your Friends here as may be most with your convenience'.

It would appear, however, that King's attempts to restore Admiralty authority disturbed and alienated many local public servants, particularly Dublin's Scottish Lord Mayor, through whose hands the long-awaited patent passed. Their anxieties may have been heightened by King's performance as Agent of the Prizes for the Port of Dublin, a post he secured sometime around 29 August, 1702. A letter from the Lords Justice of Ireland (dated 12 November, 1702) to Rochester, who by now was back in London, indicates the serious threat to the established order that King was perceived to pose. With it came 'a memorial of the Lord Mayor' in which it was apparently asserted 'that the execution of that office [i.e. Judge of the Admiralty], in that place, is looked upon by the City to be an infringement of their rights'. Even so, the letter continues, there was reason to think that the City, out of the respect they are inclined to pay to my Lord High Admiral, would not let any instruction be given to the Doctor in the discharge of his duty in that station, even in this place itself, provided there might be some private instruction given him by the Admiralty (if the officers of that court shall not be willing to alter the present commission not to force, either himself of his officers, money from the fishing and other boats that ply in this port and harbour, for liberty to fish, or to allow their free trade of carrying goods, &c, which they hear (before he is sworn) is intended to be practised, to the great disadvantage of their trade. For prizes, wrecks, and all other pretences of the Admiralty officers, the City is willing to acquiesce, rather than give any disturbance or stop to this commission.'
In view of this bureaucratic opposition and thinly-veiled threat of obstruction it is not surprising that by 16 January, 1702/3, King had still not received his commision. On that date he wrote again to Ellis to complain about the continuing delay, and to thank him for some advice he had given him, perhaps relating to the current impasse. His letter shows him to have become understandably upset and impatient about his situation, which he acknowledges was costing him, as well as the Admiralty, dearly. There is more than a hint of bitterness (not to mention English bigotry) in his feelings towards Ireland, the Irish people, and his chief nemesis, the Lord Mayor:

The continuance of your favour is all that I can desire to make this place any ways easy to me, & I must entreat you when you see Mr Clark to desire him to lett another order be sent to swear me, for my commission lies in my Lord Mayors hand...not onely to my Losse but to the prejudice of my Lord High Admiralls Jurisdiction and his interest in this Kingdom, which would soon appear with another face if I had but authority & your support. For it is the nature of this people to be insolent, & proud as they are poor, but to cringe and flatter when they have power over them. One word of yours to Mr Clark & Mr Guin I know would settle this matter more than any other method that can be taken.

The letter reveals further that immediately before his return to England in the early part of 1702 Rochester had set in train a series of moves designed to gain King the post of Vicar-General of Armagh. A certain Lord Keightley was asked to approach the Archbishop on King's behalf; but it would appear that he first had to go through another intermediary by the name of Lord Blessington. Unfortunately, King reports with a touch of bitter irony, 'My Ld Blessington refusd my Ld Keightley, and not with such civility as he expected. The place is still vacant. When the Clergy make long strides it is humbly hoped that we Civilians may creep after'. Here again is evidence of the political dimension to King's role, for he then indicates that his future depends upon either the Bishop of Rochester or the Bishop of Kildare ascending to the Primacy of the Church of Ireland. Both these men, Thomas Sprat and William Moreton, were high churchmen with strong connections with Oxford University and Christ Church in particular. The latter, it seems, had already been of some help to him, perhaps in his attaining the post of
Agent of the Prizes. Echoing the cries of contemporary high churchmen such as Atterbury that the Anglican Church was 'in Danger', he writes that the Church 'is not in so good a condition here as not to want a person that will vigorously maintain it'. His own preferment, he was all too aware, was inextricably linked to the outcome of the great political struggle being waged in London.

This political element is even evident in the friendships and associations he formed there, in particular with Anthony Upton, a judge of the local court of the Common Pleas. Upton was another English barrister whose appointment in 1702 owed a great deal to his Tory sympathies, and the course of his career testifies to the extent of political involvement in the contemporary judiciary. When the political situation changed so irrevocably in 1714, he was immediately deprived of his post and forced to return to England, where four years later in a fit of delirium he committed suicide by cutting his throat. But all this was a long way off when King first came to know him. Upton had gained a great reputation amongst his colleagues for the entertainment he provided at his splendid country estate, variously known as Monkstown or Mountown. Once owned by the regicide Edmund Ludlow, this magnificent residence was built near the site of a medieval castle, the ruins of which still stood in the midst of beautiful gardens, pleasure grounds, and stables.80 Upton was a lover of fine food, wine, and literature - a man of King's own heart. The doctor became a regular visitor to the estate, which must have seemed an idyllic retreat after the frustrations and obstructions of the previous years. In return for Upton's hospitality King provided witty conversation and poetic amusements, including a poem which was to make Mountown (or at least one of its cows) famous in London as well as Dublin. *Mully of Mountown* first appeared in a pirate edition in June, 1704, as did another of his poems, a parody of Ovid's story of Orpheus and Eurydice, the following month.81 They were both credited to the anonymous author of the *A Tale of a Tub*, a mistake which angered King more than had the unauthorized publication of his poems. He quickly retorted with a facetious repudiation of Swift's satire, *Some Remarks upon the Tale of a Tub*, which he published along with his two poems under
the identity of 'the Author of the Journey to London'. It is no doubt significant that years later, after King had become personally acquainted with the great satirist, he did not include Some Remarks in the editions of his collected works published in his lifetime.

While Some Remarks and the two burlesque poems are the only pieces King published during his six-year stint in Ireland, it is likely that many of the poems published on his return to England were written over this period. For most of the time he was presumably occupied in his various legal and official capacities, though it would appear that he became less and less enthusiastic and diligent as time went by. According to Browne, Mountown proved too much of a distraction for his professional well-being, and his career and reputation declined as his stays at Upton's alluring residence became more frequent and prolonged. The commonly-held belief that he frittered away his fortune and legal career in Upton's dining room and gardens derives almost entirely from this source, though other evidence has been used to substantiate it. The fact that King was replaced (or resigned) as Agent of the Prizes on 13 May, 1706, may indicate that his superiors were dissatisfied with his work; on the other hand, the replacement may simply have been routine. It has also been observed that his name does not appear in Dublin's 'social records'.

Perhaps the most damaging evidence is the testimony of two key witnesses. In a letter written in 1712, Swift informed Archbishop William King of Dublin that he had managed to get King the post of Gazetteer, 'which will be worth 250 l per annum to him, if he be diligent and sober.' The archbishop replied by warning Swift not to raise his expectations too high, especially when it came to 'poor Dr. King'. So far as these comments are concerned, however, two qualifications need to be made. When he speaks of sobriety, Swift may be referring not so much to a bad drinking problem as to the doctor's inability to remain serious and committed to any particular task; while the archbishop's doubts about whether 'poor Dr. King' could meet his responsibilities might have something to do with an illness he was no doubt already suffering from, and which was to prove fatal by the end of that year.
Even so, there is still Swift's remark (ultimately to prove prophetic) that he possibly lacked the diligence needed for the job of Gazetteer; and this accords with the comments of another of King's associates, the Oxford antiquarian Thomas Hearne, who noted immediately following King's death that his addiction to the 'buffooning Way' had caused him to neglect his business and ruin his career. 87 It is very likely that by the time both Swift and Hearne came to know King personally, the early keenness to get on with his official duties evident in his letters may well have dissipated. In his defence, one might point to the constant obstacles placed in his way and the apparent disaffection and distrust the local officials bore towards him, which must have taken their toll. What little evidence there is leads one to suspect that he spent at least his first few years in Dublin banging his head against a bureaucratic brickwall hastily erected by a significant section of the local establishment, something a man of his background would soon have found tiresome. Frustration resulting from a lack of preferment may also have had an influence on his changing attitude: it would not take too many Lord Blessingtons to discourage even the most ambitious of men. The fact that the fortune and reputation he could have expected from his stay abroad did not materialize could easily have stimulated his naturally cynical disposition; and he may already have suffered from the bad health that was to dog him over the last few years of his life. In short, if King did prefer the simple pleasures of rural retirement to the dubious dealings of the city, and did lapse in his performance of official responsibilities, then he may have had cause.

Though the records indicate that King remained Judge of the Admiralty throughout his period in Ireland, discontent with his legal career may have partially motivated his seeking the position of Keeper of the Records in the Castle of Dublin, which he attained on 19 June, 1707, following the death of the incumbent. 88 He may have owed this to the influence of the recently appointed Lord Lieutenant, the Earl of Pembroke, who arrived in Dublin just five days later. Politically Pembroke was a moderate; if he inclined towards any party it was the Tories, but his real allegiance was to the court. His main assignment was to reconcile the various Protestant groups and ultimately to remove the
Sacramental Test, an aim to which the high churchmen of Dublin were implacably opposed. Why he advanced such a devout high churchman as King is therefore difficult to understand, though there are two likely reasons. First, he may have known of King through his Admiralty connections, having served as Lord High Admiral of England and Ireland between January 1701/2 and May 1702; and second, temperamentally the two men seem to have been quite similar. Pembroke himself had a reputation for 'humour and oddness', as well as 'aristocratic scholarship and connoisseurship'. He possessed one of the finest collections of books and antiquities in the British Isles, and was a former President of the Royal Society - in short, he was a fine example of a Renaissance gentleman. It was this which endeared him to Swift and the other wits who congregated in Dublin Castle to drink the earl's wine and converse in their pun-laden 'Castilian Language'. It was possibly in such circumstances that King first met the man he had unwittingly mocked in *Some Remarks*, and who was to do so much for him a few years later. Unfortunately, while it is easy to imagine King joining in the fun, there is no evidence that he was ever part of the group. Whether or not he was a regular companion of the earl, he must have found the atmosphere within Dublin Castle much more to his liking.

The position of Keeper of the Records has been described as being 'analogous to that of the Keeper of the Records at the Tower of London, having the Care of such as are consulted by the Historian and Curious Antiquary, rather than the ordinary Man of Business'. While this description implies that it was rather prestigious, Swift thought it 'an old obscure place', and the records themselves 'not worth half-a-crown, either for curiosity or use'. Nor was it at all lucrative: until Addison (who became Keeper two years later) had 'a salary of 400l. annexed to it', it paid only £10 per annum. In the circumstances it is hard to understand why King should have wanted the job. One likely explanation was the close proximity to a potential patron, but one suspects that there was more to it than that. Though he could satirize certain pedants and antiquarians mercilessly, his reputation for erudition shows that archives and libraries held an equally
irresistible appeal for him; and certain parts of his *Adversaria* suggest that he took the opportunity to rummage through the shelves in search of the more interesting holdings. If between them the archives of Dublin Castle and the charms and hospitality of Mountown made his underpaid, self-imposed exile amongst the despised Irish rather more bearable, they were not enough to dissuade him from returning to England as soon as a viable opportunity for further preferment there presented itself. This he almost certainly did on 28 November, 1707, when his patent as Keeper was surrendered, and Pembroke, together with Swift and others in his retinue, embarked for England. It is more than likely that King, keen to attain the patronage of so powerful and wealthy a lord, grasped the chance to return in his presence. So fruitless had his Irish sojourn been that he apparently arrived back in London 'with no other treasure than a few merry poems and humourous [sic] essays'.

Where he now resided is open to speculation; however, it is virtually certain that it was not back at Doctors' Commons, where one imagines his room had long since been taken over by another civilian. Indeed, it would appear that King never practiced again either as lawyer or judge. Browne claims that he retired to Christ Church to live off his studentship, but Nichols assumes he resettled in London. At least initially he must have stayed in London, where one of the first things he did was to see through the press the first authorized edition of one of his finest works, *The Art of Cookery*. To his annoyance, two particularly shabby editions had already surfaced as early as November, 1707, apparently based on an incomplete draft which had preceded its author to London. First published by Lintot in January, 1707/8, the complete version was reprinted in April, when it was also released in Dublin. That month also saw the publication of his version of Ovid's *Art of Love*, which he dedicated to Pembroke's eldest son, Herbert, perhaps in the hope of securing further patronage.

These two poems re-established him in the London literary scene, and seemingly prompted Lintot to commission the publication of a collection of his previously published writings, together with a few unpublished prose pieces and poems, to be entitled
Miscellanies. Colin Horne has unearthed a sheet of proposals in the Bodleian Library which reveals that a limited edition 'for the Author's own Benefit' was to be produced on imperial paper and issued by subscription, at the price of 12 shillings unbound. The intended publication date of August, 1708, was not met, however, probably because of a lack of interest; and it was not until at least the end of the year that the limited edition was finally delivered. Another edition, this time smaller and produced on poorer quality paper for ordinary sale, was first advertised on 3 March, 1708/9. Five days later Swift reported the release to Ambrose Philips: 'Dr King has reprinted all his Works together and the Volume begins with his Answer to Mr Molesworth's Book of Denmark'. In fact not all his works were reprinted: The Transactioneer was conspicuous by its absence, probably because King had just released the first number of his Useful Transactions, another and better satire on Hans Sloane; also missing was Some Remarks. A second volume to this first edition of the Miscellanies soon followed, consisting only of copies of The Art of Cookery and The Art of Love bound together. This period of King's career culminated in what is in my view his funniest and most impressive work, Useful Transactions in Philsophy, and other sorts of Learning. Intended to mimic the monthly publication of Sloane's Philosophical Transactions, this mock journal unfortunately failed to achieve sufficient popularity to warrant its continuation beyond a third number.

Events of major political importance now caused him to return to the field of controversial literature. The domestic and foreign policies of the Junto and the two leading courtiers, the Duke of Marlborough and Sidney Godolphin, had aroused the ire of the Tory opposition, who were now pressing with renewed vigour for the strict adherence to the Test Act, the prevention of 'Occasional Conformity', and an end to the War of the Spanish Succession. The famous Sacheverell controversy, which erupted in the latter part of 1709, brought the domestic disputes to a head, leading ultimately to the collapse of the Junto and a landslide election victory for the Tories in October, 1710. If politics was not King's 'chiefest Pleasure', he nevertheless felt obliged to do his bit for
the defence of the Anglican establishment, and began attacking various low churchmen in a series of occasional pamphlets and books. He was reportedly also recruited by Harley and Bolingbroke to the group of wits responsible for the earliest numbers of *The Examiner*, though his actual contribution to the project is difficult to determine.

During 1710 he also found time to work on what was to be his most lucrative and frequently published work, *An Historical Account of the Heathen Gods and Heroes*, a kind of classical dictionary that was to remain the standard reference book in the schools for decades. About the same period he produced *Political Considerations upon Refined Politicks*, a translation of a work by Gabriel Naude, which he dedicated to Henry Somerset, Duke of Beaufort, a newly-admitted member of both Anne's Privy Council and the staunchly Tory Brother's Club. The dedication was almost certainly motivated by more than party political allegiance and admiration for the young Tory courtier, for it would appear that King was now in severe financial difficulties. In *The Present State of Wit* (published 3 May), Gay reports that he was currently spending 'the small remainder of his life in Fleet Prison', indicating that he was suffering from both poverty and severe illness. How it happened that a son of a gentleman who had enjoyed a reasonable estate, the finest education England could offer, and excellent career prospects could find himself poverty-stricken by his forties can only be surmised. There is a consensus among his earlier biographers that he wasted his talents and squandered his wealth in the taverns of London and gardens of Mountown, but the available evidence as to his attitude towards his duties qualifies this view considerably. As we have seen, the civil law was not generally a very lucrative career, and the bureaucratic posts he held in Ireland were not highly paid. Nor could he live comfortably or for very long off his studentship and the receipts from his writings, especially in view of the fact that Lintot does not appear to have paid him until mid-1712. Pembroke's patronage, if he ever enjoyed it, seems to have ceased altogether. Moreover, if he had inherited the family estates, the high land taxes levied to pay for the war must have affected him badly. How long he had already languished in Debtor's Prison by the time Gay recorded the fact is
unknown; nor is the date of his release. He may still have been there in mid-December, when Swift told Stella that Patrick, his Irish servant, had gone to the funeral of a countryman, 'who was Dr King's servant'. He had died of consumption, Swift notes dryly, 'a fit death for a poor starving wit's footman'.

Within a fortnight, however, Swift personally set about improving King's lot by installing him in Steele's old job. 'I have settled Dr King in the Gazette,' he informed Stella on 29 December; 'it will be worth two hundred pounds a year to him'. Swift also mentions that he intended to 'carry Dr King to dine with the secretary', i.e. Bolingbroke, the following day. On 8 January he passed the news to Archbishop King in the letter already referred to. News of the appointment reached Oxford quickly, Hearne noting on 31 December that 'Mr Chicheley of All Souls' had been turn'd out...& Df King of X Church (D.C.L) is put into his Room'. That same day it is reported that Swift and other old colleagues from the Examiner (including Dr Freind and Matthew Prior) paid him a visit, bringing with them the keys to the Gazetteder's office; and on the next, 'being New Years Day 1712, the Doctor took possession and entered upon his office'. With the start of the new year, then, the bleakest days of King's life were over. The life of the 'English Ovid' had undergone an amazing metamorphosis.

King's financial situation was now restored to a decent if not lavish level. His work, if Swift is to be believed, was 'the prettyest Employment in Engd of its bigness', regularly paid, and free of taxation: 'He has little to do for it; He has a pretty Office, with Coals, Candles, Paper &c; can frank what Lettrs he will, and his Perquisites if he takes Care may be worth 100 ll more'. One of his first papers (5 January) must have been an especially pleasing task, for it carried the announcement that Marlborough, for months the victim of an unremitting propaganda campaign orchestrated by Harley and Swift, had finally been replaced as Commander in Chief by the Duke of Ormonde. Rufinus: or an historical essay on the favourite ministry under Theodosius the Great and his son Arcadius, a violently anti-Marlborough tract commonly attributed to King, promptly appeared, no doubt with the intention of obliquely justifying the dismissal. But
it was quickly apparent that such hack journalism was not the sort of work he found satisfying; more to the point perhaps, it was 'not genteel enough', as his successor, Charles Ford, was to complain. Browne recalls that he soon fell out with the printer, John Barber, who insisted that he do tasks such as proof-reading that were normally done by subordinates, and which on some occasions required his working till three or four o'clock in the morning. For a man of his background, such treatment must have come as a cruel blow to his self-esteem. This, combined with encroaching bad health and his apparent lack of conscientiousness when it came to doing anything dull and tiresome, prompted him to resign sometime before 1 July, when Swift reported to Stella that he had installed Ford in the job. His decision was probably further motivated by the long overdue payment of the £50 owed to him for Heathen Gods, and the renewed publication of his writings. A new edition of The Art of Cookery had been brought out in April, followed in June by a new two volume edition of the Miscellanies, which on this occasion contained Useful Transactions, but was still without The Transactioneer and Some Remarks. A new publication, entitled Useful Miscellanies and comprising two small pieces, was first advertised on 15 July in William Oldisworth's periodical translation of Horace's Odes, another project in which he almost certainly had a hand.

He retired to a friend's house in Lambeth, where in the last few months of his life he could enjoy the things he most cherished - good wine, companionship, and a good library. In spite of his worsening health, he never lost his facetious sense of fun, as demonstrated by an incident on 7 July, when Dunkirk was surrendered to the English as part of the newly agreed peace terms. To the Tories, this was a cause for jubilation; to Whig sympathizers like Archbishop Tenison of Canterbury, however, it signalled the final abandonment of their foreign policy, and he ordered the gates of Lambeth Palace shut to the joyful populace. King's response was immediate and typical: purchasing two or three barrels of beer, he invited the watermen and poor parishioners of Lambeth over to his own revels, no doubt to the annoyance of his archepiscopal neighbour. It was
surely his happiest, most endearing, and most effective political act.\textsuperscript{108}

During these last months he occupied his time probably by writing the mocking 'Notes upon Notes' attached to Oldisworth's \textit{Odes}, and beginning perhaps two translations. The first, a version of Joseph Hall's celebrated mock-travelogue, \textit{Mundus alter et idem}, was never finished, which leads one to suppose that it was begun at this time. His translation of the \textit{Persian Tales} from the French version of Petis de la Croix, however, which also remained unfinished at his death, was to be completed and published two years later and dedicated to Theodosia Hyde, the daughter of the Earl of Clarendon, to whom King apparently paid several visits during this time. In the dedication it is claimed that the \textit{Tales} were begun on the express wishes of the young woman, and that King 'had made a considerable Progress therein' before he died.\textsuperscript{109} There is little cause to speculate, as Weeks does, that the Earl employed the doctor as his daughter's tutor.

However, as his health deteriorated with the onset of Autumn he ceased his visits and shut himself away from his friends. When news of this reached Clarendon, he reportedly arranged for some new lodgings to be made ready close to his house in the Strand, to which King was removed on 24 December. But the move came too late. That night he made his will, leaving his few remaining possessions to his sister; and around noon on a bitterly cold Christmas Day, he died aged 49, 'with the Patience and Resignation of a Philosopher, and the true Devotion of a Christian Hero'.\textsuperscript{110} Two days later, courtesy of Clarendon, he was buried besides Knipe in the north cloister of Westminster Abbey. It was a strikingly appropriate final act, for it ensured that this royalist 'lover of antiquity' and brilliant, amusing, but undeniably minor writer would rest forever beneath the trestles of perennial brass-rubbers by a back exit from Poets' Corner.
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Chapter Two

'In the hands of a Gentleman': King and the Ideology of Proper and Polite Learning

Religion here and Duty easy grew,
Thy Loyalty no new-taught doctrines knew,
But principles from education drew.¹

I

Previous critics, noting King's commitment to high church Toryism and humanistic training, have tended to interpret his satires in terms of deeply conservative reaction to the dramatic social, political, and intellectual developments of the seventeenth century. More to the point, they have usually assumed that because he wrote satires on representative exponents of modern textual scholarship and science he was necessarily opposed to both on the most fundamental grounds. It was the 'natural coalition between modern science and modern literary research' in terms of their obsession with particularities rather than Aristotelian and humanistic generalities, R.F. Jones argues, which caused the textual critic and the scientist 'to be the double target of Swift, King, Pope, and many others, who conducted an incessant warfare against the 'abusers of learning'.² King's writings, in short, proved him an archetypal 'Ancient'. Colin Horne to a large degree follows this view when he argues (with specific reference to King's satires on Richard Bentley) that as a scholar of the 'older tradition' he was offended by both the new scholarship and the Royal Society's 'investigations of the physical world'.³ And more recently Joseph Levine claims that, 'like his friend Swift he was equally opposed to all forms of modern learning, whether philological or philosophical, and frequently ignorant of them'.⁴ In this chapter I intend to reject, or at least qualify, these presuppositions, first, by reconsidering the contemporary attitudes towards literature and learning in terms of the prevailing ideal of the gentleman-scholar; next, by
determining the essential elements of Baconian science, and reviewing its relationship to
the dominant culture of the period; and finally, by closely examining King's views on
learning and literature as expressed in his non-ironic writings. The purpose of this
chapter, then, is to establish the values and standards he implicitly reaffirms beneath the
superficially negative forms of burlesque and satire.

The most important influence on his life and thought was surely his humanistic
education at academic institutions which, since the Tudor period, had been designed for
the purpose of training bright young gentleman for senior governmental and
ecclesiastical positions in the established Anglican order. Historically, the term
'Humanism' has normally been used to denote the set of intellectual and pedagogical
practices and principles derived from the rediscovery of many of the classical authors at
the beginning of the Italian Renaissance. As a philosophy, Italian Humanism rested on
the principal notion of humanitas, which stemmed from Cicero's appraisal of Greek
culture, and which, through Petrarch, came to denote 'a compassionate attitude towards
one's fellow men'. Fundamental to this was the belief in the uniformity and essentiality
of human being, which underpinned the humanists' assumption that the records of
human history and literature could serve as valid guides to present and future
generations. The classical poems, narratives, and histories were valued not so much for
their historical verity as for their fulfillment of the twin requisites of classical decorum -
instruction and delight - and especially for their insights into, and accounts of, the
manners and behaviour of people, the nature of states, the workings of diplomacy, the
waging of war, and the relative merits of legal codes, political systems, and moral
philosophies. They were also studied as models of rhetoric, the art of efficient
communication and persuasion, the task of which was the dissemination and promotion
of the truths of moral philosophy and history to the contemporary society. The function
of humanist classical scholarship and literary criticism was therefore ultimately moralistic
and utilitarian; indeed, one modern authority on the history of classical scholarship has
even described the Italian humanists in particular as 'men of letters, publicists, teachers,
but in no way...scholars'.

To the Italian humanists' veneration of the classics and belief in *humanitas*, Erasmus added and emphasized the notion of *philosophia Christi*, which derived from the Socratic principle that only through learning and the striving after wisdom could a truly moral consciousness be attained. The Christian humanists saw the humble pursuit of knowledge as a prolonged 'struggle against evil', and hence any decline in intellectual and artistic standards as the signal of a spiritual and moral decline. As Rudolf Pfeiffer has written, for Erasmus,

the revision of the ancient texts through an improved knowledge of the classical languages was the highest task of all. This revision encompassed the very sources of spiritual and moral life, first the scriptures, then the classics, and finally the Church Fathers, who formed the connection between the classics and the Bible. By purifying these texts of the errors of centuries and restoring them to their obvious simple truth, it would be possible to check the corruption of his own time.

To accomplish this, a knowledge of Greek, the language of the original New Testament as well as Homer, Plato, and Aristotle, was vital. But Erasmian textual scholarship was not 'a narrow verbal criticism', an exercise in pure learning designed to establish the most miniscule of details. For he stressed that in order to understand the particulars, the scholar first needed to appreciate and understand 'the whole of the divine word'. The message and spirit of the Biblical teachings (and for that matter the moral lessons and sentiments of the heathen authors) were to remain primary, and all particulars had to 'be shown to be in harmony with the living body of Christian doctrine which is both Gospel and tradition'. Because knowledge was so closely bound up with the moral well-being of individuals and society, its clear and easy dissemination was one of Erasmus's major concerns. He constantly emphasized the importance of clarity in language, and condemned obscurantism in any form, echoing such classical strictures as Quintilian's comments in the *Institutio Oratorio*. Style, he writes in his *Copia*, 'is to thought as clothes are to the body. Just as dress and outward appearance can enhance or disfigure the beauty and dignity of the body, so words can enhance or disfigure thought'. He
therefore urges that one should always ensure that 'the garment is clean, that it fits, and that it is not wrongly made up'. The social utility of learning in terms of religious, political, and moral instruction, and the extension of such knowledge to as many people as possible through better communication, remained the basic ideals of Erasmian Humanism.

For both practical and ideological reasons, it has been argued, Christian Humanism was adopted and promoted by the Tudors, who ensured that the 'New Learning' was introduced into the nation's leading schools and university colleges in ways which served the dynasty's interests. In the first place, it provided an appropriate and relatively efficient training for the new breed of 'governor' drawn from the lower aristocracy and gentry, which the Tudor regime had promoted as a counter to the power of the old feudal lords. Royal patronage was aimed at the creation of the eloquent, talented, and above all, loyal and obedient courtiers, magistrates, and clerics required for the new social and political order. This 'Court Humanism' also lent further legitimacy to the ideology of order and rank which underpinned both the Tudor and the Stuart states. The gentry's perception of its place and role in society was sharpened by its appreciation of the political and social structures of the ancient world, and specifically its self-identification with the equestrian order of Rome. More importantly, the medieval ideological legacy (itself buttressed by Biblical and Aristotelian teachings) was now supplemented by the writings of the ancient pagan political philosophers, poets, and historians - in particular Plato, Cicero, and Tacitus - which reaffirmed the presumption of the naturalness of hierarchy, reasserted the propriety of civil government, restated the obligations of both governor and governed, and insisted upon the primacy of laws based upon the concept of natural justice and sanctioned by divine authority. It was this profoundly conservative ideology of order and authority which formed the bedrock of the politics of the English Tory Party into the eighteenth century.

The major cultural consequence of the rise of the gentry to a position of political and social prominence was the emergence of the ideal of 'the gentleman', which was
propagated widely throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth century in verse and prose.

In the wake of such Tudor texts as Elyot's *The Governor*, seventeenth-century parental advice books and courtesy manuals, such as Henry Peacham's *The Compleat Gentleman*, Richard Brathwait's *The English Gentleman*, and Francis Osborne's *Advice to a Son*, informed their readership of the values of *sprezzatura*, the courtly ideal proclaimed by Castiglione and personified by men like Sir Philip Sidney.\(^{16}\) In such works, as John Mason writes in his authoritative study of this literature, the English gentleman is depicted 'primarily as the administator, the executive, the public servant':

> Even when he is no more than a small landowner, his chief concern is with the management of his estate, and with the settlement of the problems, domestic and social, which arise from this conception of his place in the world. His ambition is always to serve his country in some public way - as soldier, as diplomat, as statesman, as advisor to the king. For this purpose all his life and training are bent....His philosophy is neither stoical nor epicurean: he goes to the play, enjoys sport, and delights in the practice of hospitality; but he never forgets either the privileges or the obligations of his class. He is considerate of his servants, but always their master; constant in his religion, but neither hysterical nor dogmatic;...in a word, his private life is subordinate to his public usefulness.\(^{17}\)

The gentleman was expected to exhibit 'good breeding' - that is, general good manners, social etiquette, dress sense, politeness, and affability without indecorum, boorishness, or obscenity - a state of excellence achieved through the combination of pedigree and proper, 'polite learning'.\(^{18}\) Education, according to Brathwait, was the *second Nature* of a gentleman, 'which (such innate seeds of goodnesse are sown in him) ever improves him, seldom or never depraves him'. Learning was 'not only an additament [sic], but ornament to Gentry'.\(^{19}\) The study of grammar, rhetoric, and languages continued to be seen as integral to the gentleman's education, for, as Peacham notes, 'speech is the character of a man and the interpreter of his mind, and writing the image of that'.\(^{20}\) An indecorous literary or rhetorical style, therefore, was considered symptomatic of serious intellectual, social, and even moral flaws. Once matured by the aid of this 'principall'st Seasoner of Youth', the gentleman was expected to put his training to a proper social use, so that the state 'may ...reape what she hath with long hope expected, and receive a plentiful crop of that which she her selfe...hath long manured'.\(^{21}\) By the turn of the
eighteenth century, the dominant culture could be defined in terms of its ideal of the 'Happy Man', an archetype which combined Christian piety, humility, and a paternalistic commitment to an active political and social life with a capacity for wit and humour, and an Horatian attitude of moderation towards the pursuit of both learning and innocent pleasures. It was, moreover, as Marie-Sophie Rostig suggests, an inherently political creation, 'a Royalist or humanist counterpart to the grim figure of the Puritan regime'.

Though a broadly based, humanistic education was acknowledged as a necessary element of the complete gentleman, scholarly immoderation and learning for its own sake were roundly censured as pedantry, behaviour unbecoming a member of polite society. As the antithesis of the truly learned gentleman-scholar, the pedant became a favourite butt of dramatists, poets, and 'Character' writers, who continually emphasized that self-inflicted scholastic isolation and useless studies soured the temperament, dulled the 'spirits', destroyed conversation, and drove one to melancholy and madness. Butler's description of him as a 'dwarf Scholar' incapable of judgement, eloquence, and the assimilation of his copious readings, is typical: 'He speaks in a different Dialect from other Men, and much affects forced Expressions, forgetting that hard Words, as well as evil ones, corrupt good Manners'. As John Eachard pointed out, pedantry could also take the form of a zealous devotion to classical studies, to the detriment of useful and relevant modern studies, such as English and mathematics. It was not, he was at pains to stress, that he was opposed to classical learning in itself; on the contrary, he valued the Greek and Latin languages above all others 'because the best of humane learning has been delivered unto us in those languages'. 'But he that worships them', he continues,

purely out of honour to Rome and Athens, having little or no respect to the usefulness and excellency of the books themselves (as many do) it is a sign he has a great esteem and reverence of Antiquity, but I think him by no means comparable for happiness to him who catches Frogs, or hunts Butterflies (pp. 7-8).

While the essential characteristics and presuppositions of the seventeenth-century English gentleman's education remained Erasmian, over the years the parameters of polite learning were to some degree extended to accommodate the major developments in
philology which occurred during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The advances made in the fields of close textual and verbal scholarship by the men like J.J. Scaliger, Joseph Lipsius, Issac Casaubon, and the Dutch polymaths centred in the University of Leiden, were to leave a lasting impression on English scholarship, particularly in terms of the editing of classical texts and the study of English political and ecclesiastical history. If as gentlemen their reputation in England was not in all cases enviable, the northern Renaissance polymaths were generally applauded as scholars, and their basic methodology, with its close attention to detail and heavier emphasis on textual precision, greatly influenced the work of such prominent seventeenth-century English scholars as John Seldon, Thomas Gale, Thomas Stanley, Meric Casaubon (Issac's son), and, ultimately, Richard Bentley. Perhaps more importantly, the light their editorial labours and critical analyses shed on the ancient world was to colour the English gentleman's perception of ancient history and culture throughout the eighteenth century.27

Closely related to this more meticulous and fact-conscious form of scholarship was the prevailing interest in antiquarianism, which also had its roots in the great reverence of the classical world which generally characterized Renaissance Humanism.28 Many seventeenth-century authorities recognized that ancient artifacts could provide valuable insights into the nature of past civilizations, among them Peacham, who argues specifically in relation to statues that besides 'men and manners there is nothing fairly more delightful, nothing worthier observation, than these copies and memorials of men and matters of elder times, whose lively presence is able to persuade a man that he now seeth two thousand years ago'.29 Classical inscriptions and coins, he adds, are immensely useful to 'the illustration of history and of the antiquity of diverse matters...which otherwise would be obscure, if not altogether unknown, unto us'. The widespread curiosity about ancient objects coincided with the growing belief among the English aristocracy and gentry in the educational merits of foreign learning and continental travel, which, it was thought, could improve a young gentleman's command
of modern languages, knowledge of history and the classics, and understanding of foreign legal, political, and religious doctrines and practices.\textsuperscript{30}

Even so, by their very nature the various branches of philology and textual scholarship represented a fundamentally different approach to the study of antiquity from the literary study of the classical narratives which had formed the core of humanistic education since the early Renaissance, particularly in the English grammar schools and universities.\textsuperscript{31} More to the point, a concern for particularities and objects could easily become pedantic, an end in itself, and thus a hindrance rather than a help to to the understanding of the classics' moral, social, and cultural 'sentiments' and lessons. Philological excesses and abuses quickly became grist for the satirists' mill; Burton, for example, mocks those pedants, polymaths, and users of indexes who, though they 'pretend publick good' by their trifling works, are really only motivated by 'pride and vanity'.\textsuperscript{32} John Earle's 'A Pretender to Learning' is another classic instance, a figure described as 'a kind of Scholar-Mountebank', who 'talks much of Scaliger and Casaubon and the Jesuits, and prefers some unheard-of Dutch name before them all'; while his 'Critic' 'tastes styles as some discreeter palates do wine', and makes books more expensive by swelling them with annotation 'into folios'.\textsuperscript{33} By the early eighteenth century Dutch learning (like virtually everything else to do with that country) had in polite circles become a byword for intellectual and cultural perversion, its reputation worsened by the proliferation during the middle and later decades of massive 'Variorum editiones' stocked full of 'useless variants and stale notes copied from other scholars.'\textsuperscript{34} This trend, which to some extent was mirrored in England, inevitably inspired a number of witty satires (most notably those of the Scriblerians), as did the antiquarians' indiscriminate fascination for ancient artifacts. Earle's depiction of 'The Antiquary' was to become a commonplace:

He is one that hath that unnatural disease to be enamoured of old age and wrinkles, and loves all things (as Dutchmen do cheese) the better for being mouldy and worm-eaten....A great admirer he is of the dust of old monuments, and reads only those characters where time hath eaten out the letters....His estate consists much in shekels, and Roman coins, and he hath more pictures of Caesar than James or Elizabeth. Beggars cozen him with musty things which they have raked from dunghills, and he preserves their rags for precious relics. He
loves no library but where there are more spiders' volumes than authors', and looks with
great admiration on the antique work of cobwebs...a Manuscript he pores on everlastingly,
especially if the cover be moth-eaten, and the dust make a parenthesis between every
syllable. 35

Shakerly Marmion borrowed heavily from Earle's piece for his Veterano, the central
character in his dramatic presentation of the folly of antiquarian obsession. 36 Butler,
too, ridiculed the antiquary for his lack of critical judgement, which leads him to value
'old insignificant Trifles' purely on the grounds of their antiquity; to venerate customs
and words 'that are striken in Years, and are grown so aged, that they have out-lived
their Employments'; and to cherish 'one old Invention, that is lost and never to be
recovered, before all the new ones in the World, tho' never so useful'. 37 His description
of the 'Curious Man' is in many respects a more complete identification of the same
person, a worshipper and collector of rarities and worthless knick-knacks whose
obsession inevitably turns him into a curiosity himself. In a neat summation of the
general issue, he continues, 'He is one of those that valued Epictetus 's Lamp above the
excellent Book he writ by it'. 38

II

This whole question of the relationship between the close study of particulars and
the social and, as it were, holistic tenets of Christian Humanism was especially
significant in relation to the most important intellectual phenomenon of the seventeenth
century - the rise and rapid development of modern science. In considering the
relationship between science and the humanities in the period, a number of critics and
historians have tended over the years to emphasize the fundamental differences between
the study of the world and the study of the word; between empiricism, experimentation,
and scientific scepticism on the one hand, and the scholastic belief in the authority of the
text on the other. Some have claimed that modern science, by virtue of its allegedly
amoral nature, stood opposed to the humanistic tradition, with its stress on ethics,
politics, and the basic problems of human society. Paul Fussell, for example, in the
course of defining the typical Augustan humanist, claims that he/she believed that 
'inquiries into the technical operation of the external world ("science") constitute not only 
distinctly secondary but even irrelevant and perhaps dangerous activities', before adding 
that the new science, 'especially in its role as midwife to the new industrialism', was 
among the humanist's prime enemies.39 No doubt influenced by the work of a number 
of prominent historians earlier this century - and particularly by R.F. Jones's 
contributions to the subject (as outlined in the introduction of this thesis) - other 
authorities have maintained that contemporary attitudes towards Baconian natural 
philosophy were profoundly shaped by theo-political persuasions; more specifically, 
they have presupposed that conservative, high Anglican circles (notably in Christ 
Church) were deeply antipathetic to the modern spirit of empiricism on the grounds that 
it was naturally and historically associated with radical threats to the political and 
theological establishment. Rachel Trickett strikes a fairly familiar chord when she insists 
that the 'new learning', with its 'utilitarianism, its appeal to Reason alone, and its 
optimistic view of progress, was a challenge to much that was affirmed by tradition and 
had been publicly affirmed by the Restoration'. 'In Oxford', she continues, 'the 
moderns were growing to be looked on as Whigs in politics and atheists or dissenters in 
religion, while the supporters of the old learning were as inevitably associated with 
tradition, monarchy, the Establishment, and gentility'.40 It is on such grounds that the 
numerous satires on the 'virtuosi' written between 1650 and 1800 have often been 
lumped together and classified accordingly as 'anti-science'.

King has featured prominently and frequently in such discussions; and his own 
critics, particularly Weeks and Koppel, have confirmed the impression that he was 
fundamentally opposed to modern science, resting their a priori argument on the fact that 
he was an 'Ancient'.41 In this section, however, I wish to reconsider the prevailing 
attitude towards Baconian natural philosophy among Restoration and early Augustan 
polite society, with the view to dispelling the notion that King, like the other high 
Churchmen, necessarily found the study of science contradictory to his political,
theological, and cultural beliefs and ideals. In order to do this, it is necessary to reconsider both the essential tenets of Baconianism and its associations with Christian Humanism, and to review as briefly as possible the historical background, specifically in relation to the theo-political affiliations of the scientific community throughout the seventeenth century.

Bacon's programme for a new philosophy was in many respects a late manifestation of the Renaissance reaction to medieval scholasticism that had given rise to the New Learning, of which he himself was a product. Like the earlier humanists, Bacon sought to establish a more 'solid', useful kind of learning; but while he also wrote on such subjects as ethics, history, and rhetoric, his most enduring achievements lay in the field of natural philosophy. Knowledge of the natural world, he insisted, could only be advanced through the process of experimentation, empiricism, and inductive reasoning. Turning the deductivism of the Peripatetics on its head, he argued that a programme of close study of objects and phenomena should be carried out in order to establish the basis for the eventual formulation of general laws and axioms. In this, as Paulo Rossi has pointed out, he was both borrowing and deviating from the tradition of Renaissance natural magic practiced by such contemporaries as Cornelius Agrippa, Cardano, and Paracelsus, which was itself an extension of the medieval science done by men like Roger Bacon. The occultists had long advocated an empirical and experimental methodology as the means of discovering the 'Eternal Secrets' of the Divine Creation, and in the process advancing medicine, mathematics, geometry, and more technical learning. Yet they consistently stressed the mystical element of their secretive research, insisted on the sacred and supernatural properties of their cabbalistic texts written in hyroglyphics and cryptical language, prized the arcaneness and sublimity of their knowledge, and urged those intent on joining their magic circle of illuminati to conceal their own discoveries from all but the initiated.

Bacon imbibed many of the occultists' assumptions about the existence of hidden natural laws, and accepted the view put by some that through knowledge of these, real
progress could be made in science and technology, particularly in the fields of alchemy and metallurgy. True to his humanist values, however, he rejected their elitist and vain approach to learning, their emphasis on the mysterious, and their fusion of the natural and the supernatural, especially their assertion that the primary purpose of natural philosophy was the revelation of the divine mysteries. In *The Advancement of Learning* he condemns the modern exponents of natural magic for their 'credulous and superstitious conceits and observations of Sympathies and Antipathies and hidden properties', and their 'frivolous experiments, strange rather by disguise than in themselves'. Their 'science' is as far from 'such knowledge as we require', he continues, 'as the story of King Arthur...differs from Caesar's commentaries in truth of history' (III, ii, pp. 361-62). 'They... who have busied themselves with natural magic', he again notes in the *New Organon*, 'have but few discoveries to show, and those trifling and imposture-like'(IV, p. 74, LXXIII). He maintained that the study of the natural world (i.e. of 'secondary causes') should be kept separate from the study of the divine word; and, with reference to such authorities as Solomon, Plato, and Paul, cautions that the limitations of human mortality and knowledge should always be kept in mind (*AL*, III, i, pp. 264-68). Should anyone imagine that by 'view and inquiry into these sensible and material things... the nature or will of God' will be magically revealed, he writes in *The Advancement of Learning*,

> then indeed is he spoiled by vain philosophy: for the contemplation of God's creatures and works produceth (having regard to the works and creatures themselves) knowledge; but having regard to God, no perfect knowledge, but wonder, which is broken knowledge....And hence it is true that it hath proceeded that divers great learned men have been heretical, whilst they have sought to fly up to the secrets of the Diety by the waxen wings of the senses (III, i, p. 267).

Social utility and the widespread dissemination of knowledge, he demanded, should be the central principles governing the study of natural philosophy. Noting that 'in religion we are warned to show our faith by works', he insists that 'by the same rule' philosophical studies should also 'be judged by its fruits, and pronounced frivolous if it be barren'(*NO*, IV, p. 74, LXXIII). 'The true and lawful goal of the sciences', he
writes, 'is none other than this: that human life be endowed with new discoveries and
Power' (*NO*, IV, p. 79, LXXXI). As Brian Vickers has shown, Bacon's insistence upon
utility, which has so often been assumed to be crudely materialistic, in fact derives from
the classical principle of *vita activa*, and is thus an expression of the higher,
philanthropic ideals of Christian Humanism. The scientist, like the cleric and the
gentleman-scholar, was to remain conscious of his social obligations, and to use his
knowledge charitably and responsibly, 'and not to swelling; to use, and not to
ostentation' (*AL*, III, i, p.268). Since 'both heaven and earth do conspire and contribute
to the use and benefit of man', he observes, so the end of philosophy ought to be the
rejection of 'vain speculations and whatever is empty and void', and the preservation and
augmenting of the 'solid and fruitful' (*AL*, III, i, pp. 294-95).

The essential features of his programme illustrate Bacon's synthesis of the empirical
and experimental method and the social and intellectual ideals of Renaissance
Humanism. He argued that in order to collect, categorize and assess all the available
physical data, scientific research needed to be collaborative, laborious, and selfless. He
recognized two basic kinds of experiment: 'experiments of light' (what might be
regarded these days as pure science), which were aimed at illuminating axioms and laws
of causation; and 'experiments of fruit', which would yield more immediately practicable
benefits (*NO*, IV, pp. 70-72; p. 95, XCIX). Once all the relevant data were accumulated
and appropriately 'marshalled', hypotheses and axioms were to be formulated (*NO*, IV,
p. 96, CII, CIII), in a process which would ensure a 'closer and purer league between
these two faculties, the experimental and the rational'. In a passage which looks forward
to Swift's *Battle of the Books*, he claims that the 'true business of philosophy'
corresponds to the activities of the bee, which 'gathers its material from the flower of the
garden and of the field, but transforms and digests it by a power of its own'. Whereas,
like the ant, experimenters and collectors merely store up information, and 'reasoners',
like the spider, only 'make cobwebs out of their own substance', the true philosopher
lays up his observations of natural things and phenomena 'in the understanding altered
Bacon was only too aware of the inherent limitations of human consciousness, particularly the problematical nature of its relationship to sense perception. 'Human understanding is like a false Mirror', he writes in his discussion of the common Idols of the Tribe, for it distorts perception and perverts what our senses tell us to be true \((NO, \ IV, \ p.\ 54, \ XLI)\). Hence, 'every student of nature' should be sceptical of 'whatever his mind seizes upon and dwells upon with peculiar satisfaction', and should take care 'to keep the understanding even and clear' \((NO, \ IV, \ p.\ 60, \ LVIII)\). In *The Advancement of Learning*, he likewise warns against the 'impatience of doubt', which will lead to a too hasty 'assertion without due and mature suspension of judgement' \((AL, \ III, \ i, \ p.\ 293)\).

He strongly condemns as a disease of learning the twin vices of deceit and credulity,

which, although they appear to be of a diverse nature, the one seeming to proceed of cunning, and the other of simplicity, yet certainly they do for the most concur...he that will easily believe rumours will as easily augment rumours and add somewhat to them of his own \((AL, \ III, \ i, \ pp.\ 287-88)\).

Closely associated with this problem, he realized, was the question of language (the 'Idols of the Market-place'), the means by which all knowledge was disseminated. He argued that as a result of the misplaced emphases of the Schoolmen on words rather than things, language had been deprived of its chief communicative function, and so had hindered the advancement of scientific learning. The hermetics and alchemists were even more culpable, for they deliberately employed obscurantist devices in order 'to remove the vulgar capacities from being admitted to the secrets of knowledge, and to reserve them to selected auditors, or wits of such sharpness as can pierce the viel' \((AL, \ III, \ ii, \ p.\ 405)\). He advocates the use of the aphoristic form in philosophical literature because aphorisms are 'made but of the pith and heart of science' \((AL, \ III, \ ii, \ 405)\), and demands that natural philosophy be written 'in the simplest and least abstruse language' \((NO, \ IV, \ p.\ 121, \ IV)\). Because natural philosophy was a field of logic (as opposed to rhetoric), its exponents should endeavour in their use of language to relate words and things as
closely as possible, and eschew metaphors and similar linguistic devices, which could only inhibit the basic function of demonstration (AL, III, ii, pp. 409-11).

In this insistence on stylistic clarity and appropriateness, as with his demand that the pursuit of knowledge was to be essentially philanthropic, Bacon reveals the close kinship between his philosophy and the Humanism which prevailed within the contemporary intellectual community.

If Bacon's actual contribution to the body of scientific knowledge was minimal, his writings at least established the guidelines for modern scientific research; more important perhaps, their stylistic excellence and impressive argument regarding the propriety of a natural philosophy based on empiricism and experimentation in terms of the cultural ideals of late Renaissance guaranteed the widespread appreciation and acceptance of science in a society already excited by the great discoveries of Galileo, Kepler, Harvey, and Gilbert, among many others. As Vickers has concluded, 'It is this realignment of science within the social and religious goals of the vita activa and with a utilitas given the widest philanthropic application that may constitute Bacon's most valuable influence on the seventeenth century'. During the Jacobean and Caroline periods, the Baconian epistemology gradually found favour among many sections of society, both progressive and conservative, including many within the universities and the Church. A fair percentage of the prominent early scientists were devout Churchmen and royalists, and the new discoveries in such areas as astronomy, anatomy, and the applied sciences were introduced more or less formally to students, in spite of such scholastic barriers as Oxford's Laudian Statutes. By the middle of the century Oxford could boast a strongly Baconian 'Philosophical Society', the members of which included such loyal Anglicans as Christopher Wren, Seth Ward, John Evelyn, Robert Hooke, and William Oughtred. The initial advancement of scientific learning, however, almost certainly received its biggest boost from the Puritan reformers, who promoted practical scientific and technological research in London and Oxford, and appointed prominent Baconians to senior academic posts, notably the moderate John Wilkins, who became Warden of
Wadham College and the leader of the Oxford Society. Of the reformers, the most significant was Samuel Hartlib, who energetically advocated a Baconian programme, and patronised the work of young intellectuals such as William Petty and Robert Boyle, another member of the Oxford group. The spirit of cooperation and toleration which generally prevailed within the respected scientific community was to have a profound effect on many of the scientists, encouraging the development of a more rationalist and comprehensive theology later to become known as Latitudinarianism.47

A 'vulgarised' form of Baconianism was also adopted by more extreme Puritans, who were quick to emphasize the revolutionary element inherent in Bacon's challenge to Aristotelian authority, and to reinterpret it in ways more advantageous to their radical religious and political aims. Ironically, Baconianism was compounded with the teachings of the various occult and alchemical authorities (whose works were now being published with greater frequency than ever before), and this confused, pseudo-scientific mixture was bound up with unorthodox theological doctrine, astrology, and millenarianism.48

One tract representative of this 'low Baconianism' is John Webster's *Academiarum Examen*,49 in which trenchant criticism of Aristotle and the universities' scholastic education is blended with extensive references to both Biblical and theological sources, and an array of scientific authorities ranging from Bacon (e.g., pp. 25, 34), Harvey (p.74), Kepler (p.78), Tycho Brahe, Galileo, and Copernicus (p.103), to Descartes and Gassendi (p.78), John Dee (p.20), Comenius (p.22), Porta, Agrippa, Roger Bacon (p.24), Boehme (p.26), Paracelsus (p.70), van Helmont (pp.10, 106), Hermes Trismegistrus (p.70), and Robert Fludd (p.105). 'Surely natural philosophy hath a more noble, sublime, and ultimate end', Webster insists, than syllogistic speculation or even the knowledge of 'the causes, properties, operations and affections of nature'; rather it was the means by which one could 'see and behold the eternal power and God-head of him, who hath set all these things as so many significant and lively characters, or Hieroglyphicks of his invisible power, providence, and divine w[ill]sdome, so legible, that those which will not read them, and him by them, are without excuse'(pp.18-19).
He therefore enthusiastically supports the search for the 'universal Character', and a grammar based upon the 'Hieroglyphical, Emblematical, Symbolical, and Crytographical learning', in which 'great mysteries have been preserved and holden out of the world'(pp.24, 100). He also endorses astrology (p.51), natural magic (pp.69-70), and 'Physiognomy ', which is 'that science from which and by certain signs, signatures, and lineaments doth explicate the internal nature and quality of natural bodies either generally or specifically'(p.76). Of special importance is 'that sublime, and never sufficiently praised science of Pyrotechny or Chymistry ', which, having suffered from the 'corruption of time, and the wickednesse of covetous Impostures', had been revived by Paracelsus and restored to its proper place in the front rank of learning. Though he concedes that the 'grand mysteries are hid in the brests of those who are truly called Adepti ', Paracelsianism was 'in a word that Art that doth help more truly and radically to denudate, and discover the secret principles and operations of nature, than any other in the world'(p.71).

If Webster's book typifies the low Baconian synthesis of science, mysticism, devotion, and radicalism, then the two books which answered it in some measure represent the current opinions within what remained of the Anglican establishment of Oxford University. In its defence of Aristotelianism and 'humane learning', Thomas Hall's Vindiciae Literarum in many ways accords with the Jonesian view of the Ancients/Moderns debate, especially since Hall also emphasizes the superior usefulness of the traditional learning for study of theology and religious controversy. But the university's most effective and important retort, Vindiciae Academiarum, is a very different matter entirely, in its reflection of the high Baconianism which already prevailed at Oxford. The joint authors were the Puritan appointee John Wilkins, and Seth Ward, the Savilian Professor of Astronomy and later a high Anglican bishop, who was responsible for the bulk of the work. In his introductory piece, Wilkins points out initially that Webster's description of Oxonian education was anachronistic, since it failed to recognize that many scientific subjects were already being taught; furthermore,
Webster's pronouncements on science were themselves ridiculously confused, betraying a greater sympathy for the occult tradition than for serious Baconian science. His 'large encomium upon Jacob Behem '[sic] and his 'reverence ...to judicial Astrologie', Wilkins notes, 'may sufficiently convince what kind of credulous fanatick Reformer he is like to prove'(p.5). Like Wilkins, Ward is careful to pay Aristotle and 'humane learning' in general the respect they deserve, while stressing the university's appreciation of Bacon's teachings and the discoveries of Harvey, Copernicus, Kepler, and so on. With considerable wit and zest he savages Webster's arguments, discrediting his opponent's knowledge of the very subjects he recommends by focusing on Webster's occult sympathies and the irrational and obscurantist elements of his cherished educational reforms. 'Hierogliphicks and Cryptography ', he points out facetiously, were invented for *concealment* of things, and used either in mysteries of Religion which were *infanda*...How incongruous then is it, that the Art of *Concealment*, should not be made a part of the Art of *Illustration* ; surely it would make much to the advancement of Children while they are learning the Elements of Grammar, to be put upon the speculation of the *Mensa Isiaceae*, the *Canopi*, and *Obeliskes*, the *Thesaurus Hieroglyphicus*, or *Grosschel's Magical Calendar* ; This would certainly effect, even in Children, what Porta & Agrippa have done to M.Webster, bring them to *Wonder* and *Amusement* (p. 18).

Astrology is dismissed as 'that ridiculous cheat, made up of nonsense and contradictions, founded only upon the dishonesty of Impostures, and the frivolous curiosity of silly people'(p.30); while the leading hermetic authorities are mocked for their 'occult celestial signatures and taking them off from observation & experiment (the only way to the knowledge of nature) !' (p. 34).

The whole Webster-Ward-Hall controversy testifies to the essential heterogeneity of scientific opinion in the Interregnum, and supports the conclusions of such historians as Charles Webster as to the immensely complex and sometimes inconsistent interrelationships between the period's science and its theo-political context. Though the Puritan regime was instrumental in the tremendous upsurge in scientific activity and interest in the middle decades of the seventeenth century, attitudes within Puritan circles towards the methodology and purpose of natural philosophy varied considerably, as the
examples of Wilkins, Hartlib, and Webster show. Furthermore, while some conservative elements clung stubbornly to Aristotelianism and maintained the pre-eminence of scholastic and humanistic learning, the significant number of Anglican royalists (including high churchmen) among the scientific communities in both the capital and the universities proves that the Anglican establishment was by no means necessarily at ideological odds with Baconianism. As Debus points out, it is very significant that Hall felt that Wilkins and Ward were effectively on his side.\textsuperscript{52} If one central dualism in Interregnum epistemology can be isolated and related to the wider political and theological conflict, then, it is perhaps that involving low or 'Vulgar' Baconianism - with its mystical (as well as utilitarian) aspirations, hubristic overtones, and radical associations - and High Baconianism, with its insistence upon rational scepticism, humanistic utilitarianism, and generally orthodox religious and political presuppositions.\textsuperscript{53}

The Restoration no more brought uniformity to the scientific scene than it succeeded in imposing absolutism on the political front, as Cartesianism, Gassendian atomism, Hobbesian materialism, and Cambridge Platonism all enjoyed varying levels of support.\textsuperscript{54} The return of the Anglican establishment to political and social domination did, however, ensure the intellectual and cultural hegemony of the high Baconianism with which it was associated. Though the newly established Royal Society was composed of men of varying intellectual, political, and theological persuasions, and indeed strove to guarantee toleration and the free exchange of ideas, it was at pains to stress its allegiance to both Charles II and Francis Bacon.\textsuperscript{55} Typical of the Anglican/high Baconian attitude was Samuel Parker’s \textit{A Free and Impartial Censure of the Platonick Philosophie}, which vigorously reiterates the central points of Ward’s \textit{Vindiciae Academiarum}. A high church cleric and Fellow of the Society, Parker admits his preference for 'the Mechanical and Experimental Philosophie' over the Aristotelian,

not so much because of its greater certainty, but because it puts inquisitive men into a method to attain it, whereas the other serves only to obstruct their industry by amusing them with empty and insignificant Notions. And therefore we may rationally expect a
greater Improvement of Natural Philosophie from the Royal Society (if they pursue their
design) then it has had in all former ages; for they having discarded all particular
Hypotheses, and wholly addicted themselves to exact Experiments and Observations, they
may not only furnish the World with a compleat History of Nature, (which is the most
useful part of Physiologie) but also lay firm and solid foundations to erect Hypotheses
upon (though perhaps that must be the work of future Ages).56

As Michael Hunter has observed, the period's main advocates of natural philosophy
were vociferous in their pronouncements on its utilitarian merits, in terms of both
theoretical knowledge of natural laws and practical improvements in the areas of
industry and technology, agriculture, mining, navigation, and so forth.57 Two
especially notable projects intended (though never completed) by the Society were a
'History of Agriculture and Gardening', to which was partially related the publication
of Evelyn's *Sylva*;58 and a 'History of Trades, a great collaborative scheme initially
broached by Bacon and designed to collect all available information concerning the
current industrial and technological processes, which continued to inspire such
authorities as Sprat, Boyle, Petty, Evelyn, and Oldenburgh throughout the
Restoration.59

The question of the proper language for the new learning also remained a major
issue. Time and again the same spokesmen endorsed the need for the simplest and
clearest language in order to ensure the most efficient communication of the new
discoveries. Sprat's statement that the Royal Society's scientists should eschew
metaphors and other rhetorical devices in their scientific works, employ a style 'as near
the Mathematical plainness, as they can', and prefer 'the language of Artizans,
Coutrymen, and Merchants, before that, of Wits, or Scholars', is undoubtedly the best
known.60 It is also, however, the most misunderstood. As Vickers points out, the
common assumption that it amounts to a general attack on all forms of rhetoric is
erroneous; rather (like Bacon) Sprat is here concerned with the question of decorum, of
suiting style to subject matter and function.61 Boyle, too, noted 'that where our design
is to inform readers, not to delight or persuade them, perspicuity ought to be esteemed at
least one of the best qualifications of style', adding that 'to affect needless rhetorical
ornaments in setting down an experiment, or explicating something abstruse in nature, were little less improper, than it were...to paint the eyeglasses of a telescope, whose clearness is their commendation'.\textsuperscript{62} Using a metaphor at least as ancient as Quintillian, he exhorts natural philosophers to be as discrete and decorous in their use of language as in their dress: 'For, as in the fashions of clothes, though perhaps fools begin them, yet wise men, when they are once generally received, scruple not to follow them...: for it is not the use, but the affectation of them[ i.e. exotic words], that is unworthy a philosopher....I should think myself guilty of a very childish vanity, if the use I made of language were so to write as to be the less understood'.\textsuperscript{63} This recognition of the importance of efficient communication to the advance of learning led to the foundation of the \textit{Philosophical Transactions} by Henry Oldenburg in 1665, of which more will be said later.

The age's leading Anglican apologists for science also stressed the propriety of a rational and sceptical approach to their necessarily collaborative task, and were anxious to point out that while the perception (albeit partial) of the complex mechanism and beauty of God's creation could only enhance a Christian's faith, natural philosophy was not to infringe upon the domain of Divinity and attempt to unravel the divine mysteries.\textsuperscript{64} Special opprobrium was therefore reserved for the occult tradition, which still persisted amongst some sections of the scientific community (and which had attracted the more or less covert study of a number of, as it were, respectable scientific figures, including Newton and Robert Plot).\textsuperscript{65} The fact that the radical Puritans had so avidly promoted the occult sciences made them particularly reprehensible in the eyes of the royalist propagandists; in the words of one recent commentator, 'The alliance between the Royal Society and the Church of England was directed against irrationality, obscurity, and Hermeticism, whether, in Enthusiastic religion or in occult science'.\textsuperscript{66} Parker insisted that 'our late English Rosie Crucians' deserved to be 'chastised by the Publique Rods' because they 'Poison mens minds, and dispose them to the wildest and most Enthusiastick Fanaticisme'. There is, he adds,
so much Affinity between Rosi-cruianisme and Enthusiasme, that whoever entertains the one, he may upon the same reason embrace the other; And what Pestitential Influences the Genius of Enthusiasme or opinionative Zeal has upon the Publick Peace, is so evident from Experience, that it needes not be prov'd from Reason. To conclude, I am confident, that from the beginning of time to this day, there has not been so great a Conjunction of Ignorance with Confidence, as in those Fellows, which certainly of all other Aspects is the most contrary and malignant of true knowledge (p. 75).

Other notable scientists such as Boyle and Hooke emphasized the distinctions between their work and the superficially similar activities of the occultists, a division reiterated by Sprat in the History, in which the 'Chymists' who have achieved moderate success in the fields of pure, rational chemistry and the preparation of medicines are contrasted with those who 'search after riches, by Transmutations, and the great Elixir'. The success of the latter, he insists, 'has been as small as their design was extravagant'(p.37). Far from keeping their minds open to what their senses tell them, they are so obsessed with their 'chase of the Philosopher's Stone...that they are scarce capable of any other thoughts'. On those occasions when these 'dark and reserv'd Chymists' deign to communicate their learning, he adds, they deliberately make 'their style ...resemble the smoak, in which they deal' in order to conceal their 'greatest mysteries' (p. 74).

Natural philosophy also continued to make advances in the schools and universities, particularly at Oxford, which (despite maintaining officially its adherence to its Laudian Statutes) was slowly developing into a major centre of modern scientific research and education. More to the point, its leading proponents (many of whom were, like Ward, both high churchmen and fellows of the Royal Society) on the whole continued to promote, if not always to practice, the most orthodox kind of Baconianism. As Hunter has noted, 'support for science came from those at the heart of the Oxford establishment', including Obadiah Walker, who contributed a work on optics, and the Bodleian librarian and Arabic scholar, Thomas Hyde, who produced microscopical and other biological studies. Even John Fell, a man reputed to have been 'wholly addicted to the old philosophy', was so enthusiastic about modern astronomy (or at least so determined that Christ Church became a principal centre of its study) that he had to be dissuaded by Wren from converting the college's recently completed Tom Tower into an
observatory.\textsuperscript{70} If theological and classical works retained priority when it came to publication on the University press, Fell's manifesto charged that 'modern works of learned men in their several faculties, both within and out of the University', would also be printed; and among those so privileged were Willughby's \textit{de Historica Piscium} (on the suggestion of the great naturalist, John Ray), Plot's natural histories of Oxfordshire and Staffordshire, Robert Morrison's botanical studies, and Robert Boyle's treatises on various scientific subjects.\textsuperscript{71} His successor, Henry Aldrich, likewise continued to promote scientific studies alongside of the more traditional humanistic curriculum.\textsuperscript{72}

Their consistently orthodox college could boast a fine line of important scientists, notably Richard Lower, Locke, and another of Busby's favourite students, Robert Hooke, who was devout in his observance of Baconian dictates on premature hypothesising, the limitations of natural philosophy with regard to theology, the need for the plainest and clearest possible prose style, and the rejection of occult explanations.\textsuperscript{73}

Most striking of all, those allegedly prime Ancients, the Christ Church Wits, were actually heavily involved with Oxonian science. John Freind, for instance, was to become an eminent Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, a great champion of Boyle's advances in chemistry, and a leading figure in the Oxford group of Newtonians which sprang up in the 1690s with Aldrich's support under the guidance of the former Edinburgh mathematicians, David Gregory and John Keill.\textsuperscript{74}

Even so, the growing enthusiasm for science and the Royal Society in particular did cause concern in some quarters that the intellectual pre-eminence of the universities might be jeopardized and the study of the humanities adversely affected, with a resulting decline in the standards of Anglican theological scholarship and controversy. These anxieties were expressed in a number of cautionary, and in some cases highly condemnatory publications and addresses, notably from Meric Casaubon, Robert South and Henry Stubbe.\textsuperscript{75} Insofar as they were concerned with the defence of 'humane learning', such men were true representatives of the Ancients' cause; yet it would be wrong to imagine that they were necessarily opposed to modern Baconian empiricism, or
even to the existence of the Society, provided it knew its proper place and epistemological duty.76 South, for instance, at least 'had some curiosity about science';77 and as Casaubon put it, 'a man may write against the opinions of some of the Royal Society; yea and censure them as they may deserve, without any reflection at all upon the Royal Founder, or Royal Society in general'.78 What offends him is not natural philosophy itself - indeed he professes to being 'still a great lover and honourer of it' - but the extravagant claims made in its favour by its more enthusiastic proponents, and their corresponding disparagement of the humanities: 'Hitherto nothing hath been said to impair the credit or usefulness of Natural or Experimental Philosophy: but that we would not allow it to usurp upon all other learning, as not considerable in comparison'.79 He acknowledges the 'eminent worth and piety' of some members of the Society, and expresses his hope that Du Moulin will not 'think any thing I have written can reflect upon any such'.80

By the turn of the century, then, science had firmly established itself within the politest sections of the Anglican community, and a knowledge of and concern for natural philosophy had become an integral part of the gentlemanly ideal. With the emergence of provincial natural philosophic societies along the lines of the Royal Society, gentlemen all over the British Isles were encouraged to busy themselves in useful scientific activities and to develop an interest in natural objects and phenomena. One particularly notable scientific dilletante was the Swift's friend and King's patron, the Earl of Pembroke, who held the post of President of the Royal Society in the year 1689-90, though, according to reports, he never attended one its meetings. Books about the latest advances in physics, astronomy, technology, agriculture, and husbandry proliferated, written by both professional scientists and physicians, and amateur scientists, by now accorded the ambiguous title, formerly applied to the antiquarians, of 'virtuosi', in response to their specimen collecting and small-scale experimenting. Travel books, too, increasingly exhibited scientific information, a subject to which we shall return. So culturally pervasive was the scientific spirit that, as G.S. Rousseau writes,
'Not to endorse natural philosophy in some form or shape among the fashionable select few was to be a misfit, out of tune with the whole spirit of the age.'

Of course the Baconian programme, with its insistence that even 'the smallest and most despicable productions of Nature' warranted close and systematic attention, was inherently prone to pedantry when seen from a strictly humanistic perspective; and its practice inevitably inspired a satiric response from the gentlemen wits. Most of these satirists, however, of whom Samuel Butler and Thomas Shadwell are perhaps the best known of the pre-Scriblerians, were not opposed to science per se; though their knowledge and appreciation of the practicalities of empiricism and experimentation may be questioned (particularly in the case of Shadwell, whose play, The Virtuoso, to some extent parodies the work of that uncompromising Baconian, Robert Hooke), they nonetheless agreed with the widespread opinion that Baconianism was the only proper study of nature. Their real concern, as usual, was the abuse of learning, specifically in relation to Baconianism. In their satires, the virtuosi stand accused of the full range of epistemological crimes censured in Bacon's pronouncements on 'vain learning': pride, selfishness, triviality, uselessness, and impracticality, as well as those especially associated with the occult tradition and Cartesianism, namely theological presumption, premature hypothesising and systems-building, credulity, and obscurantism. As Butler explains in his Characters, the Virtuoso 'differs from a Pedant, as Things do from Words; for he uses the same Affectation in his Operations and Experiments, as the other does in Language'; and like the Antiquary, he prizes trifles and 'Rareties', ignores useful studies, and adores 'strange natural Histories', in the hope that in time he can convince himself of the verity of what is plainly fallacious and unnatural. Shadwell's Sir Nicholas Gimcrack is another manifestation of the archetype, a mere collector and 'rare Mechanick Philosopher' who proudly professes his total unconcern for utility; as he acknowledges after having been discovered mimicking the aquatic motions of a frog, 'I content my self with the speculative part of swimming, I care not for the Practick. I seldom bring anything to use, 'tis not my way, Knowledge is my ultimate end'.
Contrary to the suggestions of some critics, the experimental scientist did not entirely supplant the earlier pseudo-scientist, the alchemist/hermetic of, for example, Jonson's *The Alchemist*. Rather, in such representative characters as Sir Sidrophel and Gimcrack, the two became amalgamated, reflecting their creators' acceptance of the standard Anglican line towards low Baconianism. Butler also provided a more straightforward picture of the 'Hermetic Philosopher' in one of the longest of his *Characters*, describing him as an ignoramus, whose 'learned Discoveries, that signify any Thing, though it be vulgar and common he calls experimental truths, and those that mean nothing Mysteries, which with him is but another Word for Nonsense'.

Even the most vociferous and persistent critics of the Royal Society likewise tended to be more concerned about its members' perversion of the Baconian project - at least as it was conveniently perceived by high Anglican gentlemen scholars and wits - than the project itself. Butler ridiculed the Society's lack of discrimination in its membership, which had led to its becoming dominated by triflers, astrologers, and quacks, and thus devalued as a serious scientific body:

For when they're cast into a lump,
Their talents equally must jump,
As metals mixed, the rich and base,
Do both at equal values pass.

('Satire on the Royal Society', 9-12)

His basic charge that the Society was making itself ridiculous through not being Baconian enough is plain from the concluding lines of the *The Elephant in the Moon*:

That those who greedily pursue
Things wonderful instead of true,
That in their speculations choose
To make discoveries strange news,
And natural history a gazette
Of tales stupendous and far-set,
Hold no truth worthy to be known
That is not huge and overgrown,
And explicate appearances
Not as they are, but as they please,
In vain strive nature to suborn,
And for their pains are paid with scorn. (509-20)
Significantly, Gimcrack (who at different stages reveals himself to be Rosicrucian quack, e.g., IV, iv, 35-48), also admits to having been denied admission to the Society, the implication being that Shadwell, like Meric Casuabon after him, did not wish to reflect too adversely upon the Society 'in general', despite his mockery of some of its work.

So far as amateur science was concerned, the key issues typically seem to have been the exceedingly vague humanistic principles of moderation and discrimination. According to Judith Drake, the virtuosi 'amuse themselves continually with the Contemplation of those things, which the rest of the World slight as useless, and below their Regard'. Plainly borrowing from Shadwell, she describes the virtuoso as one that has sold an Estate in Land, to purchase one in Scallop, Conch, Muscle, Cockle-shells, Periwinkles, Sea-Shrubs, Weeds, mosses, Sponges, Corals, ... and has abandon'd the Acquaintance and Society of Men, for that of Insects, Worms, Grubs, Maggots, Flies, Moths, Locusts, Beatles, Spiders, Grasshoppers, Snails, Lizards, and Tortoises'. As a traveller he displays a similar lack of discrimination, preferring to visit 'Pits, Shores, and Hills' in quest of 'an uncommon Shell, or an odd-shap'd Stone' than the more valuable sites of human civilisation. Though he 'trafficks to all Places, and has his Correspondents in every Part of the World', neither he nor his society derives any tangible benefits from his efforts: 'A Box or two of Pebbles or Shells, and a Dozen of Wasps, Spiders, and Caterpillars, are his Cargo. He values a Camelion, or Salamander's Egg, above all the Sugar and Spices of the West and East-Indies' (pp. 93-94). Writing as Bickerstaff, Addison put it most succinctly when he insists that he would not 'discourage any Searches that are made into the most minute and trivial parts of the Creation', but stresses that one 'should not be altogether fixed upon such mean and disproportioned Objects'. It is, he claims, 'the Mark of little Genius to be wholly conversant among Insects, Reptiles, Animalcules, and those trifling Rarities that furnish out the Apartment of a Virtuoso'; before warning that 'Observations of this Kind make
us serious upon Trifles, by which Means they expose Philosophy to the Ridicule of the Witty, and Contempt of the Ignorant'. 'In short', he concludes, 'Studies of this Nature should be Diversions, Relaxations, and Amusements; not the Care, Business, and Concern of Life'.

The statements and satiric presentations by such representative social commentators as Butler and Addison are testaments to the admittedly tenuous, somewhat impracticable, but nevertheless genuine coherence of humanistic values and scientific curiosity and commitment which constituted the Anglican establishment's attitude towards Baconian natural philosophy during the Restoration period and the early decades of the eighteenth century. Certainly the ultimate practice of Baconianism, particularly in terms of the collection of specimens and their intensive examination and classification, inevitably contradicted traditional intellectual and social values; but it would seem that far from being considered necessarily antithetical to the societal ideals, a somewhat rarified kind of Baconianism had in fact become absorbed into the polite creed, mainly due to the fact that its own higher ideals - social utility and responsibility, the dissemination of useful knowledge through effective communication, humility in the face of God's creation - were identical to the central ideals of Christian Humanism. The Anglican community, moreover, was on the whole suspicious of, and opposed to, alternative schools of scientific thought, above all the occult tradition, with its strong historical links with the Commonwealth; and it was partially for broader ideological reasons that High Baconianism, as it were, was consistently endorsed by even the highest of high churchmen. The notion that their religious and political affiliations prevented the members of the Anglican establishment (and specifically Christ Church) from embracing Baconian empiricism is therefore simply fallacious. As I shall demonstrate in the remaining part of this chapter, this also applies specifically to King.

III

It was virtually inevitable, given his education and class background, that King
should have imbibed the hegemonic values of his society, as his more serious writings and offhand remarks attest. His patriotism and sense of civic duty, and his humanistic tendency to equate contemporary situations with historical precedent, are evident in the dedication to Sir Edward Warcupp of his translation of de Langlade's memoirs, in which he evokes the traditions of the Spartans as the means of praising the heroism of Warcupp's sons, and the father's honourable acceptance of their deaths in the service of their king (III, pp. 288-89). In his Essay on Civil Government, he stresses the civic obligations of magistrates and other public officials, noting that while they might 'wear chains of gold, ...they are chains as well as gold; and though their gowns are honourable, they are very burthensome' (III, p. 296). His dedication to the young Duke of Beaufort of his translation of Gabriel Naudé's Political Considerations upon Refined Politicks also reveals his traditional belief in the value of literature to the education of a governor. After applauding Naudé's 'knowledge of men and books, the variety of his conversation', and his 'wisdom, prudence, good humour, and temperance', he rhetorically expresses the commonplace view that the truly cultured leader is one who adds the polish of a proper historical and political education to the natural attributes of his aristocratic pedigree:

Now, if Youth, under all the temptations of the world, can produce commendable actions fitting the dignity of a person's birth and grandeur; if the strictest rules of oeconomy are preserved, and temperance mixed with the sweetest affability be always the product of his conversation, either in friendship or conjugal affection, the nicest trials of humanity; what may be expected from the finished years of such a one, when he knows the rocks and quicksands he is to avoid, and has no other view but where his ancestors safely harbour (III, p. 295).

King's 'polite' approach to literature and learning is especially apparent in the miscellaneous jottings and observations that constitute his Adversaria. Understandably, many notes refer to classic authors such as Diogenes Laertius (I, pp. 223-25) and Ovid (I, p.233), while Homer and Virgil are praised as 'the great Monarchs of Learning' in an extensive comparison of the two. His conservative belief in a fixed and fallible human nature, and thus the moral and political utility of the classical narratives, is manifest in
his opinion that Homer's 'grand moral' is superior to Virgil's, and his insistence that the
former's great epic will always be relevant 'if pride and ambition, if rashness or a lust of
superiority, inhabit the first officers of Kingdoms; and which crimes, I think, will never
depart from them'. Homer's moral, he continues, 'affects every kingdom of the world,
whether considered by itself, or in conjunction with its allies....Kingdoms allied are
advised by this to maintain a fair correspondence with one another; a separate one, to live
in unity with itself'. It is because the great authors, along with the Bible, provide such
valuable lessons that it is imperative that they be as widely read as practicable; 'for, as
matter may be divided for millions of years, and yet remain sufficient to divide on to all
tity; so these may be scattered among innumerable numbers, and the farther they are
diffused, still the finer they will prove'(I, p.271). 'As much as pious Christians adore
the Holy Scriptures', he observes, 'so much do learned men admire Homer & Virgil.
The Old and New Testaments contain in them all that make one good: The Iliad and the
Aeneid, all that can make a man learned and polite'.

Yet his attitude towards the ancients was by no means idolatrous and uncritical.
Diogenes Laertius's verses in his Lives of the Philosophers are dismissed as 'very dull'
(I, p.224), and even the 'great Monarchs' come in for their share of criticism. Homer's
comical treatment of the god Vulcan, moreover, is regarded as indefencible; while we
may laugh at the absurdities of the Olympian dieties, he argues, 'Homer could not
without a crime, because he thought his religion as pure and unspotted as we do ours.
And therefore it is as great a crime in him to laugh at his Gods, as it would be in us to
laugh at ours'(I, p.269). Nor is the ancients' criticism necessarily superior. Aristotle's
justification of Homer's indecorum is considered inferior to Dacier's, while Longinus's
is described as 'indeed a witty one; but not to be valued, because it is a very weak one'
(I, p.269). King's devotion to the ancient authors and the aesthetic principles of
classicism, then, was moderated by the recognition that the unfortunate realities of
human limitation extended even to the greatest geniuses of antiquity.

One of the most striking features of the Adversaria is King's appreciation of his
compatriots' poetry. The best English poetry, he suggests, should be translated into Latin so that foreigners might discover 'what the spirit of our Poets is' (I, p.237). His selection is remarkable both for its discrimination and taste, and for its sheer breadth and miscellaneity. Besides such greats as Chaucer, More, Spenser, Sidney, Milton, and the 'divine Shakespeare' (I, p.241), he would include commemorative and extempore verse from the universities and schools (e.g. I, p.237), the poetry of the Common Law (I, p.240), and many obscure works by even more obscure authors; among the stranger examples are an 'Epitaph upon the Archbishop of St Andrews, that was murdered', and 'a pretty song of the Laplanders, in Scheffer' (I, pp.241-42). He forgets neither the poetry of the Britons, the Saxons, and the Welsh, nor that of Englishmen abroad, whether from 'Colleges of the Jesuits, Benedictines, and other Seminaries', or the West Indian plantations. He is in no doubt that 'there are many remains of Poetry left by our Countrymen behind them, in the Holy Land, in Cyprus, Malta, and wherever our knights travelled'. All genres were to be represented, from epigrams to translations, panegyrics to burlesques. An especially notable comment is his evaluation of More as 'a great wit' who possesses an 'abundance of life and smartness....His Utopia may come in as a piece of Poetry' (I, p.258). His admiration for the classical and Renaissance authors did not prevent him from appreciating the literature of more contemporary times, as is clear from his references to Cleveland, Cowley, Dryden, Marvell, Suckling, Rochester, Otway, and even such minor and esoteric figures as Farnaby, Whitfield, Newey, and Stepney. Of Butler he writes, 'His thoughts are so just, his images so lively, such a deep insight into the nature of mankind and the humour of those times, that no true history [of English poetry] could be written without studying that Author' (I, p.249). Like Pope, he plainly believed that one should 'Regard not then if Wit be Old or New, / But blame the False, and value still the True' (Essay on Criticism, 406-07). All kinds of literature from all ages, he recognized, could afford delight and instruction. He notes, for instance, that there is 'such an air of piety runs throughout all Hackluyt's Discoveries that makes it seem as if that alone made them successful'. To him,
Hackluyt's moral was only too evident: 'What signified all the Buccaneers prosperity without virtue? to which authority did all their wars and conquests bring them, but to make one another rich and vicious' (I, p. 244). (It is interesting to reflect that as a judge of the Court of Admiralty, King's duties included the trying of pirates.)

His comments on scholarship and the criticism of early literature also accord with the prevailing attitudes among Restoration polite society. In an especially noteworthy passage relating to the question of how one might ascertain the authenticity of a letter of Caesar Borgia, he writes:

I should look for the spirit of the Author, and a proper description of the state of Italy at that time; with the several intrigues of the courts; and not to be concerned, if some words were not to be found in the Dictionary set forth by the Academy of Florence [sic]; for, as we see the abuse, so we see the admirable use of Criticism when in the hands of a Gentleman (I, p. 244).

His extensive notes on the great scholar and cleric, Archbishop James Ussher of Armagh (which he probably compiled while Keeper of the Records in Dublin Castle), are further evidence of his own scholastic predilections. While these passages signal his belief in the utilitarian principles of Erasmian Humanism, other parts of the Adversaria attest to his interest in fine art and antiquarian rarities, as well as his admiration for the work of such scholars and antiquarians as Camden, Leland, Bale, Seldon, Lily, and Busby. The most conclusive proof of King's appreciation of the work of the great Renaissance polymaths and the value of antiquarianism is to be found in his 'Life of Ovid', which prefaces his translation of The Art of Love. In writing this brief, very readable critical biography, he refers in passing to numerous sources, from the ancient heathen and patristic authorities, to the Byzantine and medieval scholiasts, and finally to the scholars and antiquarians of the Renaissance, notably J.J. Scaliger (III, p. 118) and Daniel Heinsius (III, pp. 117, 120). One passage regarding the extant images of Ovid is particularly remarkable for its plethora of antiquarian authorities:

Hercules Ciofani gives it us as delineated from an antient marble found at Sulmo, and given him by his Friend Julius Agapetus. Ursinus has a head of him in his collections. There are several others; one from an antient medal in the Dutch edition; another in the Dauphin's: but the most excellent, and that seems to approach nearest to the character of the original, is that
represented by Peter Bellori, Library-keeper and Antiquary to the Queen of Sweden, among
his images of antient Philosophers, Poets, and Orators, set out in the year 1685; the esteem
which his most learned Excellency Spanhemius has shewn for it in his Dissertations will
make others regard it. The medal is of brass, with Ovid's Head on one side, and on the
Reverse the head of Menander Parrhasius, who caused this Monument to be made for
posterity. Nicholas Heinsius, in his latest Edition of Ovid, prefixed this head to it, as he
received it from that exquisite treasure of Medals collected by Felicia Rondanina, a most
noble and learned Roman Matron. And the generosity and good-nature of Sir Andrew
Fountain, in communicating it out of his great stock of learned curiosities, is gratefully to
be acknowledged (III, pp. 121-22).

In this final tribute to Fountain, a loyal gentleman who (like his patron Pembroke)
combined active civil service with a cultured interest in antiquarian curiosities and
rarities, King effectively establishes the standard of polite excellence against which 'mere
collectors of trifles' like Martin Lister and Hans Sloane were to be judged. Any
historiographical and philological activity, he implies, which in some way genuinely
enhances our understanding and appreciation of the ancient world - and thus of our
essential humanity - was to be pursued with discrimination and sensible moderation; and
its findings were to be communicated to the republic of the learned in the proper spirit of
'generosity and good-nature'.

The few direct remarks about science in King's writings are also typical of
seventeenth-century Anglican Humanism, and contradict the simple idea that he was both
entirely ignorant of and opposed to Baconianism. That he was relatively unappreciative
of the virtues of some kinds of scientific activity (especially some zoological and
microscopal studies), and opposed the pursuit of scientific knowledge for its own sake,
is undeniable; his humanistic ideals and prejudices naturally led him to condemn too
much concern for such miniscule and impractical matters as pedantic trifling. His
knowledge of modern science, moreover, was certainly immensely limited, and would
seem to have been derived from the great polemics of Bacon, Sprat, and Boyle, various
popular scientific books, and perhaps his acquaintance with old Oxonian colleagues
(such as Hannes, Smalridge, and John Freind) and later associates like Joseph Browne,
rather than through direct participation in actual scientific research. All this meant that his
attitude towards certain branches of science was at best ambivalent, and generally far too
elevated to enable him to judge fairly and sympathetically the often valuable and pioneering work done by many contemporary virtuosi.

Yet his *Adversaria* suggests a decided interest in possible fields of research and experimentation. He notes, for instance, (apparently from his reading of Francois Misson's *A New Voyage to Italy*) that buffaloes and camels have elsewhere proved highly efficient farm animals, and queries whether they might not be equally useful in England and Ireland (p. 261). He considers the agricultural and silvicultural implications of different soil types (p. 284), and even proposes an experiment to determine whether rice can grow on boggy ground, an idea surely stemming from his Irish experiences (p. 261). His high Baconian sentiments are again evident in his proposal for a 'Dictionary of Trade and Merchandize, and all their Implements', an idea which clearly corresponds closely to the 'History of Trades' project mooted by scientists and virtuosi from Bacon to Sprat and Evelyn (p. 261). His keen appreciation of and sympathy with the utilitarian aims and values of the Royal Society are also implied in his observation that 'Mr Altham tells us, from Stow's *Survey of London*, that Gresham College was designed for an universal correspondence of trade and Commerce; undoubtedly not for cockle-shells and butterflies'(p. 244). His concern that the Society was not fulfilling its proper Baconian duties (as he understood them) underlies his attacks on Martin Lister and Hans Sloane, as will be shown later.

King forever remained primarily a student and admirer of *belles lettres* in the tradition of Anglican Humanism, though, a fact most graphically displayed in his highly successful school text book, *An Historical Account of the Heathen Gods and Heroes*. In the dedication to his old teacher, William Knipe, he highlights the indivisible bond between the political and theological presuppositions of the Anglican establishment, and the classical training of Restoration Court Humanism. His book, he believes, will prove useful,

not only for the the better knowledge of the Classicks and all other polite Literature, but even of the Holy Scriptures themselves. It must be acknowledged, that the utmost end of your instruction tends to the understanding of the Text of the Holy Bible in all the learned
In the preface he maintains this theme of the importance of a literary education to the development of the socially-responsible gentleman, observing that it is a 'well-grounded Opinion of learned Men, that many Principles of Morality and Policy may be gathered from the Antient Fables' (p. 11). He stresses that his book is designed to be an 'easy Introduction to the understanding of the Classics, so that Persons who have perused this may not come unprovided to the reading of them, but may do it with some Pleasure.' Written in clear, conversational prose and unencumbered by extensive annotation or other scholarly baggage, *Heathen Gods and Heroes* realizes this intention perfectly. Not only does King present the many classical myths and legends with their variations culled from a variety of sources, he also manages astutely to introduce among them the odd moral or political dictum. Hugh Williamson has claimed that 'part of the charm of *Heathen Gods and Heroes* is in finding him [i.e. King] in emphases', and this is especially true of his chapter on Jupiter, in which his high Tory opposition to arbitrary government and standing armies is implicit in his statement that 'a Prince that had in great measure been beholden to an Army for his Kingdom, could not but allow some Liberties, and wink at some Excesses in his Soldiers' (p. 57). 'It is a difficult Matter for Persons who are arriv'd at the highest Pitch of Grandeur, to contain themselves within the Bounds of Temperance', he warns;

and therefore no wonder if Jupiter having so happily overcome his Enemies, finding now no Limits to his Power, might let loose his Appetites, and in the Pursuit of his Pleasures, run into the most extravagant and infamous Debaucheries; laying aside that Frugality, Abstinence, and Chastity, for which the Reign of Saturn had before been so eminent (p. 63).

King's belief in the virtues of moderation and the traditional order of the Tudor Constitution is evident in his observation that Jupiter, having 'plac'd Kings over the several Countries he had conquer'd', then directed them to 'suppress Violence, and...rule by Law and Equity; for which purpose he constituted Magistrates, and erected
Tribunals: He endeavour'd the Preservation of Peace amongst Men, stirring up the Good by wholesome Advice to their Duty, and restraining the Bad from their Offences by the Fear of Punishment' (p. 58). The book's inherent bias develops into thinly veiled political comment in the concluding lines, as the contemporary negotiations in Europe for the end of the War of the Spanish Succession are hinted at in the context of an account of the Goddess of Peace (p. 256).

One feature of *Heathen Gods* which has apparently escaped the notice of its few modern readers is the measure of ironic wit and humour that King sprinkles among his facts and sententia, no doubt in obeyance of the humanist notion that instruction was more palatable when delivered in a delightful manner. Generally this is so subtle and litotic as to be virtually undetectable, as in his description of Jason's encounter with Hysipile ('Jason came first to Lemnos, where Hysipile, the Queen of that Country, received him so kindly, that she had Twins by him'(p.247). His chapter on 'Oceanus and Tethys' is similarly spiced:

Tethys brought forth Ephyre, who was Wife to Epimetheus, and Pleione who was married to Atlas: There were many of their Daughters nam'd in Poetical Story, Philyra, Callirhoe, Perfeis, Tyche, Oeyrhoe, Aethra, Clymene, Doris, Rhodias, Metis, Clytie, &c. It would be in vain to think to enumerate them, since their Number amounted to three Thousand (p. 31).

It is also possible to detect just a trace of irony in the account of Orion's death at the hands of his admirer Diana:

one Day seeing him walking through the Sea, with his head appearing above Water, he [ie. Apollo] offered to lay a Wager with Diana, that she could not hit that Mark with her Arrows; Diana, by reason of the Distance, not imagining what it was, and desiring to shew her skill in Archery, drew her Bow, and fixed her Arrow in Orion's Forehead: When she came to the knowledge of what he had done, she was so concerned, that to make him some sort of amends, she prevailed upon Jupiter to place him amongst the Stars (208-09).

On another occasion King's use of bathos amusingly emphasizes his reflection that the legend of Glaucus is 'very fanciful, and shews the Extravagance of the Poetical Invention':

As he delighted very much in Fishing, so one Day as he was numbring his Draught upon the Shore, he observed the Fishes to jump into the Sea again immediately upon tasting a
certain Herb; he stood amazed at the thing, and trying the Experiment upon himself, leaped in after them. Some say, that being weary of his Life, he threw himself into the Sea, and that he was turned into a Whale and not a God.

They that make him the son of Pasiphae give us this Story, that as he was pursuing a Mouse, he fell into a But of Honey, and was smothered (p. 206).

*Heathen Gods and Heroes*, therefore, is more than a 'useful' introduction to the classical myths. Informative, occasionally wryly amusing, and on the whole eminently readable, it is the embodiment of the ideal of polite learning to which King so ardently adhered; and if, as Dr Johnson wrote, 'it might have been produced without the powers of King', it nevertheless testifies to its author's exceptional knowledge and profound appreciation of classical literature and culture. At the same time, it represents the more overtly positive side of his reaction to the period's developments in the fields of philology and classical scholarship, a reaction which on most occasions took the forms of satire and burlesque. Most important, its basic ingredients of humanistic learning, moral and cultural convictions, and good humour are exactly the same as those used in the manufacture of his parodies of pedantry and virtuosity: only the measurements of each vary. And as I shall argue in the following chapter, even his satiric recipe is borrowed from the Ancients.
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There is no greater proof of intelligence than erudite joking.
Gerard Lijster

Most of King's critics have been prompted by the stylistic and formal qualities of his writings to praise his originality. From Browne's recognition that King's was a 'peculiar Vein of humour',
2 to Disraeli's statement that he was 'a wit of a very original cast' who invented a 'new species of literary burlesque',
3 to Weeks's claim that the scholarly satire of the Scriblerians 'could not have been written without the pioneer efforts of Dr King who could almost be said to have invented it';
4 the common view has been that his works are important for their unique, inventive display of wit. The sharpness and fertility of King's sense of humour can readily be granted; but it is erroneous to imagine that he originated the kind of satiric and parodic literature that later satirists like the Scriblerians were to write. On the contrary, it shall be argued in this chapter that the bulk of his satires belong to a great literary tradition that stretches back to the classical age he admired so much, the significance of which to Restoration and Augustan satire has still to be fully elucidated, notwithstanding the efforts of a number of prominent scholars and critics.
5 Labelled by Dryden as Varronian satire in his Discourse on the Original and Progress of Satire, its more correct title (and the term which will generally be used here) is Menippean satire, after the Greek satirist and Cynic, Menippus of Gadara.
6 In this chapter I shall define the essential characteristics of this major literary genre and review as briefly as possible those examples of it which almost certainly influenced King's
work. By establishing these generic boundaries, I intend to lay the foundations for a fairer and clearer analysis and assessment of King's achievements and limitations as a satirist and humorist, particularly with regard to the question of his originality.

Dryden's passing references to the genre in his Discourse represent the first English criticism on the subject, and despite their brevity still provide a useful introduction. His principal secondary source is Issac Casaubon's essay 'De satyrica Graecorum poesi et Romanorum satira', in which it is observed that the term 'satire' derives from 'saturae lanx', the name given to a full dish of various fruits offered during festivals to the gods. Casaubon also delineates the different kinds of ancient satire, arguing that the basic formal characteristic of Menippean satire is its prosimetric structure. Accordingly Dryden distinguishes Varronian satire - named after the author of some of the oldest surviving examples, the great Roman scholar, Varro of Reate - from the formal verse satire of Horace, Juvenal, and Persius on the grounds that 'This sort of Satire was not only compos'd of several sorts of Verse, like those of Ennius, but also mix'd with Prose; and Greek was sprinkl'd amongst the Latin'. He notes further that Varronian satire is an older and in some respects purer kind than formal verse satire, in that its essential variety makes it more consistent with the original meaning of the Latin root (p. 243).

More significant, however, was Casaubon's recognition that it is not so much the 'mixed form, but a mixed temperament' that links Varro's satires to Menippus's; the two satirists possessed a 'certain similar joking temper in subjects not unlike, so that not without reason one might call each author spoudogelois [i.e., serio-comic] and the writings of both a playing philosophy'. Dryden recalls that Varro's writings, though mirthful, are reputed by Cicero to have been more serious and 'Elegant' than Menippus's merely travestic and often obscene dialogues and epistles. Varro, he notes further, deliberately mingled jest and earnest with the intention of making his philosophical lessons more palatable, though his love of jesting often negated any serious message: 'as Learned as he was, his business was more to divert his Reader, than to teach him' (pp.
Witty, learned, and fundamentally serio-comic, Varronian satire is thus, in Dryden's own terms, the stuff of 'fine raillery', by which one makes 'a man appear a fool, a blockhead, or a knave, without using any of those opprobrious terms!' (pp. 262-63). It is presumably on these grounds that Dryden classifies Samuel Butler's *Hudibras*, and his own *Absalom and Achitophel* and *MacFleckno*, as Varronian satires, despite their purely poetic form (p. 245). As he claims in respect of his satire on the Duke of Buckingham in *Absalom and Achitophel*,

'tis not bloody, but 'tis ridiculous enough. And he for whom it was intended, was too witty to resent it as an injury. If I had railed, I might have suffered for it justly. But I managed my own work more happily, perhaps more dextrously. I avoided the mention of great crimes, and applied myself to the representing of blind-sides, and little extravagancies: to which, the wittier a man is, he is generally the more obnoxious. It succeeded as I wished; the jest went round, and he was laughed at in his turn who began the frolic (p. 263).

Similarly, his incorporation in the genre of a number of other great satires formally quite distinct from Menippus's original prosimetric diatribes - i.e. Petronius's *Satyricon*, Lucian's dialogues, Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, Apuleius's *Golden Ass*, Erasmus's *Praise of Folly*, 'and a Volume of German Authors, which my ingenious Friend Mr. Charles Killigrew once lent me' (almost certainly the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*) - would seem to signal his acceptance of Casaubon's idea that the genre's most vital elements were its witty, indirect banter and ultimately serious intellectual and moral themes.

Twentieth-century criticism of the genre has been dominated by two major studies: Northrop Frye's comments in the *Anatomy of Criticism*, and Mikhail Bakhtin's discussion in his critique of Dostoevsky's novels, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Frye is initially concerned with establishing the division between the novel and works of prose fiction such as *Gulliver's Travels*, *Candide*, and *Brave New World*, which he identifies as Menippean satires (though he later proposes the more 'convenient' label of 'anatomy', after Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*). Whereas the novel is basically naturalistic in its depiction of characters in action, he claims, the Menippean satire 'deals less with people as such than with mental attitudes'. Its characters are no more than mouthpieces for abstract ideas and theories, and reflect its major thematic concerns,
namely moral and religious deviancy and intellectual pretension: 'Pedants, bigots, cranks, parvenus, virtuosi, enthusiasts, rapacious and incompetent professional men of all kinds, are handled in terms of their occupational approach to life as distinct from their social behaviour'. 'The novelist sees evil and folly as social diseases', he adds, 'but the Menippean satirist sees them as diseases of the intellect, as a kind of maddened pedantry which the philosophus gloriosus at once symbolizes and defines'(p. 309). Frye observes that the longer variety of Menippean satire normally takes the form of a loose-jointed narrative, and that a 'free play of intellectual fancy and the kind of humorous observation that produces caricature' are important features (p. 310). For all its formal anarchy, however, 'at its most concentrated' the Menippean work presents what Frye calls 'a vision of the world in terms of a single intellectual pattern', another unrealistic, non-novelistic construct consistent with its archetypal characterization, and vital to the representation of moral and social deviation that is fundamental to satire. The Menippean satirist delights in intellectual games and generally in making comic and satiric use of academia, which in the case of writers like Rabelais and Burton results in vast compendia, as well as extensive digressions and nonsense passages which grotesquely distort the narrative structure. As Frye notes, the 'encyclopaedic compilations produced in the line of duty by Erasmus and Voltaire suggest that a magpie instinct to collect facts is not unrelated to the type of ability that has made them famous as artists'(p. 311). Colloquies and dialogues, and specifically Dialogues of the Dead, are given as the usual form of the short Menippean satire (p. 310).

Bakhtin's analysis is much more extensive and challenging, and relates to his attempt to explain the 'polyphonic' nature of Dostoevsky's novels.¹⁰ His starting point is the classical spoudogelion, in which he (like Casaubon) places Menippean satire along with the still older forms of the Socratic dialogue, the Cynic diatribe, and the Symposium (pp.106-12). Serio-comic literature, Bakhtin claims, is essentially 'dialogic', as distinct from the monological genres of epic, tragedy, history, epistle, and significantly, didactic and non-ironic dialogue. Monological literature reflects or imposes
a rigid interpretation of the world from a fixed and singular perspective (pp. 79-85); as Bakhtin explains elsewhere, 'Monologue pretends to be the ultimate word'(p. 292). The monologic approach objectifies, and thus denies the separate and equal consciousness of, every other individual; it 'closes down the represented world and represented persons'(pp. 292-93). By contrast, the dialogic view is sceptical of ultimate positions, emphasises the reality of the present, and interprets human existence as inherently complex and multifarious (p. 108). Its philosophical sources are the Socratic paradox that the only true knowledge is self-knowledge of one's ultimate ignorance, and the sceptical doctrines of the Cynics (pp. 110-12). Dialogic literature is thus deliberately multi-voiced, multi-styled, and multi-toned; it subverts all fixed positions and values, opening up everything to challenge and constant reassessment. It is iconoclastic, ironic, parodic, travestic; it inverts and destabilizes monologic genres, jumbling up narratives and inserting alien and incongruous elements. The formal qualities of dialogic literature therefore reflect a fundamental scepticism of the extent of human rationality and knowledge.

Turning specifically to Menippean satire, Bakhtin provides a list of fourteen generic features, many of which correspond closely to those recognized by Frye. He too places great stress on the genre's irreverend, playful temper, claiming that there is no genre in world literature which is 'more free...in its invention and use of the fantastic'(p. 114). This liberation, however, is to varying degrees put to a serious purpose; the energies released by fantasy and play are channelled into a very deliberate course, the testing of ideology and philosophical ideas. The 'content of the menippea', he observes, 'is the adventures of an idea or a truth in the world'(p. 115). Invention and fantasy are thus coupled with a broad philosophical /ideological perspective. Like the Socratic dialogue, Menippean satire is concerned with the 'ultimate questions'; but it is not so much interested in the debating and resolution of complex argument as the facetious presentation, normally by means of 'syncrisis' (or juxtaposition), of such questions stripped down to their essentials (pp. 115-16). Philosophical complexity therefore tends
to be avoided.

Recurring motifs and topoi are instrumental in the presentation of these issues, including utopian settings and journeys to the three regions of heaven, earth and hell (p. 116). Another common feature is the juxtaposition of fantasy (and sometimes mysticism) with what Bakhtin calls 'slum naturalism', images of degradation and grotesquerie such as excreta, gross sexual activity, prisons, brothels, and so forth (p. 115). Some Menippean satirists also play with the idea of being able to observe human behaviour and society in a totally detached fashion, often from a high, extraterrestrial vantage point (what Bakhtin calls 'experimental fantasticality', p. 116); and one frequently finds the satirist engaging in 'moral-psychological experimentation', as he focuses on the 'unusual, abnormal moral and physic states of human being', such as insanity, split-personality, and dreams (pp. 116-17). He notes that whereas in tragedy and epic dreams reinforce the established identity of a character, in Menippean satire they clash with the dreamer's self-image, violating and destroying his identity. The resulting incongruity, moreover, typically generates laughter. Violation, this time in terms of the accepted order and customs of society, is also the intent behind other common features, notably scandal scenes, eccentric behaviour, and inappropriate speeches and performances (p. 117). The most basic formal characteristic, prose mixed with verse, is compounded by a variety of other literary elements, such as 'letters, found manuscripts, retold dialogues, parodies,...[and] parodically reinterpreted citations'(pp. 108, 118). The verse, furthermore, generally reflects parodically on the prose in which it is embedded. The use of 'living dialects' and jargon, and of authorial masks, is also typical, as are the abrupt shifts in tone caused by the juxtaposition of 'high' and 'low' subject matter and styles, and rhetorical figures like oxymoron (p. 118). The genre, he also recognizes, is frequently journalistic and topical, again reflecting a dialogic concern for the immediate and real (pp. 118-19).

Bakhtin emphasizes that for all its apparent miscellaneity and diversity of form the Menippean satire has a real generic integrity, possessing an essential unity in its 'carnival
sense of the world', and its relationship to 'carnivalistic folklore'(pp. 107, 122-37). This notion of the 'carnivalisation' of literature is perhaps the most interesting and provocative aspect of Bakhtin's study. The tradition of carnival, he argues, with its temporary abolition of established hierarchy, its popular fairground setting, its mock-crowning and clowning - in short, its living of a world turned upside-down and inside-out - is a celebration of the liberty of anarchy. Through its inversion, debasement, and parody, carnival mocks out of court the social divisions, customs, and pretensions of the non-carnivalized world. In the process, it reasserts the natural equality of human being, and revitalises and renews society. It is thus a paradox, a ritual-parodying ritual, at once absurd and deeply serious (pp. 122-25). Folk humour, while undoubtedly reductive and iconoclastic, is ultimately healing and positive; and it is this sort of humour, Bakhtin argues, which pervades the great classical and Renaissance menippeae (pp. 126-28, 136). Certain Menippean satirists, he observes, portray 'festivals of the carnival type' (e.g. Petronius); while the sights and sounds of the town square or fairground, and its assortment of characters (lords of misrule, clowns and jesters, mountebanks and quacks, 'freaks' and grotesques), dominate the fictional worlds of authors such as Lucian, Erasmus, and Rabelais (pp. 132-34). The genre's mock-heroic and travestic elements are in effect the literary equivalent of carnival's mock-crownings and dethronings; and just as carnival ritual is paradoxically anti-ritual, and a reminder of the artificiality of form, so the Menippean genre, by its dialogic rejection of formal absolutism, is paradoxically an anti-genre. For Bakhtin, then, the imagery of carnival so vital to Menippean satire (at least that of the classical and Renaissance periods) functions symbolically as the reaffirmation of the essential freedom and 'joyous relativity' of human being, which the artificial barriers of civil society constrain or destroy (pp. 134-35).

This is not the place - and nor am I qualified - to challenge the validity of Bakhtin's thesis overall; yet it is extremely doubtful whether it is applicable to the Menippean satire of the Augustan Tory satirists, at least without a major qualification. Certainly one finds a pervasive sense of parody in the works of Butler, Dryden, the Scriblerians and many
others; and fools, mountebanks, mock-kings and mock ceremonies litter the Augustan satiric landscape. Yet for a number of reasons the significance of the imagery is surely very different from that suggested by Bakhtin. In the first place, while it may be true that the satires of Erasmus and Rabelais do reflect a sense of liberation and the optimism about human progress generated by the discovery of new worlds and ancients texts, by the late seventeenth century those feelings had in many English quarters been well and truly dissipated by the experience of political and religious strife and the epistemological disappointments of the intervening years: as David Nokes has recently observed, 'Between the two periods of Renaissance and Augustan humanism fall the shadows of Calvin and Luther'. Sobered by the experiences of civil war, zealotry, and radicalism, the conservative satirists of the Restoration and Augustan periods hardly meant to applaud the chaos they represented; on the contrary, their whole ideology stood opposed to disorder and anarchy, and insisted on the need for authority and restraints upon individualism and unorthodoxy, whether in the context of politics, religion, or philosophy. Whereas Erasmus and Rabelais represented a reasonably significant body of opinion which sought religious and educational reform of an antiquated, authoritarian medieval system, the Augustan satirists were essentially representative of an established political and intellectual order largely created by those reforms, and concerned to defend its position against further demands for change. If they could readily accept Erasmus's and Rabelais's central argument that all human beings, no matter what their rank, are prone to folly and pride, they were quick to stress that political, religious, and cultural non-conformity was subversive of the natural order, and that life under the regime of the 'Rabble' was invariably nasty, brutish, short, and distinctly indecorous.

Moreover, as historians of popular culture have noted, the attitude of the English dominant class towards the fool figure and its carnival associations had also changed profoundly over the period. During the seventeenth century the fool was generally evicted from the English Renaissance court and forced back to his original habitats, the saturnalian festivals and entertainments of the fairgrounds, where he soon lost most of
his courtly attributes. As a result, by the end of the seventeenth century the common image of the fool was not the wise wearer of motley and spinner of endless yarns of paradox, but the 'rustic, country clown', the Jack Puddings and Merry Andrews of the popular stage. The ironic councillor of kings had dwindled into little more than a figure of fairground farce and the accomplice of mountebanks, themselves increasingly associated with the degraded urban phenomenon of 'the mob'.

As Pat Rogers has pointed out, the fairground of Smithfield, by now the quintessential expression of a despised, popular sub-culture, like other proletarian domains came to play a crucial symbolic role in the work of the Augustan Tory satirists, serving as 'moral landmarks' and 'objective correlative[s]' of the chaos, corruption, perversion, and pollution of a world devoid of its hierarchy, authority, and the attendant principles of social and aesthetic decorum. In *MacFlecknoe* and *The Dunciad*, for example, carnival's grotesque celebration of chaos and anarchy is evoked in order to pour scorn on the violators of literary good taste and intellectual standards. In the case of *Hudibras*, it is used primarily to emphasize the true nature of those aspirants for real-life political and social transformation, the theocrats, spiritualists, levellers, and millenarians. In his *Prose Observations*, as George Wasserman has recently noted, Butler describes the hypocrisy of the religious zealots as 'a kind of Spiritual Carnevall, in which all men are allowed to use all manner of Freedom under a Vizard'.

Accordingly, Wasserman argues, in *Hudibras* the motif of the masquerade (like the other examples of carnival imagery that dominate each canto) stands as an emblem of both the hypocrisy and, by virtue of its saturnalian associations, the populist anarchy of Puritan theocracy. In the first part, Hudibras's initial victory and triumphal procession leads to a kind of enthroning and temporary reign of misrule in his mock-castle (II, 1115-1170), before his inevitable fall at the hands of the Amazonian Trulla, and consequent ritual disrobing and humiliation as triumphal captive (III, 915-74). The Skimmington scene in Part Two (II, 587-648) is likewise an almost Rabelaisian depiction of misrule and disorder, of a world turned upside-down and governed by
Democritean dames (I, 81-86). Hudibras himself, Wasserman observes, has all the physical qualities of the carnival 'fat man'. The fraudulence of the 'spiritual spectacle' of ranting 'Saints' condemning physicality and pretending to the pure and incorporeal is illuminated by its juxtaposition with the scatology, grotesquery, and bawdy - the gross bodily spectacle - of carnival ritual.

Bakhtin's broad argument about the essential dialogism of Menippean satire and the meaning of its carnival imagery, at least with respect to the Renaissance satirists, therefore needs considerable qualification so far as Augustan satire is concerned. As he himself acknowledges with respect to Scarron's 'reduced' expression of carnival parody (pp. 131-32), a very different historical and social background largely ensured that the spirit of Rabelais was not only dried out in the writings of Butler, Swift, and lesser figures like Tom Brown, but also heavily salinated. Carnival, with all its anarchic connotations, is in effect directed against itself, its imagery employed as symbols of regression and perversion, not freedom and progress. Far from celebrating the joyous breakdown of a restrictive order and in some measure tolerating the flaws and happy idiosyncrasies of God's human creation, the use of the carnival motif by the Tory satirists of Augustan England actually betrays a deep-seated anxiety about the impending societal collapse and a consequent descent into barbarism and philistinism, and legitimizes the hegemonic values of hierarchy, authority, and conformity.

To summarise its essential characteristics, then, Menippean satire is a serio-comic genre which, though originally specifically prosimetric, has since come to include under its banner all forms of indirect satire, including those once considered separate genres, such as the mock encomium, the Utopian voyage, the satiric dialogue, and, as Eugene Kirk's recent checklist indicates, the different varieties of burlesque poetry (i.e. parody, travesty, hudibrastics, parody, and mock-heroics). Traditionally concerned with questions of right belief and thinking, it generally reflects a pseudo-Socratic, deeply sceptical view of human rationality and capacity for knowledge. The Menippean satirist tends to hold strongly moralistic as well as 'commonsensical' (and thus normally
conservative) objections to all presumptions of philosophical or scientific certitude and systemization which differ radically from the commonly-accepted values, which he/she regards as especially dangerous and foolish manifestations of pride. In some cases this scepticism extends to iconoclasm, and invariably to parody and travesty, which have ancestral links to satanalia and carnivalistic folk humour. Paradoxically, the Menippean satirist's mockery of intellectual folly and false learning frequently displays evidence of his/her own exceptional erudition and love of scholarship. As Kirk points out, the satirist depends on a readership that is almost as erudite, sophisticated, sensible, curious, and 'humour-loving' as him/herself. If the satire is 'nearly always written "downward" to the audience', that descent is normally not very great, 'to judge by the allusions the Menippean author expects his readers to detect'(xi-xii). The genre's vital formal and stylistic qualities - what Kirk has called its 'family resemblances' - reflect its principal subject matter and themes. To quote Kirk again: 'In outward structure, Menippean satire was a medley - usually a medley of alternating prose and verse, sometimes a jumble of flagrantly digressive narrative, or again a potpourri of tales, songs, dialogues, orations, letters, lists, and other brief forms, mixed together'(p. xi). Typical devices and figures are mock-scholarly apparatus and bogus dissertations, jargon, colloquialisms, neologisms, portmanteau words, tautologies, mixed metaphors, bizarre similes, oxymorons, facile proverbs, self-conscious clichés, anachronisms, puns, digressions, lacunae - and catalogues. The device of an ironic persona or mask is normally integral to the game-playing, while the more conventional characters include Lords of Misrule, pseudo-scientists, astrologers, pedants, mountebanks, and grotesques.

As authorities from Dryden to Kirk have established, the Menippean genre includes some of the greatest and most popular works of classical and Renaissance literature; and since they were to serve as models for the satirists of late seventeenth-century England, the most important and influential warrant some discussion here. Many examples of classical ironic satire, parody, travesty, and mock-heroics came down to the Renaissance, notably the supposed prototype of all mock-verse, the
Batrachomyomachia, which was commonly but erroneously attributed to Homer himself. Parody and intellectual satire were also vital elements in the Old Comedy, particularly that of Aristophanes. Of the Roman menippeae, the most significant so far as later ages have been concerned are undoubtedly Seneca's mock-deification of Claudius, the Apocolocyntosis; and the Satyricon of Petronius Arbiter, a bawdy, violent burlesque of the ancient Greek romances and travelogues of which only a few parts apparently survive, including the most notorious parody ever written on the ancient genre of philosophical table-talk (or cena) in the episode of Trimalchio's orgiastic feast.

The most influential of the ancient Menippean satirists by far, though, was the Syrian-Greek, Lucian of Samosata. A professional rhetorician, Lucian owed his most outstanding debts to the Old Comedy, Plato's dialogues, and probably the Cynic diatribes and the lost writings of Menippus. There has also been considerable debate over the centuries as to the extent of Lucian's serious moral intent, though it appears that there is a fair degree of consensus among his latest critics that his primary aims were entertainment and humour rather than moral instruction. Certainly the most obvious qualities of his work are its formal and stylistic miscellaneity and delight in literary play (lusus), which allow him to harp entertainingly on a relatively limited range of extremely broad themes and subjects, such as the distinction between illusion and reality, the foolishness of pride and pretension, the tendency of the human intellect to irrationality, superstition, and credulity, and the humanistic relationship between language, learning and morality. His canon includes mock-encomia (e.g., The Fly), travesty (Dialogues of the Gods), mock-defence (Phalaris) and parodic dissertations (Astrology), but the forms in which he excels are the dialogue (particularly the sub-genre of the Dialogue of the Dead) and the short narrative, the best example of which is the famous model of the fantastic voyage genre, A True Story. Standard Menippean motifs and figures - e.g., the three regions, the world stage and its human actors, the insightful fool - all feature prominently in his writings; while the folly and deceit of pedants, corrupt lawyers, sham doctors, pseudo-scientists, false prophets, magicians, and astrologers are likewise
revealed in numerous pieces (e.g., Astrology, Lexiphanes, The Lover of Lies). Such people, Lucian shows, are both dangerous and ludicrous, first, because of the yawning gap between their actual intellectual paucity and their smug self-belief in their righteousness and enlightenment; and secondly, because of their pretentious (and in some cases, wilfully obscurantist) means of defining and communicating their 'wisdom'.

Throughout his works three stylistic features are outstanding. The first is the conversational, even colloquial quality of his prose, particularly in respect of his dialogues, which are enlivened by a variety of naturalistic and semi-dramatic techniques such as interjection, parenthetical remarks, and after-thoughts. This is particularly effective in what is arguably his most amusing and iconclastic work, The Dialogues of the Gods, which was destined to become the model of the seventeenth-century travesty of Scarron and his English imitators. The speech and acts of the Olympian gods and heroes, here reduced to billingsgate and knock-about clowning, have the effect of highlighting the superstitions and palpable absurdities of the Greek and Roman religion, as in the case of the birth of Athena from the head of her father, Zeus:

HEPHAESTUS
What do you want me to do, Zeus? Here I am, as you ordered, all ready with my axe at its sharpest, even if I must chop through stones with a single blow.

ZEUS
That's grand, Hephaestus. Now, down with it on my head and cut it in two.

HEPHAESTUS
Are you trying to see if I'm mad? Tell me what you really want me to do.

ZEUS
You heard. I want my skull split. If you don't obey, I'll be angry - and you know what that's like already. Hit away with all your might. Come on, hurry up. The birth-pangs shooting through my brain are killing me (VII, p. 305).

This apparent stylistic simplicity is often complemented by an extensive and ingenious use of parody, transposition, and pastiche, which not only entails allusion to such varied authors as Plato, Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Homer, Theocritus, Herodotus, and Thucydides, but also the frequent reworking of passages from his previous tracts, a technique described by one critic as 'self-pastiche'.22
The third, and perhaps most distinctive feature, is his ironic use of stock characterisation, which plainly owes a great deal to the Old Comedy in terms of the basic types. Of central importance is the *alazon*, the fool figure who pretends or tries or believes himself to be something greater than he really is. In some cases, such as *Alexander, the False Prophet*, the *alazon* is also a charleton, at once the fool and the knave; in most, though, he is merely a satiric butt, who typically reveals his essential stupidity to the audience by his own deeds and words. There are numerous variations of this; in *Astrology*, for instance, the pseudo-author of the mock-treatise condemns himself by his archaic diction and jargon, as well as his patently absurd subject matter. In *Philosophers for Sale*, the absurdity of various philosophical systems and creeds is displayed by means of a parade of their foolish representatives in the course of a mock auction. This technique of persona self-revelation was to become a favourite of satirists and humorists during the Renaissance, and especially those of Augustan England.

Equally prevalent and significant is the *eiron*, the commonsensical yet typically self-deprecating ironist who engages his foolish opposite in such a way as to encourage him to display his stupidity even more clearly; and who almost invariably is cast in the more particular role of the *kataskopos*, the detached observer. The *kataskopos* is an especially important figure in the Hadean dialogues and fantastic journeys, where he becomes physically withdrawn from the real world. A classic example is *Icaromenippus, or the Sky-man*, in which the protagonist, Menippus, recounts to a friend his recent journey to the heavens. Dissatisfied with the various explanations of the major questions of life provided by the philosophers - whose ascetic appearance, he soon realizes, only disguises their real ignorance and vanity - he had managed by certain means to fly first to the moon, from which high vantage point he could survey 'the cities, the people, and all that they were doing, not only abroad but at home, when they thought they were unobserved'. What he saw are countless incidences of adultery, incest, murder, treachery, pride, theft, and greed, from kings and plebeians alike: 'In brief, it was a motley and manifold spectacle' (II, p. 295). He compares the whole ridiculous scene to a
stage on which numerous singers perform independently and hence cacophonously. He also recalls that, seen from so distant a perspective, the human world resembled a giant ant-nest, a reductive comparison calculated to provoke reflection on the absurdity of human presumption. Flying still higher, he visits and dines with the gods, and at last receives confirmation from Zeus himself that the philosophers are 'lazy, disputatious, vainglorious, quick-tempered, gluttonous, doltish, addle-pated, full of effrontery, and to use the language of Homer, "a useless load to the soil"' (p. 317).

Menippus also features prominently in arguably the most moralistic of the different ensembles of dialogues, *Dialogues of the Dead*, a work of major significance to King's satires, as we shall later see. Central to this special sub-genre are the commonplace themes of mutability and the democracy of death, of which numerous famous and once powerful figures are constantly reminded by Lucian's eternally facetious spokesman. Time and again references are made to the skeletal state to which all have been reduced, a macabre egalitarianism which exposes the artificiality of the upper world's social divisions and foolishness of earthly vanities. In 'Menippus and Hermes', for instance, the former is shown the shades of the various 'beauties of old' (including, of course, Helen), only to realize the absurdity of the Trojan conflict, which had caused the slaughter of thousands for so 'short-lived a thing' as beauty that is only skin-deep. Even here, however, in this most didactic of his dialogues, Lucian manages to smooth over the moralising somewhat by means of a clever use of irony, as Hermes ends the conversation by insisting that 'I have no time to moralise with you, Menippus. Choose a place to lie down in, wherever you like, and I'll be off now to fetch the other shades' (VII, p. 25).

In the realistic satires, the *eiron/kataskopos* is alienated on account of his ironic and extraordinarily perceptive vision of his own society, which, as he alone appreciates, has abandoned truth and commonsense for the attractions of the irrational and immoral. The figure most commonly evoked in this context is the pre-Socratic Democritus of Abdera, a philosopher famous for his mocking response to the sins and follies of humankind, and
who in Greek tradition is diametrically opposed to that of the 'weeping philosopher', Heraclitus (e.g. *Alexander*, IV, p.199). The Democritean motif is a paradox, the prototype of the Erasmian 'wise fool'. Democritus's adamantine sense, sharp insight, and deep moral consciousness ensure his detachment from a normality characterized by superstition, egoism, deception, and ignorance; and his peculiar sense of humour reinforces his alienation by marking him as a madman. Yet as Hippocrates noted in his legendary encounter with him, there was no saner man alive.

A measure of this Democritean intelligence is essential to the normative opponents and interlocutors of the quacks and frauds, among them Tychiades and Lycinus, the principal players in the two Lucianic works most closely related to King's in terms of theme and basic stylistic characteristics, *The Lover of Lies, or the Doubter* and *Lexiphanes*. A satire on pedantry in general and the contemporary trend of atticism in particular, *Lexiphanes* is a prime example of the quintessentially Lucianic blend of persona irony and pastiche-parody, as the bulk of it - the extract Lexiphanes reads from his new book - is composed of cleverly selected quotations from Plato's *Symposium*. The product of a 'glass of fashion' whose pretentiousness is immediately obvious from his verbose, antiquated diction, the mock-*Symposium* is by no means intended by the real author as a satire on Plato's great *cena*; rather it is an exemplum of 'false learning', a rambling compilation of only the most extraneous parts of the *Symposium* built up by an idiot too obsessed with the trifling details to appreciate the truly important aspects of Plato's work. As the commonsensical Lycinus observes, Lexiphanes is the classic pedant, who 'talks to us from a thousand years ago, distorting his language, making those preposterous combinations and taking himself very seriously in the matter, as if it were a great thing for him to use an alien idiom and debase the established currency of speech' (V, p. 319). Whereas for Plato the dinner table merely provides a setting for a series of philosophical discussions, for Lexiphanes it is an excuse to prattle on in a grotesquely-inappropriate fashion about such irrelevancies as wrestling holds, eating utensils, and exotic food and drink: e.g.,
The dinner was picked up; many different viands had been made ready, pig's trotters, spareribs, tripe, the caul of a sow that had littered, panned pluck, spoon-meat of cheese and honey, shallot-pickle and other such condiments, crumpets, stuffed fig-leaves, sweets. Of submarine victuals, too, there were many sorts of selacian, all the ostraceans, cuts of Pontic tunny in hanapers, Copiac lassies, vernacular fowl, muted chanticleers, and an odd fish - the parasite....

Drinking-cups of all kinds stood on the dresser, your brow-hider, your Mentor-made dipper with a convenient tail-piece, your gurgler, your long-necker, many 'earth-borns' like what Thersites used to bake, vessels both ventricose and patulous, some from Phocaeawards, some from Cnidos way, all airy trifles, hymen thin (V, pp. 303-305).

The pedant's almost Trimalchian celebration of luxury in the context of a ludicrously opaque treatise implicitly illustrates the close association between the corruption of proper learning and rhetoric and the degradation of morality and manners. The ultimate target of this pastiche/parody, then, is anyone whose academic interests are so limited and indiscriminate, for all their superficial opulence, as to provide him with only the most meagre intellectual and moral nourishment.

The subject of The Lover of Lies is likewise epistemological, though its primary theme is the division between credulity and rationality, more particularly the propriety of deception. Formally the piece combines dialogue with extended periods of narrative, as Tychiades recounts to Philocles his experiences among the local intelligentsia as evidence of the human fondness for 'preposterous tales'(III, p. 321). Drawing a distinction between the relatively acceptable lies of the poets and the reprehensible fictions of those supposedly in the business of fact and 'truth' such as philosophers and physicians, he recalls the statements and behaviour of representatives of a variety of philosophical schools, who take it in turn to endorse palpably absurd medical prescriptions and pseudo-scientific learning (e.g. p.331), and both propagate and accept uncritically reports of bizarre and fabulous events (pp. 322-24, 353-57). As Tychiades notes, the 'venerable, almost terrible' visages they present, and particularly the impressive beards which are meant to symbolize their reputed wisdom, merely betray their actual senility and insanity (p. 327), which are soon established beyond all doubt by their almost competitive urge to spread tales of miracles and 'bugaboos':
For my part I was thinking in the meantime: "They associate with young men to make them wise and are admired by many, but what are they themselves? Only their grey hair and their beard distinguishes them from infants, and for the rest of it, even infants are not so amenable to falsehood" (p. 355).

According to Ion (plainly speaking on behalf of his associates) it was ridiculous 'to doubt everything' (p. 345), a confession of a lunatic level of credulity which is further attested by his colleagues' devotion to quakery, superstition, and the Egyptian magic of Pancrates (p. 371-75). By contrast, Tychiades's mind is as adamantine as that of the Abderan philosopher with whom he identifies (pp. 369-71), and his sceptical refusal to credit unsubstantiated claims of fantastic phenomena without first-hand experience is proof of his true intelligence (p. 343). The fools' tendency to dismiss his facetious queries as to the validity and versimilitude of 'old wives tales', and especially Deinomachus's pompous denigration of his disbelief and criticisms on the grounds that he is 'a mere layman' (p. 333), only serve to highlight the propriety of his doubting. His concluding remarks amount to a plea for the most commonsensical kind of rationality in preference to blind, harmful superstition (p. 381), a cause that was to be taken up by Lucian's numerous imitators over the succeeding ages.

In many respects it was the translation of the rediscovered Lucian by Erasmus and More in 1506 which was primarily responsible for the full reawakening of the Menippean spirit in Western Europe during the early stages of the Renaissance; though the tradition had continued to thrive in Byzantium, and arguably had manifested itself in a number of literary guises throughout the Dark and Middle Ages, including Boethius's *The Consolation of Philosophy* and Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales*. As many commentators have noted, their translation served as a kind of satiric apprenticeship, for a Lucianic spirit plainly infuses their own Menippean satires. Yet the Lucian they admired and emulated was a rather more committed moralist than had hitherto been granted, a satirist who cleverly blended jest and earnest with the intention of conveying more effectively his ultimately serious ethical themes. In their view the Lucianic combination of *lusus*, clear, easy prose, and general moral comment met precisely the
humanistic requirements that literature be delightful, entertaining, and intellectually stimulating, as well as morally edifying and socially beneficial. As Erasmus told Christopher Urswick:

[Lucian] possesses such grace of style, such felicity of invention, such a charming sense of humour, and such pointedness in satire; his sallies arouse such interest; and by his mixture of fun and earnest, gaiety and acute observation, he so effectively portrays the manners, emotions, and pursuits of men...that whether you look for pleasure or edification there is not a comedy, or a satire, that challenges comparison with his dialogues. 27

A thorough knowledge of the message and techniques of a satirist renowned for his attacks on superstition and dogma, hypocrisy and pride, greed and self-serving authority, would also serve a more serious function during a period of tremendous social and intellectual turmoil; and Erasmus, More, and other leading humanists were quick to adopt his satiric methods in their own literary campaigns against the Schoolmen and various political and theological enemies. Erasmus's *Colloquies* have their origins in Lucian's dialogues, as does his witty attack on the pedantic imitators of Cicero's prose style, *Ciceronianus*. To a large extent the models for *Praise of Folly* are such Lucianic mock-encomia as *The Fly*; while many of Lucian's more prominent satiric targets (e.g. lawyers, pedants, pseudo-philosophers) are notable figures in both *Praise of Folly* and More's *Utopia*. Above all, it is not difficult to recognize the Lucianic pedigree of Folly herself.

Yet Erasmus and the humanist satirists also built on their Menippean inheritance, introducing new and enduring elements. In their hands such sophisticated literary games (*lusus ingenii*), which could involve both the deliberate twisting of logical argument and playful appeals to classical authorities, were on one level to be indulged in as virtuoso performances of rhetorical wit and scholastic learning; but they were also to be appreciated as serious statements of the basic tenets of Christian Humanism. By means of humour and the clever use of irony, Erasmus insisted, general sins and follies could be censured, to the benefit of individuals and society. As he explains in his letter to More which prefaced the *Praise*, his 'toyes' are 'not without their serious matter', and
were 'so handled' that any reader who 'is not altogether thick-skull'd may reap more benefit from it [i.e. his 'foolery'] than from some men's crabbish and specious arguments'.\textsuperscript{28} He claims that while 'nothing is more trifling than to treat of serious matters triflingly, so nothing carries a better grace, than so to discourse of trifles as a man may seem to have intended them least'. 'I have prais'd Folly', he admits, 'but not altogether foolishly'.\textsuperscript{29}

Erasmus's scholarly satire in \textit{Praise of Folly} (which was wittily embellished in the 1519 edition by the addition of Gerard Lijster's serio-comic annotations) represents a considerable development of the Lucianic theme of false learning; and his marvellously creative exploitation of paradox greatly exceeds the similar efforts of his ancient mentor. Nowhere is the division between Lucian and Erasmus more apparent than in the latter's brilliant and bewildering assimilation of the self-incriminating \textit{alazon} and \textit{eiron/kataskopos} into the one speaker, and his consequent use of the mock-encomium. In Lucian, these two characters are generally kept distinct, and the paradox of the wise fool is barely developed beyond its simplest stage, the Democritean character, whose ultimate good sense is never really in doubt; furthermore, the mock-encomium is simply an amusing rhetorical exercise, the author's praise of the unpraisable. But by having his radically ambiguous persona indulge in numerous paradoxes of her own - in other words, by allowing the normally unpraisable to praise itself - and by incorporating within her clearly erudite address such fundamental Christian notions as the righteousness of humility, Erasmus added extra ironic layers to both the figure and the form. \textit{Praise of Folly} is a literary maze, designed to mislead and trap all but the wariest of Folly's audience. One can never be certain of the wisdom of Folly, who is both ironist and the key device in the author's profoundly religious \textit{lusus}. With her ironic disguises, linguistic juggling and logic-chopping, it is easy to see why Holbein should have depicted her as a jester, though how much of Bakhtin's carnival spirit lingers in such a highly sophisticated soul is questionable. The erudition and dialectical skill Erasmus displays are both a testimony to his own Peripatetic training, and essential
elements in his ridicule of scholastic excess.

An equally pervasive and perplexing use of irony and parody characterizes the work of More, a man renowned for his deep moral commitment, 'poker-faced jesting', and love of Lucian. According to Erasmus, More 'took such delight in joking that it would appear to be the whole object of his existence....You could call him another Democritus'. Critics have questioned the extent of his debt to Lucian in *Utopia*, though in formal terms at least the two books can be linked to the Lucianic dialogue and *A True Story*, and more specific borrowings have been pointed out. So far as King's satire is concerned, however, perhaps a more relevant example of More's serio-comic wit is his 'Letter to Martin Dorp'(1515), a controversial piece written in response to Dorp's attacks on Erasmus. By means of blame-by-praise irony and a variety of satiric devices (notably the facetious denial and mock solemnity), he highlights Dorp's uncultured sarcasm, pedantry, and philistinism: e.g.

As for your second letter, now widely read with unhappy consequences, I am inclined to believe it was no deliberate action of yours but merely an accident that it reached the public. I am forced to this point of view especially because in this letter there are some things which I am fully convinced you would have changed had you wished to publish it, as they are not quite the sort of thing to be written either to him or by you. You would not have written such harsh words to so important a friend, or in such an off-hand fashion to a man as learned as he; as a matter of fact, I am positive, you would have written in a more kindly vein, in keeping with your temperate character, and with greater care, in keeping with your extraordinary learning.

'Out of love', he continues, 'I have wanted to warn you of those matters which men, not fully understanding your temperate character and utter sincerity, are using as an opportunity to think that you are extremely greedy for your own reputation and making sneak attacks on the reputation of another'. The whole joke, of course, also has its serious side, the defence not only of a friend, but of Greek Biblical exegesis and Erasmian satire as well. This famous attack on an ill-mannered pedant, I shall argue later, may well have been a direct source of at least two of King's controversial tracts.

What has been called the Renaissance tradition of learned wit grew, therefore, from a Menippean/Lucianic homunculus, and under the tutelage of Erasmus and More
developed into a gargantuan literary corpus. Kirk's recent checklist attests to its protean nature and the myriad uses to which it was put throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Menippean satire was anthologized for the purpose of light entertainment (e.g., Caspar Dornau's *The Amphitheatre of Joco-Serious Socratic Wisdom*), pressed into service in great political and theological conflicts (e.g. *La Satyr Menippea*), reduced to the status and size of the controversial squib and anonymous lampoon, and nurtured and moulded into masterpieces of European literature. The first of the great post-*Praise of Folly* menippeae was the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum* of Johannes Jaeger and Ulrich von Hutton, Dryden's 'Volume of German authors'. This famed literary hoax, which takes the form of a collection of mock letters by various pseudo-correspondents to an opponent of the great humanist, John Reuchlin, was designed to ridicule the obscurantism and pedantry of the Schoolmen by imitating and exaggerating their own words, ideas, and stylistic idiosyncrasies to their absurd conclusion.

The greatest of the Renaissance Menippeans, though, is Rabelais, of whose work only the most cursory account can be given here. An admirer of Lucian, Erasmus, and the *Epistolae*, Rabelais blended elements of each into a work which was to have a tremendous bearing on European comedy and satire. *Gargantua and Pantagruel* was intended partially to reinforce the humanist struggle against the Schoolmen, and so contains numerous examples of Peripatetic fools violating Erasmian principles of proper learning and behaviour. But the sheer exuberance and fecundity of Rabelais's humour, his exploitation of the comic potentialities of language and exploration of the realms of the imagination, give his book a universal appeal. Standard devices (such as the mixing of languages, the catalogue, the mock dissertation, the mock calculation, the tale within the tale, the mock law, the inserted letter) and motifs (the fantastic voyage, the descent into Hades) are reinvigorated by Rabelais's comic genius; while Menippean sub-genres, such as the mock encomium (e.g., Panurge's 'Praise of debtors') and the mock epic are embedded within the broad comic narrative. In the character of Panurge Rabelais created
one of the great comic figures, another ambiguous wise buffoon in whom esotericism, linguistic and rhetorical mastery, the commonest commonsense, and the basest aspects of bodily existence are jumbled together into an organic whole: Panurge is in effect the personification of the Menippean medley. No writer in history has more successfully captured the anarchic, cacophonous, sometimes obscene spirit of folk humour, and better expressed the 'joyful relativity' of the carnivalized world. It is no wonder that Rabelais was to remain one of the most influential satiric and comic models, especially following completion of the first great translation into English of *Gargantua and Pantagruel* (begun by Thomas Urquhart in 1653) by Peter Motteux in 1693-94.36

As Pope's brief tribute to Swift in the opening lines of *The Dunciad* suggests, the other late Renaissance comic masterpiece that was to leave a huge impression on English satire was *Don Quixote*. It is significant that as far as many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century critics were concerned, Cervantes's great parodic novel belongs to the tradition of Lucian, Erasmus, and Rabelais.37 Certainly many of the basic formal and stylistic qualities of Menippean satire are evident, including poetical interjections, parody and mock-heroic, digressions and narrative insertions. The theme of false learning is also prominent, not just in isolated episodes such as that involving the scholar and his *Supplement to Polydore Virgil on the Inventions of Antiquity*,38 but also in relation to the personality of the protagonist himself, a man made mad by a pedantic interest in the illusions and anachronisms of the chivalric romances. 'As a satiric paradigm', notes Ronald Paulson,

the Quixote figure...can be used as a sick madman who has become infatuated with some idea, whether by reading too many romances, or (as Swift will use it) reading too many modern authors, or by accepting hook-line-and-sinker some sharper's project....This madman can just as easily become the selfish egoist who tries to make over the world in his own image. His madness may even have a tinge of hypocrisy as with Samuel Butler's *Hudibras*.39

It is this relatively unsympathetic conception of Don Quixote which prevailed throughout the seventeenth century and well into the eighteenth.40 In Sancho Panza, too, there is something of the Renaissance fool; the inversion of his master, he is on one level the
archetype of the uneducated simpleton who occasionally glimpses the truth concealed from his deluded master in spite of (or because of) his essential ignorance. His physical shape, scatological misfortunes, tumblings and beatings, and ridiculous aspirations to government all evoke the topsy-turvy world of carnival ritual; and it is almost certainly Sancho's activities, as well as the work's general parodic nature, which prompted Bakhtin to describe *Don Quixote* as 'one of the most carnivalistic novels of world literature'. While Sancho's Menippean pedigree is perhaps not so apparent as Panurge's, he and his master were to be just as responsible for the perpetuation of the line well into the eighteenth century, albeit in the modified forms of mock-heroic poetry and the comic novels of Henry Fielding, Tobias Smollett, Charlotte Lennox, Richard Graves, and others.

While the influence of Cervantes was not to be felt strongly in English satire until the mid-seventeenth century, that of Erasmus, Rabelais, and the other Renaissance satirists was fundamental from the late Elizabethan period onwards, and was largely responsible for the development of a native tradition of burlesque and parody during the first half of the century. Although in many cases the old notion that 'satire' derived from the mythical satyr figure continued to determine the satirist's conception of their role and the 'railing' tone and style of their work, and in particular to inhibit their use of fully Lucianic personae, English Menippean satire of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries nevertheless displays the marks of its great ancestry in its variety, invention, and liveliness, ranging from burlesque poetic fables and playful mock heroics (eg. Spenser's *Virgil's Gnat* and *Mother Hubbard's Tale*, and Drayton's *Nymphidia, the Court of Fayrie*), to Erasmian *jeux d'esprit* such as Sir John Harrington's *Metamorphosis of Ajax*, to marvellously figurative and ironic works of religious, political, or academic controversy (such as the 'Martin Marprelate' tracts) and Lucianic satires (e.g., Dekker's *News from Hell* and Donne's *Ignatious His Conclave*). Of all the Elizabethan and Jacobean exponents of the standard prosimetric form, perhaps the most brilliant and creative was Thomas Nashe, whose works include academic and
anti-'Marprelate' controversies (e.g. *Strange News* and *Have With You to Saffron Walden*), an especially grotesque example of the burlesque travelogue and picaresque novel (*The Unfortunate Traveller*), and one of the most extraordinary pieces of literary gamesmanship in the language, the mock encomium on the 'red herring', *Lenten Stuff*.

Written while in hiding following the banning of his satirical play *The Isle of Dogs* and the arrest of his co-author, Ben Jonson, Nashe's welter of neologisms and Latinisms, slang, portmanteau words, and mock histories (including a macabre travesty of the Hero and Leander myth) ultimately represents a genuine tribute to the simple honesty and decency of the burghers of Great Yarmouth.

Another prominent example was the much-maligned (and to some extent misunderstood) travelogue of Thomas Coryate, whose occasional infusions of verse and foreign language, moments of self-parody and social criticism, and rambling, figurative style suggest a conscious attempt to relate his otherwise serious travelogue to the literary family of Petronius, Lucian and Nashe. If Coryate is unwilling or unable to sustain his comic and satiric performance and often tends to wander off into the realm of Dulness, at least some passages display the playful wit and not inconsiderable learning attributed to the Mermaid Tavern's resident jester.45 *Coryate's Crudities* contributed much more to the genre, however, by inspiring the series of prefatorial mock-commendatory verses written by such contemporary luminaries as Jonson, Donne, Harrington, Drayton, and Peacham, which consistently poke fun at Coryate's 'rhapsodie of pretious things', occasionally accompanied by their own mock-literary paraphanalia.46 It also gave rise to a number of parodies, most notably by the self-confessed reincarnation of Nashe, John Taylor the Water Poet, whose diverse collection of mock literature and parodies, both mixed and pure verse, qualifies him as one of the most prolific English Menippeans of all.47

The finest of the period's mock-travelogues, however, was Joseph Hall's *Mundus alter et idem*, which King himself was later partially to translate from the Latin. An allegorical account of a fantastic journey to Terra Australis Incognita ostensibly written
by a typical *kataskopos*, the *Mundus* combines burlesque of contemporary travelogues with scholarly satire in its attack on prevailing European vices and follies.\(^{48}\) Menippean devices abound: mock-notes, bogus laws and legal jargon, mock-inscriptions and plaques, erudite word games, and the usual ironic infusions of poetry, both classical quotations and original doggerel. Intellectual satire is particularly evident in the descriptions of Moroniana, a land populated by false philosophers and quacks, religious fanatics, pedants, and pseudo-scientists. At one point 'Mercurius Britannicus' provides mock-scholarly illustrations of Moronian coins and other antiquities in an assault not only on contemporary antiquarian pedantry in general, but specifically on the renowned scholar and religious turncoat, Joseph Lipsius.\(^{49}\) In another passage he describes the Academy of Variana, a scientific institution composed of the usual assortment of useless, indiscriminate triflers and Paracelsians, who have devised a new, 'Supermonical' language for themselves; 'up to the present it is known only by the more learned'.\(^{50}\) Hall's work first reached a wider English audience through John Healey's 1609 translation, whose decidedly more colourful use of language and comically-Anglicised names (e.g, 'Tenter-belly', 'Gluttonia', 'Pewter-platteria', 'Blubberick', 'Pratlingople', etc.) lend the relatively laconic original a distinctly Rabelaisian/Nashean flavour. A typical example is the description of some of the citizens and customs of the city of Eat-allia:

The whole sort of al these citizens are generally of an vnmeasurable grosenesse (and seemed to mee when I sawe them walke just like so many tunnes, mouing each vpon two pottle pots): nor is that man worthy of any (the meanest) salutation in the world, that is not (p) al cheeke to the belly, and all belly to the knees: and such shapes doe the women of this cittie walke in also: (The Germaine Frowes doe prittily well in imitation of these Fusty-lugs, but the Barbarians come very neere them) .... They go for the most part all naked, onely their Alder-guts may wear gowmnes....Their schooles haue no lectures read in them, but onely (q) *Apicius his Instituions of the Arte of Muncherie* : & there are all the yong fry taught the Sciences of Caruing, chewing and swallowing, oh most profoundly: the Muncherie lecturer (when I was there) was one Doctor Full-Gorge, a man most rare in his profession, and indeed of his Grammar, hee read the first section of the foresaid Instituions of *Apicius*. \(^{51}\)

A conglomeration of general and intellectual satire, theo-political controversy, and personal lampoon, Hall's *Mundus* is one of the most complete examples of Menippean
satire written by an Englishman. Though largely unread today, it was to exert a considerable influence on subsequent English satire, most obviously *Gulliver's Travels*.

The other early seventeenth-century satirists who made full use of the genre's conventions in their different ways are Ben Jonson and Robert Burton. While recognizing the limitations imposed by drama on Menippean satire in terms of coherent plot and relatively consistent characterization, Douglas Duncan has observed that Jonson's plays exhibit all the characteristics of literary ingenuity and the genre's essential themes, and that in such characters as Volpone the Menippean mixture of the 'seriously threatening and broadly laughable' is elemental. Jonson's debts to Lucian, the fool literature, and the associated comic tradition of the *commedia dell' arte* are unmistakable in such plays as *Volpone* and *Epicoene* and masques like *News From the New World Discovered* and *The Fortunate Isles*. In *The Alchemist* and *Bartholomew Fair* the Menippean vein is if anything still richer; the theme of false learning is more pronounced, the *lusus* arguably more ingenious and erudite, and the characters, imagery, and action more carnivalized. In *The Alchemist*, Jonson blends extensive allusions to Lucian's *Alexander* and Erasmus's *Alchemy* with references to both contemporary occult science and Puritan extremism in an attack on greed, hypocrisy, and credulity. The Erasmian theme of the obscurantism of jargon is ironically conveyed by recurring catalogues of alchemical and Paracelsian hocus-pocus, by which the knavish Subtle and Face gull their foolish clients (e.g, II, iii, 184-198, II, v, 9-44). In *Bartholomew Fair*, with its fairground setting and assortment of gulls, quacks, mountebanks, religious hypocrites, and grotesques like Ursula, is perhaps the most thoroughly carnivalized of all. The final scenes of the play, and specifically the episode in which the Puritan hypocrite Busy engages in a scholarly dispute with a puppet controlled by Lantern Leatherhead, the Hobby-horse seller (V,v,32-112) encapsulate so many of the principal thematic and stylistic elements of the genre, and prefigure the Augustan satirists' particularly satiric usage of carnival imagery.

Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621) has been convincingly classified as 'the
greatest Menippean satire in English before Swift;\textsuperscript{57} and it is perhaps significant that this extraordinary exercise in humanistic learning and wit was the creation of a Christ Church cleric and scholar. Burton's ingenious exploitation of his astonishing erudition, disjointed, digressive style, linguistic invention, and his pose as 'Democritus Junior', a pseudonym which itself identifies the author as a member of the Lucianic/Erasmian family, may well have influenced King.\textsuperscript{58} In its blend of ironic self-deprecation and vibrant, almost violent prose, his admission of his own stylistic and scholarly shortcomings recalls simultaneously Erasmus's Folly, Rabelais and Nashe: e.g.,

As for those other faults of barbarism, Doric dialect, extemporarean style, tautologies, apish imitation, a rhapsody of rags gathered together from several dung-hills, excrements of authors, toys and fopperies confusedly tumbled out, without art, invention, judgement, wit, learning, harsh, raw, rude, phantastical, absurd, insolent, indiscreet, ill-composed, indigested, vain, scurrile, idle, dull and dry, I confess all ('tis partly affected), thou canst not think worse of me than I do of myself. 'Tis not worth the reading, I yield it, I desire thee not to lose time in perusing so vain a subject, I should be peradventure loth myself to read him or thee so writing, 'tis not worth while (p.20).

Throughout 'Democritus Junior to the Reader' the theme of false learning looms large, the chief culprits being the common assortment of Rosicrucians and Paracelsians (e.g., p.100), 'supercilious criticks, grammatical triflers, notemakers, [and] curious antiquaries'. Such 'mere triflers', he concludes, 'are a kind of mad men'(p. 95-96). The paradoxically erudite examination of one of melancholy's principal causes, 'Love of Learning, or over-much Study. With a Digression of the Misery of Scholars, and why the Muses are Melancholy' (pp. 259-82), could itself stand as a classic example of its type, with its incidental poetic passages, exhaustive and playful references to authorities both major and obscure, extensive catalogues of knaves and fools, and pervasive Erasmian themes.

If the academic wit of The Anatomy of Melancholy is redolent of the cloisters and taverns of early Stuart Oxford, the Menippean satire of the Interregnum is equally barometric of the turmoil and violence of revolutionary London, the most common forms being the minor and essentially ephemeral ones of the satiric (and in many cases, infernal) dialogue and the mock ballad. In the circumstances it is not surprising that
most were published either completely anonymously or under pseudonyms such as 'Democritus Junior', 'Mercurius Democritus', 'Mercurius Cinicus', and so on. The genre also infiltrated and enlivened the contemporary journalism, notably the weekly journals of John Birkenhead and Marchmont Needham. It could still attract more capable hands, however, including (on the Puritan side) Nathaniel Ward and Richard Braithwait, and, among the royalists, John Taylor, Henry Peacham, James Howell, Abraham Cowley, and Samuel Butler. The latter's Mercurius Menippus. The Loyal Satirist, a scathing political satire on the Commonwealth regime prompted by Charles I's execution, has been described as 'perhaps the most vitriolic composition ever attempted in the genre'. It is clear from the title, as well as the insertions of ironic doggerel amidst the sardonic, violent prose, that Butler sought in this work to imitate precisely the lost writings of the genre's originator.

In the counter-revolutionary atmosphere of the Restoration, politics and religion understandably continued to be major subjects for satire; while the century's epistemological boom, which had unearthed more than its share of intellectual fool's gold among its great finds, and which in some important ways was linked to the political and social events, also opened up new areas for satiric exploitation. What Charles Kerby-Miller has written about the relationship between Scriblerian satire and its milieu applies equally well to the preceding generation: 'With the old and new, the good and the bad, interwoven in bright colours and with informed opinion moving forward at a vigorous pace, satire was a most effective weapon, the more especially because it fitted well with the general mood'. In such a climate, motley naturally remained a very popular mode of literary dress. More important, its rough-hewn native style was increasingly fashioned according to the finest patterns of learned wit and raillery, no doubt inspired by (and in turn inspiring) a spate of translations and new Latin editions of the ancient and Renaissance Menippean masters. The years between Charles II's restoration and the death of Anne witnessed the publication of, for example, the Apocolocyntosis (1664), The Satyricon (1694, 1708), The Praise of Folly (1668,
1683), the *Colloquies* (1699), *Mundus alter et idem* (published as *Travels through Terra Australia Incognita*, 1684), and the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum* (1689, 1710). Even more significant were Sir Roger L'Estrange's paraphrase of Quevedo's *Visions* (1667); the first publication of Urquhart's translation of Book Three of *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, together with Motteux's translation of the final two (1693-94); and the two translations of Lucian produced during the period, especially the latter, more complete version commonly known as the 'Dryden Lucian'. Dryden's comments in the introductory biography are an important guide to the prevailing attitude among the wits towards Lucian, emphasizing (like Erasmus before him) not only the moral point to his work, but also the propriety and refinement of his ironic wit. Claiming that Lucian 'rather laughs like *Horace* than bites like *Juvenal*', and is an 'Enemy to nothing but to Vice, and Folly', Dryden applauds his adherence to decorum, his unaffected wisdom, and his humour, which is 'full of Urbanity...which the *French* call fine Raillery; not obscene, not gross, not rude, but Facetious, well Manner'd, and well bred'. 'If Wit consists of the Propriety, of Thoughts, and Words', he continues, 'then Lucian 's Thoughts and Words are always proper to his Characters, and to his Subject. If the pleasure arising from Comedy and Satyr, be either Laughter, or some nobler sort of Delight, which is above it; no Man is so great a Master of Ironic, as our Author'.

More contemporary foreign works also provided models for imitation, notably Paul Scarron's *Virgile Travesti*, which sparked an explosion of English travesties during the Restoration, among them Charles Cotton's *Scarronides* (1664) and *Burlesque upon Burlesque* (1675), a travesty of Lucian. Boileau's *Le Lutrin* was the main inspiration behind the general shift towards the 'high burlesque' that occurred by the end of the century, and inspired in particular Samuel Garth's important mock-epic on the struggle between the physicians and the apothecaries, *The Dispensary* (1699). Paradoxical encomia remained popular, a prominent example being Rochester's 'On Nothing'; while Menippean miscellanies composed of mock-heroics, parodies, and travesties, such as *The Oxford Drollery* (1671), appeared on a fairly regular basis. Lucianic dialogues,
perhaps influenced by the recent French works of Fontenelle, Le Noble, and Fenelon, continued to perform their satiric and controversial duties, among them Charles Gildon's *Nuncius Infernalis: or, a New Account from Below. In Two Dialogues* (1692). In the theatre Shadwell (*The Virtuoso*), Aphra Behn (*The Emperor of the Moon*), and Edward Ravenscroft (*The Anatomist, or the Sham Doctor, 1697*) were among those who produced satires and farces which played with standard Menippean themes and motifs; while Buckingham (perhaps with the help of Sprat and Butler) created a classic of its kind with his parody of Dryden's heroic drama, *The Rehearsal*, which in turn inspired later burlesquers like Thomas Duffet. Dryden himself produced two of the finest English examples of the genre, the political satire, *Absalom and Achitophel*, and his lampoon of Shadwell, *MacFlecknoe*.

The foremost Menippean satirist of his age, though, was undoubtedly Samuel Butler. Butler held a distinctly Erasmian opinion towards his satire, maintaining that comedy and burlesque handled the 'most serious' follies 'in a Frolique and Gay humour which has always been found the more apt to instruct, and instill those Truths with Delight into men, which they would not indure to heare of any other way'. If on occasion his satire was hardly 'Frolique and Gay' (notably *Mercurius Menippus*) the bulk of it generally manages to remain true to his apparent serio-comic intentions. His works include burlesque poems such as *The Elephant in the Moon*, as well as classic prosimetric tracts and pastiche-parodies, most notably 'An Occasional Reflection On Dr Charleton's Feeling a Dog's Pulse at Gresham College', an amusing and generally light-hearted mock-letter ostensibly written by a certain 'R.B', which mimics the florid, jargon-ridden scientific reporting of Robert Boyle. Though many of these pieces were not published till the next century, they were widely circulated in manuscript. *Hudibras*, his great satire on the politics and false learning of the Commonwealth regime, naturally abounds with Menippean elements. The regular devices and motifs are frequently employed (including the insertion of foreign languages, colloquialisms, parodic names, and travestic fantasy sequences, e.g. I, iii, 189-220), while the jangling, discordant
doggerel, with its frequent digressions and instances of deliberately strained and self-parodic rhyming, itself conforms to the anarchic requirements of the genre. The main characters are stereotypical proponents of scholastic pedantry and occultism who, in the standard fashion, reveal their idiocy and hypocrisy by their deeds and words, especially in the course of extensive mock-argument. Its main action is essentially carnivalistic, the significance of which has already been discussed. In addition to the general Quixotic allusion there are numerous references to a plethora of authorities, from the classical to the contemporary and obscure, so that the whole work amounts to a giant pastiche-parody of the prevailing theo-political and intellectual conflicts. In such episodes as Hudibras's brawls with Talgol and his allies, the sophisticated literary gamesmanship of mock-heroics and Homeric travesty (e.g., I, ii, 781-84, 864-66) is combined with farce and low comedy to produce exemplary Menippean satire.

As Butler's writings also illustrate, the 'New Science' (particularly its 'vulgar' Baconian variety) inevitably proved to be a favourite subject for the period's satirists, just as it had been for Jonson, Hall, and numerous European authors since the earliest days of the 'Scientific Revolution'. The numerous satires on the virtuosi written between 1650 and 1800 might best be seen, therefore, not as an independent anti-science satiric tradition, but rather as an extension of the conventional genre of epistemological satire into a vast new field of intellectual, linguistic (and thus in humanistic terms, moral) perversion. The parodic devices traditionally employed in connection with pedantry and false literature, especially allusion and diminution, were now utilized in relation to scientific learning and literature. Pastiche-parody, for example, is an important feature of Shadwell's *The Virtuoso*, which incorporates direct quotations from Hooke's *Micrographia* and other scientific reports in the *Philosophical Transactions* into Gimcrack's speech. In terms of the characterisation as well, the play very much belongs to the Lucianic tradition, at least in those scenes involving Gimrack and Sir Formal Trifle, the play's stereotypes of false learning in science and rhetoric (and the direct descendants of Jonson's 'humour characters'). The relationship between
Gimcrack and Subtle is in certain respects quite close - each, in effect, is a Rosicrucian mountebank - but like Marmion's Veterano, Gimcrack is plainly more typical of the Lucianic self-revealing alazon than Jonson's alchemical knave, as in his own way is Trifle. Indeed there are moments when the play reads very much like a dramatised Lucianic dialogue, complete with its fools and ironic interlocutors, catalogues and neologisms, and parodic allusion: e.g.

Sir Formal.
I do assure you, gentlemen, no man upon the face of the earth is so well seen in the nature of ants, flies, humble-bees, earwigs, millepedes, hog's lice, maggots, mites in a cheese, tadpoles, worms, newts, spiders, and all the noble products of the sun by equivocal generation.

Sir Nicholas.
Indeed, I ha' found more curious phenomena in thos minute animals than those of vaster magnitude.

Longvil.
I take the ant to be a most curious animal.

Sir Nicholas.
More curious than all oviparous, or egg-laying, creatures in the whole world. There are three sorts: black, dark brown, and filemot.

Longvil.
Right, sir.

Sir Nicholas.
The black will pinch the dark brown with his forceps, till it kills it upon the place; the like will the dark brown do by the filemot. I have dissected their eggs upon the object plate of a microscope, and find that each has within it an included ant, which has adhering to its anus or fundament, a small black speck, which becomes a vermicle, like a mite, which I have watch'd whole days and nights. And Sir Formal has watch'd 'em thirty hours together.

Longvil.
A very pretty employment. (III, iii, 1-21)

The play also contains carnival motifs (e.g. the mountebank and masquerade scenes, IV, v; V, iv), and it is perhaps not going too far to equate the songs that occasionally intersperse the dialogue and action with the poetic interludes of pure Menippean satire.

The developments in the fields of philology and textual criticism, especially in terms of the proliferation of 'Variorum editiones' of the classics, also continued to provide plenty of material and inspiration for the best of the post-Butlerian Menippeans, of whom Samuel Wesley (the father of John) and Walter Pope, a high Anglican cleric and prominent Oxonian scientist, are perhaps the most remarkable. Wesley's Maggots: or
Poems is a classic example of a late seventeenth-century Menippean miscellany, an assortment of doggerel parodies, travesties, various kinds of mock verse, and Lijsterian mock-annotation, all prefaced by a bantering 'Epistle to the Reader', in which critics and virtuosi are ridiculed in the course of a mock-defence of the work. The collection includes a loose imitation of the Batrachomyomachia ('A Tame Snake left in a Box of Bran, was devoured by Mice after a great Battle', pp. 11-20); 'A Pindarique on the Grunting of a Hog' (pp. 21-23); and a mock-encomium on 'A Tobacco Pipe' (pp. 36-52), which incorporates incidental jokes on the usual clutch of quack doctors, philologists, and scientists within its playful espousal of the pipe as a panacea of all ills:

Apply the Pipe! this Instrument will cure
h The Surgeons Fire, or Pincers scarce so sure,
Th' they the most effectual method take;
Cut off the Head, I'll warn't no more 'twill Ach,
This gently heals, while Chrystal streams distill,
As from the Mother-Rock some plenteous Rill,
(Tho not, like that, enough to drive a Mill.)
Thence Chrystal Streams with gentle murmures flow,
Where little Nymphs may play, for ought we know,
Fine Tad-pole Nymphs soon rotten and soon ripe,
With tapring Tails like Sire Tobacco-pipe;
Like those which Virtuoso Glasses spy,
A thousand times less than a lusty Lowses eye... (54-66).

Like most of the other verses, the doggerel is accompanied by an array of mock-scholarship which digressively extends the original joke, in this case by means of a facetious allusion to the Philosophical Transactions:

k'This is not to be understood, without stepping into the new World of Microscopes: where among the rest, One Mr. (What's his hard name?) Lewenhoec, a Dutchman, discovered in Rain-water Animalcules consisting of six Globubs, two horns, and a tapering Tayl, one of 'em, a thousand times less than the eye of a Fat Louse: vid Transactions of Royal Society. - Vol. eleventh, p. 821 (p. 49).

Pope's works are more varied and numerous, and if anything still more ingenious. The author of a mock-memoir of a condemned highwayman (Memoirs of Du Vall) and Moral and Political Fables - 'done into measured prose intermingled with rhyme' - he
probably had some influence on Swift's *A Tale of a Tub* through his almost Burtonian biography of his friend Seth Ward, *The Life of Seth, Lord Bishop of Salisbury*. One chapter in particular bears an especially marked resemblance to the *Tale*; entitled 'A Digression containing some Criticisms', it begins with the ironic confession that 'This Chapter is guilty of great Crimes, which it should be no small folly in me to conceal: First it is too long, and secondly, which is worse, 'tis a Digression upon a Digression'.72 His Wittiest and most popular pieces were *The Wish* and *The Salisbury Ballad*, which were both published initially as rather conventional doggerel ballads, before being transformed into humorous satires 'on the Dutch commentators' by the addition to later editions of 'copious notes' riddled with ironic allusions to supposed classical and Renaissance sources.73 In the former especially, each quatrain, now jokingly printed in bold Germanic type to lend it an antiquarian value, is submerged under a deluge of bogus annotation composed of original prose commentary and verse quotation, becoming in effect the poetic interludes of a pure Menippean satire. This is particularly true of the earlier stanzas (it would appear that Pope tired of the game after a while), the first of which reads:

*If I live to be Old, I for I find I go down,  
Let this be my Fate. In a Country Town,  
May I have a warm House, with a Stone at the Gate,  
And a cleanly young Girl to rub my bald Fate.*

Chorus

*May I govern my Passion with an absolute Sway,  
And grow wiser and better as my Strength wears away,  
Without Sout or Stone, by a gentle Decay* (p. 1).74

Of the verse's seven notes (which together extend for roughly five pages) the second alone contains three pages of references to Petrarch, Lucan, Tasso, a number of minor Italians, and finally Jacob Cats. A note to the opening couplet of the second stanza -

*May my little House stand on the Side of a Hill,  
With an easy Descent to a Mead and a Mill,  
That when I've a mind I may hear my Boy read,  
In the Mill if it rains, if its dry in the Mead* (pp. 6-7).
- develops into a delightfully whimsical mock-scientific digression on the advantage of studying in a noisy environment:

It will be thought the Old Man has made a very ill Choice of a Mill to hear his Boy read in; but they who make this Objection, either know not, or at least do not consider, that Noise helps deafness, which is incident to Old Age. That this is Truth, both Experience and Reason evidence.

I have known several who could hear little or nothing in their Chambers, but when they were in a Coach rattling upon the Stones, heard very well. I also know a Lady in Essex, whose Name was Tyrrel, who while she had occasion to discourse, use to beat a great Drum, without which she could not hear at all; the Reason whereof is this. The most frequent Cause of Deafness is the Relaxation of the Tympanum or Drum of the Ear, which by this violent and continual Agitation of the Air, is extended, and made more Tight, and Springy, and better reflects Sounds, like a Drum new brac'd (pp. 9-10).

The period's controversial writing was also significantly affected by both the changing social milieu and the wider appreciation of the classical Menippeans, displaying a style and spirit quite removed from the often invective-laden and highly figurative controversial prose of the Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline periods. As Hugh Macdonald has argued, Restoration controversialists came to realize that in their Democritean age there was much more to be gained from cleverly mocking their opponents out of court than by engaging them in ponderous scholarly debate or abusing them in the most ungentlemanly manner. Their basic method was to pounce on the more dubious or absurd passages of their opponents' texts, include them often verbatim in their own piece, and by means of witty retorts and various techniques (principally reductio ad absurdum) show how ludicrous their opponents' arguments really were. The very title of Andrew Marvell's two-part demolition of Samuel Parker, The Rehearsal Transpro'sd, indicates its 'buffooning, burlesquing, and ridiculing way and stile'; yet, as he makes clear in his preface, the clowning also had a serious intent. Echoing Erasmus's prefatorial letter to More, he acknowledges that 'as I am obliged to ask pardon if I speak of serious things ridiculously; so I must now beg excuse if I should hap to discourse of ridiculous things seriously. But I shall, so far as possible, observe decorum, and whatever I talk of, not commit such an Absurdity, as to be grave with a
Buffoon' (p. 46). In the second part, he again announces that were Parker to give him a reason to be totally serious, he would be; but where he 'prevaricates or is scurrilous (and where is he not?) I shall treat him betwixt Jest and Earnest' (p. 187). Formally his work is the typical prosimetric composition of allusion and conversational, colloquial banter, the central point of which is that Parker's high Anglican polemics bear all the signs of having been written by Bayes, the protagonist of Buckingham's dramatic lampoon of Dryden. Though Marvell certainly loses no opportunity to highlight Parker's factual errors and to refute his more dubious arguments with some degree of seriousness, his most effective and characteristic reaction to his opponent's rantings is humorous and pointed irony. In response to Parker's almost hysterical and erroneous remarks about the 'mighty Bramble' of Calvinism which sprang up on 'the South side of the Lake Lemane', for instance, he playfully suggests how Parker might have made his foolish hyperbole still more hyperbolical:

First, he might have taken the name of the beast Calvinus, and of that have given the anagram Lucianus. Next, I would have turn'd him inside outward, and have made him Usinulca. That was a good Hobgoblin name to have frighted Children with....And then, to make a fuller description of the place, he should have added; That near to the City of roaring Lions there was a Lake, and that Lake was all of Brimstone, but stored with over-grown Trouts, which Trouts spawned Presbyterians, and those spawned the Millecants of all other Fanatics. That this Shoal of Presbyterians landed at Geneva and devoured all the Bishop of Geneva's Capons, which are of the greatest size of any in the Reformed-World. And ever since their mouths have been so in relish that the Presbyterians are in all parts the very Canibals of Capons....He might too have proved that Calvin made himself Pope and Emperor, because the City of Geneva stamps upon its Coin the two-headed Imperial Eagle. And, to have given us the utmost Terror, he might have considered the Alliance and Vicinity of Geneva to the Canton of Bern, the Arms of which City is the Bear,....and therefore they keep under the Town-house constantly a whole den of Bears. So that there was never a more dangerous situation, nor any thing so carefully to be avoided by all Travellers in their wits, as Geneva: the Lions on one side, and the Bears on the other. (pp. 26-27)

Having already commended Butler's 'excellent Wit' and wondered 'what admirable sport he would have made with an Ecclesiastical Politician', Marvell mocks Parker as a high-Church Don Quixote, whose lunacy is nowhere more evident than in his immoderate rantings and use of strange terms, which 'seem like words of Cabal, & have no significance till they be decipher'd'(pp. 32-33). There could be no clearer evidence of Marvell's Erasmian pedigree than this condemnation of cant.
The works of John Eachard (with whom King has been compared)\textsuperscript{77} include ironic controversial tracts, pseudonymous mock letters (e.g., \textit{Some Observations upon the Answer to an Enquiry into the Grounds & Occasions of the Contempt of the Clergy}), and satiric dialogues, the most famous example of which is his attack on Hobbes's political treatises, \textit{Mr Hobbs's State of Nature Considered, in a Dialogue between Philautus and Timothy}. As he explains in the 'Epistle Dedicatory', in his view it was much more decorous to deal with a pompous, pretentious fool like Hobbes in a 'bantering, ridiculous manner' than to treat him with 'too much respect' and a 'solemn and serious confutation'.\textsuperscript{78} Eachard's lively use of the dialogue form suggests some indebtedness to Lucian, particularly in terms of his characterisation and reliance upon allusion. With both characters voicing skilfully-inserted extracts from Hobbes's tracts, Timothy functions much like the standard ironic observer of Lucian's realistic dialogues, literalizing, reducing, or extending Philautus's (i.e. Hobbes's) statements to their absurd conclusion, and in the process luring him into a damning self-revelation. Like Marvell, Eachard consistently exhibits a high level of learning and commitment, yet at the same time remains generally amusing, vibrant, and ironic. His erudite joking, to recall Lijster, is proof of a keen if commonsensical intelligence, and was to inspire a generation of Anglican controversialists, among them the young Charles Montague and Matthew Prior. Their attack on Dryden, \textit{The Hind and the Panther Transvers'd to the Story of the Country Mouse and the City Mouse} (1687), represents an especially ingenious variation on the Lucianic model. Combining the usual character types and allusive techniques with a humorous parody of Dryden's Catholic allegory, the burlesque thereby serves not only as a highly sophisticated lampoon, but also implicitly as effective theo-political propaganda.\textsuperscript{79}

The popular and political journalism of the day likewise continued to exhibit clear signs of Menippean influence, in terms of both their content and individual form, and the considerable diversity of techniques and modes utilized for various satiric and controversial ends. Journals such as L'Estrange's \textit{Observator} (1681-87), Edward
Rawlin's *Heraclitus Ridens: at a dialogue between Jest and Earnest* (1681-82), and, later, John Tutchin's whiggish *Observator* (1702-12) and Leslie's Jacobite *Rehearsal* (1704-09), all appeared in the more or less Lucianic guise of the satiric dialogue, combining plainly partisan reporting on current affairs with sardonic ridicule of their opponents. The legacy of Lucian and Quevedo is especially apparent in such periodicals as *Mercurius Infernus: or, News from the other World* (1680) and the short-lived *The English Lucian: or, Weekly Discoveries*, of which fifteen numbers were issued between January and April, 1698.80 Another favourite controversial device was the mock-letter broadsheet or pamphlet, invariably bearing the name of some facetious persona. Among the more prominent of the journalists was King's friend, William Pittis, who contributed to Motteux's periodical miscellany, *The Gentleman's Journal* (1692), before producing two numbers of his own journal of poetic jests, *Miscellanies over Claret* (1697). He was later responsible for two of the most controversial examples of the contemporary Menippean journal, *Heraclitus Ridens* (1703-04) and the *Whipping Post at a new session of Oyer and Terminer* (1705), before running foul of the law.81

Of King's contemporaries, perhaps the most important exponent of the genre throughout the 1690s was Tom Brown. Commonly considered representative of the rather less refined side of the Augustan literature, the Christ Church-educated Brown was in fact fully conscious of the requirements of the genre in which he had chosen to write, and his numerous writings generally display a considerable level of erudition and craftsmanship. He contributed to the genre in a number of ways, discussing it in his Drydenesque critical study,82 translating Scarron (1700) and Erasmus (*Colloquies*, 1699), collaborating on the 'Dryden Lucian', and probably assisting in Motteux's translations of Rabelais and Cervantes and the 1708 translation of Petronius.83 He was also the prime mover behind the publication of a collection of mock-commendatory verses (*a la* Coryate) written by the wits' against Sir Richard Blackmore.84 The tremendous variety of his own Menippean compositions is in itself impressive: prosimetric and pure verse mock encomia (e.g., 'An Oration in Praise of Drunkenness',
'A Comical Panegyric on that Familiar Animal by the Vulgar call'd a Louse'), mock academic *jeux d'esprit* (e.g., 'A Bantering Adverbial Declamation'), travesties ('Cupid turn'd Tinker'), 'Satyrical Fables' (*The Weesil*), mock sermons ('The Quaker's Sermon'), ironic letters, and satiric dialogues, including *Dialogues of the Dead* (*Letters from the Dead to the Living*); not to mention the journalistic ambulatory satire for which he is best known (e.g., *Amusements Serious and Comical*), with its decadent, chaotic hotch-potch of quacks, hypocrites, and pretentious fools. A committed Anglican and royalist, Brown was also one of the liveliest and most readable of the period's controversialists, as he demonstrated in his earliest successful tract, *The Reasons of Mr Bays Changing his Religion. Considered in a Dialogue between Crites, Eugenius, and Mr Bays*, in which he attacks Dryden's religious conversion (and in particular *The Hind and the Panther*) by way of a clever prosimetric parody of his *Discourse on Dramatic Poesy*. Among his most ingenious pieces is his parody of John Partridge's almanacs, *The Infallible Astrologer: or, Mr Silvester Partridge's Prophesie and Predictions*, a weekly mock-journal published between October and December, 1700, and initially composed of ironic predictions of the daily events of the coming week, bogus weather forecasts, and, most amusingly of all, mock advertisements: e.g.,

**Advertisement to the Ladies**

*The best time to cut hair. How moles and dreams to be interpreted.... Under what aspect of the Moon best to draw teeth, and cut corns.... How to get twins; and how many hours boiling my lady Kent's pudding requires: With other notable questions, fully and faithfully restored by me Sylvester Partridge, student in Physic and Astrology, near the Gun in Moorfields.*

*Of whom likewise may be had, at reasonable rates, trusses, antidotes, elixirs, love-powders, washes for freckles, plummers, glass-eyes, false calves, and noses, ivory-jaws, stiptic drops to contract the parts* (I, p. 150).

cynical, mordant humour of Lucian and L'Estrange's Quevedo, and the degraded carnival spirit of Butler (e.g., 'Friday 1', I, p. 151). The whole tone of the piece is summed up in the final prophesy for 'Thursday 5': 'Watches, whores, clocks, widows, physicians and lawyers, tell lies every day of the week' (I, p. 156). The medical side of Partridge's almanac also afforded the perfect opportunity for some particularly
grotesque and farcial variations on the standard theme of the quack doctor, the most
striking elements of which are the ludicrous catalogues of pills, potions, and placebos
(I, pp. 157-59), and the almost Nashean hyperbole of Sylvester's metaphors and
imagery: e.g., 'Shew me a Scrotum, distended to the size of honest Mr Moxon's globe
upon Atlas's shoulders in Warwick-lane, I'll reduce it to its pristine state, while a
Virtuoso at Child's is supping his dish of coffee' (I, p. 162).

By the end of the seventeenth century, then, the legacy of Lucian and the other
classical Menippeans that the Renaissance humanists had recovered and embellished had
been widely distributed among both the polite and popular sections of Augustan society,
whose own satirists in turn imaginatively reinvested it into the production of a wide
variety of burlesque and 'fine Raillery'. As much as any epic, pastoral, epigram, elegy,
or verse satire written at the time, the Menippean satire and, as it were, Menippeanized
controversial tracts of Butler, Walter Pope, Marvell, and Tom Brown owe their
'temperament' and form to an ancient ancestor; but the unique personalities of these
writers, and the epistemological and political surroundings from which they drew their
material and inspiration, lend their writings their distinctive seventeenth-century flesh
and finery. With their inventive variations on the generic conventions, these works
constitute another manifestation of the neo-classical concept of originality in imitation.
With this in mind, one can turn to the contribution of King.

II

No-one was more qualified to make use of this rich inheritance than King. Bright,
gifted, deeply moralistic and devout, and prone to bouts of cynical morosity between
flights of whimsy and good humour, he was by nature and nurture possessed of a
complex Democritean spirit. His command of classical and modern languages and his
love of literature ensured his familiarity with the finest Menippean models, as his
thoughts in the Adversaria on some of the previous exponents of the form (such as More
and Butler), and interest in English attempts at burlesque Latin verses and Greek
macaronics (I, p. 239), testify. The circle of wits and gentlemen scholars with whom he was closely acquainted in London and Oxford, moreover, could only encourage his ingenuity and wit. The themes of his best works, though on one level personal and occasional, are ultimately concerned with the central Menippean question of 'right' thinking, whether in terms of politics, religion or proper learning. Their formal identification as Menippean satires of one sort or another is generally straightforward: many are more or less prosimetric (e.g. *Art of Cookery*, *Useful Transactions*, *Horace at Trinity*), and in two instances also to some extent take the form of the parodic travelogue (*Journey to London*, *Voyage to Cajamai*). He uses the mock-defence, mock-epistle and dialogue forms (including the Dialogue of the Dead) in both his political pamphlets and academic satires; while his efforts in the more conventional kind of controversial literature (*Reflections upon Ms Varillas's History of Heresy*, *Animadversions upon a Pretended Account of Denmark*) are, we shall see, directly related to those of Sprat, Eachard, and Marvell. In his poetry, moreover, he employs the full range of burlesque forms, from Hudibrastic doggerel and travesty to parody and various kinds of mock verse.

His most common parodic technique - the insertion of extracts from the satirized book into a new and ironic context - is in itself hardly original, conforming as it does to the ancient methods of pastiche-parody. More importantly, the parody is compounded by the clever use of the genre's standard devices and techniques, of which the most frequently used and effective are the Rabelaisian list, the inclusion of a supposedly-recovered letter, the digression, the mixed or grossly inappropriate metaphor, and the extended pun. The characteristic feature of the inclusion of foreign languages is common, and on occasion wittily extended into sophisticated linguistic and etymological games (e.g. 'How to write unintelligibly'). Those typical sources of humour, the terminologies of the legal and medical professions, are readily exploited; while neologism is naturally a favourite device in his satires on scientific jargon. 86

Associated with this is his mock-scholarly *lusus*, which includes mock dissertations
(e.g. 'The Dissertator'), bogus histories, and such apparatus as parodic illustrations
('Horace at Trinity', 'The Tongue'), mock prefaces and annotation ('Joan of Hedington,' 'Notes upon Notes'), and Germanic type; he has been credited, moreover, with being
the originator in English literature of the mock-index.

His use of personae and characterization further identifies his literary ancestry. In
the short narratives, the ironically-named persona is a typical Menippean caricature,
either the self-assured intellectual who actually represents the antithesis of the
well-educated gentleman (i.e. 'Samuel Sorbiere', 'Jasper van Slonenburgh'), or the
ironic naif, whose mask of simplicity barely conceals the keen, commonsensical
perception of the satirist (e.g., the 'Tom Boggy' tracts). The figure of the *philosophus
gloriosus* is represented in the usual variety of guises, the more traditional stock
characters (i.e. the pedant, the astrologer, the false prophet, the quack doctor, and occult
philosopher) being augmented by the relatively modern ones of the antiquarian, the
pseudo-Baconian virtuoso and the would-be learned lady. In certain dialogues (e.g. *The
Transactioneer*, 'Modern Learning' of *Dialogues of the Dead*) they are complemented by
an aptly-named interlocutor who observes from a commonsensical perspective the
behaviour of the fool, occasionally feigning admiration for his obvious follies. More
extensive analyses of King's most popular and successful works in the context of the
Menippean tradition make up the remaining chapters of this thesis, wherein their
occasional and personal aspects can properly be taken into account. In what remains of
this chapter, I shall discuss a selection of his burlesque poetry and minor tracts,
beginning with 'A Dialogue shewing the Way to Modern Preferment'.

First published (so far as one can gather) together with a reprint of *Dialogues of the
Dead* in the first volume of the *Miscellanies*, 'Modern Preferment' is certainly an
inferior work to the satire on Bentley, being more akin to the common herd of infernal
dialogues written on theo-political themes in the middle and late decades of the
seventeenth century. Even so, it does display a measure of its author's ironic wit and
appreciation of the essential characteristics of the Lucianic form. The satire begins with a
dispute between two figures, Signior Cornaro and Don Sebastiano des los Mustachieros, as to who is entitled to pre-eminence among the 'Shades below' (p. 471). These archetypal alazons are soon joined by the kataskopic Inquisitivo, who gently chides them over their squabbling by reminding them that 'Death makes us all equal' (an allusion to Menippus's final words in the thirtieth of Lucian's *Dialogues of the Dead*).

Nevetheless, prompted by Inquisitivo's bemused query as to their reasons for assuming superiority, Don Sebastiano proudly proclaims that as the former 'Favourite and Prime Minister to Cardinal *Porto-Carero*, that great Prelate', he was the premier spirit; to which Cornaro replies by boasting that he had been the confidant of the Pope himself, having done 'many good offices' for him, 'both before and since he came to the Papacy' (p. 472). Their similarly exaggerated expression reflects their equally grandiose pretensions, yet contrasts comically with their apparent meanness; for it is soon evident that Cornaro's 'good offices' were, at least initially, nothing more than the cutting of the Papal corns, while Don Sebastiano's bureaucratic career had begun as the Cardinal's tooth-drawer (pp. 473-74). In spite of their lowly origins they had attained great political influence and considerable wealth, each being capable through his intimacy with his master of manipulating state affairs. In one of the piece's more amusing passages, Cornaro explains how this could be done by exploiting a papal corn:

> When the World was intent upon the Pope's Counsels, to see which he would most incline to, either the Interests of the Austrian Family, or else of France, in relation to the Spanish Monarchy. He calls to me one Day, 'Signior, I have occasion to make use of your Fidelity: But dare you bear Scandal...as long as I shall think it convenient for my Service? Any thing, cry I, may it please your Holiness, so you know it may be innocent. Why I must be indispos'd for some time, says his Holiness...thou shall suffer me to give out, (But stay, here are a thousand Crowns for thee.) that as thou wer't cutting my Corns, thy knife slipt, and made a Wound so uneasy to me, that walking may be dangerous. 'Twas done; for who dares disobey his Holiness. I had immediately the whole Concourse of Rome about me: Is it not enflam'd, most notable Cornaro? When will he be able to walk? When to give Audience? I have a Petition, and shall be ruin'd, if not deliver'd within these two days: Is nothing to be done in private, honest Signior? What with Cardinals Secretaries, Imperial and Spanish Factions, receiving Presents, and inwardly laughing at their Folly, I was so far wearied, that I had almost resolv'd to undeceive 'em (pp. 476-78).

King's use of naturalistic devices such as recollection, digression, and interruption enlivens his character's speech, and conveys an appropriately unstatesmanlike sense of
pride, pettiness, and egotism, reflecting the general atmosphere of corruption and degradation pervading the papal court. The arrival in their midst of Mustapha, whose speech and behaviour correspond closely to theirs, implicitly illustrates the potential of immorality inherent in all human society, and in effect repeats the Anglican charge that the Catholics were in league with the infidel. All three, much like Lucian's Alexander, are in their vanity and deceitfulness simultaneously fools and knaves. Both products of, and active agents in, their decadent political and religious systems, they had exploited others as their masters had exploited them. The dialogue ends with the moral, appropriately delivered by Inquisitive. Corrupt as they have been, he notes, they are 'not to be blam'd, since they only us'd the readiest means to modern Preferments' (p.481).

Besides its obvious function as anti-Catholic propaganda, 'Modern Preferments' is perhaps on one level a satire on the Whig Junto (a government, according to the Tories, riddled with corruption and petit bourgeois placemen). But finally, at the risk of over-valuing its serious aspect, it is aimed at any society which fails to operate according to the Christian principles of selflessness, integrity, and morality, and the traditional Tory values of hierarchy, authority, civic responsibility, and obedience to the law.

Another example of King's method of clothing a serious moral message in an ironic and somewhat comical dress is his attack on Swift, Some Remarks on a Tale of a Tub, which takes the form of a letter supposedly written by an uneducated, but nevertheless well-mannered night-carter, who recalls having come across the book while returning home from his 'Nightly Vocation'. Through this very transparent mask, King accuses the anonymous author of profanity, bad language, immodesty, and (anticipating certain Swiftians by centuries) coprophilia. The anonymous author, the nightman asserts, has

a great Affectation for every thing that is nasty, when he spies any Objects that another Person would avoid looking on, that he Embraces. He takes the Air upon Dunghils, in Ditches, and Common-Shores, and at my Lord Mayors Dog-Kennel: In short, almost every Part has a Tincture of such Filthiness, as renders it unfit for the worst of Uses (p. 10).
Such material, he points out, is entirely inappropriate in view of its religious context, and
betrays by its false wit the true state of the author's religion, conversation, manners, and
education (pp. 10-11). By contrast, he stresses that he himself will avoid lapsing into his
opponent's base manner. 'I declare to you', he writes, 'that I affect Cleanliness to a
Nicety. I mix my Ink with Rose or Orange-Flower-Water, my Scruture is of
Cedar-Wood, my Wax is scented, and my Paper lies amongst sweet Bags. In short, I
will use you with a thousand times more Respect than the Bookseller of the Tale of a
Tub does a Noble Peer under the Pretense of a Dedication, or than the Author does his
Readers' (p. 6). That a lowly nightman should have to remind a parson of a gentleman's
manners and the proprieties of literature is, of course, the greatest indictment of all. The
moral point of the piece is clear; yet it is itself ironic that with such a puerile performance
(particularly in terms of its use of the persona) King should have disavowed the
authorship of a masterpiece of Erasmian irony. As Swift himself slyly observed, it was
both curious that someone who had at times demonstrated some talent in the fields of
burlesque and persona irony should have so badly missed the point of the satire, and
futile to attempt 'to turn into ridicule by a Week's Labour, a Work which had cost so
much time, and met with so much Success in ridiculing others'.

An altogether different piece is 'A Letter to a Friend', a mock letter supposedly
penned by a certain 'Balthasar Ichenkevelt', and apparently intended to humour a friend
who had recently learned that the woman he loved had married another. Plainly (like his
creator) a confirmed bachelor, Ichenkevelt sympathetically banters his friend for having
yielded up his normal good sense to 'the Passion of love', though he admits that 'sooner
or later we must all come to it' (III, p. 271). It is therefore best, he insists, to get it over
and done with as quickly and painlessly as possible; and with any luck, one will emerge
from the experience unscathed, and reconfirmed in one's bachelorhood. The remainder
of this jeu d'esprit is given over to a series of variations on the conventional consolation
of the jilted lover - namely, that by losing the lady he had been spared the wife - which
are wittily embellished by the standard devices of the ironic poetic insertion and the
linguistic game: e.g.,

For we find in the Accidence, that happiness in Marriage seems to be confined only to Kings and Queens. There is no such expression as *Ricardus and Melinda sunt beati*, "Richard and Melinda are happy"; but only, *Rex et Regina sunt beati*, "The King and the Queen are happy;" which made me fall into this pathetic expression;

"If King's and Queens are only to be blest
When join'd together, e'en God help the rest!"

so that the Comforts of Matrimony seem to be the flowers and prerogatives of the Crown, never to be alienated (III, p. 272).

The playful spirit of 'A Letter to a Friend', the more overt moralism of *Some Remarks*, and the dark cynicism of 'Modern Preferment' are all evident in King's burlesque poetry, which constitutes the bulk of his verse. The few examples of serious verse that King published, especially his Prioresque 'Song' ('You say you love') and 'Song, to Celia', suggest that had he been so inclined, he could have been among the period's most renowned and accomplished lyric poets. The more earnest side of his character is clearly reflected in 'A Gentleman to his Wife', a simple (and admittedly rather dull) exercise on the commonplace theme of the refinement of youthful, egoistical passion into a mature, honourable love affair (III, p. 242). Yet King's muse, like Swift's, was far better suited to burlesque. Even in his didactic loose translation of Ovid *The Art of Love*, King could not resist suffixing to the majority of the fourteen verses a piece of travestic doggerel, which was designed to make the task of wading through so 'large a heap of precepts' less 'burthensome'.

Much like the dramatic device of the comic sub-plot, each travesty provides a comic restatement of the issues dealt with by Ovid in the preceding section, before concluding with an appropriate moral reflection. The characterization in these 'remarkable Fables' accords with the Scarronic practice of making the Olympian gods and heroes act and speak like the residents of Billingsgate, as in the case of the group of neighbours called by Vulcan to witness his cuckolding by Mars:

Jove should be there, that does make bold
With Juno, that notorious scold;
Neptune first Bargeman on the water;
Thetis the Oyster-woman's daughter;
Pluto, that Chimney-sweeping sloven;
With Prosepine hot from her oven;
And Mercury, that's sharp and cunning
In stealing customs and in running;
And Dy the midwife, though a Virgin;
And Aesculapius the Surgeon;
Apollo, who might be Physician,
Or serve them else for a Musician;
The Piper Pan, to play her up;
And Bacchus, with his chirping cup;
And Hercules should bring his club in,
To give the Rogue a lusty drubbing;
And all the Cupids should be by,
To see their Mother's infamy (1461-84).

King also makes use of the usual range of travesti devices, including the comical diminution of names (e.g., 'Bacco', 'Heccy', 'Gnossy', 'Ceph', 'Bull-y'), degraded proverbs (e.g., 'Pray who, except 'twere Geese or Widgeons, I would hire a Hawk to guard their Pidgeons', 1278-1279), colloquial phrases (e.g., 'We'ad fingers long before we'ad forks', 1426), and gross physical imagery. A typical instance is the story of Bacco and Gnossy, which follows the translation of Ovid's verses on the threat posed by alcohol to successful love-making and courtship, and travesties the myth of Bacchus's rescue of Ariadne (whom he later married) from Naxos, where she had been abandoned by Theseus. Here the god of wine is reduced to a common London barman:

Bacco was Drawer at the Sun,
And had his belly like his tun:
For blubber lips and cheeks all bloated,
And frizzled pate, the youth was noted.
He, as his custom was, got drunk,
And then went strolling for a punk.
Six links and lanterns, 'cause 'twas dark yet,
He press'd from Covent-Garden Market (450-57).

The social status of the Minoan princess is equally diminished to the rank of a 'punk' named Gnossy, who is deserted by her erstwhile lover not on a lonely Aegean island, but rather in the Quevedian nightmare of the city's proletarian quarters (466-67), where she is soon set upon by the drunken drawer. The consequences of this chance nocturnal encounter are their marriage and eventual partnership in the hotel business - a salutary lesson, one assumes, to a young gentleman. Perhaps the best of them is the last, which
burlesques the story of Cephalus and Procris. According to King's own account in the *Heathen Gods*, the suspicious, jealous Procris is accidentally killed by her unsuspecting husband with the unerring dart she had earlier given to him in compensation for having previously been unfaithful. The serious moral of marital trust and fidelity is amusingly delivered in King's radically-altered version, which concludes in the classic farce of the tragic 'fatal blow' that embarrassingly proves not to be quite so lethal after all:

But, as the leaves began to rustle,
He thought some beast had made the bustle.
He shot, then cried, "I've kill'd my Dear." -
"Ay, so you have," (says Cris) "I fear." -
"Why, Chrissy, pray what made you here?"
"By Gossip Trot, I understood
"You kept a small Girl in the wood."
Quoth Ceph, "'Tis pity thou should'st die
"For, this thy foolish jealousy:
"For 'tis a passion that does move
"Too often from excess of love."
But, when they fought for wound full sore,
The petticoat was only tore,
And she had got a lusty thump,
Which in some measure bruis'd her rump (2256-2270).

The clutch of burlesque tales which King first published in his *Miscellanies* are of a slightly different breed. In an article on the 'low seriousness' of Augustan burlesque, Donna Munker has argued that far from being a 'paultry' form, the period's tetrametric doggerel satisfied 'the need for a type of serious satire that could deal with the "fragmentary and commonplace", with the import, and the importance of, ordinary, immediate social experience'. After noting its classical and native antecedents, she claims that the burlesque of Rochester, Prior, and Swift, while superficially simplistic, is actually highly sophisticated and ironic, its colloquial diction and low comic elements disguising an often complex and subtle use of paradox and personae. Though written in relatively irregular pentametres, the Miscellany poems plainly belong to this satiric branch. Peopled by such common folk as Young Slouch the Farmer, Clod and Jolt, Old Paddy Scot, and Strap the Constable, and playing upon such traditional comic material as the hen-pecked husband ('The Old Cheese'), the conniving parson ('The Vestry'), the
Irish rogue ('A Case of Conscience'), and the sexual adventures of the travelling salesman ('The Skillet'), these poems generally appear on the surface to be little more than conventional, moderately amusing exercises. Yet each depicts a reality characterized by egoism, pride, greed, ambition, and lust, and implies a strict moral and social message. 'The Old Cheese', for example, recounts Slouch's attempts to convince his friends that he is 'master of his family' by publicly admonishing and insulting his shrewish wife:

Slouch by his kinsman Gruffy had been taught  
To entertain his friends with finding fault,  
And make the main ingredient of his treat  
His saying, "There was nothing fit to eat:  
"The boil'd Pork stinks, the roast Beef's not enough,  
"The Bacon's rusty, and the Hens are tough;  
"The Veals all rags, the Butter's turn'd to Oil:  
"And thus I buy good meat for sluts to spoil....  
"This Beer is sour, this musty, thick, and stale,  
"And worse than any thing, except the Ale" (III, p. 245).

From the perspective of any true-born English gentleman, the comic retribution metered out by Sue is just punishment for one who had not only allowed such a level of matrimonial dissension to develop in the first place, but had compounded the crime by resorting to subterfuge and ill manners in a puerile attempt at rectifying the problem. 'The Skillet' is likewise notable both for its farcical plot (which sees a kitchen utensil become a token of sexual infidelity) and the mercenary, amoral nature of the adulterous transactions. 'Little Mouths', in which Betty is informed that a new proclamation will allow "Maids with huge, gaping, wide mouths ' to have three husbands, similarly implies beneath its somewhat bawdy comedy a disturbing moral vacuum, of which the grotesquity of bodily abnormality is emblematic:

Betty distorts her face with hideous squall,  
And mouth of a foot wide begins to bawl,  
"Oh! ho! is't so? The case is alter'd, Paul.  
Is that the point ? I wish the three were ten;  
I warrant I'd find mouth, if they'll find men (III, pp. 251-52).

Uncompromising egoism is the theme of 'The Fisherman', which reveals a human
condition starkly antithetical to the spirit of Christian charity and neighbourly love connotated by its biblical title. The fisherman's disingenuous response to requests by downstream residents that he practice a more environmentally-conscious method of fishing is again most disturbing for its disavowal of all moral responsibility and facile recourse to neo-stoical fatalism:

"Yet 't'en't my fault; but so 'tis Fortune tries one
"To make his meat become his neighbour's poison;
"And so we pray for winds upon this coast,
"By which on t'other navies may be lost.
"Therefore in patience rest, though I proceed:
"There's no ill-nature in the case, but need.
"Though for your use this water will not serve,
"I'd rather you should choack, than I should starve" (III, p. 248).

'Hold Fast Below' (III, pp. 252-53), on the other hand, presents an image of Machiavellian evil. With his macabre, Satanic sense of humour, extraordinary cunning, and ability to reap in total safety the profits from the criminal activities of his 'infant cullies', King's rogue-hero anticipates the more famous villains of Gay and Fielding; indeed, in terms of its ingenuity, his method of disposing of outworn accomplices loses nothing by comparison with the machinations of Peacham and Jonathan Wild.

The most impressive of all the 'Miscellany Poems' is 'The Beggar Woman', which, in its treatment of the questions of promiscuity and the social responsibility of the gentleman, in some respects stands as the counter-piece to 'A Gentleman to his Wife'. Its action bears the mark of a fable, involving an apparent victim gulling her would-be exploiter by arousing and playing upon his basest drives of greed and lust. One of its most striking features is the relatively sympathetic depiction of the deserted beggar woman, who, in spite of her trickery and abandonment of her child, hardly exhibits the bestial level of depravity and hypocrisy displayed by the ironically-labelled gentleman. The brutality of his pursuit of sexual gratification, pointedly associated in the opening lines with the blood sport of coursing, is further highlighted by another example of King's ironic use of biblical symbolism:

With speed incredible to work she goes,
And from her shoulders soon the burthen throws;
Then mounts the infant with a gentle toss
Upon her generous friend, and, like a cross,
The sheet she with a dextrous motion winds,
Till a firm knot the wandering fabric binds (III, p. 254).

The beggar woman's sardonic parting remarks to the booby squire sum up the central message of this distinctly serious comic tale. If high social status and masculinity have their material and cultural privileges, they also bring paternalistic, Christian responsibilities: the infant is in effect the emblem of the gentleman's societal 'burthen'.

Much superior poetically are King's longer verse menippeae, which assume a variety of sophisticated and colourful shapes. The earliest was The Furmetary, a mock-heroic in three small cantos which purports to recount a series of incidents involving one of a number of establishments that 'dispense Furmetry to labouring people, and the poor, at reasonable rates'. Apparently written to 'please a Gentleman, that thought nothing smooth or lofty could be wrote upon a mean Subject', the poem is obviously related closely to Garth's The Dispensary, with its mock-Homeric battle scenes, passages of mock-descriptio, and monstrous, allegorical figures.\(^9^4\) The opening lines, which parody the conventions of poetic descriptions of the morning, immediately establish the overall ironic stance, playfully setting the epic pretensions inherent in the verse form against the proletarian realities of a London dawn:

No sooner did the grey-ey'd Morning peep,
And yawning mortals stretch themselves from sleep;
Finders of gold were now but newly past,
And Basket-women did to Market haste;
The Watchmen were but just returning home,
To give the Thieves more liberty to roam (1-6).

The mock-heroic tenor is maintained by a bathetic reflection on the area's ancient glories, as represented by both the sculptures on Ludgate and the illustration on a local tavern's sign-board:

Just here, as ancient Poets sing, there stood,
The noble palace of the valiant Lud;
His image now appears in Portland stone,
Each side supported by a god-like son.
But, underneath, all the three heroes shine,
In living colours, drawn upon a sign,
Which shews the way to Ale, but not Wine (11-17).

At the same time, as in *The Dispensary* the serious theme of the need for civil responsibility and Christian charity, which the real furmetary at Fleet Ditch embodied, is observable through the wit, particularly in the description of its antithesis, Ludgate's debtors' prison:

Near is a place enclos'd with iron-bars,
Where many mortals curse their cruel stars,
When brought by Usurers into distress,
For having little, still must live on less:
Stern Avarice there keeps the relentless door;
And bids each wretch eternally be poor.
Hence Hunger rises, dismally he stalks,
And takes each single prisoner in his walks (18-25).

In ironic accordance with the epic conventions, the poem's central action - the attack on the Furmetary - is prefaced in the first two cantos by paradoxical encomia and diabolical prayers to, and disguised visitations from, allegorical figures of vice and disharmony, passages which again barely conceal the poet's serious moral condemnation of egoism (28-58). As Famine herself acknowledges, this dispensary of simple nourishment symbolizes the happiness, relative prosperity, and spirit of charity which, since the outbreak of peace, threatens to engulf the nation. The poem's comic nature is dramatically reasserted at the conclusion of her speech, however, as she dematerializes not so much with a climactic Miltonic thunderclap as with a deflating, 'Suburbian' fart:

    This said, she quickly vanish'd in a wind
    Had long within her body been confin'd.
    Thus Hercules, when he his mistress found,
    Soon knew her by her scent, and by her sound (103-06).

Though comparatively brief, the ensuing battle of Fleet Ditch between Hunger's confederacy of appetite suppressants and Syrena and her allies is surely among the most engaging of its kind, particularly in its amusing recounting of the noxious qualities of tobacco: e.g.,
In the mean time, Tobacco strives to vex
A numerous squadron of the tender sex;
What with strong smoke, and with his stronger breath,
He funks Basketia and her son to death (159-62).

As the defenders of the furmetary regroup after their enemies' initial onslaught, the whole scene deteriorates into a chaotic farce sequence, the narration punctuated by moments of ludicrously inappropriate analogies:

Coffedro then, with Teedrums and the band
Who carried scalding liquors in their hand,
Throw watery ammunition in their eyes;
On which Syrenna's party frighten'd flies:...
Syrenna, though surpriz'd, resolv'd to be
The great Bonduca of her FURMETARY:
Before her throne courageously she stands,
Managing ladles-full with both her hands.
The numerous Plums like hail-shot flew about,
And Plenty soon dispers'd the meagre rout (163-180).

The lively, serio-comic wit and colourful imagery of *The Furmetary* are also vital features of King's other major burlesque poems, *Mully of Mountown* and *Orpheus and Eurydice*, both of which first appeared in 1704 in pirate editions, before being published together with 'Some Remarks' in the following year.95 Ostensibly a poem about a ill-fated cow, *Mully of Mountown* is actually a typical Menippean hotch-potch, combining three different forms of mock-literature and parody in a lightly ironic expression of gratitude for the generosity of Anthony Upton. With its opening apostrophe and the humorous allusions to the tradition of Cockaigne (and perhaps, more directly, to Hall's account of Pamphagonia in the *Mundus*) that make up its catalogue of Mountown's cornucopian delights, the initial section represents a comical variation on the conventions of the country-house poem:

MOUNTOWN! thou sweet retreat from Dublin cares,
Be famous for thy Apples and thy Pears;
For Turnips, Carrots, Lettuce, Beans, and Pease;
For Peggy's Butter, and for Peggy's Cheese.
May clouds of Pigeons round about thee fly;
But condescend sometimes to make a Pye.
May fat Geese gaggle with melodious voice,
And ne'er want Gooseberries or Apple-sauce:
Ducks in thy Ponds, and chicken in thy Pens,
And be thy Turkeys numerous as thy Hens:
May thy black Pigs lie warm in little stye,
And have no thought to grieve them till they die.
Mountown! the Muses' most delicious theme;
Oh! may thy Codlins ever swim in Cream! (1-16).

Far from deprecating his tribute, King's delightful banter adds an appropriately joyous tone and an air of friendly sincerity to what might otherwise have been merely another conventional literary exercise. After such a luxurious diet of imagery and wit, however, the subsequent mock-georgic passage advising Peggy on the art of brewing, and the mock-pastoral episode leading to Mully's unfortunate demise, are on the whole rather less satisfying. The interruptive apostrophe which brings the pastoral 'tragedy' abruptly to a halt, although consistent with the overall parodic mood, is too facile and insubstantial a conclusion to what initially had promised to be an especially appetising poetic meal. Only the darkly comic speech of Robin (another in King's line of hypocritical, anti-pastoral swains), has much appeal:

O, Sirs, when Christmas comes,
These Shins shall make the Porridge grac'd with Plums;
Then, 'midst our cups, whilst we profusely dine,
This blade shall enter deep in Mully's Chine.
What Ribs, what Rumps, what bak'd, boil'd, stew'd and roast!
There shan't one single Tripe of her be lost! (79-84).

The work which really typifies King's poetic achievements is his travesty of the Ovidian story of Orpheus and Eurydice. In spite of its apparently unfinished state, the poem has generally been praised as one of the most impressive works of its kind written in the period, and identified as a likely source of inspiration for Swift's Baucis and Philemon. In its early stages, the poem is yet another in the tradition of Scarron and Cotton, with its octasyllabic doggerel form, degenerate characters, and diminution of the classical ideal to the grossest of earthly realities. Instead of the son of Apollo, whose magical skills and musical genius allowed him to charm even the beasts of prey and inanimate objects, we are presented with a mere 'strolling' minstrel who, in partnership with his 'catterwauling' wife, has 'Set up in the Ballad-singing trade'(III, 12). Orphic
magic accordingly becomes an elaborate con-trick, the means to a far from 'honest livelihood':

The cunning varlet could devise,
For country folks, ten thousand lies;
Affirming all those monstrous things
Were done by force of harp and strings;
Could make a Tiger in a trice
Tame as a Cat, and catch your Mice;
And, by the help of pleasing ditties,
Make Mill-stones run, and build up Cities;
Each had the use of fluent tongue,
If Dice scolded, Orpheus sung (13-24).

On the same note, the tragedy of the premature death of the original Eurydice is reduced to the level of a serious threat to corporate profitability following the loss of a possibly irreplaceable business associate (37-42). At this point King begins to depart from the Ovidian original, taking advantage of the supernatural setting of the underworld to indulge in flights of poetic fancy and social satire. Ignoring Linus's advice to 'rest content, as widowers should' and thank the gods for providing him with the opportunity to 'change a living wife for dead'(49-68), Opheus makes his descent to Hades via the cave of the witch, Urganda, who also greets his desire to secure Eurydice's remission with surprise and cynical reflections on the callousness and egoism of the typical husband:

For, 'tis too sad a thing to jest on,
You're the first man e'er ask'd the question;
For husbands are such selfish elves,
They care for little but themselves.
And then one rogue cries to another,
Since this wife's gone, e'en get another:
Though most men let such thoughts alone,
And swear they've had enough of one (108-15).

King's indebtedness to Butler is apparent in the deliberately strained rhymes recounting Urganda's directions to the Fairy Kingdom, through which Orpheus must first pass on his journey to Hell; but as regards the subsequent descriptions of his hero's experiences in Fairyland, his models are surely the native tradition of Fairy poetry that stretches back
through Herrick's 'The Fairy Kingdom', 'Oberon's Feast', 'Oberon's Palace', and 'the
Beggar to Mab, the Fairy Queen', to Drayton's Nymphidia and, of course, Midsummer
Night's Dream. The conventional elements of fantastic splendour and exquisite
minutiae (particularly in terms of foodstuffs) are imaginatively utilized, but at the same
time violated and contemporized by moments of typical Kingian irony: e.g.,

A roasted ant, that's nicely done,
By one small atom of the sun.
These are flies eggs, in moon-shine poach'd;
This a flea's thigh in colllops scotch'd,
'Twas hunted yesterday i' th' Park,
And like t' have 'scap'd us in the dark.
This is a dish entirely new,
Butterflies' brains dissolv'd in dew;
These lover's vows, these courtiers' hopes,
Things to be eat by microscopes (207-15).

The poem's relationship to 'Oberon's Feast' is especially close: King's 'flies' eggs' and
scotched 'flea's thigh' seem to derive from the same lyric recipe book as Herrick's
'beards of mice, a newt's stewed thigh, l A bloated earwig and a fly' ('Oberon's Feast',
37-38); while Oberon's 'pure seed-pearl of infant dew' and 'gently pressed' wine bear
more than a passing resemblance to the ingredients of Nab's unique 'ratifia':

"A drop of water, newly torn
Fresh from the rosy-finger'd Morn;
A pearl of milk, that's gently prest
From blooming Hebe's early breast;
With half a one of Cupid's tears,
When he in embryo first appears;
And honey from an infant bee:
Makes liquor for the Gods and Me!" (228-35).

Such rapturous moments testify to King's gifts as a lyricist: yet, as the subsequent lines
show all too clearly, he is always primarily a parodist and humorist. The almost sublime
tenor of the fairy queen's speech is immediately undercut by the bathetic doggerel voiced
by the burlesque hero:

"Madam", says he, "an't please your Grace,
I'm going to a draughty place;
And, if I an't too bold, pray charge her,
The draught I have be somewhat larger" (236-39).
Similarly, the charming account of Orpheus's rest upon a bed 'stuff'd full of Harmony' (259) demonstrates both the poet's appreciation of the harmonic qualities of language, and the humorist's penchant for witty paradox and pastoral parody:

Purling streams and amorous rills,
Dying sound that never kills,
Zephyrus breathing, Love delighting,
Joy to slumber soft inviting,
Trembling sounds that make no noise,
And songs to please without a voice,
Were mixt with down that fell from Jove,
When he became a swan for love (260-67).

In its juxtaposition of city realism with the fantasticality of a 'slumbering Nature', the following passage represents another example of King's playful use of *mock-descriptio*, its first three lines in the process also directly parodying Dryden's hyperbolic descriptions of night in *The Conquest of Mexico* ('All things are hush'd, as Nature's self lay dead, I The mountains seem to nod their drowsie head', III, ii):99

'Twas night, and Nature's self lay dead,
Nodding upon a feather-bed;
The mountains seem'd to bend their tops,
And shutters clos'd the milleners' shops,
Excluding both the punks and fops;
No ruffled streams to mill do come,
The silent fish were still more dumb;
Look in the chimney, not a spark there,
And darkness did itself grow darker (268-76).

Sadly, as in *Mully of Mountown*, King is unable to maintain this level of performance. Nosnotbocai's speech, with its strained and tired anti-Catholic jokes about the concept of Purgatory and the corruption it gave rise to (299-339), may well have amused some members of its contemporary Anglican audience, but lacks any poetic or comic appeal today.100 Though marginally more creative, the allegorical section which follows it is likewise too didactic for most modern readers; while it would be perhaps too charitable to regard King's clumsy use of metric variation in the later stages of the poem as anything other than a clear sign of his lack of interest in continuing the exercise. More
than any other of his burlesque poems, *Orpheus and Eurydice* bears out Swift's assertion that King on the whole lacked the commitment and artistic maturity needed to develop a clever idea into a completely successful, polished work of literature. Its fragmentation and miscellaneity are pointers to the character of an author whose fertility of wit far outstripped his levels of poetic stamina and patience; its disorder springs from a desire to deal with every issue, and tell every joke, as swiftly and effortlessly as possible. King's highly sophisticated, and yet at the same time almost child-like mental agility, which enabled him to produce such inspired, magical moments as Orpheus's visit to the Fairy Kingdom, had its negative aspect in his frequent incapacity to concentrate for long on the game he was playing - especially if that game was as intrinsically limited and limiting as travesty.

These distinctive Kingian traits are also graphically displayed in the last of his works to be dealt with here, *The Tragi-Comedy of Joan of Hedington, in Imitation of Shakespeare*, which on the only occasions it has received any critical attention has been both maligned and misunderstood. Normally so appreciative of King's wit, Horne misleadingly labels the piece a farce, and describes its critical preface as 'a somewhat ponderous parody' of the scholarly methods of Richard Bentley. Weeks fails entirely to comprehend the parodic design of the play, and wonders how King could have allowed such a puerile and pointless attempt at drama to be published. In fact, it is highly unlikely that *Joan of Hedington* was ever meant to be performed, given its brevity and absence of any genuine dramatic action. Its two parts should rather be recognized as composite sections of an organic Menippean whole, intended to be read as a satire on both the contemporary abuses of dramatic criticism and the age's poor imitations and adaptations of Shakespearean tragicomedy. For this reason, it stands outside the contemporary tradition of burlesque drama, from which it nevertheless must have derived some inspiration (particularly, one suspects, from Buckingham's *The Rehearsal*). With its combination of a mock critical preface and deliberate exercise in the art of bathos, it would seem to be a highly original piece, which (in view of Gay's
appreciation of King's 'World of Wit') quite possibly provided some hints for the mock-preface of *The What D'ye Call It: A Tragi-Comi-Pastoral Farce* (1715), and perhaps even Pope's *Peri Bathous* and *The Dunciad*. Its original well-spring, though, is Lucian, and more specifically *Lexiphanes*. If formally quite different, the two burlesques in one respect serve identical parodic ends, in the sense that just as Lucian intends no slight on Plato when he plunders *The Symposium* for the purpose of ridiculing false imitations and pedants, King's burlesque is in no way meant as a satire on his 'Divine Shakespeare'. His real targets are, as it were, the modern equivalents of Lexiphanes, those whose fascination for the trivial and extraneous, and critical obsession with rules, cloud their perception of the true aesthetic beauties of the greatest of English authors.

Many of the devices that King uses throughout his various satires on Bentley, Lister, Sloane and the other abusers of learning and literature are again in evidence in the preface, which is ostensibly the work of 'the publisher', one of King's thinly-developed, eminently-pliable masks. His reflections on the origins and progress of prologues and epilogues, and particularly his admission that he intends to bring out a 'compleat Dissertation concerning all the Prologues and Epilogues that have come into my Hands' (p.6), amount to a relatively dry variation on the Lucianic technique of persona self-revelation and the theme of pedantry that King works more thoroughly and successfully elsewhere. Even the prefatorial pretense that the anonymous work actually recounted real events, already had something of a history and had fallen almost by accident into the publisher's hands, is a standard generic feature. Insertions of poetic quotation provide the opportunity for further elaboration on the basic ironic joke of the publisher's over-evaluation of an obviously dreadful work. A reference to the prologue of *Volpone*, for instance, inspires the publisher ignorantly to claim that *Joan of Hedington* perfectly accords with the Jonsonian ideal, even to the extent that its composition 'did not cost so much Time as the Birth of an Elephant, or the Production of the famous Oration of *Isocrates*' (p. 8). So far as the play's obedience to the doctrine of
the 'unities' is concerned, the publisher claims that he has 'seen none (except the Adventures of five Hours, and some few Tragedies in Imitation of the French), that can come near it; for the whole Space of time does not seem in probability to be of a greater extent than that of Master Church-warden's fetching up the Cows, and his Wife's milking of them'. 'There is no running from there to Cowley, so to Hinksey, and then back to Marston', he observes admiringly, 'as we have Parallel Instances in most of Shakespear's Tragedies'. His relatively fulsome descriptions of the dramatic personae and introductory account of the setting, provided in strict obedience to theatrical convention, is likewise laughably inappropriate in view of the actual nature of the characters and events concerned, to which the informed readership would have been immediately alerted by the play's title - 'Joan of Hedington' was in fact an Oxonian euphemism for a prostitute. The publisher's attempt to establish the play's chronology, as Horne points out, is almost certainly another incidental swipe at Bentley, his absurd pursuit of exactitude parodying the great scholar's Dissertation Upon the Epistles of Phalaris:

I must confess, that I have been something negligent as to the Chronology of the Play, and the Year when the Tragical Attempt was made upon Joan of Hedington; but a Learned Person may easily compute it, for it was two years after the Blazing Star, and four Months, seven Days, twenty Minutes, and fifteen Seconds, after the great Cudgel-playing at Cowley Wake, which is the Olympiad of that Country, where John Pasmore of Hedington won the Hat and Feather (p. 12).

The fact that the play itself is substantially shorter than its preface is all part of the joke, as is its abject dramatic poverty. The logical consequence of a dogmatic adherence to the formal regulations of neo-classical critical theory combined with a lack of critical judgement as to what kind of subject matter was truly tragic, Joan of Hedington is exactly the kind of tragi-comedy of which a critical pedant would approve. As the publisher informs us, the action, which is basically that of a revenge tragedy, takes place in the village of Hedington and turns on the bitter rivalry between two local bawds. In ironic accordance with Aristotelian and Horatian principles, the piece is divided into five
acts (each extremely brief), in which the heroine first emerges victorious from a public battle with Mother Harris, and then becomes the victim of a vengeful conspiracy to murder involving the vanquished Madam, her jilt of a daughter, their amorous ally, Mr Cole, and the would-be assassin, the scholastic Mr Pindar. Characteristically the combination of mock-heroic diction and bathos is vital to the humour, notably in Joan's high street soliloquy on her triumph, which, short as it is, makes up the whole of the second scene of Act II: eg.

Let's view the mighty Act which I have done:
The thing is worthy Joan of Hedington.
I that have favour'd Youngsters many a Score,
Was ne'er affronted at this Rate before
By such an Upstart, Tawdry, Pocky Whore;
She from the Maggoty Pie away was sent,
Because she had not Trade to pay her Rent.
At Hinksey then they would not let her stay,
Because she kept a Bawdy-house, they say;
But now I think I have given the Whore her due.
Shall I be hussed by a Bitch like you !
No, I have beat her, and the Drab is gone:
I will reign Mistress of this Place alone,
And be the topping dame of Hedington.
But I think I had best go home and drink a dram of brandy (pp. 21-22).

The incongruity in the following act of Cole's highly rhetorical expression and distinctly unHomeric acts which he initially considers as appropriate means of revenge - such as smashing her windows and walking out of her establishment without paying the bill - together with his subsequent remarks on the best beverage for the vanquished, yield similar comic results. The scene closes with another typical Kingian touch, as the languishing Mother Harris is carried off to the wail of bagpipes, moaning melodramatically that 'Musick encreases Melancholy Thoughts: But brings no Ease to minds oppress'd with Grief'.

The combination of bawdy, mock-heroics, and bathos makes for some particularly amusing moments in the final acts, especially in the parodic love scene involving Joan, her erstwhile client Father Clerkenwell, and his friend, Atson. Clerkenwell's threat to take his business to Joan's rival, after having been denied an extension of credit on
account of an already outstanding bill, gives way to the risible sight of the prostitute playing the role of the romantic heroine pleading for her lover to stay, which is abruptly brought to a fitting anti-climax by Atson’s suggestion as to the best means of cementing the lovers’ reconciliation:

Joan Be’nt so unkind, dear Clerky, to go thither; I vow you make me weep with your Unkindness.

F. Clerkenwell I be’nt unkind, Joany, I vow you make me cry too. I wo’nt go, Joany, I won’t.

Atson No, he shan’t go. Come, let’s all three go upstairs, and be friends, and bid your Husband bum us a Pint of Brandy (p. 25).

The catastrophe, as it were, is again heavily bathetic, as we learn from the returned churchwarden in the last scene that the would-be tragic heroine had been saved from strangulation by the last minute intervention of her hitherto unconcerned husband, and (like Procris with her bruised rump) left with nothing more to show for her epic experiences than a sore neck (p. 28). In its own dramatically moribund terms at least, this uncompromisingly dull denouement is in perfect harmony with all that had preceded it.

*Joan of Hedington* is therefore considerably more intelligent, complex, and amusing than has formerly been acknowledged; and yet there is no denying that, overall, it fails to achieve its higher satiric and comic goals. For all the ingenuity of its conception and flashes of genuine humour, *Joan of Hedington* is finally too thin for the task for which it was intended, and too easily wears even thinner. This is largely due to the strategy that King chose to adopt, which is almost too droll, too cerebral, and too restrictive to be truly comical for very long. The deliberate cultivation of bathos is inherently prone to the dulness it seeks to parody, in that the single dimensional character of the basic joke makes it even more difficult to sustain than travesty once its cleverness has been appreciated. King’s use of low comic and mock-heroic devices does provide moments of light relief; but because his dramatic exercise remains subservient to the primary theme of false criticism, and so is not developed into a full-blooded burlesque play or farce in the manner of *The What D’ye Call It* or the later works of Fielding and Henry Carey, their
full potential is never realized. The clever idea of the mock-preface also remains
under-exploited; had he relied more heavily on pastiche-parody and written an Erasmian
mock-treatise on, so to speak, 'The Art of Sinking in Drama' - as indeed he does to
some extent in a few of his earlier works - more ironic options would have been open to
him. Once again his performance validates Swift's assessment of the limits of his talent,
and Henry Solomon's claim (as quoted at the very beginning of this thesis) that his
writings were the bud from which the brighter blooms of the Scriblerians sprang. On
these grounds at least it is perhaps appropriate that Joan of Hedington was one of the
last of his works to be published.

On the other hand, Joan of Hedington is not really a fitting epitaph. For King on
occasion wrote very much better than this; and perhaps the key to its relative failure lies
in the fact that in one important respect it represents a departure from the mode to which
his abilities were best suited, and in which he produced his finest work: the more
concentrated mode of pastiche-parody and personal satire. What King's lively if erratic
mind and art needed above all, it seems, was a specific target upon which to focus all his
exceptionally varied parodic abilities. To put it another way, King's was the art of the
caricaturist; the broader canvas of the history painter, or even of the 'genre' painter, was
much too large for him to fill. As subsequent analyses will show, his most successful
tracts are those which work directly from and upon particular works of particular
individuals, inventively extracting and manipulating their stylistic idiosyncrasies and
cultural, intellectual, and aesthetic abnormalities into even more ludicrous, sometimes
grotesque imitations of themselves. This 'peculiar' talent, with all its inherent strengths
and limitations, is latent even in his earliest and most ephemeral pieces, the
Menippeanized controversial and propaganda tracts, which are the subject of the
following chapter.
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Chapter Four

'Sometimes a Silly Academic': The Controversial Tracts and Pamphlets

Although they constitute a substantial part of his canon, King's political and controversial tracts are certainly the most neglected of his writings. This is doubtless due primarily to the fact that on the whole they are his least interesting and appealing works as well. The topical issues with which they are concerned are today of little interest to anyone other than historians; and this major aesthetic drawback is only occasionally compensated by the invention and humour that make his equally occasional burlesques on pedantry and virtuosity nonetheless enjoyable. King himself is reported by Browne to have been a somewhat reluctant controversialist, and to have much preferred scribbling his literary 'Trifles' to theo-political squabbling. Yet his staunch commitment to Toryism and high Anglicanism, and no doubt the prospect of literary recognition and patronage in the early years of William's reign, as well as the financial inducements offered by Harley and Bolingbroke in the latter years of Anne's, prompted him periodically to enter the controversial and propaganda lists, where his performances were of a typically-mixed quality. His contributions to this first great age of political journalism include a decidedly legalistic pamphlet on the question of the democratic rights and obligations of the different classes and groups of the London Corporation, An Essay on Civil Government, which he may have been commissioned to produce by the sitting Tory Lord Mayor in response to moves made by the Junto to remove the right of the City's freemen to elect their alderman. He also reportedly served briefly (perhaps even as the first editor) with The Examiner; and was almost certainly responsible for Rufinus, a partial translation of Claudian's poem on an infamous Roman general and traitor, which was clearly meant as an allegory on the recently disgraced Marlborough. This chapter, however, concentrates on his early conventional exercises in controversial banter and later ironic pamphlets, works which to varying degrees display, if only fleetingly, the
brilliant markings of his Menippean muse.

While each of the tracts to be analysed here was written specifically in response to another work, and therefore will be discussed mainly in terms of its occasional context, they were all produced against one of the most dramatic and dynamic political backdrops in English history. The years between the publication of King's earliest work and his death witnessed the second overthrow of a Stuart monarch; the accession of a Dutchman determined to embroil his newly-acquired kingdom in his continental wars against Louis XIV, which in turn sparked a financial revolution in the mid-1690s; and almost the entire reign of the last of the Stuarts, which was dominated by the bloodiest and most expensive war England had yet known, and passionate, sometimes violent domestic conflict between the rival political parties and factions in what has become known as 'the first age of party'. The events of 1688/89 generated a major ideological clash between the Whigs, with their 'Revolution Politicks' and moves towards the partial dismantling of the Anglican monopoly of power; and the Tories, who faced a profound dilemma in trying to reconcile the removal of James II with their continuing commitment to the cornerstones of the Tory ideology of order and authority, the doctrines of divine right, indefeasible hereditary succession, non-resistance, and passive obedience. This fundamental dialectic, as well as the particular political issues which emerged out of it - such as the oligarchic behaviour of the Junto, the Occasional Conformity debate, the 'Church in Danger' campaigns of Atterbury and the other high churchmen, and most explosive of all, the Sacheverell Controversy - are all in some way reflected in, or more directly related to, King's tracts against a diverse assortment of Catholic, radical, and low church opponents.4

The target of his first published work (written with the assistance of Edward Hannes while still at Christ Church) was Antoine Varillas, who in his capacity as the historian of the Royal Library of France had produced the first part of his *Histoire des Revolutions Arrivees dans l'Europe en matiere de Religion* in late December, 1685.5 Already notorious (even amongst his own compatriots) for his shoddy brand of
historiography, Varillas only confirmed his uneviable reputation by this obviously biased and badly researched account of the pre-Lutheran reformers, Wycliffe and Huss. His history is tellingly described by the editors of the Biographie Universelle: 'Son style, quoique incorrect, parut vif, piquant et très-agréable'. He is guilty, the entry continues, of numerous inaccuracies and distortions, and most alarmingly, of statements which are 'entièremenent controuvés, puisque les manuscrits dont l'auteur prétendait les avoir tirés n'avaient jamais existé que dans sa tête'. Nevertheless, its propaganda value to James II and his Catholic supporters was perceived to be considerable, and Dryden, as the then Poet Laureate, was apparently commanded to prepare a translation, which was prematurely announced by Jacob Tonson in the Stationers' Register on 20 April, 1686. This immediately provoked a vigorous Protestant response, notably from Gilbert Burnet, whose Reflections on Mr. Varillas's History of Heresies, together with Daniel de Larroque's Nouvelles Accusations contre Varillas, ou Remarques critiques contre une partie de son Histoire de l'heresie, revealed error after error in Varillas's work (which perhaps explains why Dryden never completed his translation).

King's Reflections upon Mr. Varillas His History of Heresy...As far as Relates to Wicliff, published sometime in 1688, therefore represents only a minor contribution to a fairly major controversy; and indeed may owe its publication more to a separate if related series of incidents at Oxford concerning the succession to the Deanery of Christ Church. The death in July, 1686, of John Fell had provided James II with the opportunity to appoint John Massey, a Catholic outsider, to the vacant post. Massey's appointment was just one of a number of moves made by James and his Catholic advisors intended to Romanize the University, a policy which was to culminate in the dramatic events at Magdelan College in 1687, when a number of Fellows were expelled for refusing to accept as their President the royal nominee and crypto-Catholic Bishop of Oxford, Samuel Parker. It was a policy consistent with James's attempts generally to break the Anglican monopoly on public offices by removing such barriers as the Test Act, and it was bound to alienate the predominantly Anglican community of Oxford.
When Massey arrived at Christ Church in December, 1686, bearing a royal dispensation 'from comming to prayers, receiving the sacrament, taking of all oathes, and other duties belonging to him as deane', the response of the college was predictable. Wood reports the younger scholars 'laughing and girning and making a May-Game of the matter', though the canons were 'grave'. Massey's private services were interrupted by mocking students, among them Atterbury and quite probably King. His tenure was to be short, unpopular, if relatively unexciting, marked only by a drastic fall in the number of admissions to the college, and the ringing of Tom Tower's bells to announce the birth of James's son. He fled to France when the success of the Revolution became apparent.

The chief agent behind Massey's appointment was Obadiah Walker, an early convert to Catholicism and the Master of University College. Among the many new privileges allowed to Catholics was the freedom to publish their own literature, and Walker began to print (initially on the University press in the Sheldonian) a series of Roman tracts on a variety of religious and political themes. These writings, which had Massey's backing, were (according to G.V. Bennett) 'badly produced and poorly argued', and quickly inspired an Anglican response centred in Christ Church, organized by the man originally believed to be Fell's logical replacement, Henry Aldrich. Aldrich's own pamphlet on the Eucharist was soon followed by a treatise entitled *Church Government Part V* by Smalridge, and Atterbury's *A Discourse concerning the Spirit of Martin Luther*. It is not too implausible to speculate that King's tract - which he claims in the advertisement was written in response to a public request to all those 'in whose way it should lye to expose Mr. Varillas' - may originally have been 'his Share' of Aldrich's campaign, to which his old schoolmates had already contributed.

King's primary objective was straightforward and twofold: the defence of England's first great religious reformer against the false accusations of the Catholic historian; and in the process, the further justification of the Anglican compromise in all its prevailing theological and political manifestations. Embedded in his answers to Varillas's statements are pointed comments on such major contemporary issues as the question of
the succession and the nature of the relationship between the monarch and the parliament. The traditional English constitutional balance between the rights and duties of the Commons and the royal prerogative is reaffirmed in his observation that - despite what Varillas would have his readers believe - the English monarch was not as limited as 'the Doge of Venice', but rather possesses 'enough Power by Law to make him as great as he can wish; though he suffers his Parliament to maintain their just Privileges at another rate than the long disus'd Estates of a neighbouring Kingdom'(p. 426).

At the same time, Reflections represents King's first treatment of a theme that was to become central to most of his subsequent satires, namely the abuse of literature and learning. In this case, of course, his concern is the obligations and proprieties of the historian, which Varillas by his mixture of unsubstantiated anecdotes, misinterpretations, and apparent fabrications, had wilfully ignored in the interests of propaganda. The principal duty of the historian, he observes, is the pursuit of truth, a necessarily scholarly task which entails the establishment of facts from sources (to which he himself is constantly careful to refer), and precludes the sort of imaginative creativity displayed by Varillas, who 'takes all the Liberties of a Poet' (p. 463). Noting that the author of The Hind and the Panther was to have been Varillas's translator, he remarks that the French historian is therefore the mirror image of the English Laureate, who in his poetic propaganda 'has aim'd at all the Plainness and Gravity of an Historian'. The writing of history, King concludes,

is indeed a serious matter...not to be written carelessly like a Letter to a Friend; nor with a Passion, like a Billet to a Mistress; nor with Biass, like a Declamation for a Party at the Bar, or the Remonstrance of a Minister for his Prince; nor in fine, by a Man unacquainted with the World, like Soliloquies and Meditations. It requires a long Experience, a sound Judgement, a close Attention, an unquestionable Integrity, and a Stile without Affectation (pp. 463-64).

The revelation of the ineptitude and fraudulence of official Catholic historiography would thus have the desired effect of proving the rightness and righteousness of England's moderate reformation and existing theo-political structures, a strategy exemplified in King's response to Varillas's attempt to implicate Wycliffe in the Peasants' Revolt:
Wycliff’s Preaching had more relation to this Rebellion, than the Edition of Confucious in France had to be the Sufferings of the Hugonots, or than Mr Varillas’s Conclusions are us’d to have to his Premises. ’Tis well known by all Men of Judgement and Reading, that Wycliff always defended Order and Distinction; that he himself took his Degree of Doctor, and that his Friends and Patrons were of the Nobility; and that all his Troubles took their rise from his Zeal in maintaining the Supremacy of his Prince: so far was he from being Author of the Tumult against him (pp. 440-41).

The Wycliffe King describes is plainly a prototype Anglican, concerned as a good cleric should be with maintaining the existing hierarchy, and especially the sacred bond between church and monarch. There could be no firmer reaffirmation of the basic tenets of the Tory ideology of order and authority.

In order to make his controversial offering still more palatable for his Anglican audience, in the manner of Marvell and Eachard (and ultimately Erasmus) King adds to it liberal sprinklings of the sweetener of ironic humour, together with a measure of sarcastic tartrate. When Varillas unaccountably insists that two Stephens have been kings of England, for example, King is not only quick to point out the glaring mistake, but also prepared ironically to put the blame on mystical forces: ‘Sure he penn’d this Passage at a certain Season, when they say Men are us’d to see double’ (pp. 423-24). Characteristically once he has his teeth in the Frenchman’s factually flabby flesh, he is unwilling to release him without first giving him a good, patriotic shake:

Who ever heard of King Stephen the Second of England? Who was his Wife? What Children had he? What did he do? Which King of France did he beat? Where was he buried? ’Tis a Miracle that all this should escape the World; and whilst we, the ignorant, thought there never had been any more than one Stephen, Mr Varillas should produce another (p. 424).

Varillas’s tendency to invent evidence also induces witty comment (e.g., p. 436), as does his attempt to prove that Wycliffe’s death was an act of divine retribution. Varillas’s ‘fatal Palsy’ is shown to have actually been a disease from which Wycliffe had long suffered; and in any case, King adds facetiously, if ‘the Monks were resolv’d not to let him die without a Prodigy, it would have seem’d much more plausible and taking, had they inflicted upon him the Rickets, or the Small-pox’ (pp. 460-61). As errors mount
up, King pretends to recognize that on occasion Varillas is actually not as stupid as he would appear, but on the contrary both self-aware and mathematically ingenious:

Now I begin to have some hopes of our Author; for I see he knows himself so well, as not to rely upon his own Relation laid down before; and Mr Varillas will not believe Mr Varillas. He guesses again, and thinks 'tis here, as in Arithmetick, where two false Suppositions may produce a Truth (pp. 427-28).

When Varillas is discovered to have only half the number of assasins of Thomas a'Beckett, the mock excuse is again mathematical: 'I am the more willing to excuse him for being too short in this account, because he allows for it in the Two Stephens' (p. 427). On the same note, the Frenchman's ignorance of the real events and leading figures of the Peasants' Revolt is defended on the grounds that his intentions were quite possibly parabolic and fabulous:

Mr Varillas mentioned above, that the Archbishop was beheaded in his Palace; and now assures us, that the Chancellor was murdered in the Tower, either forgetting what he had told us before (p. 28) that both those Dignities were in one Person, Sudbury; or designing to deter People from Ambition and a desire of Plurality in high Offices, by shewing that a Man must undergo as many several Deaths as he holds Preferments; and in this Example, that the same Person was first put to death in his Spiritual Capacity of Archbishop, and again Massacred some time after for his Temporal Qualification of State-Minister (p. 445).

When Varillas similarly confuses the date of the death of Archbishop Courtney, King suggests that perhaps 'he died twice, in imitation of his Predecessor Sudbury' (p. 462).

Glaring infringements of the decorum of history writing compound the Frenchman's crimes against verisimilitude, particularly in terms of his habit of romanticizing his narrative, as King points out in answer to the assertion that Edward III's mistress was a Spaniard, 'by name Alex Perez':

Having read that Wycliff was a Person of great Accomplishments, improv'd by Travel, and a large Conversation, I began to be afraid that Mr Varillas, who has an Ambition to improve all things into a Love-Intrigue, would have made the King's Mistress have a Design of Kindness upon him. But finding that he had fail'd me there, I began to bethink me who that Alex Perez might be, and whether 'twas true, that King Edward had fetch'd a Mistress out of the same Country that Duke John had brought his wife from. But who would suspect that this Court-Beauty, whom Varillas has dress'd up a l'Espagnole, should prove to be no body else, but our own Alse Pierce, English born, and English bred? (pp. 417-18).

King's blend of fact and facetiousness is typified by his demolition of the Frenchman's
version of the final episode in the political life of the mysterious pseudo-Iberian heroine, which had her fleeing back to Spain to avoid the cruel persecution of the English. His increasingly heavy irony and witty allusion to Cervantes's great mock-history and romantic parody reinforce his central argument that Varillas's so-called history is no more than the fictional creation of a quixotic lunatic:

Had he liv'd in the days of Knight-errantry, he would certainly have invited over to the Honourable Employment of Imperial Historiographer in the Court of Trebizond, and deserved a Pension extraordinary from his Highness Don Alphebo. Having here to do with a Female, he has acquitted himself extreme civilly, and much like a Gentleman, to re-conduct the strange Lady to her own Country, with all her Jewels and other stol'n Accoutrements. But our rough Historians deal more unkindly by her, and tell us, that by a Parliament at Westminster, Alice Pierce had all her Goods Confiscate, and herself banish'd, so as really to be left the Unfortunate Alix Peres (pp. 438-39).

If Reflections is hardly great literature, it is in some respects a harbinger of King's later work, revealing both an already well-trained, logical mind and a ready wit capable of some genuinely amusing passages, which enliven what would otherwise be a tedious exercise. It is the work of a good lawyer and a better humorist and journalist, combining attention to detail and incisive argument with the spark and spirit necessary for popular consumption. It was evidently a considerable success within the Oxford Anglican community, and earned its young author something of a reputation, judging from a letter sent two years later from Dean George Hickes to Arthur Chartlett. 'I saw Milton's eiconclastis [sic] a month ago', Hickes writes, 'I wish some such man as Mr. King of Xi would answer it by way of animadversions, or reflexions'.13

Coincidentally, when King again assumed the mantle of animadverter, his opponent, though no Puritan, was in other respects a direct descendent of Milton, and a far more immediate threat to the Anglican establishment. The Anglo-Irishman, Robert Molesworth, was one of the most important radical thinkers of his day.14 The author of The Principles of a Real Whig and a self-confessed Commonwealthman, he was also the patron of the most famous Deist of the day, John Toland, and a frequenter of the
notorious Grecian Coffee House, where radical works by writers such as Giordano Bruno and Algenon Sidney were read and discussed.\textsuperscript{15} His friends and associates testify to his character and political views. In a letter to Locke dated 11 September, 1697, William Molyneux informed the great contractualist that he was 'here happy in the friendship of an honourable person, Mr Molesworth, who is an hearty admirer and acquaintance of yours. We never meet but we remember you; he sometimes comes into my house, and tells me, 'tis not to pay a visit to me, but to pay his devotion to your image that is in my dining room'.\textsuperscript{16} Locke replied in an almost equally effusive fashion, asking Molyneux to return his 'acknowledgements' to Molesworth in 'the civilest language you can find', and expressing his disappointment at being unable to benefit from an 'acquaintance with so ingenious and extraordinary a man as he is'.\textsuperscript{17}

As one of William's most trusted adherents, Molesworth was appointed Ambassador to Denmark in 1692, a position he held until a series of incidents in which he was involved caused such offence to the Danish court that he was effectively declared \textit{persona non grata}. Leaving Denmark abruptly early in 1694, he spent some time in Flanders where he wrote \textit{An Account of Denmark as It was in the Year 1692}, which was published soon after his return to London.\textsuperscript{18} Ostensibly his book belongs to the same literary category as, say, Sir William Temple's much-praised \textit{Observations Upon the United Provinces of the Netherlands}, the principal generic requirement of which was a somewhat detailed account of a particular foreign country's history and contemporary state of affairs, and its people's distinctive characteristics and culture.\textsuperscript{19} \textit{The Gentleman's Journal} of November, 1693, accordingly described it as an excellent treatise on travel and education, and advertisements for it twice appeared in Dunton's \textit{Athenian Mercury} in March, 1694.\textsuperscript{20} In reality, however, it is a highly critical examination of Danish society, the intention being to reveal that something had become very rotten as a result of its adoption of absolutism in the middle of the seventeenth century. More importantly, the \textit{Account} represents a significant contribution to the political literature of the immediate post-Revolution period in England, and is basically a
radical attempt to influence the Revolution settlement. Its real targets are the Court politicians and the Anglican establishment, and its central theme is that liberty is essential to the economic, political, religious, and epistemological well-being of the nation. As he makes clear in the preface, his observations of Denmark amount to a case study of the political and economic effects of absolutism, a plague which the English were so recently spared, but which certain sections of English society still seemed intent on introducing. Significantly, to emphasise his point he resorts to the modern variation introduced by certain seventeenth-century political theorists on the traditional analogy of the body politic to the human body: 21

Want of Liberty is a Disease in any Society or Body Politick, like want of Health in a particular Person; and as the best way to understand the nature of any Distemper aright, is to consider it in several Patients, since the same Disease may proceed from different causes, so the disorders in Society are best perceived by observing the Nature and Effects of them in our several Neighbours: Wherefore Travel seems to be useful to his country, as practicing upon other mens Distempers is to make an able Physician: For although a man may see too frequently the misery of such as are depriv'd of health without quitting his own Country, yet (thanks to Providence) he must go out of these Kingdoms who would know experimentally the want of Public Liberty (sig. a2 - a2v).

The study of politics is thus empirical and comparative: to teach their sons this branch of science, parents should send them abroad, so that the evils of foreign despotism might be measured against the 'freedom and ease' of their 'home Constitution' (sig. a3). To avoid their developing into the decadent Francophiles who so often returned from the Grand Tour, Molesworth suggests that they be sent to Denmark, where the splendour that clouds Louis's tyranny is not to be seen.

Molesworth is especially scathing in his criticism of the high Anglican clergy, particularly as regards the effect their teachings have on the liberty of their students and parishioners. Education is the 'very Foundation stones of the Public Liberty', he claims, but the priests, with whom the 'restored Learning of Europe is principally log'd', have used their influence to serve their own ends by propagating a 'pernicious Doctrine [i.e. passive obedience] with all the success they themselves could desire' (sig. b2 -b3v). University education, he writes, has tended to be merely 'a training up in the Knowledge
of Words and Languages:

whilst the weightier Matters of true Learning, whereof one has occasion every hour; such as good Principles, Morals, the improvement of Reason, the love of Justice, the value of Liberty, the duty owning to one's Country and the Laws, are either omitted, or slightly passed over: Indeed they forget not to recommend frequently to them what they call the Queen of all Virtues, viz. submission to Superiors, and an entire blind obedience to Authority, without instructing them in the due measures of it, rather teaching them that tis without all bounds: thus the Spirits of Men are from the beginning inured to Subjection, and deprived of the right Notion of a generous and legal Freedom; which among them (so hardly are the Prejudices of Education shaken off) grow sensible of, till they become of some Age and Maturity, or have unlearn'd by good Company and Travel those dangerous passive Doctrines they suck'd in at the Schools and Universities: but most have the misfortune to carry these slavish Opinions with them to their Graves (sig. b3v - b4).

As long as 'the Ecclesiasticks...keep not only the Education of the Youth, but the Consciences of old Men in their Hands'(sig. b6v), he continues, English society and the advancement of English learning will be threatened.

If there was much in Molesworth's polemical preface to annoy English conservatives, there was also much in the Account itself to offend the Danish monarch, a brother of whom also happened to be a member of the English royal family (i.e. Prince George, the husband of the then Princess Anne). While the present king and queen are treated quite sympathetically (e.g., p. 149), their forebears are frequently accused of either weakness or gross ambition, the two factors which had brought about the destruction of the earlier and, to some extent, elective monarchy (pp. 54-57). This theme of the benefits of elective monarchy is one of Molesworth's favourities. He notes that, while the first son was generally preferred as the next in line, should he prove tyrannical the Danes were within their ancient rights to depose and even 'destroy' him, at which time a new man, perhaps 'the valiant Man that had exposed himself so far as to undertake the Expulsion or the killing of the Tyrant' (p. 43), would be chosen. It is not difficult to recognise the similarity between such circumstances and those of 1688.

Absolute monarchy, according to Molesworth, has been an enormous blow to Danish society, not just in terms of abstractions such as rights and freedom, but in practical and particularly economic terms as well. Absolutism, he claims, is synonymous with heavy taxation, which in turn leads to a lack of initiative on the part of
the farmers and peasants, causing lower levels of production and, finally, poverty (pp 10, 86-87). Absolutism also restricts trade: were Copenhagen a 'free city', he ventures, it would be the Mart and Staple of all the Traffick in the Baltick '(p. 13). Before the change to 'arbitrary government', shipping tolls had been 'an easie contribution which Merchants chose to pay for their own Convenience, and whereof the King...was only Treasurer or Trustie, to see it fairly laid out for the common use', but since then it had grown to become 'a heavy imposition upon Trade, as well as a kind of servile acknowledgement of his Sovereignty of those Seas' (pp. 21-22). The relative prosperity of Jutland is used as evidence to support his claim that those provinces furthest away from the seat of arbitrary government are most likely to thrive (pp. 30-31). Even the state of the buildings is directly related to the nature of the government, the only decent ones being those constructed when the monarchy was 'neither Hereditary nor Absolute' (pp. 14-15). Christians living in Turkey, he argues with some irony, despite the heavy taxation imposed upon them because of their faith, actually fared better than those in Denmark, who did not have the same opportunity to alleviate their financial hardship by surrendering their children to the Turkish authorities to be raised as Muslims (Account, pp 262 - 63). Colourful metaphors help to drive home the point; whereas the older type of king lived on the 'Revenues of his own Estate, and eat not through the Sweat of his Subjects Brows' (p. 46), the common people 'have since experienced, that the little Finger of an Absolute Prince can be heavier than the Loyns of many Nobles' (p. 73). He admits that law and order are better maintained under absolute monarchy, but only because it is in the king's own interest to ensure social stability, 'for the same reason that Folks kill Vermine in Dove-Houses' (p. 239).

As regards religion and education, Molesworth is no less critical of the new Denmark. Previously, he remembers, the nation had produced 'very Learned Men, such as the famous Mathematician Tycho Brahe', but now 'Learning is at a very low Ebb', despite the fact that 'Latin is more commonly spoken by the Clergy than with us' (p. 255). Even English religious oppression pales besides the situation prevailing in
Denmark, where there is only a state religion, with all its political evils. Because the Church is 'entirely dependent on the Crown, and the People absolutely governed by the Priests in matters of Conscience...the Prince may be as arbitrary as he pleases, without running any risque from his Subjects' (pp. 250-51). Denmark is thus a state characterized by total uniformity in opinion, devoid of 'Enthusiasts, Mad-men, Natural Fools or fanciful Folks', where people tread the 'ordinary beaten road of sense...without deviation to the right or left' (p. 257). There are no 'Seditious, Mutinies, or Libels against the Government, but all the People either are or appear to be Lovers of their King, notwithstanding their ill treatment, and the hardships they groan under' (p. 246). But such stability, he insists, dull and dangerous in itself, is really due to everyone's being equally heavily taxed, so that the envy which causes the oppressed to rebel is not present (p. 246). Molesworth is therefore back on the track of conspiracy, not just that which gave rise to Danish absolutism, but that which maintains it, through the Church, the educational institutions, and the military. Denmark is indeed, according to Molesworth, a 'miserable sick Debauchee', whose festering political sores are all too apparent beneath its garish royal robes.

In England, An Account of Denmark soon became one of the most cherished works among those defending the "natural blessing" of liberty, being reissued in English at least nine times up to 1756, and establishing a place in a tradition that included the works of Milton, James Harrington, Algenon Sidney, and Locke.22 Steele for one believed that 'nothing can be better writ' than Molesworth's 'very accurate' Account, 'or more instructive to any one that values Liberty, than the Narrative of that Tragedy in that excellent Treatise'.23 Praised by Bayle and others in France and Germany, it was also translated several times into French, German, and Dutch.24 Not surprisingly, however, it aroused considerable anger in Denmark, and a formal complaint was quickly lodged by the Danish ambassador, Mogens Skeel, along with a request that the book be publicly burnt by the hangman and those responsible for its writing and publication severely punished. Probably because Molesworth had effectively operated as William III's spy in
Denmark, though, no official action was ever brought against him, and the Danish authorities (apparently with some hesitancy on the part of Skeel) resolved upon a literary campaign against the book instead. Presumably it was King's reputation for ironic controversy among the high church establishment (which was also no doubt keen to see Molesworth charges refuted) and his recent admission to the nearby Doctors' Commons which led the Danes to commission him to assist them in the enterprise. According to his own account of events, he was approached by Iver Brink, the pastor of the Danish Lutheran Church in London, who with Skeel supplied the various data that was to inform the defence of Denmark.\(^{25}\) In May Brink wrote to a friend in Copenhagen to tell him that the book was progressing well, and in August it finally appeared bearing the title *Animadversions on a Pretended Account of Denmark*.\(^{26}\)

In the opinion of Paul Ries, King's 'immediate object' was 'to create an image of "Molesworth the Monster" which, it was hoped, would distract the readers' attention from the substance of his book, but outside Denmark this strategy failed'.\(^{27}\) While it is certainly true that King does not shrink from personal attacks on his opponent (particularly over the issue of his premature departure from his post), his obvious readiness to meet Molesworth's arguments and the often impressive store of counter evidence he provides suggest that distraction from the substance of Molesworth's book was in fact far from his mind. Molesworth's 'Old Whiggism' and the ill manners he had shown towards his former hosts genuinely affronted King's own values and beliefs; and so far as the validity of Molesworth's picture of Denmark's recent history and current situation was concerned, he could only rely on the factual details and denials supplied to him by Brink and Skeel. He fully appreciated that the Commonwealthman's remarks, whether in connection with Denmark or the situation in England, demanded the most responsible and convincing refutation, particularly in view of the concern expressed in both the Danish and English royal families. The whole question of the propriety and merit of a strong monarchy, in terms of both its relative economic performance and guarantee of civil rights, is tackled by means of the usual array of Tory arguments in the
preface, which mirrors Molesworth's in its concentration on the English political scene. King notes, for example, that the 'Jus Divinum of Kings and Princes was a Notion in the Northern Parts of the World, long before these later Ages of Slavery; that is, before Milton ever wrote, or England suffer'd under the Tyranny of a Commonwealth'. 'Passive Obedience', he continues bluntly,

*as stated by Reverend and Learned Divines, though it should still be maintained by them under their present Majesties, would be more suitable to Sovereign Authority, and the Welfare of these Nations, than any Doctrins since coined; For the Ecclesiasticks, established by the Laws of this Realm, are so far from having an Interest separate from, and opposite to the Publick,...that no Persons have defended the true Constitution of the English Government, with greater Temper and Hazards (sig. A8 - A8v).*

Furthermore, the king's prerogative is 'kept sacred' by the English Constitution, through the Lords and the Commons each have a role to play in government (sig. A8v). When the rights of any of these parts of the English political whole 'have been encroached upon', King insists that 'the English Clergy have in all Ages made a vigorous stand, and the publick Liberty has been so dear to them, that many of them have sacrificed their own Freedom to it' (pp A8v - a).

This profoundly conservative line runs right through the *Animadversions*, displaying itself most graphically in a classic restatement of the traditional 'argument by correspondence' as laid down by such authorities as Hooker:28

> It is very probable, that the original of Parliaments in general, is not so much owing to any particular Nation, as to Nature itself. And for the due and firm constitution of the Government, I take it be by King, Lords, and Commons; I look no further than the Body natural, (viz.) that of man, the most Divine part of the Creation; and there I find the head dignified with exceeding Power, Command, and Honour; there are other members, which being most useful to the principal part, are exalted to a particular preferency, and a third sort, inferior and less useful, which through their weakness &c. seem liable to contempt and neglect, and consequently to grievances; so it is but meet for them to have recourse to their Superiors, to set forth their wants, and likewise to declare their willingness, so far as in them lies, to contribute towards the Support of the whole; and it seems not unreasonable that it should be thus in the State, since we find St Paul to the Corinthians, most admirably describing it to be so in the Church; where having first made Christ the Head, and secondly constituted Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, he yet further in the third place, makes every particular Christian come in for a share as member, *That there should be no Schism in the body, but the members should have the same care for the other, and whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it* (pp. 57-58).
The crucial difference between King's use of the body politic/body natural analogy and Molesworth's is that the former turns naturally to the Scriptures, and to a priori reasoning based on the most fundamental premises of Christian Humanism and Restoration Toryism. Just as the mind is superior to the body (especially the lower regions of it), so too is the monarch naturally superior to the Commons and the mob it represents. When Molesworth refers to the 'monster' of absolutism, King answers, 'if I were to have a Monster, I would rather have one that is all Head and no Body, than such a one as he would make, which is all Body and no Head' (p. 166). Not that he was necessarily advocating arbitrary government as the only sensible form of government: a monster was still a monster in any form. He concedes that the 'nature' of absolutism is such as potentially to impose 'several inconveniences in respect of the People', and to tempt monarchical encroachment upon civil liberties, but a 'wise and good King' will ensure the security and well-being of his subjects, and thus bring glory to himself (p. 76). In Denmark's case, he points out, absolute power was not handed to the king 'till the necessity for it was unavoidable' (p. 71); and in any case, the king is rightfully subject to certain Scriptural laws (p. 68).

As in the case of Reflections, King's legal training is manifest in the quality of his argument, especially in the variety of approaches he takes in the course of his rebuttal. He is quick to spot contradictions in his opponent's argument (e.g., p. 162), and to accuse him of distorting truth out of spite (e.g., p.123). Those of Molesworth's points that are factually true but which demand some justification are dealt with either by admitting the case while emphasizing the rarity of its occurrence (e.g, pp 122-23, in relation to the Poll Tax), or by arguing that since the same applies in England it is disingenuous to criticize the Danes, in whose country things are often a good deal better (as in the case of the city's sanitation, p. 18). Elsewhere he qualifies Denmark's high military expenditure by pointing to the actualities of European politics, in particular French expansionism, in the process again cleverly twisting to his own advantage one of Molesworth's charges (pp. 145-47). Some matters are defended by insisting that what
applies to the English should not necessarily be grafted on to the Danes, whose temperament, traditions, constitution, and even appetite are quite different (e.g., pp. 10, 117). Like a good politician, he also resorts to, as it were, an official secrets policy, excusing himself from broaching rather delicate matters for fear of endangering the outcome of certain negotiations (e.g., 165-66). And he offers an alternative account and interpretation of the events which led to the formation of the absolutist regime (pp. 77-89).

He answers Molesworth’s charges regarding the state of Danish learning in the same fashion in which they had been levelled, by placing education within its political context, and by direct and oblique reference to the English situation. The advancement of learning, he stresses, has not suffered through absolutism; on the contrary, royal ‘encouragement’ and funding has ensured that the standard of Danish education and research remains high (p. 192). He points to the Danish excellence in the sciences and the arts, paying particular attention to the ‘admirable’ museum in Copenhagen stocked with the ‘exquisite Rarities of Art and nature’, and to the ‘Closet’ of the ‘learned’ Olaus Wormius (p. 22). Church steeples, organs, the ‘Kings Statue on Horseback’ in the ‘Kings New Market’, and notably the library of the University are alluded to enthusiastically (pp. 21-23); while the subject of Danish literature is considered at some length (though the information is apparently copied ‘almost word for word’ from Borrichius’s Dissertationes). Though at one point he seems intent on distancing literature and ‘gentiler Learning’ from politics and ‘Satyrs’, (p. 22) he nevertheless immediately informs his readers that the great museum and library belong to the king. Education, in both its direct and broader sense, is the duty of clerics, whose principal task was to teach ‘such due obedience as the Gospel enjoyns’ (p. 175). The results in Denmark are a ‘Union and Harmony of Religion throughout the Whole Kingdom’ (p. 175), and genuine political stability. The uniformity of Danish opinion that alarms Molesworth is thus redefined as a harmonious ideal only achievable when Church and state are bound inextricably to promote civil obedience while guaranteeing the lawful
rights of the people. The current Denmark, then, is a place where the political head
governs wisely to prevent 'Schism in the body', and might indeed serve as a guide to
Englishmen as to the wisdom and righteousness of non-resistance, passive obedience,
divine hereditary right, and the royal prerogative.

Such was the nature and significance of King's brief that the earnest aspect of
Animadversions is inevitably more prominent than in Reflections. Yet here again his
witty irony and humour is employed to good effect, particularly in the somewhat
Lucianic preface addressed 'To Mr M---', a sustained ironic argument in the manner of
More's Epistle to Martin Dorp refuting the prevailing belief that Molesworth was the
author of the Account. It is surely impossible, he writes, that a man of 'so great a
collective in the World' and with a 'Reputation so Universal' could be responsible for
such a tract, adding that only those out to 'injure' him could circulate such a travesty:
'for certainly a man of such settled Principles as you are, of thoughts so sedate and
composed, would never expose any thing to the publick View, which, you would not set
your Name to' (sig. A2). He claims that it is inconceivable that 'a Gentleman of your
Parts would write so tedious a preface' by spending numerous pages on 'things that
were granted by the Author's great-grand-mother' (sig. A3); nor would so complete a
gentleman insist that one could learn more about political philosophy and manners from
the Asians or the 'man-eaters and savage Americans' than the European classical
authors. Above all, he stresses, Molesworth would never suggest that the education of
the 'Nobility and Gentry' be placed in the hands of philosophers rather than priests (sig.
A4v - A5), for he would be fully aware that the Bible is an even better book than
'Tully's Offices' as the basis of moral teaching. He alludes to a number of incidents
which had offended the Danish king involving a certain 'Envoy' to Denmark, who, he
notes, had effectively been denied access to the king as a result, and had then left
Denmark in contravention of protocol. Accordingly, he was not given the usual 'Present
for Envoys', which, King speculates, explains the spite in the Account. Yet, he
concludes with mock sincerity, 'I would not, Sir, believe anything like this of you' (sig.
The wry, sometimes sarcastic asides and odd moments of jesting in the main body of the work again show King's kinship with the other Restoration exponents of controversial banter. His reply to Molesworth's claim that no-one rides a sled or crosses a new bridge before the king does, and that even Copenhagen's clocks are not allowed to strike the hours unless the Court clock has done so, is a typical instance:

If these Remarks were but as True, as they are Nice, they would be admirable; but as soon as the Snow comes every one Presumes to use his Sled, the Diversion of it indeed is become more fashionable, when the King and Court have done it one night through Copenhagen. As for new Bridges, some of them might drop down again without any Passage over them, if no one were to go till the King had done it: in the mean time our Author must provide Ferries for the Passengers; the Clocks of Copenhagen must be the most complaisant in the world; otherwise if some traitorous Clocks should chance to go fast, they might make an exception to a rule so universal. I like this Account our Author gives us of Precedency in such ridiculous matters most extremely, because having been searching according to his advice among the Barbarians, I find something like it at the Savage Court of Monomotape, where the Emperor having dined, commands a Trumpet to be sounded, to give notice to the rest of the Princes of the World, that they may go to Dinner (pp. 125-26).

In relation to Molesworth's claim that the relatively prosperous island of Amack had been incorporated into Denmark to the great cost of its predominantly Dutch residents, King first asserts that the Dutch constituted only a small minority of the population, before aiming a heavily ironic blow at the European state which embodied Moleworth's republican ideal, in the process cleverly twisting Molesworth's comments on the nature of the common Danish diet against him:

Now 'tis very hard, that a free people bred in a Commonwealth, as North Holland is, where they lie under no Impositions, have no Excises, should be betrayed into a Country, where there is a necessity of their paying Taxes; that they should be reduced to powdered Beef and stubble Geese, like common Danes; whereas, at home in the seat of Liberty, they could have Regaled themselves and Families with a Red herring one day, White-herring another, and Pickled-herring a third, for greater change and delicacy (pp. 39-40).

On occasion his banter takes on a somewhat macabre tone, as when he computes the number of Danish kings who have been deposed, banished, murdered, and 'formally Executed', an exercise eventually concluded by the observation that Molesworth's chapter 'gives us the very image of the Describers own thoughts and inclinations, and
shows us what sort of King, a Commonwealths man may perhaps condescend to make, and then how many particular ways and means, he can find out to dispatch him' (pp., 65-66, 76). He reserves his darkest humour for the end, when - in a passage which to a small degree anticipates *A Modest Proposal* - he answers Molesworth's near heretical and highly insulting statement that Islamic Turkey was kinder to its Christian subjects than Lutheran Denmark by extending his opponent's apparent argument in favour of financial expediency over ethical responsibility to its absurd conclusions:

I profess upon reading this Paragraph, I enquired how many Children were starved every week in *Copenhagen*; and whither there was not greater quantities that died for want throughout all *Sealand*; I ask'd whither there was not an abundance of famish'd Infants, that their Parents would be glad to part with for Skeletons, upon reasonable terms: But being resolv'd that there was Pap and Milk-porridge, and the like, in those places; and that the Children when they cried, had as much Bread and Butter as is usual in other Countries, I resolv'd with my self, that my Children should rather go to *Danmark*, with all its conveniences, than be circumcised or made Eunuchs, upon the hopes of coming one day to be Caimacan, or Grand Visier. I wonder most, how our Author ever came to like *Turky*, since I do not find, that he has any hopes or reassurances from the *Mufti*, that any Rebellion shall be raised there speedily (pp. 198-99).

It was this combination of ideological purity, close argument, and occasional flashes of ironic wit which ensured that for a time *Animadversions* enjoyed a fair degree of popularity both at home and abroad, even though the continued popularity of Molesworth's book in England and on the continent meant that it had plainly failed in its main objective. If *Reflections* had brought its young author to the attention of prominent members of the Oxonian community, its successor surely established him as one of the brightest of the new generation of gentlemen wits within the capital. The establishment's response was perhaps expressed by William Bishop, who, in a letter to Arthur Chartlett, suggested that the book was likely to 'trouble y'Gentlem' He answers': though he also noted that 'there is one main objection ag'st the D' viz His not being ever in Denmark.' As we have seen, the work also earned him royal and ecclesiastical applause and rewards in both Denmark and England, and was translated into French, German, and Dutch, the only occasion King was ever accorded such an honour. In this respect at least, *Animadversions* must be considered one of his most important achievements.
Yet despite such encouragement, he was never to compose another major controversial work again. For the next fifteen odd years he preferred the much more enjoyable sport of burlesque poetry and satires on abuses of learning; and when he was finally induced back into the political fray towards the end of the first decade of the new century, his contribution to what had become a raging conflict was relatively meagre. Reportedly recruited to the ranks of the Tory wits assembled by Harley and Bolingbroke to counter the Whig propaganda of the Kit-Cats, he seems to have been incapable of fulfilling whatever expectations his managers apparently had of him, at least in terms of producing a sustained effort as a political journalist. Only *Rufinus* in any way represents a substantial piece of work; and even this remains essentially little more than a compound of a partial translation of Claudian’s original work and a brief historical essay, a task he would not have found too arduous. He did, however, produce a small number of ironic pamphlets, all of which to varying degrees touch upon the major theo-political issues generated by the actions of the Whig Junto during the first decade of the eighteenth century, which came to head with the impeachment and trial of the high church demagogue, Dr Henry Sacheverell. In the midst of this increasing turmoil and the enormous propaganda war it gave rise to, King singled out for special attention a trio of notable low church clerics, each of whom had published tracts which in some way had endorsed the practices and policies of the Whig regime.

Perhaps the earliest of his pamphlets was ‘An Answer to Clemens Alexandrinus’s Sermon’, a very minor piece occasioned by the publication of an oration delivered by White Kennett at the funeral of William Cavendish, Duke of Devonshire, a Whig grandee and a notorious gambler and debauchee. According to his most recent biographer, Kennett’s sermon was delivered at a time when he was striving to gain ecclesiastical preferment, and against a backdrop of high church suspicions that the low churchmen were attempting to stack the episcopal benches with sympathisers. A former high churchman who had changed sides to become one of the leading figures in the
Convocation battles of the early eighteenth century, he was a firm supporter of Marlborough; and it was probably through the offices of Sarah Churchill and the Duke of Sunderland that he had been appointed royal Chaplain in June, 1707. Following his sermon he was made first Dean, and eventually Bishop, of Peterborough.37

It was galling enough for the Tories that in his address Kennett took the opportunity to praise senior Whigs for their opposition to 'Arbitrary Government', and attempted to discount the Duke's dissolute past by emphasizing his supposed death-bed repentance. But what made the address especially odious were Kennett's warning that a last minute repentance was in itself no guarantee of salvation, all too often being 'the Plank after Shipwrack, whereon if one or two escape, it is little Comfort for others in a Storm to expect the like Deliverance';38 and his uncharitable assertion that this spiritual spar was almost exclusively the property of the privileged:

This rarely happens but in Men of distinguish'd Sence and Judgement. Ordinary Abilities may be altogether sunk by a long Vitious Course of Life. The duller Flame is easily extinguish'd: The meaner sinful Wretches are commonly given up to a Reprobate Mind, and die as stupidly as they lived; while the nobler and brighter Parts have an Advantage of Understanding the Worth of their Soul before they resign it. If they are allow'd the Benefit of Sickness, they commonly awake out of their Dream of Sin, and reflect and look upward.39

Such remarks cut directly against the patristic tradition of high Anglicanism, and particularly the teachings of one of the most admired of all the Fathers, Clement of Alexandria. Responding to Mark's warning that it was easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven, Clement stresses that through acts of charity and the appreciation of their social responsibility the wealthy too would be 'blessed by the Lord and called poor in spirit'.40 'Salvation', he preaches, 'does not depend upon outward things, whether...small or great, splendid or lowly, glorious or many, but upon the soul's virtue, upon faith, hope, love, brotherliness, knowledge, gentleness, humility, and truth'. Thus any sinner could be saved, provided he 'implant love in his soul' and accept 'pure repentance'.41 In the eyes of the high churchmen, then, Kennett's sermon amounted to a blatant contradiction of the most
orthodox Christian doctrines purely for the purposes of Whig propaganda and personal preferment.

In response, King adopted the standard Lucianic strategy of impersonation and self-revelation, his satire taking the form of a brief mock-sermon which, by its incorporation of the most indicting extracts from Kennett's sermon, pretends to reaffirm the low church's doctrinal deviations and seemingly callous desertion of the very people whose interests the Whig party had in the past claimed to champion. The combination of allusion with the low comic features of colloquial names and images results in a sermon which cleverly travesties Kennett's original lesson, and suggests the rantings of the Tory stereotype of the dissenting minister. The following is representative:

I have before insinuated, that a good rich witty man may do anything but be damned. But I see some people pricking up their ears there. You, Goodman Two-shoes, and you, Gammer Two-shoes, and you, Tom Trap, and you, Dick Frost, and you, Goody Gurton, that have lain in straw ever since your bed was taken away for plunder in the civil wars; let me tell you, you are "poor stupid wretches;" your "duller flame will be more easily extinguished; you meaner sinful scrubs are generally given over to a reprobate mind;" your barley-bread and pease-pudding make you heavy and stupid: and, "if you do not take care, you will die as stupidly as you lived." Therefore look to it, and begin to repent as soon as you can; the sooner the better for you who are poor people. But Heaven forbid that I should preach this doctrine to you, Mr Alderman Occisi; or to you, Mr On-All the Recorder; to you, the worshipful Mr Justice Conform; or to you, my honoured patroness, Lady Mity! You are gentlefolks all; you are persons of greatest wit, and wealth, and ability, in this rich and ingenious corporation; whom I am glad to see at church now and then, as your leisure will permit you. I beseech you not to surmise that I mean the least part of this to your Honours. All I mean is this: "Ordinary abilities may be altogether sunk by a vicious course of life." But it is an undoubted maxim, "That persons of distinguished sense and judgement, by their nobler and brighter parts, have an advantage of understanding the worth of their souls before they resign them." Therefore, gentlefolks, I have reserved for you an expedient, called "A death-bed repentance" (III, p. 39-40).

Kennett's shipwreck metaphor affords King the chance to make the point with a sharp, facetious twist. 'After "you have made a shipwreck of a good conscience" ', the preacher informs his congregation,

I have a plank for you, upon which "one or two" (I believe I can make room for you four gentry) "may escape". But, do you hear, you "meaner sinful wretches", that do not sit upon cushions, and are not asleep, and have no vote in the vestry; it will be little comfort to you, in this storm, to "expect the like deliverance" (p. 40).

The same tone pervades 'A Friendly Letter From Honest Tom Boggy' and 'A
Second Letter From Tom Boggy to the Canon of Windsor', two pamphlets written in response to the publication of a sermon by the Rev. Thomas Goddard entitled *The Guilt, Mischief, and Aggravations of Censure*, which had originally been preached on 25 June, 1710, before a congregation including Sarah Churchill, Duchess of Marlborough. Taking as his lesson James's admonishment, 'My brethren, be not many Masters,' and posing as the spokesman of moderation, uncommitted reasonableness, and Christian right thinking, Goddard had cautioned his auditors against presuming to criticise their leaders and fellows - especially with 'sharp and bitter Invective' (p. 15) - on the grounds that their own imperfections disqualified them from the office of censor (pp. 8-9). In reality, however, his sermon was by no means an expression of pious neutrality, especially when viewed from the perspective of a high churchman. Delivered in the last days of the Whig Junto, both its content and context betray its partisanship. His directive that the subject should not criticise his government is effectively applied only to the present one, which, he insists, had struggled in the face of unreasonable opposition to govern justly in the interest of the 'Public Good' (p. 18). His virulent broadside at the 'wicked slanderer' Sacheverell, whose recent 'passionate' sermon had in a most unChristian way pronounced 'Eternal Damnation on his Brethren' (p. 15), is only the most blatant sign of his actual political allegiance. In short, Goddard's sermon is a contradiction of itself; not only does he foolishly condemn others for presuming to condemn, he knavishly lays the guilt for all the current political mischief and aggravations squarely at the feet of the Tories. A pulpit advertisement for oligarchic government, it was precisely the kind of sermon the beleaguered Whig managers wanted to hear, and duly earned the applause of Steele and Defoe.

Naturally King's retort focuses on the disingenuousness of Goddard's censure of censure, the absurdity of which is mocked through the conventional mask of the country naif. With his apparent simplicity barely concealing a truly commonsensical intelligence, Boggy contrasts ironically with his self-deluded 'chum' Goddard, whose statements are demolished by an amalgam of lively jesting and earnest, learned argument. A passage of
doggerel in the second letter, and the device of the letter-within-the-letter in the first, add some variety to the satire, if little vigour and originality. The witty twisting of allusions to Goddard's text is typical King, as is the tonal variety of the humour, which ranges from the relative urbanity of blame-by-praise irony to the sharpness of sarcastic mockery. Noting that Goddard had dedicated his sermon to the notoriously ambitious Duchess, whose political machinations, pride, and ill-temper had led to her falling out of Anne's favour, Boggy remarks in his first letter:

I own, that you are extremely happy in a Patroness. Such an obliging, peacable, condescending, and forgiving temper must captivate Mankind. When a Person appears so averse to Pride, Malice, Detraction, and Censoriousness; so reserv'd as to her own Interest, but so communicative and diffusive of Good to all others; who cannot but wish, as you do, that she may reap the Fruits of these good Qualities. \(^4^4\)

He begins his second letter (which was also prompted by Defoe's endorsement of Goddard's sermon) on a disarmingly self-deprecating note, admitting that while he was 'not very well versed in these Laws, nor yet in the Prophets', he had heard that 'some of them, as Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, and Jonah, in particular' had in fact behaved contrary to Goddard's instructions, and published and proclaimed 'both to Prince and People, those Sins which were like to bring down God's Judgements upon them'. \(^4^5\) By the end Boggy's censure is far less muted, and by implication no longer restricted to the Canon of Windsor, as he rhetorically highlights the logical consequences of Goddard's argument:

After your General Argument against Public Censure, you come to your chief Point, and Shew of what ill Consequence 'tis when applied to Great Men. When Great Men are reflected on, what a Discouragement it is to them to proceed in their Labours for the publick Good! What a continual Trouble and Vexation it gives 'em! Yes indeed! Who knows but that they may be so discourag'd in their Great Labours, that they will no longer be at the Pains of receiving Five, Ten, or Twenty Thousand Pounds a Quarter! who knows but they may be so Vex'd at last, that they will resign their Places! And what shall we do then? Woe be to the Preacher that has so Vex'd them! (p. 12).

The last of King's ecclesiastical targets was William Bisset, a former student of Westminster School who in 1697 had become rector of Whiston, before being elected two years later as an elder brother of St. Catherine's Collegiate Church in London. If
Kennett and Goddard represented the more moderate wing of the low church party, Bisset was both ideologically and stylistically closer to the dissenters. In 1710 he published one of the most provocative books of the age, *The Modern Fanatick*, a vitriolic and ferocious attack on Sacheverell and the other 'high flyers'. Some idea of the overall flavour of the book can be gleaned from his hyperbolic response to the phenomenon of the Sacheverellite mobs, which, it is claimed, not only pose a greater threat to English liberty than any Junto judiciary, but also offer the prospect of a whiggish martyrdom:

I bless God I fear nothing but Him, whilst in the way of my Duty, and hope for nothing but Heaven; for I must not think of rising, (as an honest Friend told me) till the General Resurrection; and can say upon as good Grounds as the Doctor (i.e., Sacheverell), am ready not only to be bound, but to die, &c. for I matter all I have in the World, and my Life too, no more than the Paring of my Nails in the Cause of Insulted Religion, Truth, and British Liberty, (all which are directly struck at); and could suffer the last Extremity, as acceptably, I doubt not, to God, and as comfortably to my self, under High-Church Tyranny, as under Nero or Dioclesian: For their Malignity is not less, and their Hypocrisy greater.

In a farrago of abuse, he accuses the Tories of crypto-Jacobitism, cruelty, pride, bigotry, and greed (p. 7-13), and Sacheverell specifically of deceit, rudeness, gaming, profanity (pp. 25, 28-9) and worst of all, pride, which had made him as 'Mad...as ever was the Pewterer's Wife in Bedlam' (pp.18-19). And in a statement that was bound to attract King's attention above all, he asserts that the Tories' supposed demands for unlimited obedience to the monarchy threaten English liberty by encouraging the sort of absolutism currently prevailing in Sweden and Denmark, 'as Mr Molesworth in his State of Denmark acquaints us' (p. 60).

Since Nichols's inclusion of them in the *Original Works*, it has generally been taken for granted that King was responsible for a sequence of anti-Bisset tracts, including arguably the most important piece of Sacheverellite propaganda, *A Vindication of the Reverend Dr Henry Sachevrell* (1711); as I argue at some length below, however, this was almost certainly the work of another high church propagandist, Charles Lambe. Yet one can be fairly sure that he was the author of a related pamphlet, *An Answer to a Second Scandalous Book, that Mr. B--t is now writing, to be Publish'd as Soon as Possible*. The evidence for King's authorship is quite substantial: in the first place, it
is the one anti-Bisset pamphlet that Joseph Browne acknowledges as his. Internally there are such marks as the author's admission of having been a former Busby boy himself (p. 11); an incidental witticism regarding Richard Bentley ("that great Star and mighty Lumen of the Republick of Letters", p. 9); and a reference typical of King to the subject of his recent 'An Answer to Clemens Alexandrinus's Sermon'(p. 4). Moreover, the basic joke of the piece - the paradox of answering a book not yet published - is the same one he had first used in a very brief (and otherwise unremarkable) pamphlet eighteen years earlier ('An Answer to a Book, which will be published next Week, intitled, "A Letter to the Reverend Dr. South, Upon Occasion of a late Book, intitled, Animadversions on Dr Sherlock's Book, intitled, "A Vindication of the Holy and Ever-Blessed Trinity". Being a Letter to the Author").

His second attempt is understandably far more developed, and is levelled not just at the 'poor Mad Fool' Bisset but the more powerful and infamous enemies of the newly-elected Tory government: Benjamin Hoadley, Kennett, Bishop Lloyd, and Marlborough. Jokingly assuming the role of a soothsayer, he anticipates Bisset's retort that it was impossible to answer a book which had not yet been published by arguing that if Marlborough could be continuously praised by the Whigs for achieving the impossible militarily, and if Bisset himself had been so impossibly presumptuous as to publish his lies against Sachaverell, then it was perfectly possible that he should realise this kind of impossibility. 'I am', he confesses,

a mighty Friend to all great Achievements, and scorn to engage in any Work, that to vulgar Minds does not seem to have something in it of the Impossible; my natural Inclination to great Designs and great Actions, will make me for ever respect a Reverend Divine, for the surprising Apotheosis of a certain Duke; nothing but the most exalted Genius, could have founded his Grace's Title to Heaven, upon such occult, and most indisputable Reasons; the World will not exceed this great Work, till the Man is found, that can square the Circle, and take a Comet by the Tale (p. 4).

Lest anyone imagine that his own ability to predict future events is equally mystical, he 'solemnly' denies any 'Commerce with Satan', brotherhood with Flamstead and Partridge, 'Assistance, directly or indirectly, from the Pope' or the Pretender, or any
relationship whatsoever with 'Mahomet's Pigeons...the French Prophets, the B[i]shop of W[orcester], or any second slighted[sic.] Person' (p. 5). And yet, he claims, 'for all this, I know that Mr. Bisset, notwithstanding his solemn Promise to the contrary in his late Recantation, is now writing against Dr. Sacheverell and his Vindicator. This second Book will not be so big, but it is resolv'd by the Party, that it shall be as false as the First' (p. 5). The usual device of incorporating the butt's own words in such a way as ironically to rebound on him is handled particularly well in relation to Bisset's endorsement of Hoadley:

He is griev'd, p. 9, that Mr. Ho_dly has met with such indifferent Treatment: He lays himself out very pathetically upon this occasion, and declares, with something little less than an Oath, that he deserves more than all the Writers on this side the Cape. Here, indeed, Mr. B_t and I shall shake Hands; I think I am really of his Opinion, and am so far from being Mr H_dly's Enemy, that I do not care if he had his Deserts to morrow (p. 7).

As in the other pamphlets, the longer the performance continues the more tart the irony, which by the end almost disappears behind invective, as Bisset's indecorous verbage is rebuked with an appropriate dollop of scatology:

If I had time or patience, I would give you an Account of some other parts of his intended present to the World; but I protest when I am raking in his Works; I envy even the Gold Finders of this Metropolis, they poor Rogues, now and then meet with something that is good, but I, poor unhappy I, have one continued, unrewarded Stench; am forc'd, without all hopes, to turn over and remove the wretched Excrement of his Head, which is worse to me, than that of his Tail (pp. 12-13).

He partially restores the ironic tenor in the concluding stages, however, mimicking the hedging of more renowned prophets like Partridge in his concluding assurance that everything he has claimed about Bisset's forthcoming volume is certainly true, but if his references 'are not found in his printed Book, depend upon it, that in pure Spite to me, he has left them out, only to depreciate my Reputation with the Learned World' (p. 13).

Fortunately King's 'Reputation with the Learned World' does not have to rely on his Answer to William Bisset, or for that matter any of his controversial tracts and pamphlets. As Dr Johnson points out in relation to the best of them, 'books of this kind seldom live long, when interest and resentment have ceased'. In the final analysis,
they tend to bear out Browne's assertion that politics was not King's 'chiefest Pleasure', and even to some degree lend credence to Arthur Mainwaring's description of him (in relation to his apparent participation in The Examiner) as 'a silly Academic' who sometimes dabbled in a field for which he was not properly equipped. Nevertheless, they do deserve some recognition for what they manage to achieve in such a confined space, and for their odd flashes of their author's ironic sense of humour. If, like the archetypal cavalier, he did not much enjoy his tours of duty in the fields of controversy and went somewhat reluctantly to the line, once there he performed with real commitment to Church and monarch, and with some distinction in the close quarters of single combat.
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Chapter Five

'Under the Pretext of Criticism': The Satires on Richard Bentley

The critic Eye, that Microscope of Wit,
Sees hairs and pores, examines bit by bit:
How parts relate to parts, or they to whole,
The body's harmony, the beaming soul,
Are things which Kuster, Burman, Wasse shall see
When Man's whole frame is obvious to a Flea.
(The Dunciad, IV, 233-38)

There is little doubt that as a satirist King was better suited to dealing with abuses of
learning and literature than questions of a political or religious nature. The follies of
pedants and virtuosi were much less threatening in an immediate sense than the sins of
political opponents and religious apostates, and thus were more appropriately ridiculed
by means of the elaborate Menippean gamesmanship at which he was so adept. His
finest and most amusing writings compose what might best be described as two satiric
triptychs, which take as their unifying theme the impoliteness and indecorum of 'false
learning' in terms of both philology and natural philosophy. The first of these was
constructed between 1698 and 1700; the second, which effectively replicates the other,
between 1707 and 1711. In both cases, each panel is devoted to a particular paragon of
pedantry, and occasionally embellished with representations in the background of
various auxillary figures. This chapter will consider, as it were, the composition of the
first wing piece of the two ensembles, which were devoted to probably the greatest of
King's principal subjects, Richard Bentley.

The common perception of Bentley today as a dull, morose, somewhat absurd figure
is a testament to the distorting power of great satire, specifically that of Swift and Pope.
In fact, Bentley was one of the most remarkable geniuses of the age, a man who could
count among his friends and associates Pepys, Evelyn, Wren, Locke, and Newton, and
who can lay claim to being considered the greatest classical scholar England has ever produced, particularly in the field of Greek studies. Born in Oulton in Yorkshire in 1662, he graduated at the age of eighteen from St John's College, Cambridge, whereupon he spent some years as the personal tutor of the son of the famous scholar and cleric, Dr Edward Stillingfleet, a post which allowed him ample opportunities to pursue his own scholarly aspirations. After entering the clergy in 1690, he continued to serve for a time as chaplain to Stillingfleet (by now raised to the bishopric of Worcester), and to further his knowledge of classical languages and literature. In 1692 he was chosen to deliver the first series of Boyle Lectures, which had been established under the will of Robert Boyle for the express purpose of reconciling science and religion in order to demonstrate the errors of 'atheism', and which contributed greatly to the popularization of Newtonianism in the early eighteenth century. His work as both editor and critic, which really came to prominence with the publication in 1691 of his Epistula ad Millium, marks him as both the inheritor of the tradition of Renaissance textual scholarship (particularly that of the Dutch school of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), and the originator of the more 'scientific' methodology still in use today. His diligence and devotion to the accumulation and collation of data, his logical genius and phenomenal erudition, and his unequalled knowledge of the ancient lexicographers and contemporary manuscript holdings, enabled him to establish with as much certitude as possible the correct and authentic text of any work with which he was concerned, and to make a number of significant discoveries in the fields of Greek linguistics and poetry. He even felt confident enough to speculate upon possible corruptions and to emend and 'improve' original texts where he saw fit, a tendency which occasionally resulted in glaring absurdities of his own, particularly with regard to his work on Horace and Milton. Nevertheless, his contribution to the history of classical scholarship is monumental, and his writings brought him an international fame that was to persist (especially on the continent) long after his death in 1742.

The clash between Bentley and King began with the series of incidents and literary
battles known as the Phalaris Controversy, about which so much has been written that only the barest details regarding King and his Christ Church colleagues need be recounted here.\(^4\) Almost certainly in response to Sir William Temple's endorsement in his *An Essay Upon Ancient and Modern Learning* of the *Epistles of Phalaris* as the 'oldest and best' book of its kind,\(^5\) Dean Aldrich of Christ Church had encouraged the young nobleman, Charles Boyle, to produce a new edition of the work, a manuscript of which was in the custody of Bentley (only recently installed as King's Librarian in charge of the St James Palace Library), who had in the meantime already privately expressed his belief that the work was a fraud devoid of any literary merit. After he had with some reluctance lent the manuscript for collation to Thomas Bennet - the bookseller who had published King's *Animadversions* and apparently acted as the college's literary agent - a dispute arose between the two men over the tardiness of the work, which led to the manuscript being returned equally reluctantly, with the collation still incomplete. When Boyle's edition finally came out in 1695, it carried a facetious reflection on the 'singular humanity' of the King's Librarian, prompting a stream of sarcastic and arrogant retorts from Bentley in the course of his initial refutation of the *Epistles'* authenticity, *A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides, and Aesop's Fables*, which William Wotton attached two years later to the second edition of *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*, the book originally written to challenge Temple's assertions of the general superiority of the Ancients.\(^6\) Boasting that such was the strength of his 'Proofs' that he would be surprised if anybody were to 'persist in his old Opinion of making *Phalaris* an Author' after reading them (p. 13), he concludes a series of arguments establishing some of the inaccuracies in Boyle's edition with a jibe which typifies his response:

I was, but just now, in the mind to oblige them, by going through the whole Book, and correcting for them all the Faults, that give offence to the best Readers. But now, that I cast my eye backwards, it makes me look as blank, at the prospect of all that's to come; as *Hercules* did, when after he had made a bargain unseen, he saw the Stables of *Augeas*. For if the very First Epistle, of nine Lines only, has taken me up four Pages in scouring, what a sweet piece of work should I have of it, to cleanse all the rest for them? I must beg their Excuse therefore for the present; and shall only, to keep my Promise, give one Touch of their industry and skill, in making use of the manuscript (p. 73).
Such remarks demanded an effective answer; and accordingly early in the following year a group of College Fellows under the leadership of Boyle's tutor, Francis Atterbury, produced their famous controversial tract, *Dr Bentley's Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris, and the Fables of Aesop, Examined by the Honourable Charles Boyle, Esq.* (1698), more commonly known as *Boyle Against Bentley.*

Thus while the Bentley/Christ Church clash was in some respects related to the Temple/Wotton dispute (which arguably had much more to do with the merits of modern historiography and philology than the question of the superiority of the Ancients or Moderns), it was essentially a separate issue, specifically concerned with Bentley's pedantry and overall impoliteness - his 'Learning and Manners Together'.

The general theme of *Boyle Against Bentley* is the Christian Humanist notion of the connection between proper learning, morality, and the social responsibility of the gentleman. In the eyes of the college wits and the 'gentlemen of the town' who supported them, Bentley represented the living embodiment of the pedant figure so frequently described by the Character writers, whose distinctive qualities are reiterated at one stage in a catalogue of scholarly abuses. 'Pedantry in the Pen', 'Boyle' begins, 'is what Clownishness is in Conversation; it is *Written Ill Breeding*'(p. 93). Bentley's overbearing pride and arrogance, the ill manners, rudeness, and sarcasm he had displayed towards his fellow scholars and social betters, and the numerous stylistic shortcomings in his writings, only confirmed the real paucity and irrelevance of his superficially impressive learning. It was not, they were at pains to stress, that they were opposed to philology and similar 'modern' historiographical disciplines (eg chronology) *per se*; indeed, in what amounts to a companion piece on the nature of the true scholar, such studies are lauded for their 'Excellent Use to the World when wisely employ'd'(pp. 223-24). In Bentley's hands, however, scholarship and philology had become merely the vain accumulation of trivial knowledge for its own sake. His microscopic focus on textual particulars served no literary, ethical, or religious purpose; on the contrary, it actually prevented him from
appreciating the moral and aesthetic qualities of the heathen classics that made them so worthy of a Christian gentleman's attention. Nothing demonstrated this more conclusively than Bentley's singular appreciation of Lucian's *Lexiphanes*; the pedant's references to Thericlean cups, they noted, seemingly meant more to him than Lycinus' advice about proper learning. Perhaps if Bentley were to read the work more critically, the Examiner concludes, and 'take the good advice that Lucian gave there of Sacrificing to the Graces, and to Perspicuity; and suffer some skilful friend to administer to him the Emetic Draught there provid'd it would do him the World of Service' (p. 288).

As a Christ Church alumnus and an old friend of Atterbury, King had good cause to join the conflict, especially since he had actually witnessed at first hand the original argument in Bennet's shop. In a letter to Atterbury prefaced to *Boyle against Bentley*, he admits to having overheard clearly only one detail of the conversation (concerning the value of a collated manuscript); but he does recall that the 'whole Discourse was manag'd with such insolence, that after he [i.e. Bentley] was gone, I told Mr Bennet, that he ought to send Mr Boyle word of it'. 'For my own part', he continues,

(I said then, what I think still) I did not believe that the Various Readings of any Book were so much worth, as that a Person of Mr Boyle's Honour and Learning, shou'd be us'd so scurvily to obtain 'em. That Scorn and Contempt which I have naturally for Pride and Insolence, makes me remember that, which otherwise I might have forgot.¹

In some respects this brief epistle, with its insistence on gentility above all else, represents the definitive statement of King's attitude not just towards Bentley, but the pursuit of learning generally. He clearly shared his colleagues' belief that Bentley amounted to a modern-day Lexiphanes; and he was almost certainly responsible for providing the appropriate parodic emetic in the circumstances. As Colin Horne has revealed, a letter from William Warburton to Bishop Hurd provides external evidence of King's responsibility for what has generally been considered the most impressive part of *Boyle against Bentley*, in which the Examiner, pretending to be a future critic, refutes Bentley's authorship of the *Dissertation* by means of mock-Bentlian scholarship.¹¹ Warburton recalls that Pope,'who had been let into the secret concerning the Oxford
performance', had told him that

Boyle wrote only the narrative of what passed between him and the Bookseller, which too was corrected for him; that Freind, the Master of Westminster, and Atterbury wrote the body of the criticisms; and that Dr. King of the Commons wrote the droll argument to prove Dr. Bentley was not the author of the Dissertation on Phalaris, and the Index. 12

What Pope had apparently said about the authorship of the bulk of the book basically tallies with what Atterbury says in a letter to Boyle on the subject, and though it cannot be deduced from this that the remainder of his claim must also be true, there seems no good reason to doubt the validity of Warburton's testimony. 13 Horne notes, moreover, that in its witty use of pastiche-parody the piece bears all the stylistic signs of King's authorship. 14 In this particular case, this entails the mingling of select quotations with invention, and often involves little more than the substitution of topical subject matter and contemporary names and places for Bentley's originals. Key phrases and passages are often retained almost intact, the intention being no doubt to allow Bentley's own critical misdeeds and ill manners ample opportunity to convict him; while the inventions and substitutions reduce Bentley's achievement to a ridiculous level at the same time as they amplify his obvious penchant for the trivial and mundane. As Horne has demonstrated, a comparison of the following two extracts shows this to good effect:

Had all other ways fail'd us of detecting this Imposter, yet his very Speech had betray'd him.
For his Language is Attic, the beloved Dialect of the Sophists, ...in which they affected to excell each other, even to Pedantry and Solecism. But he had forgot that the Scene of these Epistles was not Athens, but Sicily, where the Doric tongue was generally spoken and written.... How comes it to pass then, that our Tyrant transacts every thing in Attic, not only foreign Affairs of State, but domestic matters with Sicilian Friends, but the very Accounts of his Houshold? Pray, how came that Idiom to be the Court Language at Agrigentum? (Dissertation, pp. 40-41).

Had all other ways fail'd us of detecting this Impostor, yet his very Speech had betray'd him, for it is neither that of a Scholar, nor an Englishman; neither Greek, Latin, nor English, but a Medley of all Three: He had forgot that the Scene of these Writings was London, where the English Tongue was generally spoken and written; as besides other Testimonies, the very thing speaks it self in the Remains of London Authors, as the Gazettes, the Cases written by London Divines, and others. How comes it to pass then that our Dr writes not in English, but in a Language farther remov'd from the true English Idiom than the Doric Greek was from the Attic? Why does Dr Bentley, an Englishman, write a New Language, which no Englishman before ever wrote, or spoke? How comes his Speech neither to be that of the Learned, nor that of his Country, but a mix'd particolour'd
Dialect, form'd out of both? Pray, how came that Idiom to be the Court-language at St. James's? (pp. 185-86).

Throughout the parody the irony cuts two ways. At the same time as Bentley's pointless trifling is ridiculed, his equally indecorous bad manners are highlighted by mock-Bentleian arguments 'proving' that it would be absurd to imagine that such a highly respected figure as Bentley could ever be guilty of such breaches. Another direct descendant of More's *Letter to Martin Dorp*, the piece represents a development on his ironic preface to *Animadversions*: e.g.,

For Dr Bentley is known to have appertain'd to the Family of a Right Reverend Prelate, who was the Great Ornament of that Age; to have had an University-Education, and to have convers'd much in the City, and at Court; and with those advantages, he could not but be more refin'd than the Writer of this piece of Criticism; who by his Manner of expressing himself shews, that he was taken up with quite other thoughts and different Images from those that use to fill the Heads of such as have had a Learned and Liberal Education (pp. 187-88).

Mimicing another of Bentley's methods, King discovers that the style of the age of Tillotson, Sprat, and Temple 'had a quite different Turn and Fashion from that of our Dissertator' (p. 186). He declares Bentley's mixture of obscure Greek, Latin and northern English dialect offensive and pretentious, and more suitable for the mountebank's stage than a learned dissertation (pp. 190-91). He argues that the plagiarism and glaring errors which riddle the work could never have emanated from the great Bentley (pp. 196-97), and insists that the same man who had delivered the universally acclaimed Boyle Lectures could not have wasted time and talent on such a 'Thin Diet' of learning as constitutes the *Dissertation* (pp.196-97). Focusing on the obvious rudeness which informs the work, he notes that the modern sophist's imitation of the great scholar is clearly inconsistent with the Bentley everyone knew. Could the Boyle Lecturer, he asks rhetorically, have expressed such contempt for a relative of the great natural philospher? And could the same man have been so rude to Temple? One
need not agree with all of Sir William's conclusions, he concedes, but surely someone like the real Dr Bentley, a scholar, a clergyman, and now a courtier, would never do so with such immodesty and incivility (p. 200). Why, Bentley himself had confirmed elsewhere that such behaviour was completely foreign to his nature (p. 197). Could anyone reasonably suggest, therefore, that Dr Bentley was a hypocrite too?

When the second edition of Boyle against Bentley came out not long after, it carried what has been described as the first satirical index in English literature. That this is King's work has generally been acknowledged, since a similar device features in A Journey to London and his subsequent writings. The joke (in this case at least) is not particularly amusing; but as Horne points out, the device must have seemed to Bentley's many foes a particularly appropriate joke on a man notorious for his love of indexes, and stands as further evidence of King's capacity to introduce novel touches to the conventions within which he worked.

In March, 1699, Bentley's revised and very much enlarged Dissertation was published, a work which remains to this day a masterpiece of classical philology. Totalling nearly five hundred and fifty pages of antiquarian facts and literary references dredged from a vast array of classical and scholastic sources and marshalled into a series of separate though related discussions, the new work in effect extends and substantiates the claims more hastily made in the original dissertation. His earlier remarks on Thericlean cups, for instance, are amplified to such an extent that they fill over thirty five pages with erudite and highly digressive commentary on different kinds of ancient cups and bowls (pp. 109-45). The huge, eight page index is a fitting appendix to such a tome. In the preface (which itself adds in excess of one hundred pages to the volume) he challenges his opponents' version of events and explains his behaviour in relation to the manuscript affair, before launching fierce attacks on both Bennet and King. The charges of arrogance and indecorum that had been levelled at him are returned with interest, as he savages King for interfering in a matter which did not concern him. 'The Dr's Testimony', claims Bentley, has an 'Air and Spirit' that is 'extraordinary', and a degree
Virulency and Insolence so far above the common pitch; that it puts one in mind of Rupilius King, a great Ancestor of the Dr's, commended to Posterity by Horace under this honourable Character,

Proscripti Regis Rupilli pus atque venenum
The Filth and Venom of Rupilius King.

And if the Dr. do not inherit the Estate of Rupilius; yet the whole World must allow, that he is Heir of his Virtues; as his Writings will vouch for him, his Deposition here against me, his Buffoonery upon the Learned Dr. Lister, and some other Monuments of his Learning and his Morals (pp. xxviii-xxix).

After accusing King of making unwarranted attacks on his reputation, he attempts to degrade his scholarship by referring to a certain passage from A Journey to London: 'we must not expect from the Dr. that he should know the worth of Books: for he is better skill'd in the Catalogues of Ales, his Humpty Dumpty, Hugmatee, Three-Threads, and the rest of that glorious List, than in the Catalogues of MSS'. King's alleged inconsistencies are also explained on the grounds that he was no doubt 'dos'd with Humpty Dumpty' at the time (pp. xxxiv-xxxv). Thus, when he notes briefly that the parody in Boyle against Bentley bears all the signs of having 'been writ in a Tavern than in a Study' (p. cviii), there would seem to be little doubt that even Bentley considered the 'Humpty Dumpty Author' its most likely author as well.

King's first chance to retaliate came with the publication of A Short Account of Dr Bentley's Humanity and Justice, one of the many tracts spawned by the controversy. Tacked on to it is an appendix which contains another of King's letters, together with a contribution ostensibly from Bennet (although this too may well have been King's handiwork). In his letter, King once again effectively sums up the whole argument when he notes that Bentley 'thinks meanly...of my Reading; as meanly as I think of his Sense, his Modesty, and his Manners', adding that it would appear that 'under the pretext of Criticism' one 'may take what Freedom he pleases with the Reputation and Credit of any Gentleman'. He contrasts his own view that a manuscript's value lies in the moral instruction and aesthetic appeal of the text with Bentley's professed belief that
its value is determined by its exchange rate in the market. And he again expresses his
disgust at the use of bad language and ill manners. But *A Short Account* was merely a
preliminary sortie: he reserved his real wit for the main attack, *Dialogues of the Dead*.

*Dialogues of the Dead* is perhaps the best known of King's burlesques, and in
recent years especially has been the subject of considerable critical interest. Developing Boyce's link between King's dialogues and those of Lucian himself (at least
in terms of his 'dramatic technique', stylistic devices, and 'banter'), both Frederick
Keener and David Lampe have declared it the first true imitation of the Lucianic original
in the language, thereby distinguishing it from the mass of English infernal dialogues
which preceded it (e.g., Donne's *Ignatious his Conclave*, Dekker's *News from Hell*)
; it is also the first of its kind to be devoted entirely to burlesquing the works of a specific
individual, and the first fully-fledged satire on the 'awful Aristarch' of Augustan
England, a subject destined to engender many more in the future. Lampe in particular
has emphasized the essential dissimilarities between King's 'colloquial, animated' use of
the form and the much more 'polished, cerebral' French Dialogues of the Dead of
Fontenelle, Fenelon, and Le Noble, which Egilsrud erroneously assumed to have been
the models for King's satire.

It has also commonly been observed that while some of King's dialogues are
directly imitative of some of Lucian's, others effectively dispense with the Hadean
setting altogether (e.g.,'Modern Learning', 'Affectation of the Learned Lady'); and that
in shrinking Lucian's general satire on human follies and vices to a lampoon, King deals
only marginally with the broad philosophical and moral questions inherent in the form
itself. One might add that in terms of its principal theme of pedantry and parodic
technique, King's *Dialogues* resembles more closely *Lexiphanes* than *Dialogues of the
Dead* ; so that the question remains as to why he should have chosen the latter as his
ostensible model, especially in view of the fact that the Christ Church wits themselves
had drawn the connection between the King's Librarian and Lucian's pseudo-Plato.
Lampe's suggestion that he chose the form in order to display his own 'just Relish of Antiquity' while burlesquing Bentley's alleged lack of true classical learning is as it stands only partially convincing; after all, an imitation of *Lexiphanes* would also have served that purpose. The Dialogues of the Dead form, though, does offer obvious advantages so far as characterisation is concerned. Different mythical and historical figures, their names rich with widely recognized moral and intellectual significance, can be employed in such a way as to ensure that these connotations readily adhere to the real satiric butt, either by having such a spokesman voice extracts from the parodied work and thus identify him/herself with its author, or by having another allusive speaker demonstrate the butt's relationship to the archetype. King utilizes either or both of these techniques in most of the dialogues, including the first, in which the controversy's central issues are introduced during a conversation between Charon and Lycophron. The two speakers discuss the scholarly disputes which had broken out in Hades since the young Schrevelius (Wotton) was brought across the Styx carrying the 'confounded heavy' work of the 'Snarling Critic Bentivoglio' (p. 2), disputes which threaten to erupt into an almost Swiftian battle between authors and scholars (pp. 4-5). King wastes no time in reminding his readers of the charges brought against Bentley by the Christ Church wits, as Lycophron explains:

> Why some are of your Opinion, that indeed *Bentivoglio* is a Heavy Writer; and say further, That he is too Bulky, and too Tediuous, that he argues upon Trifles only with great Gravity, and manages serious Things with as much Lightness. That he has pillag'd Authors to gain a Reputation, but has so manag'd his Contrivance that he has lost his end. In short, there are mighty Disputations whether he has least *Wit, Judgement, or Good -manners* (p. 2).

Lycophron (who had earned the reputation as the most obscure of all Greek poets) admits some partiality in the dispute, since Bentivoglio had 'very much oblig'd me throughout his Works', and imitated him 'even without reason, for, as it was my choice, his natural Genius leads him to be unintelligible'. 'A Man may as soon understand *his* Latin as *his* English,' he continues, 'and *his* English as *my* Greek; *his* Prose is as Fantastick as *my* Verse; and *my* Prophecies carry more light with 'em than *his*
demonstrations' (p. 3). Even more damning is the endorsement of the imperial pedant, Claudius, by whose decree Bentivoglio's uncouth use of proverbs and rules on spelling are to be established as law 'under the Penalty of Bentivoglio's irresistible Criticism, and our utmost Displeasure' (pp. 5-7).

Other aspects of Bentley's character and the controversy are dealt with in the remaining dialogues, which exhibit a variety of different character relationships. The question of the *Epistles* authenticity is covered in a dispute between Phalaris and a Sophist ('Impudence: or, The Sophist'), the latter's greatly condensed restatement of some of Bentley's main points emphasizing their pettiness (pp. 9-13). In 'Self-Love: or the Beau', the vanity of Bentivoglio/Bentley is shown to have exceeded even that of Narcissus by another of the scholar's personae, Ricardo (pp. 20-24). Travesty is also the principal element in 'Modern Achievements,' an imitation of Diogenes's encounter with a boastful Heracles in Lucian's eleventh dialogue.28 Presumably inspired by Bentley's facetious self-identification with the Greek hero in his first dissertation, King presents Hercules as a Bentleian braggard who has become embroiled in a verbal battle with a Talgol-like butcher. Again King's mockery is levelled mainly at Bentley's obsessive concern for philological trifles, specifically his discussion on a 'Herculean cup' in which the hero was supposed to have once sailed (*Dissertation*, pp 113-115):

e.g.,

Hercules: You could still pretend to out-do the Ancients; but let me tell you one thing which I did, which I must own my Thanks to Bentivoglio, is by him Recorded to posterity. I had a mind to go to *Erythraea*, an *island* in the Western Ocean, and how do you think I got thither? In a Ship, you will say. No! In a *Brazen ship*? No! In a *Golden Bed*? No! How then, you will say in the Name of Wonder? Why, in short, *I got the Sun to lend me his Golden Cup to sail in*, and I scudded away as well as if I had had all the Wind and Sail imaginable (pp. 17-18).

The butcher's retort, however, and particularly his references to his comparable fairground exploits, puts such feats (and by extension such scholarship) in their proper perspective:

Butcher: And no great matter at last! I remember, as I was boasting one day of my Exploits to a good jolly *Muscovite* at the *Bear-garden*, he told me, that St. *Nicholas* came to
their Country sailing upon a Mill-stone, which I thought as humorsome a Passage as your Cup. But to be short and plain with you, I have Witnesses both on this side and 't other side of Styx, that saw me Row myself from the Horse-Ferry to the other side of the Water in my own Tray, with a couple of Trenchers; and there is a Tray and a Mill-stone for your Cup and your Cauldron (pp. 18-19).

A number of dialogues operate by way of the simple alazon - eiron relation, such as 'The Dictionary,' in which the question of the social role of literature and learning is raised in the course of a discussion between the classical lexicographer Hesychius (upon whom Bentley had relied heavily) and his more commonsensical colleague, Goldman. The latter clearly voices his creator's opinion in his observation that while the words used in 'all Wit, Arts, Genteel and Mannerly Conversation, are contain'd in Dictionaries' (as Hesychius had asserted), it is only their combination into great literary works which renders them truly intelligible and valuable; and that is an 'Art our Dictionaries will never teach a Man' (p. 27). Similarly in 'Affectation of the Learned Lady', that paragon of womanly virtue, Bellamira, throws into greater relief the absurd pedantry of the quixotic Caliphurnia, who has become so enamoured of Bentivoglio's false learning that on his advice she has even had her looking glass converted according to the classical rules, and will only eat what can be found in obscure classical sources (pp. 32-33). In 'Chronology' the emphasis is again on the question of scholarship's social utility, and Bentley's perversion of a discipline which in better hands had proved so beneficial to church and state. The close relationship between King's satire and the character literature is demonstrated in Lilly's assurance that Bentivoglio need only 'get a sentence of Greek in his Mouth, and turn it once or twice upon his Tongue [to know]...the growth of it, as a Vintner does Burgundy from Maderas' (p. 41), a joke almost certainly derived from Earle's portrayal of the critic as someone who 'tastes styles as some discreeter palates do wine'.

The best of this group is 'The Imposture', in which King utilizes the conventional Renaissance motif of a debate between the weeping philosopher Heraclitus and his laughing colleague, Democritus of Abdera, to ridicule Bentley's abuse of antiquarianism and misguided emphasis on the merely physical and extraneous aspects of books,
instead of their abstract aesthetic virtues and moral 'sentiments'. True to type, the melancholy Heraclitus voices Bentley's strident pronouncements on the spurious authorship of various classical works, only to be mocked out of court by the witty good sense of the most Lucianic of all spokesmen. Echoing Temple, Democritus makes the point that what is important about the Epistles is not so much their authenticity as their display of 'Life, Spirit and a great Genius' (p. 45), before launching into a series of ironic remarks on the uselessness, gross materialism, and downright caprice of Bentleian criticism (p. 46). His catalogue of favourite dissertations, including 'The Theological Collation, occasioned by the words Tirez, Mirez, Beuf, that is, Take, Look, Drink, by the profound Scholar, Adrian Vander Blict', amounts to yet another parody of Bentley's remarks about the shape of ancient cups. At the same time, it illustrates King's penchant for sophisticated, multilingual punning: besides implying a standard joke on the Dutch polymaths, the scholar's surname (or at least, 'van de blik') means 'of the tin' or 'can' - as in beer can.

The penultimate dialogue, 'Modern Learning,' presents the same essential theme in a very similar fashion, only this time in relation to Wotton's part in the controversy. The dialogue has sometimes been interpreted as King's tacit vote in favour of the superiority of the Ancients and a sign of his rejection of modern natural philosophy, though as we have seen King was an advocate of Baconianism, at least insofar as it accorded with the principal tenets of Christian Humanism. It is surely significant that most of Wotton's statements on the subject are left untouched, their validity apparently accepted. What he did object to, however, and what he found palpably absurd, was Wotton's effusive praise of the recent biological and microscopical studies of Swammerdam, Goedartius, Malpighius, van Leeuwenhoek, and - most significantly - Martin Lister, which had been applauded as outstanding examples of epistemological progress despite the fact that their subject is the 'lowest and simple Order of Animals' (Reflections, p. 307), and that their work brings no tangible social benefits. 'This is what our Age has seen,' Wotton had proclaimed,
and it is not the less admirable, because all of it, perhaps, cannot be made immediately useful to Humane Life: It is an excellent Argument to prove, That it is not Gain alone which biases the Pursuits of the Men of this Age after Knowledge; for here are numerous Instances of Learned Men, who finding other Parts of Natural Learning taken up by Men, who, in all probability would leave little for After-comers, have, rather than not contribute their Proportion towards the Advancement of Knowledge, spent a World of Time, Pains and Cost, in examining the Excrescencies of all the Parts of Trees, Shrubs and Herbs, in observing the critical Times of the Changes of all sorts of Caterpillars and Maggots, in finding out, by the Knife and Microscopes, the minutest Parts of the smallest Animals, examining every Crevice, and poring in every Ditch, in tracing every Insect up to its Original Egg; and all this with as great Diligence, as if they had had an Alexander to have given them as many Talents, as he is said to have given to his Master Aristotle (pp. 313-14).

Goedartius, he admits, 'was no Philosopher, but one who, for his Diversion, took great Delight in Painting all sorts of Insects', and in the process had provided 'exact Histories of the several Changes of great Numbers of Caterpillars into Butter-Flies, and Worms or Maggots into Flies; which had never before been taken notice of, as Specifically different'(pp. 310-11). Here then, according to Wotton, was 'an admirable Specimen of the Modern Advancement of Knowledge', a testament to the superiority of modern empiricism over the general observation of Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Pliny. To find this ridiculous, one did not have to be an Aristotelian opponent of modern Baconian empiricism; regardless of the validity of Wotton's pronouncements, the fact was that, enunciated so baldly, they contradicted the most fundamental premises of Christian Humanism and (at least when seen from the purest and highest utilitarian perspective) Baconianism itself. To hold up such useless studies into 'the minutest parts of the smallest of animals' as exempla of modern science, King believed, was both to do Baconianism and its great exponents a disservice, and to betray the injudiciousness of a pedant. King would almost certainly have been prepared to concede that 'Experiments of Light' were necessary for the advancement of natural philosophy, and to accept that a moderate interest in biological studies did not conflict with the dictates of polite learning; but he certainly could not allow that the intensive study of maggots represented either an appropriate full-time occupation for a gentleman or an intellectual enlightenment.

'Modern Learning', in other words, is on one level a satire on Martin Lister and his-
ilk, but remains primarily a topical animadversion on Wotton's *Reflections*, and specifically a satire on his peculiar value judgements. It is relevant to note that in one of the mock-letters to Martin Lister that make up part of *The Art of Cookery*, the Correspondent refers to Wotton's book as 'Modern Learning', and continues to highlight its author's tendency to argue the case for modern superiority on the basis of puddings, jellies, and salad dressings (Letter III). In the dialogue, Moderno is thus effectively a composite representative of Lister and Wotton, the grubby state of his appearance (the legacy of his fossicking in muddy ditches) symbolizing his wilful dirtying of a gentleman's manners. Again the satiric strategy depends on the combination of pastiche and the most conventional kind of character interaction, the aptly-named Indifferentio fulfilling the traditional role of ironic interlocutor: e.g.,

Indifferentio. But what may have been your Diversion in this Ditch.
Moderno. Why, I have only been a tadpole hunting, and have had a very good sport, only at last the Rain disturb'd it, just as I had found out the seat of their Animal Spirits.
Indifferentio. Is it not a little too soon in the Season for Tadpoles?
Moderno. Something too soon, but a Man is so satiated with the Winter Sports within Doors, as Rat-catching, Mouse-fleying, Crevice-searching for Spiders, Cricket dissecting, and the like; that the Spring leads us into the Fields upon its first approaches.
Indifferentio. Pray, Sir, have you not some Diversions peculiar to the Summer?
Moderno. Oh! yes! infinite, infinite! Maggots, Flies, Gnats, Buzzes, Chaffers, Humble-bees, Wasps, Grass-hoppers, and in a good Year Catter-pillars in abundance.
Indifferentio. I thought some of these things did harm, especially Maggots and Catter-pillars.
Moderno. How extreamly a Man may be mistaken that has not Learning! The most useful Knowledge imaginable may be gather'd from them by a Philosopher (pp. 54-55).

As usual the Wottonian line is pursued by the *alazon* to its absurdly fatuous conclusion, as when Moderno informs his associate that 'Another Friend of mine has made many Observations upon Insects that live, and are carry'd about upon the Bodies of other Insects, and oftentimes upon the Bodies of Rational Beings, whence he has given admirable Reasons, why Idle Boys scratch their Heads, and Beggars shrug their Shoulders' (p. 56). His subsequent comments concerning different scholarly knick-knacks in effect reiterate the commonplace association of pedantry with scientific
virtuosity as they parody Wotton's remarks on other pieces of evidence of modern superiority, such as the advances in the 'Art of Making Cydar, at least of Chusing the best Apples' (Reflections, p. 296), and the Moderns' possession of coffee and sugar (pp. 297-98). The ultimate satiric source is again Lexiphanes: as in the case of his ancient ancestor, Moderno's actual moral and intellectual malnutrition is revealed paradoxically by his obsession with culinary trifles:

Moderno. As for Caesar, poor Gentleman, he is not so much to be blamed, for he did what he could, considering the age he liv'd in. But that Age, which others think so great for Learning and Empire, lay under several apparent Disadvantages; for I have often read Xenophon, Polybius, Tully, and Q. Tacitus, to see what Raggs might have been among the Ancients, but I cannot find (though I learn from Terence they had some) what use They put them to. 'Tis a Demonstartion that they made no Paper of their Linen Rags, and Caesar when he had subdu'd France, and wrote his Commentaries, could not have Printed them, if he could have pawn'd his Conquests.

Indifferentio. Were they so unhappy in all other Matters?
Moderno. Yes, Sir; I really pity the Ancients, as to their Opticks, Divinity, Tobacco, Cydar, Coffee, Punch, Sugar, and several other things, of which they were ignorant (pp. 59-60).

With his rational faculties so obviously addled by such intellectual abuse, Moderno is unable to assimilate the humanistic lessons provided by the classics, and thus blithely asserts that an individual's merit is more graphically evidenced by the size and style of his tobacco-box than 'his Discourse and Writings' (pp. 63-64).

These observations extend into a further series of reflections which tacitly raise another humanistic and Lucianic theme: namely the necessary equation between the corruption of learning and the perversion of morals, specifically in terms of the question of luxury, which for centuries had been condemned by moral philosophers, biblical and theological authorities, and satirists such as Horace, Juvenal, and Petronius. More important, the subject of food has conventionally provided metaphors for all forms of intemperance and indiscretion; in particular, the display of gluttony, a sin in itself, has also functioned as a graphic symbol of a general absence of moral constraint and proper, socially-conscious manners.33 Hence Wotton's praise of the Moderns' discoveries of sweeteners, coffee, chocolate, and distilled and fortified alcohol, besides testifying to his
pedantry, could easily be construed as further proof of his ignorance of the most basic ethical strictures upon the excesses of luxury. Accordingly, with all the foolish pride of his ancient role model, Moderno boasts that the Moderns had excelled even the ancient world's most infamous glutton, Apicius, in their gourmandizing and tippling (pp. 65-66), thereby indirectly reaffirming the basic Erasmian tenet that one of the real costs of pedantry was moral ignorance.

The last of the dialogues, 'The Dissertator', is in many ways the most impressive, not least because King dispenses with a genuine authorial spokesman and presents instead the inherently amusing sight of two clowns seemingly trying to outgallop the other's hobby-horse. The specific targets in this instance are Bentley's especially prolix sections on the origins and progress of comedy and tragedy, and his recovery and emendation of a manuscript anthology of verses by Callimachus and various minor Greek poets, despite the fact that they possessed little aesthetic merit (e.g., Dissertation, pp. 457-60). Even the somewhat more defensible discovery that Callimachus's epigram was in fact a particularly esoteric parody is itself parodied in a farcical conversation between those perennial Augustan butts, Richard Flecknoe and Thomas Dekker, both of whom express their delight at having at last found a critic whose appreciation of literature matched their own. The dialogue exhibits a diversity of Menippean devices and characteristics: doggerel insertions, pastiche, and, most effectively, mock-scholarship and carnival imagery. Dekker's rambling, almost surrealistic mock dissertations on 'strollers' and the puppet-shows of Bartholomew Fair, written in emulation of Bentivoglio's and accompanied by their own marginalia citing the obscure sources favoured by the King's Librarian - including that other notorious contemporary pedant, Thomas Rymer - are perhaps the best moments in the whole work. In their mimicry of scholarly duncery, deliberate formlessness, and saturnalian symbolism, they represent a satiric bridge between the satires of Dryden and Butler on the one hand, and the Scriblerians on the other: e.g.,

When fair Rosoman first appeared as a Puppet, there was nothing between her and the Spectator, to hinder and amuse the Eye-sight. Sandy's Water-Works, at first had the same
Simplicity, but the Water flowing perpetually, gave the Spectators great Diversion, afterwards strings were found out by Devaux, and several other Scenes were introduc'd, the French Court was represented, Sarabards were Danc'd, and Punch appear'd with Quick and lively Motion in his Eyes, Activity in his Gesture, and Vivacity of Wit in his Expressions. Devaux increased the Statue of the Puppets, to almost the bigness of Children.... Afterwards, as the Luxury of the Age increas'd, they brought Artificial Butter-Flies upon the Stage, and Serpents issued from Punch's Eyes, to the Amazement of the Spectators. Then Sedgemore came to the publick View, Guns in Miniature manag'd the attack, and Bells of the Bigness of those at Horses-Ears, Proclaim'd the Triumph. Thus they ran on to excess, and consequently to Poverty and Licentiousness, till at last the Operator was forc'd to Snow Brown Paper instead of White, and Merry Andrew, who manag'd the Mob without Doors, was sent to Bride-Well, for making free with his Betters (pp. 73-74).

As usual, King's persona's allusions to the low-life realities of the Fair function as powerful objective correlative for chaos, cacophony, absurdity, and vulgarity; and ultimately, of course, all these associations adhere to Bentley like Thames mud. But at the same time, there is something of Erasmus in the fool's recognition that the consequences of an addiction to 'Luxury', even in relation to the production of a puppet-show, are 'Poverty and Licentiousness ... Brown Paper instead of White'.

Yet for all the generic similarities between Dekker's dissertations and those of Swift's Hack and Martinus Scriblerus, a comparison only highlights the overall inferiority of King's satire. To some extent this is due to his choice of form; though the dialogue provides certain opportunities for the display of wit, the demands imposed by its character interaction tend to restrict the possibilities of the prolonged exhibition of ironic virtuosity offered by such alternative Menippean kinds as the parodic narrative, the mock memoir, and the mock-heroic. Moreover, the personal and parodic nature of Dialogues almost inevitably lessens its artistic value; by contrast, for the Scriblerians Bentley was just one of many manifestations of pride, pedantry, and cultural decline, albeit a particularly monstrous one. More important perhaps, King utilizes less readily and extensively than Dryden, Swift, and Pope the heaviest and ugliest of the satirist's tools. Dekker and Flecknoe are merely the farcical brothers of Swift's ordure-eating madmen; and if there are disturbing undertones in this final picture of two fools in Hades discussing child-sized puppets from whose eyes issue snakes, as in Animadversions the satiric potentialities of grotesquerie are left sadly under-exploited. While King's
caricature of the critical dunce is drawn along fairly similar lines to that of the Scriblerians', and with the same Christian Humanist ink, his satiric shading pales noticeably beside the 'Universal Darkness' which threatens to engulf their landscape. Despite his Hadean setting, King's vision is generally unQuevedian. To look at Bentley through his Lucianic eyes is to see not so much a monstrous symbol of society's moral and cultural decay as a somewhat knavish individual hell-bent on making a complete fool of himself.

Even so, thematically, formally, and stylistically, *Dialogues of the Dead* is a highly original piece of burlesque, exemplifying King's unsurpassed capacity to imitate and adapt classical models to topical and personal subjects. Yet in the latter sense at least, it inspired few imitations of its own; perhaps only an anonymous tract which appeared in 1701 claiming to be a continuation of 'that Silly Book, the Dialogues of the Dead', and Tom Brown's *Letters from the Dead to the Living* (1702), owe any direct debt to it. As Keener points out, later English versions, such as Prior's (c.1720) and Lyttelton's (1760), almost invariably took their cue from the French models of Fontenelle and Fenelon. In thematic terms, however, its descendents are considerably more numerous; if one discounts Boyle against Bentley, *Dialogues of the Dead* represents the origin of the line of anti-Bentley satire that was to extend well into the eighteenth century.

It was not until 1711, however, that King himself returned to this fertile satiric field, prompted by two events of major proportions involving the great critic. The first was a controversy between Bentley (who since 1699 had held the position of Master of Trinity College, Cambridge) and a confederacy of college Fellows, which was to continue on and off in the courts and the College for another thirty odd years. The dispute had begun as early as 1709, when Bentley attempted to initiate a series of reforms intended to modernize the College's operations (particularly with respect to the granting of fellowships and scholarships), and thus consolidate and build upon Trinity's reputation
in letters and science. Some of these moves brought him inevitably into conflict with the Fellows, whose attempts to maintain the existing state of affairs in turn provoked some ill-mannered and vitriolic attacks from Bentley accusing them of 'vice and idleness' and of standing in the way of 'vertue, learning, and good discipline'. The outcome was an action brought by the Fellows against their Master, which charged that he had not only deprived and insulted them, but had also acted contrary to the College statutes and, worst of all, had misappropriated and wasted College funds. The charges were publicized by Edmund Miller in his Remarks on Dr. Bentley's Letter, from which King was later to draw some particularly damning material. It was not until late 1713 that the case was finally heard, and the whole issue was not completely resolved until 1738.35

The second event was the publication in 1711 of Bentley's edition of Horace (republished in Amsterdam in 1713). The two issues were connected by the fact that Bentley dedicated the work to Robert Harley, a move widely perceived at the time to be a blatantly opportunistic (and in view of his past preference for the Whigs, somewhat hypocritical) move designed primarily to enlist the Lord Treasurer's backing in his struggle against the Fellows. The edition itself was in some respects another astonishing piece of scholarship, a massive tome containing over seven hundred emendations to the existing text, all prefixed by a typically arrogant 'Preface to the Reader', in which the editor consistently boasts (though often unjustifiably) of the originality of his critical revisions. As for the alterations themselves - which, contrary to the accepted editorial practice, were introduced directly into the new version - even Bentley's greatest admirers have almost unanimously found it impossible to defend most of them, despite the undeniable learning displayed in his attempts to justify them. Jebb, for example, claims that 'Horace would probably have liked two or three of them,- would have allowed a very few more as not much better or worse than his own,- and would have rejected the immense majority with a smile or a shudder'. One example to which he refers illustrates perfectly Bentley's apparent inability to appreciate the moral value of poetic licence, and that good poetry occasionally requires the contradiction of logic and common experience:
Thus in the Epistles (I. vii. 29) we have the fable of the fox, who, when lean, crept through a chink into a granary, and there grew too fat to get out again. "To the rescue," exclaims Bentley, "ye sportsmen, rustics, and naturalists! A fox eating grain!" And so Bentley changes the fox into a fieldmouse (volpecula into nitedecula). But the old fabulist from whom Horace got the story, meaning to show how cunning greed may overreach itself, had chosen the animal which is the type of cunning, without thinking of the points on which Bentley dwells, the structure of its teeth and its digestive organs.36

No wonder, then, that another of Bentley's old enemies, Atterbury, slyly wrote to him to thank him for the 'great pleasure and instruction I have received from that excellent performance', adding that this new edition had nevertheless left him feeling rather uneasy now that he had 'found how many things in Horace there were, which, after thirty years' acquaintance with him, I did not understand'.37 On a more superficial level, too, it is not difficult to see why King's humanistic sensibilities should have been offended. Whereas the Latin text itself spans approximately three hundred pages, Bentley's annotations, emendations, and other scholarly paraphernalia consume around four hundred and sixty. If King can be criticized for failing to recognize the brilliance and value of Bentley's work on Phalaris, then at least on this occasion the validity of his case against the great scholar must to some degree be conceded.

The publication instantly gave rise to a spate of minor satires, which attacked Bentley both for his quintessentially pedantic labours and for the sycophancy and 'servility' of his dedication to Oxford. Of these, the most extensive and prolonged by far was William Oldisworth's version of Horace's Odes, Epodes, and Carmen Seculare, which appeared fortnightly in pamphlet form from the end of June, 1712, until well into the following year, when they were bound together by Lintot, normally in a two volume set.38 According to the Preface, the purpose of the new translation (which came complete with a copy of the original Latin text) was not only to 'shew...the best Author of Augustus's Age, in his native Purity' and demonstrate that 'no matter how good a translation is, it cannot match the original'; but also 'To convince him [i.e. the reader], how ridiculous it is to presume to correct Horace without Authority, upon the pretended Strength of Superior Judgement in poetry'.39 Besides the verse, each number also contained what purported to be a literal translation of Bentley's notes, though according
to Monk they are in truth 'mere travesty; adopting such a vulgar phraseology, as would
give a ludicrous character to any book that ever was written'.

The satire was rounded off by an additional body of mock annotation entitled 'Notes
upon Notes', which are claimed to be written in the 'Bentleian Style and Manner', and
which are almost certainly the work of Oldisworth's friend and mentor, King. As
evidence of the doctor's participation in the project as author of the mock annotation,
R.F. Jones has noted that the title page bears the same illustration of an obese, drunken
Horace that appears in King's *Horace at Trinity* (to which I shall turn shortly); to this
one might add the fact that King's *Miscellanies* is given special attention in a catalogue
of Lintot's publications attached to the 1719 complete set, in which the rest of King's
writings also figure disproportionately. More significant than this admittedly slender
circumstantial evidence is the style of 'Notes upon Notes'. The best of them display the
classic parodic blend of mimicry and *reductio ad absurdum*, together with occasional
infusions of nonsense verse (notably nursery rhymes), travesty, and blame-by-praise
irony, which King employs so frequently in his other works: e.g.

[Arboribus raro aut nunquam Columbae insideant.

This Observation is certainly most just, *that Pigeons do very seldom Perch upon Trees;*
and therefore *Horace* did ill to call the *Elm, Nota sedes Columbis*. Whether the *English*
Pidgeon be the full *Translation of the Latin Columba*, is not yet settled by the *Learned:*
Neither do we fully know what sort of *Perches* were *allow'd* for *Doves among the Romans*;
but I hear the celebrated and *accurate Bursmannus* will shortly oblige the *World* with a very
*curious Dissertation on the Rise and Improvement of Roman Pidgeon-Houses, which will
set this matter in a clear Light* (I, p. 23).

One note in particular recalls 'Modern Achievements': 'History does not give us a full
account of this *Euthymus*, who was, no doubt, a famous *Olympick* Champion; but
whether Quarter-Staff, Back-Sword, Single Fauchion, or Sword and *Poklid* were his
weapons, as also whether the Bull or Bear was his chief Game, is not so clear from
Antiquity'(I, p. 14). Although essentially conventional, the joke in Part III about critics
guessing at broken inscriptions also bears a reasonably close resemblance to 'The
Imposture'(pp. 11-12); while there is something of both 'Modern Achievements' and
'The Dictionary' in the annotator's rhetorical observation of how 'noble' an 'Art is
Criticism, where an Excursion into a *Vocabulary*, or a tolerable Progress made in an *Index*, shall be deem'd an Achievement [sic], an Adventure, and accordingly entitle a Man to everlasting Honour and Glory!" (p. 18).

King's parting shot at Bentley was fired soon after the first of the 'Notes upon Notes' appeared, and was aimed at the much broader target of the Master's alleged activities at Trinity College. Published in *Useful Miscellanies* - which was advertised in the second of Oldisworth's *Odes* (15 July, 1712) as being published that same day - *Some Account of Horace's Behaviour during his Stay at Trinity College in Cambridge* is a classic Menippean satire, a prosimetric mock-defence by a 'Well-wisher' to the college of the Master's extraordinary expenditure on food, drink, and firing, on the grounds that the real culprit was in fact his overseas guest, Horace. Using carefully-selected extracts from Horace's *Odes*, Epistles, and Sermons (together with Creech's notoriously poor translation of them) as evidence of Horace's supposed tendency towards Epicurean excess, the Well-wisher not only claims to have established the Master's innocence, but also argues that the enormous costs could be defended on the basis that Horace's residency would ultimately bring great credit and international recognition to the institution (p. 39). Home has pointed out that the inspiration for the satire probably stemmed from Bentley's dedication to Harley, in which he himself playfully refers to Horace as a noble guest who had been residing with him during the preparation of the edition, and incorporates Horatian phrases into his prose in the process. In Home's view the piece lacks much of the 'personal rancour' of the earlier burlesques if none of King's characteristic wit and ingenuity; though he asserts that through his satiric method, which is travestic in effect if not strictly in form, 'Horace is maligned for the castigation of Bentley, both of whom appear as debauchees responsible for the exorbitant consumption of beer and victuals in the Master's Lodge'. Weeks suggests that the real target of the satire would appear to be the whole, indecorous conflict itself, and more especially 'the pomposity and solemnity' of the two main protagonists. Placing it in the 'best tradition of laughing satire', he considers it 'one of
the most amusing things that King ever wrote'.

Both these interpretations, however, miss a fundamental element of King's satiric strategy, which has major implications so far as the real meaning and tone of the piece is concerned; i.e., the figure of the Trinity Horace is not intended to represent the real Horace at all. In fact, he is an 'emended' Horace, a hypocritical imposter dressed in the critic's own clothes, who has abandoned all the general moral principles he had professed previous to his arrival at the Master's lodge. Effectively, then, the satire simultaneously attacks Bentley's criticism and his allegedly hedonistic manners and morals, both charges being reinforced by the introduction of allusions to Miller's Remarks, which together act in such a way as to illuminate the essential unity of Horace and the Master, the creation and the creator. Miller's charge that Bentley had unjustly annexed the Fellows' 'kitchen-garden', for example, is juxtaposed with an allusion to Horace's famous (and, significantly, ironical) admission to Tibullus in the fourth epistle of his first book that he had grown as 'plump and fine' as one of 'Epicurus' Swine'. In a clear reference to Bentley's assumption that his criticism was designed to perfect the literary text, the Well-wisher notes that Horace

is much improved since that time, and is become Totus Teres atque Roundus, as Round as a Bowl, or the Hoop of a Tierce of Claret; so that, when the Fellows saw this black unwieldy Outlandish Pig come into their Kitchen-Garden (which the College Cooks used to have for Pot-herbs, Sallads, &c but has since been forcibly dispos'd of, [by the Master] by taking the Key and giving it to one of the Fellows, expressly against the Consent of the Seniors; (See Remarks upon a Letter, by Mr. Miller, Fellow of Trinity-College, p. 69) they might apprehend, in the very worst Sense of the Proverb, that a Hog was got into their Pease; for he ravaged them like an Irish Cocherer, who never departs as long as he can find a single Potato (pp. 30-31).

In fact, he is not only 'improved'; as the Well-wisher further points out, his character has changed radically since his arrival. Whereas he originally ate and drank relatively sparingly and 'would often repeat these Verses of the Thirty-first Ode of his First Book' advocating a life-style based on the principle of moderation in all things, the Horace who now resides there had shown 'himself not to be so easy a guest; and declares himself for 'Banquets, ...for Rummaging, Carelessness, and Debauchery' (p.
31). Just as the comparatively unassuming and undemanding Horace who came to Trinity represents the received, unemended text resurrected by the Renaissance scholars, therefore, so the new Horace staying at Trinity is at once the personification of Bentley's scholarship, his corrupt edition, and of Bentley himself. His unweildy bulk, the consequence of the vast quantities of beer, bread, butter, and pigeon meat, consumed at the Master's lodge, corresponds to that of Bentley's massive edition, grown fat as a direct result of the editor's gargantuan appetite for emendation, annotation, and indexation. In another example of King's delight in multilingual word-games, the Well-wisher further associates the Trinity Horace with both Bentley himself and his edition, which was soon to be re-released in Amsterdam. 'As he grew daily more unweildy', we learn, 'so he fell into the Dutch faction', the joke extending by means of a pseudo-Dutch translation of the first line of Ode III xxii into a conventional Tory jibe at the bourgeois character of the United Provinces. 'I fancy it might not be improper for Horace to take a Journey to Amsterdam', the Well-wisher continues, 'to see what Improvements he can make of himself in Holland'; before noting that many within the College had started to complain that they should not be expected to 'pay for Horace's Maintenance, whilst he was recruiting himself with some Emendations of his Work' (p. 37).45

The real theme of Horace at Trinity, then, is the humanistic relationship between proper learning and the inculcation of manners and morality, a theme (it will be recalled) that King had already touched upon in Dialogues of the Dead. As the behaviour of the Trinity Horace clearly demonstrates, the mere emendation of textual particulars without regard to the wider themes of the work as a whole invariably leads to a state of moral, cultural, and even spiritual degradation. Paradoxically, for all his additional bulk, the Trinity Horace is plainly less rounded a figure in more essential terms than he had originally been; having shed so many of his old ideas, attitudes, values, and ironic nuances, he was in one respect only a fraction of his former self. This is formally represented by his defender's highly-selective quotations, which, taken crudely out of
their context, in themselves contradict the general 'Horatian' message of the Odes, Satires, and other original sources. From the urbane, witty advocate of virtuous merriment admired by humanists since the Renaissance, the Trinity Horace had shrunk to a crass, gluttonous, beer-sodden, Dutchified buffoon whose only concern seemed to be that he remained plentifully supplied with food, alcohol, and fuel. Worse still is his hypocrisy, particularly in connection with religion, which is explicitly shown to be a direct consequence of pedantry. Here the burlesque in effect becomes distinctly rancorous (not to say grossly unfair), as Miller's particularly damning allegation that Bentley only paid lip-service to religion is juxtaposed with the professed Epicureanism of his guest, despite his 'pretended Recantation...published in the Thirty fourth Ode of his First Book' (a reflection, perhaps, on Bentley's earlier participation in the Church's campaign against the Epicurean philosophy):

But I never heard that Horace, whilst in College, kept Chapel (ibid.)himself, but that he never hindered other Persons from minding Divinity, which should have been their proper Study, rather than to find out Que's, and Atque's, and Vel's, and Nee's, and Neque's, at the Expense of a thousand Pounds a Year and upwards, designed for much better Uses than to correct an old Latin Song-book, not to say worse of it, notwithstanding all the Graces and Beauties of its Language (pp. 32-33).

On top of this are his immodesty, presumption, and sycophancy, as evident in his invitation to Maecenas/Harley 'to lay aside Thoughts of Public Business' simply in order to join him in an all-night drinking binge, 'which was but a moderate Request for so great a Man to do for such a Friend'(p. 36). By its deliberate distortion of the theme of Ode III viii - in which the poet's friend and patron is invited temporarily to put aside public matters for the pleasures of good wine and feasting in celebration of the anniversary of Horace's narrow escape from an accidental death - the combination of allusion and invention again infers the gap between the real Horace and Bentley's bowdlerized version, as it ironically stresses the fact that Bentley's Maecenas was by no means his friend and patron. Bentley's scholastic travesty is further represented through the amusingly-reductive substitution of items from Miller's expenditure lists for those of the original:
Horace was resolved to keep up the good Custom in England, though it was after something a different way from what he used to do at Rome: A Friend of his, coming into his Chamber on the Calends of March, which is more generally known by the Title of St. Davids-day, found him very Complaisant to the Season; instead of his Vessel of old Wine, he was very plentifully provided with a Crag of Welsh ale; instead of the Flowers that used to Crown his Head, he had got a prodigiously over-grown Leek in his hat; and the Thankful Sweets were much more satisfactorily supply'd with the Odour of a dozen of warm Crusts and a whole Cheese toasting before the Fire (p. 36).

The travesty of the last lines of Epistle II ii is a final variation on the theme. The real Horace's mature reflections on the wisdom of living one's life richly yet virtuously, generously, and in a fashion commensurate with one's age and station, and of avoiding the mockery of youth by quiting 'the feast' of life with dignity and grace when that time inevitably arrives, is reduced to the doggerel level of an undergraduate taunt demanding that his Bentleian reincarnation finally 'take his Leave of Trinity College' (pp. 39-40). Yet, as in Lucian's treatment of Plato in Lexiphanes, King's low comic adaptation of 'the best Author of Augustus's Age' in no way reflects adversely on Horace himself. It is, as it were, his Lexiphanic abuser who is really maligned, and whose hedonistic grossness is so graphically captured in the image on the medal 'taken out of Trinity College Buttery'.

For all its apparent flippancy, then, Horace at Trinity is both considerably sharper and more complex than has previously been recognized. Its sophisticated concoction of allusion and travesty emphasizes the paradox of Bentley's philistine, self-proclaimed improvement of the poet renowned above all for his lightly-ironic castigation of affectation and immoderation, a paradox made all the more striking by the scholar's alleged intemperance in relation to the college resources. In the process, it effectively repeats the achievement of Dialogues of the Dead, displaying through its burlesque its author's own extensive knowledge of Horace's writings and literary skills. If in formal terms its model is of the 'Varronian kind', its 'sentiment' is indisputably Horatian.
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Chapter Six

'A Dish not so very common': The Satires on Martin Lister

If Atticus dines sumptuously, he is thought a fine gentleman; if Rutilus does the same, people say he has lost his senses: for at what does the public laugh so loudly as at an Apicius reduced to poverty.

Juvenal

On 29 December, 1707, Martin Lister, a noted physician, virtuoso and only recently responsible for a new edition of an ancient cookery book, complained to a colleague about a 'fresh attack' upon him by 'a villainous buffoone, set on by the Physitians as in R.W [i.e. King William's] time'. The 'buffoone' was, of course, King; and the attacks were The Art of Cookery (which in fact was yet to be published in an authorized form) and A Journey to London in the Year 1698 after the Ingenious Method of that made by Martin Lyster, one of the group of prose parodies he wrote around the turn of the century. If Lister's reaction is perhaps understandable, his description of his anonymous assailant neither does justice to the elaborate wit and humour of his burlesques, nor acknowledges the genuine ideological and cultural convictions which underlie them. While in thematic terms essentially identical to the satires on Bentley, King's parodies of Lister's efforts in the fields of travel literature and classical scholarship are perhaps the most colourful and vibrant of all his works, with the possible exception of Useful Transactions in Philosophy.

Whether King's satires were actually connected in some way with the the internal divisions within the Royal College of Physicians over such issues as iatromechanism and the foundation of the Dispensary - a charge Lister was to reiterate in two subsequent letters, and which his most recent biographer tends to accept - is unlikely ever to be established; one suspects, though, that they were at least partly motivated by factors quite removed from Lister's work as a scientist and author, notably politics. Though his
political views in the early 1690s apparently tended towards Toryism, his actual political connections by the end of the century could hardly have endeared him to someone like King. His niece was Sarah Churchill, and it was largely through her efforts that he came to be one of Queen Anne's physicians by the early 1700s, an appointment which aroused considerable resentment within the Royal College of Physicians and the Royal Society. With Hans Sloane, Tancred Robinson, James Petiver, Nehemiah Grew, and William Charleton, he was known to frequent that haven of Whiggish virtuosi, the Temple Coffeehouse. He had also offended various people in Oxford over a matter concerning the Ashmolean Museum. The chief reasons why King focused on Lister, though, were no doubt because Wotton had defined him as the very model of a modern virtuoso, and because his works had more than justified the tag. As a scientist, he had become famous for a series of articles published in the Philosophical Transactions on spiders and insects, and a massive study of shells, Historiae sive Synopsis Methodicae Conchylorium (1685-1692). Like Bentley, moreover, he was renowned for his pride and arrogance.

By 1698 he already had attained the position of physician to the Duke of Portland, Hans Bentink, William III's unpopular Dutch favourite; and it was while accompanying Bentink (and incidentally, Matthew Prior) to Paris on a diplomatic mission that he wrote A Journey to Paris in the Year 1698. This somewhat rambling account of his experiences in the French capital represents his contribution to the immensely popular seventeenth-century genre of travel literature, which included both the inherently educational travelogues of the Grand Tour, and the more marvellous (though as time wore on, more scientifically valuable) accounts of distant voyages to, for example, Terra Australis Incognita. Frequently written by former travelling tutors, the earliest versions of the first type performed a similar function to that which many modern travelogues still do, providing basic commentaries on a particular area's history, geography, cultural traditions, political and legal systems, languages, and so forth. Another obligatory feature, reflecting the Renaissance interest in classical antiquity, was the description of
any local ancient ruins, statues, or other philological curiosities. Some idea as to what was expected of a continental travel book by its polite audience in terms of its content can be gleaned from Bacon's directions in his essay 'Of Travel' (one of a number of similar statements on the subject made by courtesy book writers) as to the sort of details young gentlemen 'Tourists' should record in their diaries of their overseas experiences:

the courts of princes, specially when they give audience to ambassadors; the courts of justice...; the churches and monasteries, with the monuments which are therein extant; the walls and fortifications of cities and towns, and so the havens and harbours; antiquities and ruins; libraries; colleges, disputations, and lectures...; shipping and navies; houses and gardens of state and pleasure, near great cities; armories...; exchanges; ...exercises of horsemanship, fencing...; treasuries of jewels and robes; cabinets and rarities; and to conclude, whatsoever is memorable in the places where they go....As for triumphs, masks, feasts, weddings, funerals, capital executions, and such shows, men need not be put in mind of them; yet they are not to be neglected.  

Often the work of courtiers and ambassadors, the most acclaimed of the Restoration continental travel books and accounts of individual foreign countries, notably Sir William Temple's *Observations Upon the United Provinces of the Netherlands* and Sir Paul Rycault's *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (1668), remained essentially true to these broadly humanistic criteria.  

(As we have seen, it was to this genre that Molesworth's *Account of Denmark* also ostensibly belonged.)

In keeping with the developing interest in natural philosophy, and no doubt encouraged by the directions to travellers issued by Robert Boyle in various numbers of the *Philosophical Transactions* (reprinted in 1692 as a book entitled *General Heads for the Natural History of a Country*), more and more travel books in the latter part of the century also came to exhibit geological and biological information, and famous natural philosophers such as John Ray and Francis Willoughby joined the list of travel writers. The later years of the Restoration period witnessed the publication of numerous popular journals, abridged travel books, rarity books, and catalogues detailing the whereabouts and special features of continental cabinets, and providing rules and advice on how to view them. No less than the essentially non-scientific travelogues, the best of these were considered an important element of a gentleman's broad cultural education, and were
read avidly for their provision of both curious and enlightening information about the
natural world and its multifarious civilizations.\textsuperscript{9} As we have seen, King himself
probably derived his ideas about more efficient farming techniques from Francois
Misson's \textit{A New Voyage to Italy}.

This mixture of polite edification and exotic entertainment, then, was basically the
sort of work Lister's book was meant and expected to be - and what, to some extent at
least, it is. His account of his visits to various Parisian institutions and meetings with
different members of the French scientific community and intelligentsia (including the
Daciers) certainly had its admirers in its own day, and has since been praised for its
industry and insights into contemporary French society by its nineteenth- and
twentieth-century editors. Even they, however, have conceded its obvious and myriad
flaws. George Henning admits that 'some things of a trifling nature found their way into
it, as if the learned author had merely transcribed his journal; and that the 'style itself was
also remarkably inaccurate and negligent'.\textsuperscript{10} Raymond Stearnes likewise notes that
Lister's choice of subjects and failure to adhere to accepted generic guidelines caused
offence to some contemporary readers.\textsuperscript{11} Indeed, by Lister's own admission his book in
many respects contradicts the gentlemanly conventions regarding travel reporting laid
down by the courtesy book writers. Confessing that his 'Tract was written chiefly to
satisfie my own Curiosity, and to delight myself with the memory of what I had seen',
(p. 1) he promises not to trouble his reader with 'Ceremonies either of State or Church,
or Politicks, for I entred willingly into neither of them, but only, where they would
make a part of the Conversation, or my walk was ordered me'. 'You'll easily find by
my Observations', he continues,

\begin{quote}
that I incline rather to Nature than Dominion; and that I took more pleasure to see Monsieur
\textit{Breman} in his White Wastcoat digging in the Royal Physick Garden, and sowing his
Couches, than Monsieur de \textit{Saintot} making room for an Ambassador; and I found my self
better disposed, and more apt to learn the Names and Physiognomy of a Hundred Plants than
of Five or Six Princes. After all, I had much rather have walked a Hundred Paces under the
meanest Hedge in \textit{Languedoc}, than any the finest Alley at Versailles or \textit{St.Clou}, so much
I prefer fair Nature and a warm Sun, before the most exquisite Performances of Art in a cold
and barren Climate (pp. 2-3).
\end{quote}
Consequently, he spends most of the book describing cabinets and expressing his regard for what he calls 'particular History', such as treatises on insects, tadpoles (p. 105), Egyptian rattles (pp. 44, 113), and other virtuoso interests. A number of cuts at the front of the book illustrate the more impressive of the philological rarities and biological specimens he had encountered, among them various Palmyran coins, shellfish, and centipedes. He cannot resist recalling his own contributions to the burgeoning corpus of antiquarian knowledge, including a 'Discourse in the Ph. Transactions' on the 'different make and goodness of Egyptian Chisels' (p. 114). His dedication to the accumulation and recording of factual data, regardless of their intrinsic humanistic worth, leads him to incorporate detailed and lengthy discussions on the most mundane subjects, such as the sorts of meat and vegetables available in Parisian markets, the best method of growing mushrooms, the nature of the local drinking water, and the amount of dust on Parisian streets:

The Dust in London in Summer is oftentimes, if a Wind blow, very troublesome, if not intolerable; in Paris there is much less of it, and the reason is, the flat Stones require little Sand to set them fast, whereas our small Pebles, not coming together, require a vast quantity to lay them fast in paving (pp. 26-27).

Whether or not Lister felt that such observations might in some way prove useful, he gives the clear impression that in his view dust is more noteworthy than the court of the Sun King. Another aspect of the book which was bound to prove offensive is its extensive discussions on medical and anatomical matters, of which the account of a demonstration of the operation of a human embryo's heart, which had been 'obligingly procured' for him 'with the Lungs intire', is perhaps the most graphic instance: e. g.,

the Foramen Ovale was shut and opened more or less, at the pleasure of the Embrio, according to the Necessities of Nature, and the quantity of Blood that was to pass: That it was probable, that all Insects had a command of their Hearts (of which I had given large Instances elsewhere) by some such Passage, which they could not shut altogether, or in great part, as they had a mind, in Winter, in Fear, or Fasting for want of Food: That the shutting up of the Passage in adult Animals was therefore done in an instant, by drawing the Curtain fully, which could never be again drawn back and opened, because of the great Torrent of Blood, which now entred the Right Auricle, and stopp'd it in that Posture, which in time could altogether stiffen and lose its Motion of Relaxation. As a Hen, when she sleeps, draws over the Membrana Nietans; and likewise when she dies, the same membrane
As interesting and valuable as such information might have been to a physician, it is hardly the stuff of which polite travel literature was made. With its patently indecorous subject matter, inelegant phrasing, and grotesquely inappropriate use of metaphor and simile, this passage exemplifies Lister's consistent violation of the accepted bounds of the genre. It is not difficult to see why King should have found *A Journey to Paris* an irresistible subject for parody.

On the surface *A Journey to London in the Year 1698 after the Ingenious Method of Martin Lyster* recounts the experiences in the city of a certain Samuel Sorbiere, particularly his encounters with a number of local antiquarians and virtuosi. These features have prompted some critics to associate it with the period's ambulatory satire, notably Ned Ward's *The London Spy*, the initial numbers of which were published in the November of that year. There are some fundamental differences between the two works, however. While the *Journey* contains moments of broad social satire and journalistic commentary - such as the jokes on the Catholics (pp. 9-10), corrupt officials (p. 33), and the contemporary trend for canalization implied in the account of the king's ducks (p. 28) - they are merely incidental and secondary to the book's main aims of personal lampoon and parody. Its real ancestors are the parodies of travel literature written earlier in the century, notably the mock travelogues of John Taylor and the poetic mock-encomia of Donne, Jonson, and the other wits inspired by Thomas Coryate's penchant in his *Crudities* for mountebanks, prostitutes, execution sites, and similarly indecorous 'Trifles'. A more direct source is Thomas Sprat's *Observations on Monsieur de Sorbiere's Voyage into England*, a famous piece of controversial banter on a travelogue published in 1664 by the then Historiographer Royal of France Samuel Sorbiere. In the eyes of the English public, Sprat's *Observations* brilliantly laid bare the numerous inaccuracies and misrepresentations in Sorbiere's fairly uncomplimentary account of Restoration London, and succeeded in making its author's name synonymous
with poor travel writing and pedantry. He observes, for example, that Sorbiere was incapable of judging what was truly meritorious and worthy of inclusion in his narrative:

But to give you further evidence of the solidity of his humour. In all the Rode between London to Dover, he forgets not to enlarge upon everything that he saw, except only that which is one of the bravest spectacles in the World. He is very exact in surveying the Bay-Windows of Canterbury. He fully describes the Bowling-Greens and the very Rowlers, that make them smooth: he speaks so Romantically of the Vallies, the Hills, and the Hedges of Kent, that the Authors of Clelia, or Astrea, scarce ever venture to say so much on the like occasion....Who can deny, but in all this he is a very circumstantial, and Faithful Relator? But I pray, Sir, mark, that he spends very many more lines in speaking of each of these Toyes, then of the most magnificent Arsenal at Chatam [sic]....where then was his Philosophical Curiosity? where his discretion to know good things? where his Love for Great, and Wonderful Arts? what was a fitter Prospect to have stop'd at? where could the ancient, or present World have shewn a nobler sight? (pp. 42-45).

In his fascination for trivia, writes Sprat, Sorbiere was another Coryate, who would not allow 'Horse nor Man' to 'escape his pen', but would describe his 'host's Beard and Sign Post' (pp. 39-40). He is particularly aggravated by Sorbiere's account of the Royal Society, in which the Frenchman mistakenly asserts that its chief influences were Descartes and Gassendi (rather than Bacon), and seems primarily concerned with the arrangement of the chairs at meetings. 'I suffered his Tittle-tattle on Rochester Bridge', he writes with obvious impatience, 'But is not this a shameful Sign of his weakness that he has insisted so long on such mean circumstances, while he was describing a subject that might have yielded him so much noble matter for his Pen?' (pp. 238-240). Sprat's conclusion that Sorbiere is nothing more than a 'vain Traveller, an empty Politician, an insolent Pedant and an idle Pretender to Learning' (p. 255) is more or less the same judgement that King passes on Lister on account of his Journey to Paris - hence his ironic adoption of the Frenchman's identity as the ostensible author of his mock travelogue.

Together with his usual allusive technique, his use of the persona of 'Sorbiere' is the key element in his parodic strategy, and represents another major contrast with Ward's London Spy, the narrator of which (as the title suggests) is something of a katascopos. Sorbiere, on the other hand, is an archetypal philosophus gloriosus, whose
self-incriminating descriptions of London mimic the 'Inimitable Pattern' of Lister's account of Paris, which, he claims in a brief preface, 'for the clearness of his Expression, the Elegancy of his Descriptions, as well as Ingenuos Choice of his Subjects, deserves a particular Salutation from all the Admirers of the Belles Lettres in the Universe'. As in the earlier controversial tracts, King adheres to to his opponent's text, selecting passages from the original, and even indicating page references in the margin. But his intention in *A Journey to London* is to ridicule and amuse, not debate, and accordingly he makes full use of his satiric license to misquote and distort Lister at almost every turn, deliberately taking him out of context, jumbling quotes up, substituting reductive phrases and objects, reversing his syntax, embellishing passages with sentences and images of his own - anything to achieve a comic effect. He allows Lister's own promise 'not to trouble you with ceremonies either of State, or Church, or Politicks' to form the basis of his persona's account, and by manipulating other phrases of the original, adding a few clauses of his own, and extending the sense of Lister's remarks to their absurd conclusion, he broadens the gap between decorum, moderation, and common sense on the one hand, and Lister's rampant 'Curiosity' on the other: e.g.

> for though I met with an English Gentleman who proffer'd to shew me the Princes of the Blood, the Prime Ministers of State, the Lord Mayor, and other Officers belonging to a *City of so immense a greatness as that of London*, yet I refus'd the Civility, and told him, *that I took more pleasure to see honest John Sharp of Hackney*, in his *White Frock*, crying *Turneps ho!* *four bunches a penny*, than *Sir Charles Cottrel*, *making room for an Embassadour*, and *I found my self better dispos'd*, and more apt to learn the physiognomy of a *hundred Weeds*, than *of five or six Princes* (p. 2).

Lister's tendency to include in his narrative the most personal, trivial details, such as his suffering from a cough (Lister, p. 4), is mirrored in Sorbiere's informing his reader that he too had fallen 'sick upon the road', having lain 'dangerously ill of the Tooth-ache'(p. 3). Naturally Sorbiere is as fascinated by London's dust as Lister had been by Paris's:

> *I could heartily wish, I had been at London in Summer*, to have seen whether they have *more Dust* at *London*, than in *Paris*. *I have notwithstanding in my Curious Enquiries after Dust*, found that there are several dust Carts about the Town, and there are several Women
that take delight, and as I have heard pay money to ride in 'em (p. 11).

Reflecting Lister's, Sorbiere's style is characteristically subjective, rambling, and often clumsy. His witless inversion of the elements of Lister's decidedly unscientific simile in his own description of a certain curiosity highlights how absurdly 'ill pair'd' and 'unlike' Lister's figures and similes really are:

I also saw in this Collection an Hippocampus about four Inches long, the Tail square, thick Bellied and Breast like a Miller's Thumb (Lister, p. 60).

In this Collection I saw a Miller's Thumb, which he told me was taken by a Miller with his Thumb and for finger. It is very like a Hippocampus as to the Thick belly and breast of it (p. 16).

The philological and scientific content of A Journey to Paris left the parodist plenty of openings for academic satire, which is achieved by means of an assortment of mock-scholarly paraphernalia, most notably the mock index and marginalia summarising the subjects which most concern 'Sorbiere': e.g. 'Asses', 'Beggars', 'Cabbage','Ducks', 'Pox!','Monks (none)', 'Miller's Thumb'. In what amounts to a classic example of his humour, King also makes use of Germanic script to denote a bogus antiquity in the course of parodying Lister's Coryate-like assertion that the inscriptions recording various ancient battles on some Greek marbles established both the marbles' authenticity and the Roman debt to Greek calligraphy (pp. 48-49). For his part, Sorbiere assumes the authenticity of some Scottish stones on the grounds that the letters of their inscriptions (which conclude with a 'Noble Pindarick' on a hero of the battle of 'Chevy Chase' who continued to fight 'upon his Stumps") have a particular 'Blackness..., particularly the word Stumps' (pp. 20-21). Similarly, Lister's extensive records of botanical specimens are humorously reduced to a bizarre bilingual catalogue of floral exotics, such as the 'Utica male olens Japoniae, the stinking nettle of Japan' and the 'Blooming Bramble of Lapland' (p. 26); while his calls for dissertations covering seemingly all topics, no matter how insignificant or esoteric, find their parodic echo in Sorbiere's promise to supply a dissertation on 'the Remarkable thickness and thinness
of Mufflers' (p. 22), and demands for the publication of studies and 'figures' of tadpoles, 'a certain Day Butterfly ...and some considerable number of Snails, as well naked as fluviatile' (p. 21). After more calls for studies of the Dauphin's 'Playthings or Puppets' and an Egyptian 'Sistrum' (pp. 21-22), King's point is made ironically by his foolish persona's proffering his assistance in the completion of 'so useful a Collection as that of Play-things and Rattles' (p. 22). He was to dust off and develop the same joke some years later for his parody of Meursius's dissertations on Greek games in the Useful Transactions, from where perhaps the Scriblerians were to get their idea for Cornelius's treatise on 'Play-things'.

As in Dialogues, carnival imagery and allusions to the fool tradition perform a conventional reductive function. Inevitably Sorbiere's travels take him to Bartholomew Fair, where (in a passage which imitates Lister's comments on the activities at the Fair of St Germain) he diligently observes the performances of the rope dancers (p. 27). The motif is more ingeniously utilized in Sorbiere's account of his visit to the Tower of London. Given the chance to view the armoury and crown jewels (items which Bacon for one specifies as especially noteworthy) he declines on the grounds that he inclined 'rather to Nature than Dominion'. Consequently he is then shown some 'Lyons, Tygers, and two very remarkable Cat-amountains', but prefers to concentrate on 'two Owls, of an immense greatness, but by their being without horns, I take 'em not to be a distinct species from the European' (pp. 17-18). On one level this is another joke on Lister's pedantic concern for species classification; but on another, Sorbiere's disinterest in the crown jewels and the big cats symbolizes his lack of regard for matters of which they are traditionally emblematic - government, law, kingship and so forth - matters especially deserving of a gentleman's attention. The owl, on the other hand, is an ambiguous figure, for while it is commonly associated with Minerva and wisdom, it also has strong associations with the fool tradition, in particular with the mythical German buffoon, Till Eulenspiegel. Made famous in England through the jest book literature, Eulenspiegel is depicted in his traditional guise in Ben Jonson's Lucianic Masque of the Fortunate Isles,
The emblem's Eulenspiegelian connotations survived through the seventeenth and into the eighteenth century, as is evident from *Hudibras* (II, iii, 803) and *The Dunciad* 's accompanying illustrations of a frowning owl perched on the ass's burden of dunce literature, and wearing the cap and bells of the fool. By his enthusiasm for the owls, then, Sorbiere symbolically both confirms his true intellectual character and represents Lister's ludicrous subversion - or to put it another way, his carnivalization - of the cultural and intellectual values of the gentleman scholar.

Moments of bawdy also serve a number of functions, emphasizing not just the baseness of Lister's Coryate-like pedantry, but also illustrating once again how conducive the abuse of learning is to immorality. At the same time, of course, King exploits (perhaps hypocritically) the comic potential of sex, as in Sorbiere's recollection that it had been 'a pleasant Diversion to me to read upon the Walls' the 'Quack Bills' guaranteeing remedies for the pox, an admission which echoes Lister's confession to the same effect *a propos* a series of Parisian advertisements proclaiming 'par l'Ordre du Roy. Remede infallible & commode pour le gerison des maladies secretes sans garder la chambre'(pp. 240-41). The London bills, not surprisingly, are substantially less refined: e.g.,

The Unborn Doctor, that Cures all Diseases. He is to be spoke with at Boiling Cooks, in Old Bedlam, from Ten till Two, and afterwards at his Stage in Moorfields.

Another

At the *Golden Ball* and Lillies-Head,
*John Case lives, though Saffold's dead* (pp. 24-25).

If the moral message is in this case well-concealed behind the billingsgate and doggerel, it is made more explicit in a passage parodying Lister's verbose musings on Cardinal
Mazarin's castration of some ancient nude statues, which conclude with a rhetorical question as to why nudity should be so offensive, 'since a very great part of the World yet defies Cloaths, and ever did so; and the parts they do most affect to cover, is from a certain necessity only' (pp. 31-32). In response, King has his persona reveal that - as in the case of Shadwell's Gimcrack - his obsession with curiosities coincides with a lecherous disposition. In recalling a conversation he had had with a suitably embarrassed lady before a properly-endowed statue at Hyde Park Corner, he vainly records how he had defended his lack of conventional sexual morality and modesty in a series of pseudo-philological reflections on ancient dress, particularly with respect to the ease with which the Roman toga could be discarded at bedtime (again a distorted allusion to Lister's commentary). But as his female interlocutor points out, his display of pedantry is ultimately a sign of hypocrisy, an 'Apology for talking obscenely' (p. 12).

As Sorbiere also shows, the link between academic obsession and physical lust further extends to gastronomic greed and the love of luxury. As we have already seen in relation to the satires on Bentley, besides being consistently censured by both the Scriptures and classical moralists excessive gourmandising had long been deplored by medical authorities anxious to emphasize the connection between proper diet and good health; while the Horatian ideal of a simple, yet nutritious diet was an important element in the self-identity of the English gentleman, setting him apart from his sauce-loving, onion-eating Gallic enemies. In addition, the issue of luxury had become part and parcel of much contemporary economic theorizing, particularly in terms of the prevailing doctrine of mercantilism, the basic tenet of which was that the key to economic prosperity lay in a favourable balance of trade. The importation of foreign luxury items was therefore considered a recipe for economic disaster; and the fact that such goods principally came from France made them even more reprehensible in the eyes of the more moralistic, patriotic sections of English society. Lister's appreciation of luxurious French interior decoration (p. 9) and such products as artificial pearls (pp. 142-44), together with his extensive and enthusiastic accounts of the finest French
foodstuffs (including 'champignons and moriglios', pp. 155-58), could therefore easily be misconstrued as evidence of his serious ethical shortcomings - despite the fact that Lister actually criticizes the French for their obesity and condemns their immoral tendency towards luxury (pp. 169-70). As ever, King's absurdly smug, French stereotype is unable to discriminate between the positively beneficial and the merely ostentatious when reviewing the the English 'Braziers and Turners Shops':

I found it true, what my Country Man Monsiuer Justell formerly told me, that according to his Catalogue there were near threescore utensils, and conveniences of Life more in England than in France. But then the English, since the breach of their Commerce with France, lie under great necessities of several commodities fitting for the ease and support of Humane Life, as Counterfeit Pearl Necklaces, Fans, Tooth Picks, and Tooth Pick Cases, and especially Prunes, the Calamity of which has been so great for Ten Years last past, that they have not had enough to lay around their Plum Porridge at Christmas (pp. 4-5).

Lister's almost encyclopedic musings on the numerous varieties of French wines and spirits (pp. 161-68) are parodied by means of a postscript containing a catalogue of beers (the serious point of which Bentley patently failed to appreciate when he used it to substantiate his accusation that King was more familiar with the insides of taverns than of libraries). Lister's digression on the medicinal and nutritional qualities of chocolate and tea, which culminates in a brief reflection on the gastronomic habits of the ancients, is also mocked by an inventive example of reductio ad absurdum, as Sorbiere introduces a more concrete, antiquarian element to Lister's somewhat idiosyncratic historical speculations:

The old Romans did better with their Luxury; they took their Tea and Chocolate after a full Meal, and every Man was his own Cook in that case. Caesar resolved to be free, and eat and drink heartily; that is, to excess, with Tully; and for this purpose Cicero tells his Friend Atticus, that before he lay down to Table, Emeticen agebat, which I construe, he prepared for himself his Chocolate and Tea; something to make a quick riddance of what they eat and drink, some way or other (A Journey to Paris, p. 171).

I met with a Gentleman, that told me a secret, That the old Romans in their Luxury took their Tea, and Chocolate, after a full meal, and every man was his own Cook in that Case. Particularly Caesar that most admirable and accomplish'd Prince, being resolv'd to Eat and Drink to excess before he lay down to table, Emeticen agebat, prepared for himself his Chocolate, and Tea. He presented me with a Roman Tea Dish, and a Chocolate Pot, which I take to be about Augustus's time, because it is very Rusty; my Maid very ignorantly was going to scour it, and had done me an immense damage (A Journey to London, pp. 25-26).
On one level, Sorbiere's equation of antiquity and worth with the accumulation of rust signals again the archetypal pedant's mindless lack of discrimination; and at the same time, the alazon's praise of the immoderate Caesar and apparent endorsement of the use of emetics in the interests of gluttony provide further evidence of the corrosive capacity of pedantry on the manners and morals of the Christian gentleman. As Kerby-Miller and Levine have pointed out, the cleverness of the joke was not lost on the Scriblerians.19

That King's parodic travelogue enjoyed a fair degree of popularity (and remained one of his own favourites) seems to be borne out by the fact that a number of his subsequent, otherwise anonymous tracts (e.g. Dialogues of the Dead) were published as the work of 'The Author of A Journey to London'. It may have had a slight influence on Swift's bantering defence of another of Matthew Prior's peace missions, A New Journey to Paris (1711), the French persona/narrator of which bears some resemblance to Sorbiere in terms of his gullible reflections on the economic and political actualities of France.20 As events were to show, however, the only effect it had on the ever-curious Lister was to cause him a certain degree of irritation, which became more acute when King's offensive was relaunched over much the same ground nine years later.

The occasion was the publication in 1705 of Lister's edition of the ancient world's most famous cookery book, De Opsoniis et Condimentis, sive Arte Coquinaria, a collection of recipes of exotic dishes and sauces traditionally ascribed to Apicius Coelius.21 Subscribed by a select readership which included Archbishop Tenison of Canterbury, Robert Harley, and various Fellows of the Royal Society, including Wren, Newton, and Sloane, its initial printing run amounted to only one hundred and twenty copies, though a second edition was published four years later in Amsterdam.22 This fact alone indicates the nature of the book; for Lister's Apicius, like Bentley's Horace, is a typical example of the 'Variorum' editions of the classics that proliferated in Holland in the late seventeenth century, its original text swamped not just by his own extensive
notes, but also by those of its earlier editors, Gabriel Humelberg and Caspar Barthius. The extraordinarily pedantic nature of such an exercise is obvious; but what made matters even worse so far as King was concerned was that Lister had felt it necessary to revive the work of the most notorious glutton of the ancient world. Apicius - 'a voluptuary of extraordinary wealth, who gave his name to many kinds of cakes' - is reported by Athenaeus to have once sailed to Libya merely in order to buy some highly reputed prawns, only to return immediately on discovering their reputation to be unwarranted. Martial focuses on Apicius's notorious suicide, apparently in a bout of despair over his severely reduced financial (and hence gastronomic) circumstances. His recipes for such delicacies as doormouse sausages were almost certainly used by Trimalchio's chef to prepare his feast in *The Satyricon*, and formed the core of the curriculum in Tenterbelly's 'Institutions of the Art of Muncherie', as recalled by Hall's Mercurius Brittanicus. This, then, was the author whom Lister had felt deserved the honour of a modern edition. To King, it must have seemed that a contemporary Moronian was intent on spreading the depraved gospel of the guru of Gluttonia.

King's response to this epitome of false learning, the first of his works to be published following his return from Ireland, initially suffered the fate of 'Mully of Mountown' and *Orpheus and Eurydice*. To King's understandable annoyance, a pirate folio edition, consisting only of the imitation of Horace's *Ars Poetica*, was advertised in *Works of the Learned* in November, 1707, and again in mid-December. It was quickly followed by a very shoddy edition 'in chap-book style', which was attributed to 'the Author of a TALE of a TUB', a particularly ironic mistake in view of King's 'Remarks'. The original Lintot edition was published on Thursday, 8 January, 1707/08, advertisements being carried in both the *Daily Courant* and *The Post-Man*. This time the author was correctly identified as the same one responsible for *A Journey to London*, and the well produced work, priced at two shillings, contained not just the Horatian imitation, but a copy of Horace's original on facing pages and an accompanying series of mock letters to Lister. With the exception of *Heathen Gods*, it was King's most
popular and lucrative work.\textsuperscript{26}

As John Fuller has correctly argued in his perceptive and enthusiastic Chatterton Lecture for 1976, 'Carving Trifles: William King's Imitation of Horace', the basic moral lesson implicitly delivered in King's satire - particularly by the central persiflage of the \textit{Ars Poetica} - is the quintessentially Horatian one of the propriety and wisdom of moderation.\textsuperscript{27} He detects the major influence of the second, fourth, sixth, and eighth poems of Horace's second book of satires, which treat the subject of diet in the broader thematic context of the social and personal benefits of simple, moderate living. Clearly Lister's resurrection of Apicius represented a glaring contradiction of the Horatian ideal, not just in terms of its apparent incitement to gastronomic riot, but also in respect of its ludicrous obsession with annotation and other forms of scholastic superfluity. From the perspective of the Tory gentleman, moreover, it was a particularly perverse contradiction in view of England's increasingly costly struggle with the modern nation synonymous with culinary extravagance and modishness: as Lister had already effectively confirmed nine years earlier. As the foreword announces - and the dedication to Richard Estcourt's Beef-Steak Club implies - \textit{The Art of Cookery} is an expression of its author's 'esteem for Horace...and aversion to the introduction of luxury, which may tend to the corruption of manners' at a time when England's essentially Horatian traditions, customs, and above all, simple, beefy cuisine were ensuring its triumphs over the sauce-drenched French.

King's condemnation of Apician luxury and concurrent advocacy of Horatian virtues are the principal themes of the two verse sections of the satire, the first of which, an imitation of Horace's fifth verse of the first book of \textit{Epistles}, dominates the fourth of the accompanying letters. According to the accepted Restoration and Augustan practice of paraphrase and imitation,\textsuperscript{28} Horace's invitation to Torquatus to supper is contemporarized and naturalized, the Roman's happy celebration of the good life being mirrored in his imitator's offer of a 'few Dishes, and some Wine', good company, a selection of pleasant English literature, and in general, 'A Cleanliness, from Affectation
free' (pp. 15-17). After this poetic *hors d'oeuvre*, the main course is eventually laid before us in the form of a parodic imitation of the *Ars Poetica*, in which King wittily transposes Horace's relatively flexible principles of poetic and dramatic composition and performance to the subject of gastronomy. The result, ostensibly, is an amusing guide to good cookery and etiquette, which for all its sophisticated bantering, nonetheless ultimately provides a genuine set of moral, cultural, and of course, literary and scholarly precepts which had been happily adopted by the Beef Steak Club, but which Apicius's latest editor was plainly guilty of violating: e.g.,

```
Happy the Man that has each Fortune try'd,
To whom she much has giv'n, and much deny'd:
With Abstinence all Delicates he sees,
And can regale himself with Toast and Cheese.
Your Betters will despise you if they see,
Things that are far surpassing your degree;
Therefore beyond your Substance never treat,
'Tis Plenty, in small Fortune, to be neat (p. 73).
```

Criticism of pedantry is implicit in the general Horatian approach to the culinary art, and explicit in a passage relating to Horace's comments on valid criticism (*Ars*, 617-40). After alluding to Horace as a model cook blessed with 'Wit and Judgement'(p. 129), King insists that the good cook will submit his work to the assessment of the true critic, since

```
Judgement provides the Meat in Season fit,
Which by the Genius drest, its Sauce is Wit.
Good Beef for Men, Pudding for Youth and Age,
Come up to the Decorum of the Stage.
The Critick strikes out all that is not just,
And 'tis ev'n so the Butler chips his Crust.
Poets and Pastry Cooks will be the same,
Since both of them their Images must frame.
Chimera's from the Poet's Fancy flow,
The Cook contrives his Shapes in real Dough (p. 131).
```

The symbolic contrast set up in the latter stages of the poem between beef - the food of heroes, both English and Homeric - and the fricasseed frogs, snails, and worst of all, sauces of the French not only plays an important part in the presentation of the Horatian theme, but serves a propagandistic function as well. The cry to buy British and so-
support the war effort is heard in the claim that 'native ingenuity' has not only provided its own excellent cuisine, but also improved the 'French Kick-shaws' and Spanish oglios imported into England in the past (p. 101). The triumphs of the British navy, and by extension the superiority of the sailors' diet of salted pork and boiled liquor, are proclaimed amid warnings that ultimate victory is only assured by patiently adhering to Tory military strategy (pp. 101-02). English conquests, however, were being threatened by the decadence of the victorious general's table, now overflowing with champagne, snails, beccoficos, and ortolans (pp. 91-92). The increasing English hostility towards the policies of the States-General that was to culminate in the John Bull tracts and The Conduct of the Allies is also detectable behind the poet's amusing imitation of Horace's contrast between the cultured wit and superficiality of the Greeks and the homely materialism of his countrymen (Ars, 461-78):

The French by Soups and Haut-gousts Glory raise,
And their Desires all terminate in Praise.
The thrifty Maxim of the wary Dutch,
Is to save all the Money they can touch:
Hans, cries the Father, see a Pin lies there,
A Pin a Day will fetch a Groat a Year.
To your five Farthings join three Farthings more,
And they, if added, make your half Pence four.
Thus may your Stock by Management encrease,
Your Wars shall gain you more than Britain's Peace.
Where Love of Wealth and rusty Coin prevail,
What hopes of sugar'd Cakes or butter'd Ale? (pp. 107-08).

As with Swift's and Arbuthnot's satires and polemics, the urgent call for an advantageous peace implicit in these lines is no less strident because of the facetious and humorous form in which they are couched. 'The Roast Beef of old England' may well have triumphed at Blenheim, Ramillies and Oudenarde: but, warns King, if the result was to be rich terrenes for Marlborough and the Whigs, and onion soup for the landed gentry, then such victories, like Malplaquet, would be very Pyrrhic indeed.

That these topical passages sit as well as they do in the context of an otherwise playful Horatian parody is further testimony to the skill and imagination of King's poetic craftsmanship, of which Fuller also provides some excellent examples, at least one of
which is worth repeating. Horace's dictum that one should have the more bloodthirsty scenes of a play narrated rather than performed -

Yet, to the stage, at all thou mayst not tender
Things worthy to be done within, but take
Much from the sight, which fair report will make
Present anon: Medea must not kill
Her sons before the people; nor the ill-
Natured, and wicked Atreus cook, to the eye,
His nephew's entrails; nor must Progne fly
Into a swallow there; nor Cadmus take,
Upon the stage, the figure of a snake.
What so is shown, I not believe, and hate (260-69).

- is transformed into an instruction not to prepare the more indelicate foodstuffs in the full gaze of the diners:

Far from the Parlour have your Kitchen plac'd,
Dainties may in their working be disgrac'd.
In private draw your Poultry, clean your Tripe,
And from your Eels their slimy Substance wipe.
Let cruel Offices be done by Night,
For they who like the Thing abhor the Sight (p. 85).

The reduction of Horace's three specific examples (the entrails of Atreus's nephew, the transformations of Progne into a swallow and Cadmus to a snake) into tripe, poultry, and eels typifies King's comic ingenuity. Horace's prescription that one should be prudent in the use of both antiquated and modish language (Ars, 65-68) is likewise diminished into a warning that one should not 'change old Bills of Fare' too often, 'Yet Credit to the Artist will accrue, Who in known things stll makes th' appearance new'(p. 61). Another of Horace's more famous and important passages - his querying of whether 'Nature, or Art' produces 'the nobler verse' (Ars, 581-86) - is delivered in terms of an appropriately culinary dialectic:

'Tis a sage Question, if the Art of Cooks
Is lodg'd by Nature, or attain'd by Books:
That Man will never frame a noble Treat,
Whose whole Dependence lies in some Receipt:
Then by pure Nature ev'ry thing is spoil'd,
She knows no more than stew'd, bak'd, rost, and boyl'd.
When Art and Nature join, th' Effect will be
Some nice Ragoust, or charming Fricasy (p. 123).
Sometimes the parody takes a particularly witty twist, as when King substitutes in place of Horace's praise of Quintilius his own praise of Horace (p. 129), parodies Horace parodying Homer (pp. 79-81), and inverts the Roman's gastronomic metaphor into a dramatic one (*Ars*, 557-64; *The Art of Cookery*, pp. 115-17).

But there is more to King's imitation than just the witty substitution of cuisine for poetry; the concern expressed in the foreword about the ultimate quality of the poetry is manifested in the poem's abundant imagery, musicality, and linguistic subtleties. For example, Horace's perception of the dynamism of language as being analogous to the mutability of nature (*Ars*, 83-89), and his allusion to Roman programmes of land development through marsh draining, are rendered in rich, natural images with a delicately humorous touch which culminates in an ironic aside on the late Restoration fashion for canals. The final four lines in particular exemplify King's capacity to blend wittily the harmonic qualities of rhyme, alliteration, and the striking and apt cacophony of the third last line into a fresh, lightly satirical variation on the most commonplace of themes:

The Seasons change us all, by Autumn's Frost,
The shady Leaves of Trees and Fruit are lost.
But then the Spring breaks forth with fresh Supplies,
And from the teeming Earth new Buds arise.
So stubble Geese at Michaelmas are seen
Upon the Spit, next *May* produces green.
The Fate of things lies always in the dark:
What Cavalier wou'd know *St.James's Park*?
For *Locket's* stands where Gardens once did spring;
And *Wild-Ducks* quack where Grass-hoppers did sing.
A Princely Palace on that Space does rise,
*Where Sidley's* noble Muse found Mulberries (p. 63).

Similarly, Horace's irresponsible, unstable, 'unbearded youth' (*Ars*, 229-36) becomes indentifiable by the way he dines and squanders his wealth at the Rose Tavern, where 'His eating must be Little, Costly, Nice'(p. 83). This short line not only conveys the luxury theme through the symbol of the ostentatious dinner: the cleverly-controlled cadence captures the youth's affected airs, the stress falling appropriately on each telling,
paradoxical adjective, the final monosyllable being at once delightfully litotic and musically arresting.

A rather different note is struck in other passages, in which splashes of Hogarthian imagery evoke some of the flavours and smells of the Augustan streets, especially in a section parodying Horace's account of the development of classical drama from its humble beginnings as itinerant popular theatre to the masks, costumes, and fixed stage of Aeschylus (Ars, 311-18). What was more normal for the author of The Art of Cookery than to think of Thespian carts in terms of the still humbler wagons of the popular fairground markets, and to reduce Thespis to Tom Bold, who 'did first begin the Strolling Mart,/ And drove about his Turnips in a cart'. Aeschylus is reduced still further to a grocer's wife:

_Bess Hoy_ first found it troublesome to bawl,
And therefore plac'd her Cherries on a Stall;
Her Currants there and Gooseberries were spread,
With the enticing Gold of Ginger-bread (p. 99).

As the Greek theatre graduated from the 'rough rude Satyrs naked' to the gentleness and modesty of the tragic muse (Ars 319-40), so the 'hideous din' of the fairground spruikers selling 'Flounders, Sprats, and Cucumbers' in time gave way to the sale of less 'noisy Food', like 'new Milk and Maccarel'(p. 101). This profusion of imagery, both proletarian and polite, may call into question Weeks's claim that the poem imitates 'the style and dry tone of Horace'. Like the Scriblerians, King tops his Horatian mask with the playful extravagance of a late Stuart peruke, and his Horatian sandals are daubed with London's mud.

The accompanying prose section, which is composed of a series of a mock-letters, is if anything even more delightful than the central poem. With some justification Williams describes the letters as 'an oasis to anyone who has crept through all the illimitable and dusty desert of the general run of eighteenth-century prose', adding that 'with their outrageous pedantry, their gleeful mockery, and their sparkling familiarity, [they] give some of us more pleasing relief than do even the more noted effusions of
Addison and Steele'. Noting that they shift the 'satirical focus' from the *Ars Poetica* to Lister's edition, Fuller argues that in the process King also draws on a different Horatian source, namely the group of poems in the second book of Satires that deal with the question of 'extravagant or pretentious living'. He observes that the fourth satire (to which King at one point refers directly) is of special importance, since the method Horace employs here is 'remarkably similar' to King's ironic posing throughout the letters. Horace's satire is formally a dialogue between the foolish Catius and Horace himself, though the great bulk of it is given over to a virtual monologue by the former apparently made up of gleanings from a gastronomic lecture he has just attended. Fuller claims that 'Horace's remarks in the dialogue convey a secret smile to the reader as he elicits the precious and recondite information', and that King, playing Horace to Lister's Catius, likewise counterfeits 'a desire to partake of such learning, and also to boast of his achievements in that line'.

While it is certainly the case that on occasion the Correspondent sounds remarkably Horatian - as in his statement in the last letter that the best physicians are 'Dr Diet, Dr Quiet, and Dr Merriman', who, 'if kept at a constant Pension,...will not be very costly'(p. 138) - we should not, I believe, too readily assume such consistency in respect of the Correspondent's identity and equate Horace's technique in his satires so closely with King's. For the most part the Correspondent in fact more closely resembles Catius and the Nasidienus of *Satire* II vi - or better still, Lexiphanes - than Horace, providing pedantic treatises on gastronomic history and enthusiastically advocating culinary excess. While one might maintain that all this is just King playing his Horace to an exaggerated degree, it is more likely that in the majority of letters King is playing a very different and more complex game, one which, as Fuller acknowledges, formally belongs to the tradition of Varro, Lucian, and *Epistolarum Obscurorum Virorum*. The Correspondent, in other words, is a Menippean mask, who despite the odd flashes of Horatian commonsense and ostensible authorship of the imitations, is on the whole a disciple of Listerian philology. In view of the wide licence of Menippean satire, the
character inconsistency is not problematical. Rather like Erasmus's Folly and Swift's Tale-Teller, Gulliver and Modest Proposer, the Correspondent is potentially a very flexible mouthpiece capable of a variety of poses and voices, though King mainly restricts his role to that of a Listerian mimic (in keeping with his much more limited parodic intentions). In his opening letter, for instance, the Correspondent compares favourably the 'closet learning' of the 'curious' with the 'old Store' of classics like Cicero and Virgil; and impressed by the example of Heliogabulus - 'who, tho' vicious, and in some things fantastical, yet was not incurious in the grand Affair of Eating' - proposes Apicius's teachings as a necessary corrective to 'the Barbarity of our present Education':

> For what hopes can there be of any progress in Learning, whilst our Gentlemen suffer their Sons at Westminster, Eaton, and Winchester to eat nothing but Salt with their Mutton, and Vinegar with their Roast Beef upon Holidays? What Extensiveness can there be in their Souls? Especially when upon their going thence to the University, their Knowledge in Culinary Matters is seldom enlarg'd, and their Diet continues very much the same; and as to Sauces they are in profound Ignorance? (pp. 3-4).

In his third letter, he further betrays his own 'closet' mentality by his fascination for that prime symbol of virtuosity, the crocodile (p. 7), his readiness to search into Marsham's Dynasties and 'the Fragments of Manethon' in order to add to Lister's account of 'dentiscalps, vulgarly called tooth-picks', and his increasingly illogical reasoning and strange associations. The Egyptian subject immediately puts him in mind of the opening part of Juvenal's fifteenth satire, which (as King was well aware) attacks with sharp irony the savagery and absurdity of Egyptian superstition; this theme, however, is apparently lost on the Correspondent, who regards the poem merely as a source to confirm that it had once been 'Sacrilege to chop a Leek, or bite an Onion' (p. 13). It is so characteristic of the virtuoso-pedant that his writings should meander aimlessly from a series of digressions on the special qualities of cutlery to a reflection on a famous treatise on salad dressings to an aside on the nature of Pharaoh Necho's porridge (pp. 10-13).

In letter five he notes that Horace is 'severe upon our sort of learning' (p. 18), before incorrectly asserting that even he provides recipes for eggs in Satire II iv - significantly,
it is actually Catius who does so. Inevitably he depreciates Homer and accepts the validity of Wotton's trifling arguments for the superiority of the modern world over the ancient:

*Homer* makes his Heroes feed so grossly, that they seem to have had more occasion for *Scewers* than *Goosequills*. He is very tedious in describing a Smith's Forge and an Anvil: whereas he might have been more polite, in setting out the *Tooth-pick-case* or painted *Snuff-box of Achilles*, if that *Age* had not been so barbarous as to want them. And here I cannot but consider, that *Athens*, in the time of *Pericles*...and *Rome* in its Height of Empire...had nothing that equal'd the *Royal* or *New Exchange*, or *Pope's-head Alley*, for curiosities and *toy-shops* (p. 19).

Once astride his hobby-horse, his critical fancy for 'Trifles' inevitably gallops away with his reason, leading him to propose for future publication a 'Bibliotechia Culinaria', which will contain everything from references to Athenaeus's *The Deipnosophists* to old recipes for custard (pp. 26-27). This pattern of psychological regression is especially noticeable in his criticisms of the plays and prologues of Dryden, Buckingham, Shadwell, and William Grimston in letters six and eight. As a critic, he is naturally predisposed to notice the dramatists' use of gastronomic imagery, costumes, and props: e.g., 'I have known a supper make the most diverting part of the comedy' (p. 29). But much like Lexiphanes in his response to Plato's *Symposium*, his obsession for such trifling properties has robbed him of all critical acumen, leading him to judge plays solely on the basis of the propriety of their portrayal of the kitchen. A thorough knowledge of gastronomy and culinary antiquities, he insists, would immeasurably benefit the dramatist's art, particularly in respect of his obedience to the 'unities' of both table and stage (pp. 30-31). Antiquarianism and philology, then, should provide the basis of a new concept of decorum, which would proscribe anyone who, for instance, used a 'Hen-Turkey' as a prop in a comedy (pp. 32-33).

The point is made especially well in the eighth letter, in which King's own performance takes on a more Erasmian character in the Correspondent's praise of the dramatic folly of William Grimston; indeed, even more than *Joan of Hedington*, this letter anticipates such Scriblerian exercises as Pope's ridicule of Blackmore in the *Peri*...
Bathous, on which it may have had a minor influence. In technical terms it represents a momentary return to his favourite method of pastiche-parody, as extracts from Grimston's notoriously awful play, *The Lawyer's Fortune; or, Love in a Hollow Tree* (1705) - which had earned him such a reputation for dulness that he himself is reported to have eventually tried to suppress it34 - are interspersed with ironic reflections on the dramatist's mastery of the art of the dramatically bathetic. To the Correspondent, though, it is an 'exquisite Comedy', a 'Poem carefully fram'd according to the nicest Rules of the Art of Cookery'(p. 41). One scene in particular, in which the hero is 'reduc'd to the Extremity of Eating his *Cheese without Bread*, and having no other Drink but Water', moves him to assert that there is nothing more 'moving to Compassion...amongst the Moderns'(p. 47). 'I cannot believe there was any thing ever more of a Piece than this Comedy', he concludes, having amply supported his claim with direct references to Grimston's text; 'Some persons may admire your meagre Tragedies; but give me a Play where there is a Prospect of good Meat or good Wine stirring in every Act of it'(p. 49). Apparently the proof of the play, so far as he is concerned, is in the eating.

If the multiplicity of King's masks is displayed in the earlier letters, the final one, in which the details of Lister's book are at last brought to our attention, certainly resembles closely Satire II iv. Fuller claims that King keeps it to last in order to lend a sense of tension and a 'dramatic shape to his work', and that this device 'conforms to the spirit of restless inquiry of much contemporary scientific correspondence'.35 I would suggest instead that it signifies the elitism and obscurantism of the conventional pedant, who jealously guards his curiosities and, like the hermetic, conceals his findings from all but a privileged circle of acquaintances: as we learn from the Correspondent, his friend (from whom he derives all his knowledge of the book) could only ever get a 'very slight View of it, the Person who was Master of it not being willing to part with so valuable a Rarity out of his Closet' (p. 136). His informant is very much a Catius, impressed as he is by the 'handsome' appearance of the volume, particularly the 'good Print, and fine Cuts [which] make a Book become ingenious, and brighten up an Author strangely' (pp.
His summary of the contents of the new edition corresponds to Catius's recounting of the gastronomic lecture; while the Correspondent's own irony is reduced to the Horatian level of wry asides and reflections, which both infer the real wisdom of Galenic and Stoic proscriptions of luxury (e.g., pp. 150-51), and highlight the Heliogabalian grotesquity and real barbarity of Apician 'Daintiness', notably in respect of Dormice (pp. 152-53) and seafood\textsuperscript{36}: e.g.,

> It was an unusual Expression for a Roman to say, *In other matters I may confide in you, but in a thing of this Weight it is not consistent with my Gravity and Prudence, I will trust nothing but my own Eyes, bring the Fish hither, let me see him breathe his last.* And when the poor Fish was brought to Table swimming and gasping, would cry out, *Nothing is more beautiful than a dying Mullet!* My Friend says, the Annotator looks upon these as *Jests* made by the Stoicks, *and spoken absurdly and beyond Nature*; 'tho the Annotator at the same time tells us that it was a Law at Athens that the Fishermen should not wash their Fish, but bring them as they came out of the Sea. Happy were the Athenians in good Laws, and the Romans in great Examples; but I believe our Britains need wish their Friends no longer Life than till they see London serv'd with live Herrings and gaping Maccarel. 'Tis true we are not quite so barbarous but that we throw our Crabs alive into scalding Water, and tye our Lobsters to the Spit to hear them squeek when they are rosted; our Eels use the same peristaltick Motion upon the Gridiron, when their Skin is off, and their Guts are out, as they did before; and our Gudgeons taking opportunity of jumping after they are flower'd give occasion to the admirable remark of some Persons Folly, when to avoid the Danger of the Frying-pan they leap into the Fire (pp. 158-59).

Nowhere is the voice of Horace more evident than in the Correspondent's concluding promise of a fascinating 'History' of the Sybarites, and his invitation to his friend to bring 'Dick Humelbergius' and Caspar Barthius with him over to a dinner boasting such Trimalchian delicacies as a 'wild Sheep's head...a ragout of Capon's Stones, and some Dormous Sausages' (pp. 159-60).

Consequently, one can locate a final, implicit theme in *The Art of Cookery*. By adapting the *Ars Poetica* properly and wittily in order to convey the moral lessons of Horace to his own age, King once again demonstrates through his parodic art what Humanism held to be the real point of classical scholarship.\textsuperscript{37} To borrow his metaphor, *The Art of Cookery* is a well-crafted, richly-flavoured tribute not only to Horace himself, but also to the teachings of Erasmus and the English Humanist tradition. Into it he put his finest ingredients of wit and learning, moulding the mixture with greater care and
commitment than he managed on any other occasion into a multi-layered, neatly structured creation. With its parodic imitations, mock epistles, mock histories, critiques and treatises, ironic critical review of Lister's edition, numerous instances of incidental satire, mask-swapping, and general prosimetric miscellany, The Art of Cookery is truly a generous offering of satiric fruits. Like the gastronomic 'Surprize' the Correspondent reminds us of, it is 'a Dish not so very common, which promising little from its first Appearance, when open abounds with all sorts of Variety' (p. 22). 38
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Chapter Seven

'Experimental Philosophy in a manner laid aside': The Satires on Hans Sloane

...whatever appears trivial or obscene in the common notions of the world, looks grave and philosophical in the eye of the virtuoso.

(The Tatler, no. 216)

Perhaps the most amusing and misunderstood of King's satires are his two burlesques of Sir Hans Sloane's Philosophical Transactions, The Transactioneer and Useful Transactions in Philosophy - the final variations on the theme of false learning. Frequently recognized (like Dialogues of the Dead and Journey to London) as important precursors of the Scriblerian satire on the Royal Society and its virtuosi,¹ they have almost invariably been interpreted as evidence of his fundamental antipathy towards modern Baconian science and the Society in particular. Weeks, for instance, in an attempt to prove his anti-scientific credentials, indiscriminately connects King's parodies with Stubbes's rants against the Society and its leading apologists, as well as the satires of Butler and Shadwell.² More recently Joseph Levine has reasserted that The Transactioneer attests to King's ignorance of, and opposition to, the practice of modern science;³ while Roger Lund has argued in his recent article on The Transactioneer that King's dogmatic support of the Ancients' cause underlies his attack on Sloane, who 'easily symbolized all that was most excessive, self-aggrandizing and ridiculous in the activities of the modern virtuoso'.⁴ It was 'modern science itself', he implies, which is condemned, not just Sloane himself.⁵ The point has already been made a number of times in this study, however, that this image of King as one of science's implacable foes is essentially erroneous; and that while his view of certain branches of science was certainly prejudicial and myopic, his overall attitude towards natural philosophy was grounded in his theoretical knowledge and appreciation of the basic tenets of the High Baconianism adopted and promoted by the Anglican establishment. This impression of
King's true position as regards Baconian natural philosophy is confirmed beyond reasonable doubt by a close reading of The Transactioneer and, to a lesser extent, Useful Transactions in Philosophy. It will also reveal for the last time King's outstanding capacity to utilize his Menippean inheritance in uniquely impressive ways, a process which in itself illuminates his appreciation of the fundamental, idealistic bond between Humanism and Baconianism.

Sir Hans Sloane's statue near the entrance to the British Museum pays tribute to a man who devoted his life to science and the Royal Society, and whose vast collection of books, letters, and biological and philological rarities was to form the basis of the Museum. Educated in London and the Protestant University of Orange, he was (like his friend and colleague Martin Lister) by profession a physician. Having spent a period as an assistant to Thomas Sydenham, he established his own practice in the capital, before being elected in 1685 to the Royal Society on Lister's recommendation. Two years later he secured the position of physician to the Duke of Albermarle, Governor-General of Jamaica, where he spent the next two years practicing medicine, conducting some research (including some pioneering work on the use of quinine), and indulging what was to be a life-long passion for the life sciences. Later published in his massive A Voyage to Jamaica, his records of his discoveries and experiences in the Caribbean initially appeared in the Philosophical Transactions, of which he became the editor upon assuming the Secretariat of the Society on 30 November, 1693. For the next forty eight years he was to serve in the highest offices of the Society, succeeding Newton as President in 1727. In the meantime he also became one of Anne's court physicians in 1712, attained the Presidency of the College of Physicians in 1719, and founded the Chelsea Botanical Gardens in 1721. Over these many years he earned the respect and admiration of many of the greatest scientific and intellectual figures in the British Isles; and by the time of his death in 1753 at the age of ninety three, he had established an international reputation as a major collector and promoter of natural philosophy, and become familiar with the likes of Voltaire, Franklin, and Linnaeus.
If there is no denying Sloane's exceptional energy and commitment to the pursuit of scientific knowledge, the real merits of his own scientific labours and performance as Secretary of the Society and editor of the *Transactions* were by no means universally acknowledged in his day, and have remained a subject of debate amongst historians of science. His modern admirers have pointed to the truly scientific nature of his experiments and specimen collecting, and in particular to his recognition that the practice of Baconianism necessarily entailed a great amount of laborious fact-gathering and a considerable degree of 'trial and error'. Maarten Ultee, for instance, has emphasized the relationship between his approach to the life sciences and his medical training, noting that an identical position was held by such illustrious contemporaries and colleagues as Ray, William Derham, and Sydenham, in whose hands it had 'proved particularly fruitful'. 'By contrast', he continues,

>a narrower approach concentrating on mathematics and the physical sciences would have severely limited both theoretical and experimental advances. What is important in the history of science is not merely what fits the context of later science, or fires revolutions in thought; as Hans Sloane knew, progress in science may require the pursuit of intriguing but ultimately unsatisfactory paths.8

In the true Baconian spirit Sloan was acutely conscious of the utilitarian aims and ideals of science, and of the distinction between 'Matter of Fact, Experiment, or Observation, and what is Hypothesis', of which he was suitably suspicious. As he announces in the Preface of the *Transactions* for 1699 (volume 21), hypotheses which were prematurely conceived and ran counter to observable phenomena were dangerously counter-productive, and had already caused many 'mischiefs ... by putting People from further search, out of the way, and making them wrest matters of Fact to their Fancies'.8 Others have also pointed out that many of the scientific activities carried out under Sloane's management that have been roundly condemned for their negligible intellectual value were also readily conducted under earlier and later regimes without generally incurring anywhere near as much criticism.9 Nor can Sloane be held responsible for the problems of declining membership and attendances, and financial shortages which the
Society faced in the early 1690s. A legacy of apathy largely inherited from the previous administration, these matters were energetically tackled by the new Secretary; and his tighter financial management and active promotion actually led to an improvement in the Society's economic affairs and a burst of recruitment, boosting the membership considerably.  

Even so, other commentators have observed that during his Secretaryship the Society was commonly perceived to have gone into decline, and to have failed to achieve the utilitarian goals expected of it by its original royal patron. Michael Hunter claims that in some ways Sloane's financial actions and recruitment drive only exacerbated the Society's plight, since most of the new members proved worthless and consequently lowered the overall standard. Because a substantial percentage were admitted on Sloane's recommendation, the result was a distinct change in emphasis in the Society's activities towards his principal areas of interest, the life sciences and natural history. Some, like the apothecary and naturalist, James Petiver, were among the Secretary's closest friends; and their admission, as well as his general administration, encouraged other friends and associates who were already members to return to more active roles in the Society, among them Lister and Tancred Robinson. Moreover, Sloane, whose Whig affiliations were well-known, seems to have ensured that his nominees were, so to speak, ideologically sound. According to Hunter's catalogue, they included two Huguenot refugees, two Dutchmen, an Italian, another Frenchman, and James Cunningham, a surgeon to the East India Company. Another was King's old enemy Robert Molesworth, who promptly nominated a certain Edward Haistwell, listed in Hunter's catalogue as a 'Quaker Merchant'. It is difficult to imagine a group of candidates less favourable to the Oxonian scientists and Royalist gentlemen who had dominated the Society in the 1670s and 1680s, and who now found themselves increasingly at odds with the Sloane group. A number of prominent Oxonians, among them Seth Ward and Richard Lower, even ceased attending the Society's meetings altogether; and one might speculate that to the Tory rearguard it must have seemed that...
the Society which had once boasted the patronage and membership of Clarenden, Boyle, and Wren, and which had voiced so vociferously its loyalty to the established institutions of church and state, was now in danger of joining the newly formed Bank of England and the New East India Company in the growing portfolio of the stock-jobbing Whigs. Whether for obliquely political or purely intellectual reasons, the level of factionalism within the Society reportedly worsened. By 1699, according to Sir Robert Southwell, the Royal Society's 'Stock' had sunk 'so low as hardly to keep Life and Soul together'.

It was almost certainly this combination of the Society's politically significant compositional changes, public infighting, and intellectual shifts in the direction of biological studies and rarity collecting that sparked the spate of satires aimed at Gresham College (or at least those now in charge of it) written by a number of Tory wits during the last years of the century. Though these satires no doubt drew some inspiration from the early satires on the virtuosi, and repeated many of their general charges of uselessness and pedantry, they were perhaps motivated more directly by topical affairs and personalities than has generally been acknowledged. Without specifying any individual, Judith Drake hints at Sloane in her character of a 'Virtuoso', in which she mocks the presumption of those who imagine themselves philosophers simply because they have accumulated a 'Collection of Garden-snails, Cockle-Shells, and Vermin', before asking facetiously whether such 'Mushroom and cockle-shell Hunters' could ever be responsible for 'Improvements of Physick, or any useful Arts'. Anxious to separate such men from 'any sincere and intelligent Enquirer into Nature' - particularly Boyle, who is deemed 'more honourable for his learned Labours, than for his noble Birth' - Drake further insists that her remarks are not aimed at the Society itself, which by 'their great and celebrated Performances, were an illustrious Argument of the wisdom of the August Prince, their Founder, of happy Memory, [and]...highly merited the Esteem, Respect, and Honour, paid them by the Lovers of Learning all Europe over'. She admits a 'very great Veneration for the Society in general', but notes a 'vast
Difference between the particular Members that compose it', concluding that it has now 'fallen into a faithless incredulous Generation of Men'.\(^\text{17}\) The 'laboratory keeper' whom Ned Ward's Spy encounters while visiting Gresham College might also be on one level a caricature of the Secretary. A 'raree-show interpreter' obsessed with mummies, dead birds, crocodiles, and 'abortions put up in pickle', his 'notable harangue upon every bauble in this store-house' eventually drives the Spy away from 'Maggot-mongers Hall' and on to Bedlam.\(^\text{18}\)

Sloane's handling of the *Philosophical Transactions* also provoked criticism from the same quarters for very similar reasons. Founded in March 1664-65 by one of the Society's original members, Henry Oldenburg, in accordance with the high Baconian principle that 'there is nothing more necessary for promoting the improvement of philosophical Matters, than the communicating of such', the journal remained until 1753 an unofficial and private venture normally undertaken by one of the Society's secretaries, which carried reports of the Society's proceedings as well as book reviews and foreign and domestic correspondence concerning a variety of scientific and philological matters.\(^\text{19}\) Oldenburg (who served as its first editor up until his death in 1677) had promised in the introduction to the first volume that the journal would focus on 'solid and useful learning' and studies which 'delight in the advancement of learning and profitable discoveries', which were to be 'clearly and truly communicated'. The Oxonian scientist Robert Plot, who renewed the journal in 1683 after a brief lapse, in effect reiterates Oldenburg's aims in his brief introduction to number 143, stating that while the *Transactions* and the Society were separate entities, the former was 'a *Specimen* of the latter's activities, and so contained a *great Variety* of useful Matter'. It would continue, he claims, to be 'a convenient *Register*, for the Bringing in and Preserving many *Experiments*, which, not enough for a Book, would else be lost'. It should be noted, however, that even at this stage the satirists were quick to ridicule the publication for failing to provide the 'useful Matter' it promised. Samuel Wesley, for instance, in the bantering 'Epistle to the Reader' that prefaces his collection of mock-heroics and
parodies, *Maggots: or Poems*, mockingly enquires as to where 'in Paul's Churchyard, Duck-Lane, or Little Brittain, I should ...find a Treatise of the Causes, Essences and Property's of a piece of Ginger-bread, or in what part of the Transactions of the Royal Society, I should find how many yards a nimble Louse reaches at Hop-Stride-and-Jump?'.

After another, lengthier lapse between 1687 and 1691, the journal was revived by Sloane's immediate predecessor, Richard Waller, whose apparent editorial policy was bound to encourage the wits. Even bad articles and improbable reports should be published, he once advised his successor, on the grounds that it was up to the readers to determine their merits, and that those responsible for the *Transactions* were 'in no way answerable for the validity of what is there set forth'. This consciously indiscriminate approach, designed to stimulate debate by providing all available facts and ideas regardless of how inconsistent with existing knowledge and theories they were, was accordingly followed by Sloane, under whose direction the *Transactions* carried a greater proportion of articles dealing with natural history and medicine. It is significant, too, that an increasing number of them came from friends and colleagues such as Petiver and Grew.

Questions about Sloane's editing of what had become an internationally-acclaimed publication had apparently already been raised within the Society itself by the time the anonymous pamphlet, *The Transactioneer*, appeared sometime in January or early February, 1700. Immediately a group of disaffected Fellows led by Sloane's bitter rival, John Woodward, was suspected of being behind it, though both Woodward and his friend, the Oxonian divine and scientist John Harris, denied any complicity and all knowledge of the author - and even condemned him for his ignorance and unjust reflections on other Fellows - in letters read before the Society on 20 February. Nonetheless, each confirmed that considerable opposition to Sloane's handling of the *Transactions* was growing within the Society, and claimed that at least some of the charges levelled in the satire were valid. Harris went so far as to urge again that the
Society publicly disavow Sloane's *Transactions*, since they now only dishonoured its good name, did not in fact advance 'natural and useful learning', and even deterred other 'curious and ingenious Gentlemen' from 'communicating their Papers to the Society by the bad company they perceive they must keep, if publish'd in the Transactions'. Woodward - who was himself soon to become immortalized by the Scriblerians in *Three Hours after Marriage* and *The Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus* - pithily asks 'whether there was not occasion given' for the attack, despite the fact that the 'writer of it is but meanly qualified for what he undertakes'. The 'world', he continues, 'has been for some time very loud on the subject, and there were those who laid the charge so much wrong, that I have had but too often occasion to vindicate even the Society itself & yt in public company too'. The Society, though, not only reaffirmed its faith in Sloane's management and editorship, but issued a statement proclaiming that 'on Consideration of the Book lately printed Called the Transactioneer they were of opinion that whoever was the Author of it was Scurrillus and injurious to the Society and Should be proceeded against (if any member of the Society were in any way concerned in the writing of it) to be ejected out of the Society'.

No action was ever brought against the real culprit, however, despite the fact that his identity was soon widely known. Without apparently knowing his name, Sloane himself almost immediately guessed who was responsible, as he reported to the eminent Oxonian mathematician, Dr John Wallis, on 6 February 1699/1700. 'I doubt not you have seen a very malicious pamphlett agt the transactions', he writes, adding that the unknown author was so ignorant, for in many things he ridicules the terms of art & lays down very false principles that any not knowing the least in surgery, anatomy, physic or natural history must own to be great mistakes. As for the critical part, either he is altogether out, or frivolous. For my part I am not the least concerned at it & shall answer it no other ways than by despising it. I have not been yet able to find out the author or bookseller, but by what I can guesse by my best informations they are the same that wrote & printed the Journey to London agt Dr Lister. Though there is some reason to believe there were more than one abt it, yet I believe the chief compiler was the same with that. In his reply Wallis confirmed that the 'Author of it, and of ye Journey to London, is here
sayd to be Dr King, formerly of Christchurch Oxford, now of Doctors Commons London'. 'I do not here [sic] him commended for either', he adds reassuringly: 'And it is thought below his character to trifle at that rate'.27 Wallis's remarks were largely supported by John Shadwell (ironically enough, Thomas's son) in a letter sent from Paris to Arthur Charlett later that year: 'I had lately sent me a pamphlet against our Friend, Dr Sloane wch I was sorry to see and can't but wonder what has enrag'd Dr King so much against our Faculty who can't peep abroade in print but they are sure to have him upon their backs'. Interestingly Shadwell continues by claiming that 'Moliere was never a greater enemy to the Physicians here than he is to those of his Country', before observing ominously that 'if he ever falls into their hands they perhaps may be reveng'd of him'.28

In fact, in some respects the Society's reaction was excessive and unjust, since King goes to some lengths in his preface to ensure that his attack on Sloane and his associates could not be misinterpreted as a general condemnation of the institution itself. What actually concerned him was that such an 'Excellent Society' was in danger 'of being Eclipsed by the wretched Gambols' of the 'Person, and some Correspondents, of one who is slipp'd into the Post of Secretary of that Illustrious Body'; and that the 'vast esteem' in which the Society was held by 'Learned Men abroad' was 'now like to decline; they having no other way of judging of it but by the Philosophical Transactions' (Sigs.A2v-A3r). 'I am mov'd by the Respect I have for Natural Studies', he explains,

and a fear least those Men who have made such great Advances in it, and thereby gain'd the Applause of all the Learned World, should lose any part of it by the trifling and shallow Management of one who wants every Qualification that is requisite for such a Post. All who read his Transactions, either in England, or beyond the Seas, cry out that the Subjects which he writes on are generally so ridiculous and mean: and he treats of them so emptily, and in a St[yle] so confused and unintelligible, that it is plain he's so far from any usefull Knowledge, that he wants even common Grammar (Sig. A3r).

Lund has asserted that these remarks are the 'disengenuous' statements of an 'ironic spokesman', and hence obliquely justify his assertion of King's anti-science prejudices, a deduction based largely on the premise that 'nowhere else in his writings does King
suggest anything but hostility toward modern virtuosi'. Though the preface certainly contains the odd flash of King's bantering wit - notably the remark that instead of attempting the relatively difficult task of becoming an author, Sloane 'should have kept to his old way of bustling, vying with Dr Salmon at Auctions, mustering up Books for a shew, and of acting by Signs, Scrapes, and Wriggles'(Sig. A2v) - it generally remains a relatively serious, straightforward statement of the author's attitude towards Sloane and the work's personal satiric intent. He claims to have treated Sloane 'under two Characters: as an Author and an Editor'; adding that in 'the former I have consider'd his own personal Capacity: in the other, his Judgement in the choice of his Friends, and of the Discourses that he Publishes' (Sig. A2r). His comments on the importance of stylistic clarity for the effective transmission of learning are especially sober:

'Tis plain a Man that is himself once possess'd of any Subject, can express it to another, if he has but Language. If his Head be clear, and the Things rightly digested in it, there can be no Difficulty in the conveying them thence. But where a Man has no real Parts; and is Master of only Scraps pick'd up from one and from another, or Collected out of this Book or that, and these all confusion in his Head, 'tis obvious what a Writer he must needs make (Sig. A2v).

He rhetorically questions the practical value of Sloane's *Transactions*, and compares it to the distinctly useful journal that Oldenburg, Plot and others had previously produced. These statements, I contend, are absolutely genuine, and totally consistent not only with the position taken in the past by such humanistic critics as Meric Casaubon and Drake, but also with what he himself had noted about the current state of the Society in his *Adversaria*: 'Mr Altham tells us, from Stow's *Survey of London*, that Gresham College was designed for an universal correspondence of trade and Commerce; undoubtedly not for *cockle-shells* and *butterflies*'(I, p. 244). Whether they are just, and whether King's implicit approach to science is consistent and could ever be practical, are different questions entirely, and somewhat irrelevant so far as his performance as a satirist is concerned.

Above all is the theme of Sloane's credulity and apparent fascination for the bizarre, which is treated in connection with both humanistic and Baconian censures of
irrationality and deceit. If social utility is the chief end of Baconian natural philosophy, a degree of rational scepticism lies at its methodological core; and on this count, too, Sloane and his favourite correspondents stand condemned. In the preface, King writes that Sloane and his Transactions have 'gained so much upon many People, that they will scarce believe the Evidence of their own Senses'(Sig.A2r), a fundamental violation of the empiricists' creed. At the same time, his pronouncements for all intents and purposes echo Tychiades's concluding remarks in Lucian's The Lover of Lies to the effect that those who insist on 'truth' and 'sound reason [being] brought to bear everywhere' need have no fear of being poisoned by 'empty, foolish lies'. In this lodges the clue to the main reason behind King's retention of the dialogue form. In his eyes, Sloane was merely the modern-day equivalent of Lucian's philosophical quacks; despite his pretensions to true science, he was in reality no more than a senile purveyor of fantastic tales unsubstantiated by meaningful empirical evidence. His journal corresponded to Eucrates's house, a place where idiotic colleagues could impress one another with their absurd, trivial nonsense. In short, it was, as it were, the Eucratean nature of his subject which prompted him to imitate the most appropriate classical model. In turn, the choice of form itself served to reinforce the theme, since the classically educated readership would readily identify the original source and appreciate its significance. This correlation of an ancient literary paradigm with modern subject matter demonstrates yet again the real sophistication and intricacy of his burlesque, and at the same time represents the broad correspondence that was held to exist in polite, Anglican circles between the most basic humanistic values and Baconianism.

But while The Lover of Lies is the ultimate satiric ancestor of The Transactioneer, the two works are not strictly identical in formal terms. The latter is comprised of two related dialogues, and (much more in the manner of Lexiphanes) relies more heavily on King's conventional technique of pastiche-parody, in this case involving various articles in the original Transactions. The Lucianic nature of the piece is instantly apparent in the characterisation: immediately identifiable by their titles, the three speakers perform the
conventional roles of *eiron* (the Gentleman) and *alazon*, represented in the first dialogue by the Transactioneer's enthusiastic proponent, the Virtuoso, and in the much larger second, by Sloane's representative himself. The standard Menippean elements are cleverly and amusingly utilized: besides insertions of doggerel and Latin verse (pp. 8, 50, 67), there is an assortment of mock-scholarly devices, including a mock table of contents which lists among other items 'Mr. Ray's *Definition of a Dil---oe*', 'A China Ear-Picker', 'A Head that was a Bag', and 'Mr. Hone O Hone's *Travelling Irish Bog*'.

The prefatorial remarks are immediately confirmed by the opening section of the first dialogue, which finds the Virtuoso enquiring about the latest 'Philosophical News' regarding any 'New Discoveries or Improvements', only to be met with the Gentleman's admission that since Plot and Oldenburg had died, he had not 'enquired after Philosophical News', even though there still existed 'many Men of Learning and Merit...who bear not only the Titles of Virtuosi, but really deserve them' (p. 1). The problem, he adds, is that nowadays such men only communicated their findings to their friends, being reluctant to publish them in the *Transactions*. The subsequent exchange ironically presents the general themes of the whole work, as the Virtuoso continues to press the Gentleman for the reasons for their unwillingness to publish what could promote 'natural knowledge' and prove beneficial to the public:

*Gent.* Then you must know Sir, these Gentlemen have that vast Opinion of the present *Philosophical Transactions*, and the papers communicated therein, that they are unwilling to Publish their poor Discoveries or Improvements, amongst Subjects so Noble in themselves, and so accurately writ.

*Virtuos.* Truly their Caution is but requisite, for in the Late Transactions, most of the Subjects are indeed most prodigiously sublime; and penn'd too in a Wondrous manner, So that it is a hard matter for the generallity of Virtuosi, who imitate Bacon, Boyle, or Men of that Character, to write in the Language observable in most of those Papers; for there the Expressions are suitable to the Sublimity of the Subjects, and consequently mighty Mysterious, and above the reach of these Gentlemen.

*Gent.* Yes Sir, The Sublimity of the Stile makes it inaccessible to those that are not accustomed to such Flights.

*Virtuos.* Why, 'tis no wonder; for you must know the Philosophical Transactions come through the Hands of one; who takes care that every thing be nobly and clearly expressed, and by his own Writings, which so plentifully adorn those Papers, One may see, is abundantly Qualified for the Task he has taken upon him.

*Gent.* Pray are not the Philosophical Transactions then Published by direction of the Royal Society.

*Virtuos.* No, no, Sir, far from it, that lies all upon one Mans Head; and 'tis happy he has so good a Head-piece (pp. 2-3).
Given the stereotypical nature of the speakers, the basic accusations levelled against the real butt become all too obvious. Far from being an attack on Bacon and his followers, it is implicitly an endorsement of them; and it is against their standards that Sloane's contributions to science and, specifically, scientific reporting are to be evaluated. This has already been partially recognized by Lund, who argues that the distinction and real uniqueness of King's satire lies in 'its preoccupation with the language of scientific reporting, and the degree to which the Royal Society and Sloane...had preserved those new standards of scientific style so boldly enunciated by Thomas Sprat in *The History of the Royal Society*. This he attempts to demonstrate by comparing Sprat's statements with the charges made both directly and obliquely in *The Transactioneer*. He notes, for example, that Sloane's editorial policy hardly accorded with Sprat's claim that the Society had 'striven to preserve that it [i.e. 'the knowledge of *Nature* '] from being over-press'd by a confus'd heap of vain, and useless particulars'; and that Sprat's banishment of all figurative language from scientific writing had in effect been overturned by the actions of the Society's secretary. As Lund records, numerous jokes turn on the ironic quotation of the stylistic violations committed by Sloane and some of his correspondents. The Transactioneer's stylistic crimes are myriad, ranging from simple grammatical errors to syntactical peculiarities and tautology, to the obscurantism of jargon. As the Gentleman implies, the virtuoso's tendency to form 'new Phrases' and coin 'strange Cramp Names' - faults which Bacon and Boyle had strongly indicted - is especially indecorous (pp. 12, 35). The Gentleman is ironically critical of Sloane's and Petiver's clumsy phrasing and use of simile, on one occasion drawing attention to the latter's statement that the sharp claws of an American tortoise are 'like a Mouse' (p. 37). At one point he begs the Virtuoso 'to give the meaning of what you have related in plain English; for the sublimity of this way of expression is above my mean capacity'(p. 5). After noting that the Transactioneer had claimed that a certain Jamaican stone he had found was 'a sort of coral', and reported that, with respect to
fossils, there are many other things growing in the seas adjoining to Jamaica, and not to be found in these parts, which are frequently dug up in the inland parts of England, and elsewhere, where they do not naturally grow.

- the Gentleman makes a mocking attempt at deciphering the meaning of the prose:

what he has [said] about its being found and found again, has almost confounded me....His Intelligencer [i.e. his Correspondent] says, 'twas found in Wales. He, that it grows in the Seas of Jamaica: That it is frequently found Fossile (mark the Phrase) in England: That he has some of it found here, which was many years since found out by Mr. Beaumont: That there are many things found in the Seas of Jamaica, not to be found in these Parts (i.e. in England) which are frequently to be dug up in the Inland Parts of England, where yet after all they do not grow. This in my sense is to say it was found in Wales but grew in Jamaica: 'Twas frequently found in England, and by way of reinforcement 'twas found here, and many years since found. And that there are many things growing in those Seas, not found in these Parts of England, which are frequently dug up (or found) in the Inland parts of England, where yet they do not grow, or are not found. (pp. 6-7)

'This to a man of ordinary Understanding', he says, 'is pretty odd!'. He criticizes another correspondent for resorting to an inappropriately romantic style in order to describe a Welsh mineral spring (p. 49), and comments wryly on 'a mixture of designed Poetry and Accidental Poetry' which had stumbled into one of Sloane's contributions (p. 9). When the Transactioneer himself metaphorically comments on his style, he proudly compares its carelessness to the dishabille of the beau monde (p. 81), an analogy which mirrors his corruption of both classical and Baconian dictates on the proper dress of philosophical thought at the same time as it reveals his essential foppishness.

While Lund's basic point about King's criticism of Sloane's failure to observe the established dictates of proper scientific reporting is to some degree valid, in view of the fact that it is not to Sprat but rather Bacon, Boyle, Oldenberg, Plot, and even Descartes (p. 74) that references are directly made, one might argue that they (and particularly the two former editors) are the most significant paradigms. When the Virtuoso acknowledges proudly that 'there is not an odd coloured or an ill shapen Pebble in the Kingdom, but the Secretary will manage it so as to make it contribute to the general heap
of Transactions' (p. 16), the allusion may be to Sprat but the proper model is Oldenberg, as the Gentleman later confirms:

> You have quite out-done Mr Oldenburg, for the World never thought he Published enough; but you heap Philosophical Relations together at such a Prodigious Rate, that you Publish Transactions as fast again as they desire you. The world is quite over-powered with them (p. 32).

The Baconian theme of utility is central to the satire; and again it is in the spirit of the earlier editors that the Gentleman asks his two interlocutors whether a particular account in the new Transactions really amounts to an 'Advancement of Knowledge' (e.g., pp. 15, 16, 43). For the Sloanian virtuoso, though, the value and development of learning are to be measured purely quantitatively, not qualitatively; 'if it encreases Knowledge', the Gentleman is informed, 'it certainly advances it' (p. 40). Thus his policy is to ensure, with his 'utmost Diligence and Care, that not the least thing in Nature should escape my Notice' (p. 33). Clearly the larger and more confused one's heap of 'vain, and useless particulars', the more knowledgeable, in Sloanian terms, one was.

The commonplace association between the activities of the pedant and antiquarian on the one hand and the virtuoso on the other is drawn yet again in the course of parodying Sloane's article on a Chinese rarity cabinet in number 246 of the Transactions, in which great attention is paid to a collection of devices 'contrived for the taking any substance out of the Ears, or for the scratching or tickling them, which the Chinese do account one of the greatest pleasures'. Accompanying the descriptions of the ear-pickers is a series of diagrams, including one of a rather grotesque 'Chinese Figure...using one of these Instruments, and expressing great Satisfaction therein' (p. 392). After meticulously describing the contents of the cabinet, Sloane adds a health warning on the dangers of picking one's ears too much:

> Whatever Pleasure the Chinese may take in thus picking their Ears, I am certain most People in these parts who have their hearing impaired and have advised with me for their Help, I have found have had such Misfortunes first come to them by picking their Ears too much, and thereby bringing Humours, or ulcerous Dispositions in them.
This homily, it seems, is both Sloane's concession to utility and his explanation as to why such an article should appear in the *Transactions*. It is not difficult, therefore, to see why King chose this article to parody (indeed, one wonders why he did not do better with such material). The Transactioneer proudly proclaims that his article deals with 'a Rarity that few People have thought worth their while to write Dissertations about, or indeed, worth their Notice'; to which the Gentleman replies with the tongue-in-cheek admission that anyone who could bother with such trifles is certainly commendably curious and humble, before asking whether the picture of the delighted ear-picker might not be 'the Author's'(p. 15). When he queries the use of knowing all about Chinese ear-pickers, he is told that the 'chief design was to entertain the Philosophical Secretary; for he took [sic] as much satisfaction in looking upon the Ear-Picker as the Chinese could do in picking his Ears' (p. 16). The Virtuoso (much like the Correspondent in *The Art of Cookery*) then expresses his hope that the *Transactions* will soon carry detailed descriptions and illustrations of similar English 'Rarities', such as knives and forks. The fascination for the laborious collection of 'things', regardless of their intrinsic worth, has thus reached its logical absurd conclusion, a collection of no doubt rusty cutlery. The moral is given finally and pointedly by the Gentleman in the course of his parting exchanges with the Transactioneer: 'Much Pains, it must be allowed, ye have taken, 'tis pity ye had not consider'd to what Purpose'(p. 86).

King's satire on Sloane's preoccupation with freaks and fantastic phenomena runs especially close to his original satiric model, and at the same time accords with another aspect of the common image of the virtuoso as presented in the Character literature; namely that he so adores 'strange natural Histories' that he fails to assess them critically. Just as Tychiades's inherent scepticism leads him to question the miracles reported by Eucrates and the others, so the Gentleman constantly expresses his doubts as to the veracity of the many accounts of miraculous births and freakish events (pp. 53-66), including one of a child born without a brain, which (both the Transactioneer and the Gentleman observe), 'had it lived long enough would have made an Excellent Publisher
of Philosophical Transactions (p. 56). His queries as to the editor's judgement in propagating such strange, unsubstantiated rumours evinces further evidence of the Transactioneer's abrogation of his proper responsibilities as scientist and editor:

Transact. I beg your Pardon, if I tell you it's no wonder, for I am not inclined to distrust Mankind.

Gent. To speak the truth; indeed, you have a peculiar faculty for believing almost any thing. But pray, what reasons can be given to justify the sincerity of your Correspondents?

Transact. Reason! Pshew! I do not trouble myself to inquire after the reason of every thing that is told me; if I should, I should have work enough, to find reasons for every thing that is communicated in the Transactions (p. 55).

As usual the Gentleman's facetious reaction sums up the situation perfectly: the Transactioneer's correspondents, he reflects, 'are as Judicious in making Observations, as you are in Publishing them' (p. 57).

As in King's earlier burlesques, types such as fops, beaux, and fools, as well as scatological images and scenes of lunacy (e.g. pp. 39-40, 76), all function as metaphors for Sloane's alleged abuse of learning and love of lies. In the manner of Lucian's fools, the Transactioneer's recollections of a series of bizarre phenomena reported by his correspondents develop into a veritable anatomy of absurdity. It is totally consistent with the Transactioneer's intellectual fetishism, and a perfect reflection of his own mental state, that he should find it necessary to publish such unsavoury reports as those detailing the strange case of Dr. Mullen and the poppy-pie, the poisoning by cynocrambe of Will Mathews and his family (pp. 39-41), and the lunatic and obscene behaviour of the woman who had become so obsessed with dancing after having eaten some herbs 'that she would have given her Cow for a Bag-pipe' (p. 44). The Gentleman also asks rhetorically whether the indiscriminate collecting of the Sloanian virtuoso is not the sort of behaviour one might expect of a child (p. 69), a criticism of such activities often made by the great proponents of science, and reminiscent of Tychiades's observation that only 'their grey hair and their beard' distinguish Eucrates, Deinomachus, and their associates from 'infants, and for the rest of it, even infants are not so amenable to falsehood' (Lucian, III, p. 355). The Transactioneer, however, typically oblivious to the condemnation implied, actually endorses this analogy between children and his
correspondents, and encourages both to indulge in such an 'innocent diversion' as collecting (p. 69). The metaphor is extended by the depiction of Sloane and James Petiver as a fairground mountebank and his clown, who impress children, 'amuse the ignorant', and provide a source of laughter for 'the whole World' (pp. 18, 19, 35, 88).

Indeed, so credulous are the Transactioneer and his colleagues that (in the tradition of both *The Lover of Lies* and *Hudibras*) their brand of natural philosophy borders on Hermeticism. A clue to the Transactioneer's occultist leanings is provided early in the first dialogue, when, in relation to the Gentleman's comments on the obscurity of his jargon-laden prose, the Virtuoso admits that at least 'one poor simple fellow that read it thought it had been a charm' (p. 6). The Gentleman promptly replies, 'Very like!'. Later, while recalling a correspondent's report that 'The inhabitants of St Kilda, are every Summer infected with a Cough upon the Chamberlans Landing', the Transactioneer places upon this obviously clumsy construction a mystical interpretation consistent with his own interest in the bizarre. The equally strange 'usual Remedy' which is also supplied prompts the ever witty and perceptive Gentleman to note that 'the Qualities of the Remedies are as occult as the Cause of the Cough' (pp. 52-53). Inevitably the Transactioneer is only too willing to publish and endorse a letter recounting some of the cases of the famous Irish 'stroaker', Valentine Greatrakes; which leads the Gentleman to ask whether the Correspondent was 'Compos Mentis, when he sent you that Relation, or was he in a Fright?' (p. 76). When he admits that the reports 'are so strange, that I have not enough Faith to believe them', he receives the classic, dismissive reply of Deinomachus: 'If you have not Faith enough to believe what my Correspondents Discover and Relate? perhaps it may be because you have not Application enough to search into the Causes of Things' (p. 76).

Apart from its directly parodic nature, *The Transactioneer* is also distinctly occasional in terms of its satire on Sloane's management of the Society, a thematic element which has hitherto largely gone undetected. The concern expressed in some quarters that the Society was being systematically transformed into a club for the likes of
those who frequented the notoriously Whiggish Temple is reflected in the Gentleman's
discovery that at least some of the Transactioneer's madness has a method: he intends to
stack the Royal Society with men 'of his own Kidney' (p. 20). Levelled principally at
Sloane's relationship with Petiver, King's charge of maladministration and nepotism is
conveyed in a passage which, in its interjections, digressions and use of allusion,
exemplifies his sophisticated, lively use of the Lucianic dialogue for the purposes of
personal and topical satire:

_Transact._ I can never be to seek where to begin then, as long as there is such a Personage as
Mr. _J-- Pet--r_ in the Philosophical World. He's a F. of the R. S. indeed! I made him so. 'Tis my way of Rewarding my Friends and Benefactors. We now begin to call it
_Our Royal-Society (mus. Pet. C. 5.)_ One would never think it that looks upon him,
but he's certainly the Darling of the _Temple-Coffee-House Club._

_Gent._ Pray what's that ?
_Transact._ Oh lay! why don't you know ? Where can you have lived ? Why you must be an
utter Stranger to Philosophy, and all _pretty Things_ ! never heard of the _Temple_ Club ?
Oh for shame, let's see you there a _Friday_ Night. I'm President there, and I'll assure you
there are many _odd Things_. And Mr. _Pet--r_ is, Gad he's every thing. He is the very
Muffti, the Oracle of our Club. For my part I never saw anything like him exactly.

_Gent._ No, I believe not.
_Transact._ Oh, then I perceive you know Mr _James------_
_Gent._ No indeed, not I.
_Transact._ No, I wonder at that....Sir, he and I are all one. You must know we club Notions,
laying them up in a kind of Joynnt-Stock, and have all things in common: Sometimes
he draws, and sometimes I, as we have occasion. But he pays in more plenteously. By
my good-will I would never be without him. I call him the Philosophic _Sancho_, and he
me _Don_ (pp. 33-34).

Certainly the fascination for the fantastic which characterizes the Transactioneer's
scientific pursuits and editorship is reminiscent of Quixote's lunatic desire to bring to
reality the illusions which had brought him such 'strange pleasure'; and clearly he is no
more capable of recognizing a barber's basin or a windmill, or for that matter a Chinese
ear-picker, for the mundane things they really are than was the mad knight of _La
Mancha_. Moreover, like Quixote, he is a vain fool. His frequent boasts of his 'not
inconsiderable achievements' match those of Cervantes's burlesque hero in the field of
chivalry, and have about as much justification. Like the pedants of Butler and Burton, he
pretends to be working for the public good (pp. 32-34) and the 'Advancement of Natural
Knowledge, and not to gain Applause' (p. 57) - but such protests only fool other fools.
The Transactioneer is in fact only too pleased to show off his trifling, fatuous 'knowledge', and to receive sycophantic tributes from 'Beauxes' intent on ensuring their publication in his journal (p. 38). 'Sancho' Petiver, as his master is quick to point out, 'values himself for being the first Catcher' of his numerous zoological specimens, and 'looks as big upon his Botanick Acquisitions' (pp. 35-36). Yet Bacon had insisted that any student of nature should doubt 'whatever his mind seizes upon and dwells upon with peculiar satisfaction', and that natural philosophy 'tends to the putting off of all vanity'; Sprat had argued that 'Experimental Knowledge...is an enemy to all manner of fals superstitions, so especially to that of mens adoring themselves, and their own Fancies'; and Boyle had reminded his readers of the danger of letting their 'mindes be so taken up, and as it were, charm'd with that almost infinite variety of pleasing Objects, which Nature presents to their contemplation'. It comes as no surprise, therefore, to find the Transactioneer unable even to define 'philosophy' adequately (p. 72), let alone practice it properly.

The Transactioneer, then, was not intended as an attack on the Royal Society and modern natural philosophy in general, but rather as a lampoon on Hans Sloane and his clique, specifically in respect of their handling of what was at the time an essentially independent scientific journal. More to the point, King's basic charge is that Sloane had transgressed not merely humanistic ideals regarding the proper purpose of learning and literature, but also the basic tenets of the philosophy of which he was supposedly a leading proponent. It is against the standards of proper science and scientific communication set by Bacon and, more particularly, his adherents in the early Royal Society that the performances of Sloane and his associates are evaluated and found (regardless of how justly) to be laughably wanting. And, as usual, it was Lucian who provided King with an appropriate formula of satiric medicine.

The fact that The Transactioneer was the only one of King's early burlesques and controversial tracts (besides Some Remarks) not to find a place in his Miscellanies might
indicate his continuing anxiety about the Society's threat of prosecution. Perhaps, too, he was unwilling to resurrect it in the light of his recently published *Useful Transactions in Philosophy and other Sorts of Learning*, the second of his satires on Sloane's journal. Later included with *The Art of Cookery, The Art of Love*, and *Useful Miscellanies* in the second volume of the second edition of the *Miscellanies* (1712), *Useful Transactions* originally appeared in the shape of a mock journal, which parodied the monthly numbers of the *Philosophical Transactions*. Though there is no real reason to assume that his opposition to Sloane's activities was any less serious and committed than it had previously been, one reason for the renewal of his attack was surely the belief that the venture would be financially rewarding; and in this respect he was no doubt encouraged by the apparent success of *The Art of Cookery*, which had proved that a clever variation on an earlier theme could be both lucrative and popular with the public. Sloane's continued editorship ensured that there was no shortage of mockable material in the current *Transactions*; and with the reputation of the Society still at a low ebb after a further spate of internal bickering, there were plenty of opportunities open to the satirist of the virtuosi. Steele, for example, was later to note in *Tatler* no. 236 that the leading officials of the Society seemed intent on choosing 'into their Assemblies such as have no Pretense to Wisdom, but Want of Wit: or to natural Knowledge, but ignorance of every Thing else'. It would appear that even some of Sloane's allies were apprehensive about the current stock of articles. The Reverend George Plaxton, for instance, writing to Ralph Thoresby on 1 July, 1707, warned that 'The Doctor hath put in many trivial things which will occasion laughter'; ironically, when King's parody finally appeared eighteen months later, one of his victims was to be Plaxton himself.

Presumably he had originally envisaged that the mock-journal would be a relatively long-term project, in the mould of, for example, Tom Brown's burlesque on Partridge. Two numbers were soon issued in the early part of 1709, the first for the months of January and February, and the second for March and April. Yet the third, for the
following months up until September, seemingly did not appear until the very end of the year, judging from a letter dated 25 October written by John Flamsteed, in which it is stated that the Philosophical Transactions had already been 'twice burlesqued publicly; and now we have had none published I think this four months'. Since King's satire was apparently intended to shadow the real Transactions (without necessarily parodying them directly), its own temporary cessation was almost certainly a consequence of its target's, as the 'Publisher' of the long-delayed third number, A Voyage to Cajamai, infers. With politics dominating the public's attention, he writes, 'Poetry and Philosophy have in a manner been laid aside by the Curious'; and for this reason he had decided to turn to the travelogue, the genre which alone had remained consistently popular, as the publication of a number of recent examples evidenced (p. 132). Yet despite the fact that Useful Transactions ranks beside the Art of Cookery as his most ingenious piece - and indeed is surely one of the most elaborate and amusing prose parodies written during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries - its sales seem to have been relatively poor: as Gay notes in The Present State of Wit, despite King's 'World of wit...the Town soon grew weary of his writings'. This disappointing reception for what must have required an immense effort to sustain, and doubtless the fact that he received only 'five miserable pounds' per number from Lintot, were enough to discourage him from continuing the exercise beyond the third number.

Useful Transactions (especially the third part of it) was no doubt also motivated by Sloane's remarks in the preface of his Voyage to Jamaica concerning those who had already satirized him. Echoing the pronouncements of Sprat, Wotton, and others as to the dangers posed by the wits to the pursuit of natural philosophy, and repeating what he had said privately to Wallis in respect of the author of the Transactions, Sloane writes:

I have been conversant in matters of this nature for several years, that I know 'tis impossible to escape the censure of several sorts of men, as the Envious and Malitious, who will, I am sure, spare no Pains to find Faults; those who strive to make ridiculous anything of this kind, and think themselves great Wits, but are very Ignorant, and understand nothing of the Argument. These, if one were afraid of them, and consulted his own Ease, might possibly hinder the Publication of any such Work, the Efforts to be expected from them, making possibly some impression upon Persons of equal Disposition, but considering that these sorts of Men, have been in all Ages ready to do the like, not only to ordinary Persons, and
their Equals, but even to abuse their Princes, and blaspheme their Makers; I shall, as I have, ever since I seriously consider'd this Matter, think of, and treat them with the greatest Contempt.⁴³

To King, the suggestion that he possessed a tendency towards blasphemy and disloyalty simply because he had ridiculed Sloane for perverting Baconianism must have been even more provocative than the accusations of envy, malice, and ignorance. And yet, if his burlesque is any guide, Sloane's remarks - which his persona, Jaspar van Slonenbergh, is of course quick to echo (p. 139) - were more amusing to him than annoying or insulting; for apart from A Voyage to Cajamai itself, Useful Transactions is on the whole not only less critical of Sloane in both personal and professional terms than The Transactioneer, but also considerably more sophisticated and humorous. Though its broader themes are basically identical to those of the earlier work (as the title itself infers), it also deals more or less seriously with a number of other issues at the centre of much contemporary debate within the intellectual community. The overall lighter tone of the first two numbers is also in large measure due to the basic formal move away from the dialogue, with its inherent tendency towards pat, repetitive jokes, to the much less restrictive and, in the circumstances, more mimetic Menippean form of the miscellany of hoax epistles, burlesque reviews, and mock dissertations, contributed (in the tradition of the Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum) by a confederacy of self-condemning pedants and virtuosi. The change provides him with much greater opportunities for his Lucianic gamesmanship, as his various personae are allowed a free rein to display the fly-blown fruits of their ill learning without having to put up with the interruptions of an ironic interlocutor. In some cases (e.g., 'A New Method to teach Learned Men how to Write Unintelligibly', 'An Historical and Chronological Account of Consecrated Clouts') King even abandons his usual technique of pastiche-parody in favour of, as it were, textually-independent mock reports. Indeed, in the case of 'Consecrated Clouts'(which was apparently inspired by a report published in the Post Boy to the effect that the Papacy had supplied consecrated swaddling cloaths to the members of the French royal family)⁴⁴, the format of the mock academic journal itself serves merely as a convenient
vehicle for patriotic and anti-Catholic satire; the theme of false learning is temporarily relegated to a supportive role, as the article's mock history of the Papacy's shady dealings in consecrated nappies and similar goods eventually develops into a piece of anti-French propaganda relating to the claim of the Bourbons to the Spanish throne (pp. 130-131).

At the same time his use of the genre's numerous comic and parodic devices is more inventive and extravagant than ever. Besides poetic insertions (including nursery rhymes and nonsense verse), there are passages of mock scholarship and antiquarianism, bogus biological research, and apparently unique, the adaptation of original scientific diagrams. Allusions to Don Quixote, The Rehearsal, and Hudibras, as well as carnival imagery, are again cleverly handled in such a way as to damn by their association. In the preface, for example, we are reminded of an old saying that 'there is no opinion so absurd, but that it has been maintained by some Philosopher; as "That Snow is Black; that Cabbages speak in the Moon; and that the Magpye is the most considerable Lawyer in the Sun"'. 'Some tell us', King continues,

that "That this Moon is such another thing as Mambrino's Brass Bason in Don Quixote;" but Don Lamberto, in his famous History, proves it, by arguments undeniabile, from mutton green boiled that is red, from green geese that are white &c. "that, notwithstanding its appearance, it is made of Green Cheese." Some tell us, "That Women have no Souls; that Self-murder is lawful and convenient"...with a thousand such-like fancies, which have considerably shewn both their wit and judgement. It may not improperly be said at present, that there is nothing in any art or science, how mean soever it may seem at first, but that a true Virtuoso, by handling it philosophically, may make of it a learned and large Dissertation (p. 59).

The world of the Sloanian virtuoso, then, remains an absurd, quixotic one, peopled by Sir Sidrophel's intent on establishing what the moon's 'diameter to an inch is, And...[that] she is not made of green cheese' (Hudibras, II, iii, 265-66). The reader is assured that the new journal is 'designed to promote Learning as much as any thing of the same nature and method that for these many years past has appeared in publick', and in a statement reminiscent of the Correspondent in The Art of Cookery, further informed that fortunately the current stock of contributors can be relied upon to continue the supply of such articles and letters, since they 'have infinitely more in their closets' (p.
Mimicing Sloane's journal, the Useful Transactions carries articles dealing with a diversity of pseudo-scientific and antiquarian concerns. The first, which bears the wonderfully bathetic title, 'An Essay on the Invention of Samplers; communicated by Mrs Judith Bagford: with an Account of her Collections for the same. By Mrs Arabella Manly, School-mistress at Hackney', parodies a piece by John Bagford on the invention of printing published in the April number of the Philosophical Transactions for 1707 (Volume XXVI), which also included an account of Bagford's collections of book fragments by the famous antiquarian, Humfrey Wanley. Bagford was just the sort of individual likely to aggravate King. A 'shoemaker and biblioclast', he has been described as 'the most hungry and rapacious of all books and print collectors', who 'in his rage...spared neither the most delicate nor the most costly specimens'. With the intention of writing a history of printing, he had amassed a huge collection of 'curious broadside ditties', title-pages, and other fragments, some details of which are recounted in his article. He begins by promising 'a short account of the Observations I have made in many Years from old Books of several sorts and kinds', but in fact provides a detailed discussion of the relationship between the printing of books and playing cards in Germany and Holland, and an account of his recent journey in search of an antique book and a replica in Leiden of a statue of the printer, Laurens Coster (c1370-1440).

It was virtually inevitable that the author of this stuff should find himself parodied in King's journal of scientific quixotism, especially since one of Don Quixote's scholarly acquaintances had also believed on the basis of one of the mad knight's hallucinations that he had discovered the antiquity of playing cards. King's parodic method is the typical one of substituting a low subject for the higher subject matter of the original, his Mrs Bagford informing her curious readers of the 'observations I have made so many years from old pieces of linen, of such several sorts and kinds as I could find in Long-lane, Theiving-lane, Monmouth-street, and other repositories of valuable rarities'(p. 61). King has his persona ramble on like Bagford himself, allowing her to
indulge in mock historical research into the earliest references to samplers, and eventually to take ship for Westminster in order to see a statue of a woman who 'I heard had killed herself with working' (p. 66), the sight of which causes her such 'concern and indignation' that she is compelled to break into some ludicrous mock-heroics. She is particularly keen to recall her meetings with a certain Mr Prestwick, a virtuoso who had inspired her love of all things Greek simply by promising her that he would teach her 'in an evening's time... that or any other language I had a mind to' (p. 63). The true extent of Prestwick's philological knowledge, though, is unwittingly revealed by his adoring pupil's recollections of his prized collection of rarities, which include a bowl 'with D.O.G upon it, which, he said, was that of Diogenes, an ill-natured philosopher... an old great long table-cloth marked "J.U.L", which, he says, Julius Caesar left behind him in Britain; [and] a dirty handkerchief, marked N.E.R. which...belonged to Nero; and it was very bloody' (p. 63). When she had enquired as to why he had not washed it, she reports, the shocked antiquary had exclaimed, 'Oh fie!...that is not like an Antiquary! It is the dirt that makes them valuable'. Clearly we are back on the familiar ground of *Dialogues of the Dead, A Journey to London*, and the numerous depictions of the 'Antiquary' in the Character literature. The implication of the parody is obvious: by his fascination for the mere 'thingness' of books and lack of discrimination in his antiquarianism, John Bagford has earned himself a place beside Bentley and Lister in King's pantheon of pedants.

On the same note are the reviews by 'Dr Playford' of Johannes Meursius's studies on 'Grecian Dances' and 'the Plays of the Grecian Boys', which, as Kerby-Miller has pointed out, probably had a minor bearing on *The Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus*. Compounded from a jumble of mock histories, pedantic digressions, carnival imagery, and allusions, the first letter in particular amounts to a piece of inspired Rabelaisian nonsense aimed at satirizing once again the scholastic excesses of the Dutch polymaths and their English equivalents: e.g.,

The Greeks had...their dumb shews, which was action, though no voice; as our modern Opera's have voice and no sense. These we properly should call muttimers; from whence we
have changed the word *mumtimers*, mumpers, mummers. This comes from the Latin word *mutum*, as, Cornutus has it: *ne muttum unum omiseris; ne Mu quidem, vel Mut seceris*; "not a word;" which is more elegantly expressed in our usual phrase, "Mum for that". And I take this to come to us wholly from the Latin, being absolutely against the opinion of Blasius Multibibus, "De Jure Potandi;" who quotes Gripholdus Nicknackius, "Floia Cortum Versicale;" a writer, in my judgement, not authentic; and the large Folio of Sekieckius Rodornus (who proves High Dutch to have been the language of Japhet) to shew that Mum, even in this case, came from Brunswick; though I confess, if taken in a convenient quantity in a morning; it will occasion sleep as well as silence (pp. 80-81).

Continuing down the same well-trodden path in his second letter, Playford exhibits all the critical acumen of the Correspondent in *The Art of Cookery*, praising as 'very remarkable, and very useful' some of the games brought to light by Meursius's labours, and condemning as an absurd anachronism the use of particular type of hobby-horse in *The Rehearsal* (p. 83). The nursery rhyme commonly (but we are assured, erroneously) known as 'Girls and Boys come out to Play' is found a classical pedigree (pp. 84-85), before the whole piece is rounded off by Playford's devastating admission that his own research can only progress once his son returns 'home from school next Easter' (p. 85).

Mock scholarship and elaborate word games, this time played in Latin, Greek, Arabic, as well as English, are also the central features of 'A Method to Learn to Write Unintelligibly'. In a manner reminiscent of Panurge's multi-lingual performances, this letter reports the attempts of a certain Mr Loveit to formulate the best way of writing complete nonsense, based upon his 'Collections out of Softlinus; Bardolius and Bardocoxcombious, one Poet Laureat to King Lud, the other to Queen Bonduca; Scornsensus and Egyptian, &c'. Citing as an example the original form of that ancient British masterpiece, 'Good King Cole', Loveit points out that a particularly opaque way of writing would be to have one's work rendered in pseudo-Celtic lettering, by which means one can 'amuse the learned, and terrify the vulgar' (p. 87). Loveit's crazy notions reach their final level of absurdity when, having discovered that elephants have a language, he confesses to having written to the court of Siam to find out whether 'the white Elephant keeps a Secretary or an Interpreter, and what compositions are amongst them in prose and verse'. 'I have a Friend', he admits, 'who converses much with fanciful beings, who has procured me many elegant works of the Fairies' (p. 91).
Loveit's admission plainly has all the unselfconscious candour of the lunatic.

Of the more 'scientific' articles, one of the funniest is the letter from the Welsh schoolmaster, which parodies Plaxton's 'Some Natural Observations made in the Parishes of Kinardsey and Donington in Shropshire'. Like Bagford's, Plaxton's contribution epitomized all that King found ludicrous about Sloane's *Transactions*, as he drones on and on about the number of aged parishioners, the etymology of the surrounding place names, and the area's soil composition. He 'judges' the wall of a neighbouring farm to be a 'British Fortification', computes the number of people he annually buries, and informs the waiting scientific world that 'he was the sixth rector of the parish since Henry VIII'. In his corresponding, 'Some Natural Observations made in the School of Llandwwfwrhwy', King's playful ingenuity comes to the fore, as his persona mimics Plaxton's style, inverts Plaxton's mortality rates into a mock calculation of the amazing fertility rate amongst the locals, and offers his own account of the nature of the Welsh language, particularly with regard to the prolificacy of Ws:

for $W$ is significant of a mountain, and the more $W$'s there are in a town's name, the more mountains about it....Now there are few towns in Wales without a $W$. The name of the very country itself beginning with it, shews it to be the predominant letter of the nation. Now $W$, in this town's name, being four times multiplied into itself, produces $W$ four, or the fourth power of the root $W$; which is equal to $W$ mountains quadratically multiplied into $W$ mountains, which make a power of mountains (p. 68).

His observations of the soil composition advance beyond Plaxton's own tautological account into the realm of Pantagruelism, as he points out that Welsh mountains *seem to be nothing else*...but a composition of such hard, rocky, marmoreous, flinty, lapideous, stony, scopulous, torrey, cretaceous, obdurate, petrifactory, intractable, indissoluble, and, in a word, mountainous matter'(p. 68). In a delightful piece of comic invention, King has his persona present a history of his school which reaches back to antediluvian days (in the process making a few jokes at the current controversy over fossils). 'All the damage it sustained by the Flood, notes 'R.P' proudly, 'was contracting some damp', a problem that was quickly solved by the actions of Japhet's eldest Welsh son, Price Ap Japhet. Since then, he adds,
there have been four hundred sixty-six, and I am the four hundred sixty-seventh master; before the Flood, they lived long, there were but two, Rice Ap Evan Dha the good, and Davie Ap Shones Gonnah, or the naught, in whose time the Flood came; so that, by adding two to 467, if I am not mistaken, I am the 469th master from Reyner, alias Morgan Dha, the founder - and God bless him, and Rice Ap Japhet too.

He is especially excited by a poetic inscription on a wall surrounding the finest leek garden in the world -

Dwyth Llwydd Dwynnth,
Llwyd Dwyth Whynnyth,
Whynnyth Llwyd Whyn,
Llwyd Whynnyth Gwynn,
Gwynn Dwynnth Whyth,
Whynnth Llwyd Dwyth.

- which, we are assured, should be translated thus:

Come, Britons, come, and each receive
Such verdant Leek as tempted Eve;
Transplanted here from paradise,
'Twill safely make ye brave and wise;
'Tis with this scent we will oppose
The sweetness of the English rose (p. 71).

A brief letter 'concerning the Migration of Birds' from another clerical virtuoso, Rev. William Derham of Upminster, Essex, provided the inspiration for the hilarious 'Migration of Cuckoo's...with their Destruction of Eggs: And general Remarks concerning Birds Nests, with Speech of Birds, communicated by Mr. Martin Cheapum, M.A.F.U.S.' 48 In his article, Derham suggests that the 'Members of the Society all over the Realm, would themselves, or procure their inquisitive Friends to observe, and note down the very Day they first see or hear of the Approach of any of the Migratory Birds'(XXVI, No. 315, p. 123). By way of an example, he provides a sample of his observations of the previous year,

viz. The Swallow came March 31, making a great Outcry at his Approach, as if he saw something strange. April 1, the Jynx first yelped here...The 5th I saw the Martin. The 6th the Nightingale first sang with us. The 7th the Cuckow I was told was heard, and the 9th I heard it myself (p. 124).

As usual, King's parody goes some distance beyond the Vicar of Upminster's original
letter, as Cheapum - a witty double pun on 'cheep' and the first syllable of Derham - outlines the sort of national project likely to be approved by Dr Playford. 'To promote this the more effectively', he proposes in an appropriately officious tone,

in my judgement, it might not be improper for the Secretaries of our Society to send circular Letters to all School-masters, School-mistresses, and all persons bearing a rule and authority over youth, that they give full liberty and leave to them to go a Bird's-nesting as often as the said youth may think convenient: for by these means they may arrive at greater knowledge and preferment, than by always poring over their Books. "The several observations which they make ought to be communicated to the Society" (p. 116).

Cheapum, too, provides a sample of his earlier observations, recalling that when he first saw the swallow - which was "making a great outcry at his approach, as if he saw something strange" - he was 'then walking in my garden, in my new silk night-gown, and a velvet cap' (p. 116). Again like Playford, Cheapum is blessed with extraordinary linguistic abilities; he is, we learn, 'versed...in the language of Birds' (p. 117), a capacity which enables him to appreciate the wisdom communicated by the 'yelps' of his feathered friends. Derham's daily account is extended into a fully-fledged mock-scientific chart, in which it is recorded, for example, that on 'April the 2nd. The Certhia, or Creeper, crept here', and that on 'April the 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, I spent each day in doing the same thing, that is hearkening to the Cuckoo' (p. 117). 'I do not know that I spent a month more to my satisfaction than this', he writes wistfully, 'upon the reception of these my migratory acquaintance (p. 118). Through a process that exhibits all the absurd logic of madness, Peacham's happy memories of Summers past set in train a further series of reflections on the theatre. As with the other members of his fraternity, his virtuosity has had a profound effect on his aesthetic judgement, his obsession with bird-watching attracting him inevitably to plays which portray speaking fowls, and causing him to praise above all Tom D'Urfey's notoriously bizarre and Whiggish comic opera, The Wonders of the Sun, or, the Kingdom of the Birds (1706), from which he enthusiastically draws the more outstanding examples of avian 'gibberish of the Author's own composing' (p. 119). The full extent of his fixation, and of his
consequent ignorance of the ways of the world - evident in his earlier surprize at finding smoke in 'my old Lady Sparewell's kitchen chimney' the day after she had been buried and 'her grandson, jolly Sir John, ...[had] got in possession of her jointure' (p. 117) - is revealed by the end of his letter, where he records the findings of his friend, Mr Slyford, regarding the nature of the 'Birds' in D'Urfey's cast. Slyford, he notes,

was credibly informed, by the Keeper of the First Gallery, that, near adjoining to the back-side of the Rose-Tavern, and contiguous to the Play-house, there is a large nest, in which a sufficient quantity of Turtle-doves and young Pullets are brought up by He and She Canary Birds, to serve Gentlemen at a certain rate, not only in the performance of these Hieroglyphical Operas, but likewise on many other pressing occasions.

My Friend asked him, if these Birds were not migratory, or kept to any one place more particular. He said, that the chiefest of them were of the migratory nature, often moving from the Hay Market to Drury Lane, and from Drury Lane to the Hay Market' (pp. 120-21).

Some, he adds, 'upon a North-easterly wind...migrate into the Plantations', although 'their return from thence' had not been found to be 'altogether so certain' (p. 121). True to his Sloanian instincts, he promises to ensure that his friend searches 'further into the nature of these Birds; which, as soon as the particulars come to hand, I shall communicate to the Publick'(p. 121).

The disciplines of physics, chemistry, physiology, and psychology, all of which were bound up with the current vogue for the philosophy and science of Mechanism, also afforded King plenty of opportunities for Menippean wit. The extent to which any serious criticism of mechanism is finally intended by the group of highly sophisticated parodies which touch on the subject in a variety of different ways is difficult to determine. Certainly there had been a great deal of wariness shown in ecclesiatical and some scientific quarters towards mechanistic and materialistic theories since Hobbes had declared in the middle decades of the seventeenth century that anything other than what was corporeal was a mere 'phantasm' and insisted that all physical things, whether human or non-human, animate or inanimate, were subject to the same laws of causation. These pronouncements had naturally evoked a storm of condemnation from churchmen appreciative of the massive theological implications of such a position, particularly in terms of such orthodox notions as free-will. Largely for reasons of its close
association with Hobbesian materialism (as well as its rationalist as opposed to empiricist nature), Cartesianism itself had enjoyed only a lukewarm reception in England.\textsuperscript{51} Even so, by the end of the century mechanism in its most benign forms had generally been validated by even the most conservative of institutions, notably the College of Physicians, which (it has been claimed) embraced the associated theory of iatromechanism for socio-political reasons as much as purely intellectual ones.\textsuperscript{52} With the authority of Boyle and Newton behind it, mechanism had also taken root within the University of Oxford, where the local Newtonians, notably John and James Keill, and King's old colleague, John Freind, introduced mechanistic ideas into their physiological treatises.\textsuperscript{53} Closely related to this were developments in the field of psychology, which increasingly had seen the introduction of mechanistic theories linking human behaviour and madness to physiological factors, a formulation which, at least in its most extreme forms, effectively denied the traditional Renaissance perception of psychology and behaviour as 'pre-eminently moralistic' questions, fundamentally governed by the moral exercise of the 'higher' rational faculties over the 'lower' bodily faculties.\textsuperscript{54} Inevitably such theories became prime targets for humanist satirists like Swift, whose \textit{Tale}, according to Michael De Porte, is on one level a burlesque on 'those disciples of Hobbes and Descartes who would see man as a machine animated by material forces'.\textsuperscript{55}

While it is likely that (in line with the position adopted in his old college) King was more or less prepared to accept that the human body at least was essentially a machine, like Swift he would undoubtedly have found ludicrous any idea that human beings could be equated unequivocably with inanimate objects, and potentially dangerous any assumption that all human action, including such mental activity as moral decision-making, was no more than the product of material processes acting as mechanically as a clock. If his treatment of the same theme is typically much less developed and more flippant than Swift's, his ambivalence towards Cartesianism and the more extreme mechanistic theories is evident, I suggest, in a number of articles, which wittily explore the connection between questions of legality and the physical and
physiological properties of humans and objects. In 'An Essay, proving by Arguments Philosophical, that Millers, though falsely so reputed, yet in reality are not Thieves', a certain 'Dr Williams' attempts to resolve what is essentially a straightforward moral and legal matter regarding the alleged cheating of tailors and millers by reference to both empirical research and mechanistic hypotheses in connection with the behaviour of particles of cloth and grain. Before one could judge fairly the 'honesty and veracity' of a Miller, he claims, it is necessary for him to study 'Experimental Philosophy and the Cartesian hypothesis of atoms,...to have so far a knowledge in opticks and to make use of a magnifying-glass, and to read carefully all Mr. Leewenhoek's observations'(p. 75). Acting on the mechanistic premise that there is no distinction between the behaviour of things and human beings, but at the same time inverting the whole argument, Williams proceeds to anthropomorphize inanimate objects, all the while indulging in a vain display of linguistic obfuscation. Noting that the pages of books shrivel up after being subjected to heat - a phenomenon which 'may likewise proceed from the want of heat, as in old men and women' - Williams continues to point out that such

"...shrinking may be for fear; this some Authors denote by shrinking away, slinking away; but my manuscript, which is an exact copy of a Glossary out of the Duke of Burgundy's Library, has it now plainly running away, of which the French have given many instances, at Blenheim, Ramillies, The Scheld, Brussels, and several other places. This may very seasonably be used by rational creatures, to avoid a blow; when we see the inanimate use it upon a touch of the fingers, of which the sensitive-plant is a sufficient demonstration."...

Then I shewed him, how cloth had endured moisture, fire, water, blows innumerable, pressures, extension, convulsion, contraction, and indeed everything that is terrible: from which I concluded, that I could not believe that the boldest of materials, much more cloth, after such hard usage at the formidable approach of a tailor's large pair of sheers, would be apt to retrocede, turgiverse, or contract, itself....I discoursed to him of the nature of turnings-in and hemmings, of stay-tape, and button-holes; how it must bear the pressure, heat and hissing, of a large iron goose when over-roasted." I therefore told him, "That for these various reasons, no wonder if his cloth might have contracted itself for about a yard"(pp. 73-74).

By the end of his article, Williams has plainly lost all control over his hobby-horse, his hallucinatory descriptions of the millions of 'unruly animals' liberated by the grounding of a corn kernel attesting to the mental state of a Bedlamite (p. 76). With his lunacy, though, comes the fool's grain of Democritean wisdom: "This, well thought of, would terrify such a beau as the Lord Foppington, to find, at the powdering of his perriwig,
what a hideous number of monsters he bears about him'(p. 76).

The same underlying theme runs through 'The Eunuch's Child', though on this occasion King also has his sights aimed at a specific parodic target, and the tone of the piece, due largely to the bawdy, is generally more overtly comical than 'Millers not Thieves'. The parody entails the conversion of a series of accounts of electrical experiments by Francis Hauksbee\textsuperscript{56} - in which references are made to 'effluvial discharge' and erections induced by static electrical charges - into a series of pseudo-scientific explanations reportedly given during a recent Venetian paternity case for the apparent potency and fertility of a eunuch. Here again a Rabelaisian influence is detectable in the depositions presented at the trial by various lawyers and virtuosi, which are intended to refute the commonsensical view that the eunuch could not possibly be the father by reference to a number of experiments which had demonstrated the amazing erectile properties of wax when stimulated continuously by the rapid motion of 'one's hand, finger, or any other body'(p. 97). As one virtuoso argues, there is no reason to assume that the eunuch's semen should in any way differ from the inanimate 'effluvia...proceeding from the artificial phosphorus' (or electricity) generated by the rubbing of an amber rod. 'If their effluvias can cause light', he continues, 'why may not your more noble ones do the same', particularly in view of the fact that Boyle had shown that real phosphorus could be produced from human urine(p. 98). 'I make no question', he concludes, 'but, upon using a longer and larger piece of amber, both the cracklings and light could be much greater, because I never yet found any crackling from the head of my cane, although it is a pretty large one' (p. 99). Charmed by such palpable quackery, the court's sanity is inevitably only saved by the testimony of a common 'Gentlewoman', whose personal experience (or at least her daughter's) of a eunuch's inability to perform his most basic marital duty is enough to convince all and sundry that Signior Valentino was plainly not the litigant's 'only slip'.

The question of mechanistic psychology is also touched upon in the course of two spoofs on a series of reports from the great Dutch microscopist, Anthony van
Leeuwenhoek, which are surely among the most elaborate and (and in terms of their use of parodic devices) original burlesques on microscopy in Augustan satire. In the first of his articles, dated 20 April, 1706, van Leeuwenhoek had related his observations of the blood vessels and membranes of the intestines, noting, for instance, that:

When I observed that little piece of Gut, that was prepared, nicely thro' my Microscope, I could perceive a great Quantity of Blood lying without the Vessels, which I never did discover in the Guts of other Animals before; from whence I concluded, that as a great many Animals lose their Lives by the spilling of their Blood, that some Blood, notwithstanding the quicker motion of the Heart in the Pangs of Death, continues its Circulation: Whereas in those that are Hanged or Strangled, as this Woman was, the Circulation of the Blood is as a great measure interrupted by the Rope: To which, if you add the dismal Thoughts of Approaching Death, upon Account of the deserved Punishment they undergo, (which Thing does not occur in Beasts) and the great Concern at that time, there will be a much greater profusion of the Blood of a Rational Creature, than that of a Beast.

...having acquainted Professor Bidloo with these my Thoughts, he had the Goodness to send me, on the 12th of March, two Dissertations subscribed with the Name of Peter Evertse in Latin; from whence a day or two after it was explained to me, that the Woman to whom that Gut belonged had been Hanged, and that in her Life-time she was troubled with a Falling-Sickness (Volume XXVI, No. 314, p. 54).

Gauging from the profusion of fat particles around the piece of intestine, he concludes that 'the Woman, who was the Owner thereof, had been very fat' (p. 57). The unwitting grotesquery which results from this juxtaposition of pseudo-scientific terminology (with its frequent banality and pretensions to rational objectivity) with the unavoidably emotive reflections on the victim of an execution, must have made the satirist's task that much simpler. 57 Having observed a similar specimen, King's 'grave Matron' from Field Lane (a woman 'long accustomed to Experiments' with 'Trypal Vessels') reports on her meeting with a certain Professor Slaughter, to whom is attributed van Leeuwenhoek's curious phrases concerning the ownership of the intestines. According to the matron, Slaughter next 'laid down two very extraordinary maxims':

viz. "That, in such persons as are hanged or strangled, as this Woman was, the circulation of the blood is in great measure interrupted by the rope" ...And this he proved by innumerable instances of persons, whose blood not only stagnated, but whose breath had been stopt, and their necks broken, by that fatal operation (p. 122).

After similar remarks, the correspondent writes that she tried to 'divert' the aptly-named Slaughter from 'this melancholy subject' by preparing him a dish of tripe, explaining as
she did so that 'at present this Tripe "belonged to me"; that it formerly had been in the possession of an ox; that it was never "troubled with the Falling-sickness", till it was knocked down by the Butcher, that he might more easily cut its throat; and in that manner it died, as "a great many other animals lose their lives by the spilling of their Blood"'(p. 123). Leeuwenhoek's microscopy is thereby reduced to the classic parodic level of the kitchen, as the Matron continues to draw her customer's attention to the fact that the 'delicate whiteness' of her tripe proves that the animal had been well bled at its slaughter, since she would otherwise 'have found the "Tunicas and coats of the small Vessels extended, and the Blood philtrated through them lying dry in little lumps upon the extreme membrane", in case the Ox had been hanged'(p. 123).

This comic confusion of an organ's alimentary function with its gastonomic merits is developed still further in the other parody, a report on the nature of tongues communicated by a certain Dr. Testy, which mocks two articles on the microscopic properties of the tongues of different animals and 'Feverish Persons'. The joke here is basically an extended pun on the verb 'to taste': whereas van Leeuwenhoek seeks to establish the process by which we taste by examining 'the External Particles, that are upon the thickness of the Tongue', Testy's colleague, Mr Trencher, tests his taste buds by eating the scientific specimens, and so learns just how delicious a well-prepared tongue can taste. While the Dutchman's studies had revealed that the seemingly smooth surface of a tongue was actually made up of particles resembling needles (p. 115), thimbles (p. 111), and other substances which have 'the likeness of a Weaver's shuttle'(p. 120), Trencher discovers that 'the sharp pointed particles of the Hog's Tongue, together with the saline particles and the fumous or smoaky particles which it contracted or acquired in its drying', could be 'mollified, dulcified, or smoothed with sugar'; and that whereas the particles of an ox's tongue 'appeared like Pack-needles', those of the hog were like 'Needles fit for a Nun's working of point of Venice' (pp. 110-111). After assimilating into his own article van Leeuwenhoek's observation that the diametre of a particle of muscle from the tongue is roughly twice the size of a 'Hair's
breath of one's Head', and subsequent computation that '90000 of the said small
Muscles of Flesh make no more than the thickness of one Inch', Dr Testy is moved to
ponder with a Rabelaisian degree of precision the voraciousness of the human appetite,
which is capable of consuming 'in a small piece of Tongue, of no more than the
thickness of one inch' such a gargantuan amount as 'a hundred and eighty thousand
hairy diameters, which is a sum prodigious'. 'But more exact calculations of this and
many other things', he stresses, 'shall be demonstrated, in a large Treatise I intend,
concerning the proportion of a Hair's-breadth to a Cows-Thumb'(p. 112). He can,
however, confirm the crude mechanistic assumption that the shape of the tongue particles
corresponds not just to the nature of one's speech, but also to one's sex, character and
behaviour (p. 113), supporting his argument by reference to a series of diagrams.
King's incorporation and playful reinterpretation of van Leeuwenhoek's original
illustrations constitute a particularly outstanding instance of his capacity to produce
original variations on the genre's existing devices.

We have already seen that Flamsteed's letter to Sharp would seem to indicate that the
third and last of the Useful Transactions did not appear until very late in 1709, and that
this lengthy pause might have corresponded to an apparent hiatus in the publication of
Sloane's Philosophical Transactions. This may also explain why King turned for his
final number to Sloane's A Voyage to Jamaica, the first volume of which had come out
two years earlier. Its short title suggests a kinship with such highly popular travelogues
to distant parts of the world as William Dampier's New Voyage round the World (1697)
and A Voyage to New Holland (1703), which provided both entertainment and, over
time, a valuable fund of biological information for the European scientists. Bacon
himself had noted the developing relationship between the voyages of discovery and the
new science in The New Organon, writing that 'many things in nature have been laid
open and discovered which may let in new light upon philosophy' (IV, p. 82,
LXXXIV); while Boyle had lent his authority to the call for sailors to be pressed into the
service of science. It was clearly in this spirit that Sloane published his account: as he
explains in the preface, his passion for botany and zoology, and his understandable interest in the medicinal qualities of tropical plants, led him to record in great detail his observations and to commission numerous splendid illustrations of the local flora and fauna. The outcome was, at least from a modern point of view, an often fascinating and beautiful book which was also to prove fruitful scientifically, notably in respect of his discussions on quinine and the medicinal qualities of chocolate. In many ways, then, it did not deserve to be ridiculed.

The problem was, however, that like Lister's *A Journey to Paris, A Voyage to Jamaica* hardly conformed to the traditional requirements of the travel genre in terms of both its stylistic qualities and much of its subject matter. The introduction alone occupies one hundred and fifty four pages, and contains numerous examples of the author's tendency to lurch towards the trivial, the facile, the fatuous, and the 'nasty'. He observes, for instance, that Jamaica 'has one continu'd ridge of Hills running East and West through its Middle, which are called generally the blue Mountains, from their appearing of that colour, which comes from the Eyes going through a vast quantity of *Aether*, or Air'; adding that the 'tops of some are higher than others'(viii). We learn, furthermore, that there are 'many sorts of Water...as in *England* ; River-water, Pond water, Well-water, Spring-water, &c; that the former 'carries with it much Clay and Earth, whereby 'tis muddy and thick', and so 'has an odd taste'; and that 'Water gather'd off the Ships Decks from Rain, smells and ferments presently, because of Spittle, Dung, &c'(xxiv). He also provides extensive catalogues of local foodstuffs (xxi-xxii), the music and untranslated lyrics of a West Indian song (I-li), and a lengthy discussion on 'The Diseases I observed in Jamaica, and the Method I used to Cure them' (xc-cliv). The marginal headings testify to the character of much of the Introduction: 'Of a Mania which was occasioned by excessive drinking, and had Fits which follow'd the Full and Change of the Moon' (cxliv); 'Of the Ringworm' (cxlvii); 'Of Black Nurses' (cxlviii); 'Of Vomiting and Looseness from Excessive drinking from Canary (cxliii); 'Of a Scabby or scall'd Head'(cxxxiii). The initial stages of the actual account are largely
given over to medical matters, and again the constant references to such complaints as
diarrhea and constipation, and to 'cures' involving the procuring of 'Vomition' and
'stools', soon become unintentionally comical. A case in point is a two page description
of sea-sickness, the symptoms of which include:

a great uneasiness and load about the Stomach, disorder and aching in the Head, high
colour'd Urine, and Vomitting at first what has been lately eat or drunk, then a great quantity
of serous Matter insipid to the Tast, and mixt with Ropy Phlegm. Then if the Vomiting
continues, comes the Yellow bitter Bile, pump'd up by the inverted motion of the
Duodenum out of the Gall-Bladder, as well as the sub-acid Juices from the Pancreas and
neighbouring Glands, which give a greenish Tincture to whatever comes up, and sometimes
a sour Tast; and after these Liquors are vomited up, as after a Natural or Artificial Vomit,
the Persons generally from desponding and not caring what happens to them, come to be
very easie (p. 2).

For all its virtues, then, *A Voyage to Jamaica* is plainly not without its flaws and
idosyncracies, particularly when measured against the cultural values of Augustan polite
society. A great deal of the information supplied in the Introduction and early stages of
the account could hardly be described as valuable and original biological and medical
research, let alone morally-uplifting and socially-instructive literature. In short, to King a
*Voyage to Jamaica* was *A Journey to Paris* writ large.

Accordingly, *A Voyage to Cajamai* bears many resemblances to the earlier parody,
both in terms of its principal themes of uselessness, pedantry, and indecorum, and in
basic formal and stylistic attributes. A Dutchman, Jaspar van Slonenbergh, has replaced
a Frenchman as the ostensible author, though for all intents and purposes they are one
and the same creature, a proud, self-deluded authority on the most trivial and base
subjects imaginable (e.g., the shape and colour of cabbage leaves, p.137). As the
'Publisher' acknowledges in his preface, the "'Feeding of Fowl", Intro. p. 16, 17; "the
education and discipline of Swine," p. 30, 31; "the making of Beds, the untying of
Breeches, and loosening of Girdles," p. 47...may seem at first to be trivial, yet contain
in them great penetration of thought and depth of judgement. By those means
philosophers search in to the recesses of Nature; which though to nice persons...may not
appear so cleanly, yet have not the less use in the animal oeconomy'. While conceding
further that most of the information recorded might have been obtained sitting at home, that 'an old woman could effect such cures,' and that the observations, 'which are sometimes run a little upon the nasty', are made from the meanest actions of mankind, and the very dregs of Nature', the publisher nevertheless defends the book in the best tradition of Lucian's Dienomachus, by accusing his accusers of 'ignorance and want of reading; for they must show themselves not to have studied any late Transactions of Philosophy, and that they do not know the methods of gaining a reputation at present, and carrying the Modern Learning far above any thing that could be pretended to by the Ancients' (p. 135).

In one respect, though, A Voyage to Cajamai differs markedly from the earlier mock-travelogue, for part of its joke is that in effect it is not really a mock-travelogue at all. Anxious to ensure that his own account of his journey is modelled as closely as possible on the 'example of a British Author, who...published a large Folio of his Voyage into the American Islands' (p. 135), van Slonenbergh spends so much time prefacing and introducing his book that he never actually begins it. The comic table of contents confirms the fact that the whole work consists entirely of preliminary paraphanalia: a 'Preface of the Publisher', a 'Preface of the Author', and an 'Author's Introduction'. As he admits in the last paragraph, 'This being a digression from my design, I am afraid I may trespass upon my Reader; but, if it find encouragement, I have materials enough to advance it into a complete Treatise' (p. 177).

It is the usual combination of allusion with a full complement of parodic devices, however, which highlights the real worthlessness of Sloane's West Indian pearls of wisdom, and (as in 'Modern Learning') ridicule any assumption that such intellectual dross could be accounted an important increment on the legacy not only of such classical authors as Varro, Pliny, and Columella, but the best of the modern authorities on medicine, husbandry, and natural philosophy as well. A typical instance is van Slonenbergh's observations on 'Muddy and Stinking' Cajamain water:

I found that "Water being thick and muddy will have an odd taste if you drink it," p.10; that the best method is to give it time to settle. We have a way in Cajamai of letting it
"percolate through a porous stone, made into the form of a mortar;" but here great care must be taken of "putting the water into the concave side," ibid. for otherwise Water is of that fluid nature, that it will not easily remain upon the convex. This observation may be of great use to many persons, especially to such as are accustomed to bite and sup their milk, and have not seen the use of spoons; for they, notwithstanding the nature of concavity and convexity, and that the concave side is more capacious of liquids than the convex, when they first handle that instrument are apt to slobber (p. 141).

Sloane's remarks on the Duke of Albemarle's abortive attempts to produce saltpetre from 'the Earth dug out of Caves where Indians were buried, or where Bats, and their Dung, are in great quantities' (Jamaica, p. ix), are burlesqued by means of a delightful piece of prosimetric nonsense:

The Count Dhona was very desirous to have found large quantities of "salt-petre," upon account of his own private interest; and had therefore "carried several people thither, on purpose to "try to make it, having had a patent for that design"; but being chiefly encouraged by an ancient Prophesy:

There was Seven Men came out of the West
To make Salt-petre strong,
To turn it into Gun-powder,
To charge the King's Cannon:
Then let this health go round,
Then let this health go round,
Although your Stockings are made of Silk,
Your knees shall touch the ground, &c

I told his Excellency, "that there was not any Salt-petre to be had from any natural earth, but some kind of Tineal or borax out of a red earth; and that what Salt-petre was to be had there, was from the earth dug out of caves where Indians were buried, or where bats and their dung are in great quantities." ibid

I told him likewise, "that I had seen in the woods many of these Indians bones in caves"; and proposed to him a collection of them and bats dung; the usefulness of which had not been treated of by any European Virtuoso; but this great design, as likewise nurseries I had projected for Bats, Owls, and other noctivagous creatures, fell to the ground without further encouragement (Cajamai, p. 140).

Inevitably Sloane's tautological and jargon-laden prose is a prime target. His humble confession that his style was occasionally shoddy due to the haste of composition is naturally alluded to, as his Dutch alter-ego anxiously seeks to allay any supposition that his constant use of strange terminology has anything to do with magic (p. 138). Sloane's statement that the meat of Jamaican swine 'tastes much as Bacon if broiled on coals' is extended by van Slonenbergh into a series of reflections on how the 'Baconic Particles in Swine's Flesh' ensured that, no matter how it was prepared, pork
surprisingly 'eat much as Bacon', rather than 'red Herrings or dried Salmon' (p. 149); while his casual observation that the local 'Muscovy Ducks' came 'originally from Guinea' (*Jamaica*, p. xvii) is developed by van Slonenbergh into an historical explanation (complete with references to Columella, Martial, Alexander the Great, and Sardanapalus) of the African origins of a nominally-Russian duck (pp. 148-49). The 'nastiness' of Sloane's subject matter is amusingly satirized by van Slonenbergh's recollections of the 'long and tedious' problems of sea-sickness he experienced on his own voyage, which, he admits, had badly affected his ability to care for his patron's family and to 'make such experiments and observations...as I intended'. 'Some of the women,' he continues, 

that had done puking, asked me, "Doctor, why don't you cure yourself?" To which I replied, sea-sickness was not in my "preliminaries nor conditions," and then discoursed to them concerning the nature of Saline Particles, Aquatic Exhalation, unusual Vibration and Tolutation of the Intestines, p. 3,4,...; but they seemed to have little apprehension of such philosophical ideas, being immediately called away to dinner (pp. 136-37).

The charge of credulity made in the early satire is likewise reiterated in connection with Sloane's account of the feeding-time behaviour of Jamaican pigs, which, in their reaction to the calls of their overseers, 'seem to be as much, if not more, under Command and Discipline, than any Troops I ever saw' (*Jamaica*, p. xvii). King's point is made through a typical mixture of litotic persona irony, literary allusion (to *The Rehearsal*), *reductio-ad-absurdum*, and diminution, tacked on to the end of the quotation:

I was relating this story to Dr Van Slyboots...who had been a great Traveller, and had spent much of his time in England. He told me, that their Swine there had something of this discipline, but nothing equal to that of Cajamai; that twice a day they were call'd to their food, which was Whey, Butter-milk, or Common Hog-wash; that the ceremony was performed by a Wench, who, with a stick striking upon a trough or pale, used to endeavour to represent a drum, and then with a shrill voice, cry, "come, Tig; come, Tig; come, Tig." That they never said for the word of Command, of "One, Two, Three, and away," but he that heard the first sound ran as if the Devil drove, and left him to take the hindmost. That they never complimented, as "Pray, Captain Swineface, help yourself. Where's the Silver Ladle and a Soup-plate for Colonel Parker's Lady? I will not be so rude as to carve the carrot-tops before Madame Pigsney;" but all fell to like Hogs, and eat like Hogs. They tell us indeed of a place where Pigs play upon the Organs; but I take it to be fabulous (p. 150).

While on the subject, van Slonenbergh recalls a similar strange phenomenon - which he
is 'credibly assured by a worthy Colonel' is more than 'a story' - concerning the 'admirable oeconomy' of the 'Wild Dogs of Cajamai', which had also developed a highly-organized method of taking 'their supper'(p. 152). And yet if his readiness to credit such unsubstantiated reports is still further proof of van Slonenbergh's unscientific credulity, he nevertheless on occasion reveals, like Sorbiere and the Correspondent, all the wisdom and clear-sightedness of the fool. 'These instances of Wild Dogs and Swine', he observes, 'might convince us of the rationality of these creatures; and shew that their oeconomy is better, in taking their Suppers orderly, than of such animals as sit up all night drinking of Punch, or playing at Basset or Ombre, and take care what they call Supper when it is a more proper time to go to Breakfast' (p. 152).

The extensive records of Sloane's medical cases which dominate his Introduction - including many involving the death of patients - naturally afford King numerous opportunities for pastiche-parody. Alluding to a passage from Sloane's work on Jamaican burial practices, King has his persona consider one of the most pressing concerns of any physician when setting up a new practice:

I think it one of the most necessary things in the world,...to look out for proper and convenient Burying-places for his Patients; considering that we are all mortal, and it would be too much charge to embalm every person, and therefore the sooner out of sight the better. Cajamai is a most excellent place for this; "the air being so hot as to corrupt and spoil meat in four hours, no wonder if a diseased body must be soon buried; they usually bury twelve hours after death, at all times of the day and night ",... so that the melancholy object of the corpse is soon removed from being a reproach to the Physician; who if he be prudent enough for so many hours to keep himself from touching the dead body, so as not to make it bleed, may escape well enough without censure (p. 158).

After noting the location of burial places outside the town, van Slonenbergh points out that 'spirits in that country tell no tales, nor how they came to be separated from their body, which leads me to my next head, viz., "The Method I used to cure Diseases in Cajamia"'. What follows is a string of jokes on Sloane's medical failures, proving that his medicine was more life-threatening than the diseases it was supposed to cure. Sloane's genuinely modest and honest appraisal of the dangers associated with practising medicine in foreign circumstances - particularly his unease that 'by ignorance I should
kill instead of curing' (xc) - is naturally seized upon (p. 159), and used to introduce a section comprised of many of Sloane's original cases telescoped into a virtual mortality bill of those who had succumbed to van Slonenergh's care (pp. 160-63). In some instances, the Dutchman admits, through his actions minor ailments (notably hangovers) had become mortal: 'I was sent for to several when they were drunk, and left them dead drunk' (p. 162). His successes, on the other hand, are plainly such as could be achieved by even the least medically-adept, his medicine consisting of a combination of faith-healing a la Greatrakes (pp. 159-60) - a play on Sloane's perceptive recognition of the psychosomatic aspect of medicine - and the most home-spun of concoctions, such as 'Watergruel, Chicken-broth, Betony, Sage, and Rosemary tea' (p. 163). 'I may likewise boast,' he adds, 'of my improvement of the use of Feathers in the Case of Vomiting'. His catalogue of medicinal preparations (filched from five pages of Sloane's original), with its blend of obscure, abbreviated Latinisms and commonplace beverages -


- is emblematic of the farcical nature of his medical learning, as is his interest in the well-being of 'Ballad-singers...Trumpeters to Monsters, High German Artists...Merry Andrews' and other figures of the fairground. His confirmation that he once 'practised as a Mountebank' at Bartholomew Fair (pp. 169-70) is hardly necessary. Yet in this context too, van Slonenergh's flashes of insight show himself to be a true son of the Lucianic carnival. It is, he claims, the 'perfection of a Physician to bring people "not to judge harshly in case the person dies " (p. 159); and his own experience had taught him that in the majority of cases a person's willingness to place his or her relative in the hands of a doctor, and to accept uncritically the propriety of the prescribed treatment in the event of the loved one'd death, was in direct proportion to the amount he or she gained by it (p. 160). And it is van Slonenergh himself who ironically provides the real
clue to good health and long life - the preventive medicine of moderate living. 'I pleased one of my Patients,' he notes, 'whom I had relieved of the Belly-ach. I wished him to avoid taking away any Blood, or making use of Physick; and that he should take an exact care of his diet, that it were easy of digestion and pleasant to his palate. To these last prescriptions he readily agreed, and I heard no more of him," p. 129. Whenever I made use of the method before mentioned, my Patients never died under my hands' (p. 164).

Typically, however, such moments of real Horatian wisdom are fleeting; and by the end, the Dutch quack is again precariously astride his rampant hobby-horse, compiling vast catalogues of meat and vegetables drawn from such sources as 'Pontakeronskiniski's Treatise on the Tartarian Luxury' (p. 174), Joachimus Struppius's 'Achora Famis'(p. 175), and - of course - 'the ingenious Author of "The Soups and Sauces of the Ancients" (pp. 176-177). Once more pedantry has led unerringly to the abandonment of reason, manners and ethics, to the crazed consumption of such Trimalchian 'dainties' as snails and 'Rats... though I know the generality of persons take them for Dormice' (p. 176). His friends and acquaintances, among them one who had painstakingly prepared for some less than appreciative 'Gentlemen' a dinner consisting of 'two brace of boiled Cates and Onions, and a dish of roast Hedge-hogs'(p. 176), are no doubt a pointer to his own culinary predilections and cultural perversions. His final endorsement of another friend's project of rearing spiders for the table - 'the largest of which was a very sensible creature, knew his master's voice, and answered to the name of Robin' (p. 177) - represents not only the conclusive evidence of his mental and moral degeneration, but also a brilliantly fitting climax to King's serio-comic anatomy of the man he held chiefly responsible for a serious decline in English natural philosophy. For it is entirely apt that the Sloanian virtuoso should speak in such glowing terms about one who had found so much to his 'palate' a creature which, since Bacon's comments in the *New Organon*, had come to symbolize the very antithesis of proper, Baconian natural philosophy.
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38. The Tatler, edited by Donald F. Bond, 3 vols (Oxford, 1987), iii, p. 220. Bond has also noted, and dismissed, the suggestion made by earlier editors that the mock-letter, ostensibly written by a certain 'T.B.' and concerning the migration of frogs in Ireland', that makes up the bulk of this number is connected to King's satires on Sloane. 'If the satire here is really directed at Sloane', he argues, 'it seems strange that it should be printed in the Tatler, since Sloane was a Whig and King a well-known Tory and High Churchman, an early editor of the Examiner', p. 218 n. 6. Even so, it is interesting to recall Nichols's assertion that 'Though no friend to the political character of Mr. Steele, he readily assisted him on occasion as an Essayist', and was therefore probably the author of various parts of the original series of the journal; though Nichols himself offers no suggestions as to possible examples (ii, p. 304 n. a). Perhaps this mock-letter is a good candidate. The link between Ireland, the initials 'T.B.', and King becomes a little stronger when one remembers his two pamphlets bearing the pseudonym 'Honest Tom Boggy'. It is possible that the wittier, more aware readers could be expected to make a connection between the correspondent's 'Irish' descent, his initials, his boggy subject, and the 'Tom Boggy' responsible for two other current mock letters. And certainly both the subject matter and the style are typical of King.

Incidentally, the anonymous pamphlet, The Present State of Physick in the Island of Cajamai (London, 1710?), which Bond erroneously claims for King, was almost certainly not his work. A rather poor piece, it was obviously inspired by King's A Voyage to Cajamai, but exhibits none of that parody's wit and and humour.
42. According to Disraeli, he received 'five miserable pounds' from Lintot for each of the Useful Transactions, p. 328.
43. A Voyage to the Islands, Madera, Barbadoes, Nieves, St Christophers and Jamaica, 2 vols (London, 1707-25), i; page numbers for subsequent references will be given parenthetically after the quotation in the text.
44. A report carried in The Daily Courant for 18 August, 1704, (and taken from a recent Paris Gazette) confirms this practice, recording the fact that on 14 July, 1704, the Pope had 'dispatch'd a Courier with Letters to the King of France and the Duke of Burgundy, in Answer to those they sent to acquaint him with the Birth of the Duke of Bretagne. His Holiness has resolv'd to send to the Dutchess of Burgundy consecrated Swadling Cloaths for the young Prince (which is a Compliment usually made by the Pope, to Queens and Princesses on the Birth of their Child)'. Quoted in
45. *DNB*.


47. Kerby-Miller, pp. 72, 221-22.

48. *DNB* notes that Derham (1657-1735), who was later to become a Boyle Lecturer, a prominent physico-theologian, and eventually Chaplain to the Prince of Wales (later George II) and Canon of Windsor, also contributed articles on meteorology, wasps, and the 'will of the wisp', as well as a large treatise on 'Watch and Clock work'. Somewhat misleadingly, W. P. Jones describes King's parody as 'a delightful satire on adultery in various parts of London', *The Rhetoric of Science*, p. 71.

49. Performed on 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10 April, 1706, and published that year by Jacob Tonson (with a dedication to the Kit-Cat Club), D'Urfey's play was on one level a political satire aimed at the 'high-flyers'. It proved a financial disaster, and was never revived; see William W. Appleton's introduction to the Augustan Reprint Society's edition, No. 104 (Los Angeles, 1964).


55. Pp. 10, 61-62. Donald Davie also notes Swift's treatment of the materialist-mechanist theme in the *Tale*, claiming that, along with Pope, Berkeley, and other conservatives, he ridicules the Lockean assumption based upon 'hints from the scientists' that there is no gulf fixed between the material and the immaterial worlds, *The Language of Science and the Language of Literature 1700-1740* (London and New York, 1963), pp. 23-29.

56. Heilbron has noted that Hauksbee, 'a draper turned instrument maker and physical lecturer', was denigrated on account of his low social status by the more 'polite' sections of the scientific community. There is also, one suspects, an element of snobbery in King's satire as well.

57. This matter has been considered by Ronald Paulson in his study of Swift's *Tale*. Using an actual report from the *Philosophical Transactions* on the microscopical examination of bodily substances taken from a dissected dog as an example of the great 'contrast between what is said and the way it is said', he notes linguistic elements, such as pronouns, which unavoidably conjure up 'our world, with its accompanying ideas of morality and taboo', and which conflict dramatically with the activities and experiments being described. He observes, moreover, that scientific objectivism, with its inherent attitude of superiority over the feelings and emotions of the individual, is invariably betrayed by the language it employs, so long as that language retains its emotive connotations. The result is that 'the scientist reveals himself as a self-appointed god', falsely trying to deny the emotional and moral aspects of his social and human being. The incongruity of a pretentious objectivism and one's immovable, massive 'humaness' leads inevitably to a sense of absurdity, madness and horror. This disturbing incongruity was especially prevalent in the earliest scientific reporting, and it was this, Paulson shows, which Swift so brilliantly captures and exploits in the *Tale*; pp. 52-65.

58. The problem of appropriate language was no doubt exacerbated in van Leeuwenhoek's case by the fact that his letters had to be translated from Dutch by local translators; see Clifford Dobell, *Antony van Leeuwenhoek and his "Little Animals"* (London, 1932), p. 44.
Conclusion

This study represents a substantial contribution to the existing field of scholarship and criticism devoted to the life and literature of William King, for several reasons. It provides the most complete biography of King yet written, and redefines the relatively flat image of him presented by some of his most recent admirers as a 'humorist' who 'steadfastly refused to take his life seriously'. It portrays instead a complex, enigmatic individual, a devout Anglican of impressive talent and learning, whose moral, cultural, and ideological convictions and sensitivity combined to form a personality which can best be described as 'Democritean'. Reportedly disposed to bouts of moodiness and possessed of a frequently 'ill-natured' tongue when it came to those he considered fools and knaves, nonetheless he made an affable and delightful friend, who was of such a tender and caring disposition that - to repeat arguably the most significant piece of his friend and first editor's testimony - 'Tears would fall from his Eyes upon the smallest Occasions'. His character apparently bore the contradictory marks of intolerance and cynicism, compassion and idealism; while his intelligence, though high and quick, was by no means profound, except in the sense of its being profoundly commonsensical. The compound formed by these elements was a mind particularly alert to abnormality, paradox, and pretension, and which naturally responded to such phenomena ironically.

The reappraisal of King's cultural, intellectual, and ideological milieu conducted in the first part of the study, and the close examination of his essentially non-ironic writings, together establish that the values which he either explicitly or implicitly affirms throughout his works were derived more or less uncritically from the hegemonic culture of his age. His were the ideas and the ideals of the governing class to which he belonged, imbibed during the course of a humanistic education designed to perpetuate the dominance of the gentry and nobility, while at the same time inculcating a sense of paternalistic responsibility into its members. Built upon rigid hierarchical foundations, and reinforced by an historiography itself based predominantly upon the interpretation of
classical and historical narratives written by and about 'great men', his 'world view' was inevitably conservative and traditionalist. His life-long commitment to the High Church party, for whose cause he seems temporarily to have worked as a constituency activist as well as a propagandist, was a direct outgrowth of his class and educational background. If (as has commonly been asserted) he found politics a somewhat tiresome distraction from his real pleasures, he knew his duty: any idea that his political and controversial tracts were merely mercenary is erroneous.

It has been shown that King's themes directly relate to his attitude towards various fields of learning. The close analysis of previously ignored or misinterpreted sources (notably the *Adversaria*) in the context of the prevailing ideas and social conditions of late seventeenth-century England, particularly with respect to Baconianism, either qualifies or contradicts many of the preconceptions of earlier critics, who, conscious of his undoubted devotion to late Christian Humanism, have tended to depict him as an inveterate opponent of 'modern' philology, antiquarianism, and science. King's views on these subjects emerge as at once more complex and more simple than this overly formulaic impression would allow. True to the dominant principles of his age and class, he believed that learning had above all to be socially useful in the broadest possible sense; and for this reason he placed the greatest emphasis on the disciplines of moral philosophy, rhetoric, history, politics, and classical literature, for which he personally had a pronounced preference. From the finest classical and Renaissance authors, as well as the Scriptures, he drew the principles by which he endeavoured to live his life (if not always successfully): duty and social responsibility, obedience to legitimate authority, and the propriety of moderation, whether in terms of the pursuit of pleasure or the quest for knowledge. By the same token, he believed strongly in the importance of literary decorum and the virtues of stylistic clarity, especially in respect of philosophical literature, where the primary requirement was the efficient communication of 'truths'. Consequently he condemned as 'vain' and 'false' any form of scholastic or social behaviour which exceeded these vague but firm Horatian boundaries, and which
appeared to lack more noble ends than its own sake.

It was this set of prejudicial values that he applied to all areas of learning, as a result of which he was often prevented from recognizing the real worth of, for example, Bentley's philological discoveries and Sloane's biological collections. But this is to recognize that from our perspective his view of 'proper scholarship' and, in particular, 'proper science' was too simplistic and impracticable to realize its own utilitarian ambitions: which is not the same as saying that he was 'anti-science' and 'anti-modern'. Indeed, he could rightly argue that his criticism of Hans Sloane and Martin Lister was in large measure justified by the directives and judicial aphorisms laid down by Bacon himself, which not only corresponded in their most rudimentary elements with the higher ideals of Humanism, but had actually been endorsed by the Anglican establishment. The argument that King's supposed 'satires on science' amount to an endorsement of the central tenets of Baconianism, and were motivated by a perceived failure on the part of Lister and Sloane to practice natural philosophy properly, departs from previous interpretations. His mockery of Bentley, Lister, and Sloane (not to mention Wotton, Bagford, Petiver, and the rest of his gallery of academic and scientific fools) stemmed, in other words, from much more than petty spite or a desire to make his audience laugh; it derived from a deep conviction as to what was right and proper, and a genuine belief that these accepted procedures and levels of excellence, whether in the fields of philology or science, were being grotesquely violated.

The main contribution of this work to our appreciation of King's satires lies in its development of earlier, relatively perfunctory or specifically-related discussions on their generic nature, and its subsequent assessment of his overall literary performance. Although King's attacks on Bentley, Lister, and Sloane (as well as his burlesque poetry and drama) have been associated with the tradition of Menippean satire before, the extent of their relationship to the tradition, and the full significance of their generic identity, is here demonstrated more comprehensively than in any previous study, particularly in respect of King's debts to Lucian. It has been shown that his decision to
adapt the genre to his own immediate requirements, and to emulate such models as *Lexiphanes*, *Dialogues of the Dead*, and *The Lover of Lies* (as well as great Renaissance and near-contemporary Menippeans like Erasmus, More, Rabelais, Hall, Jonson, and Butler) in itself represents a reaffirmation of the essential principles of Humanism. If his Democritean personality inevitably made him a satirist, the nature of his subject matter, his vast erudition, and paradoxically his recognition of the doctrine of kinds, equally led him to adopt this anti-genre of parody, miscellaneity, carnival, and 'erudite joking' in order to mock his society's quacks, pseudo-scientists, and pedants.

It is evident from the discussion and survey of the Menippean tradition that King cannot be credited with the invention of the kind of satiric cuisine he served, nor with altering radically its basic features. For this reason, the question of the extent to which his 'Trifles' directly influenced the work of the Scriblerians - the issue which has arisen most consistently in previous discussions of his parodies - remains an especially difficult, perhaps an impossible, one to answer definitively, except in respect of borrowings of particular images and subject matter. At best it might be argued that his burlesque academic discourses, dramatic criticism, and scientific parody, and more particularly his original use of mock-scholarly devices, brought a level of wit and humour to the genre unknown in England since Butler, and provided the Scriblerians immediately prior to the formation of the Club with examples of recognizable application to their purpose.

The main conclusion that emerges from these analyses in the context of the tradition of Menippean satire is that King's performance in many respects mirrors his character and life: brilliant, but erratic, by turns charming, amusing, and sharp, yet on the whole somewhat disappointing, considering its great promise. It is certainly indicative of his limitations both as a writer and as a man that King should have restricted his literary endeavours to the sub-genres of pastiche-parody, Lucianic dialogue, travesty and mock-heroic, and not attempted the more taxing yet more rewarding challenge of an extended satire on his period. That he failed to complete the translation of just such a
work (Hall's *Mundus*) is emblematic of his life and literary career.

Even so, it is inherently unjust to assess a writer's achievement according to totally inappropriate criteria; or to put it another way, to weigh the work of the parodist and occasional satirist on scales designed for heavier kinds. King's canvas is quite deliberately small and precisely defined; and though his themes do extend beyond their occasional frame, it is as a parodist and caricaturist that he should be judged. As this study has established, in these fields he excels. In the final analysis, his achievement was inventively to reduce the genre to its most highly-concentrated state of direct parody, and personal and occasional satire. In the process, he introduced numerous unique variations on original themes, especially in terms of his combination of allusions from diverse classical and contemporary sources, his mock-indexes and 'Notes upon Notes', and his appropriation and reinterpretation of microscopic diagrams, the latter in particular serving as a graphic illustration of his special gift for uniting convention with originality, traditional techniques with modern ingredients. The more one is prepared to savour his seemingly light and insubstantial creations, the more one becomes appreciative of their impressive richness, complexity, and intricacy. If they possess neither the depth of the greatest intelligence nor the transcendence of the finest art, and are prone to repetition (as Gay recognized), his best works - especially *The Art of Cookery* and *Useful Transactions* - exhibit a breadth of learning and a vivacity of wit rarely found in other works of their kind. His skilful and original adaptation of his generic models, his ultimately Erasmian concern for the proper use of learning and human reason, and above all, his unsurpassed talent for humour and a sense of the absurd, all infuse what would otherwise have been entirely forgettable lampoons, and transform them into some of the finest examples of the art of burlesque. If their relatively small scale and ephemerality mean that King's place in the tradition of Menippean satire must remain less than monumental, nevertheless that place deserves to be more widely and readily acknowledged.
King and *The Examiner*

King's involvement in *The Examiner* has consistently been assumed by a number of literary and historical authorities, although the extent of his contribution to the project is perhaps impossible to determine. The original source of the idea that King wrote for the journal in its earliest days would seem to be the 1721 edition of Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses*; though Browne also asserts that, having been approached by Swift, Dr Friend, 'and some others' to participate, he had joined the confederacy of Tory wits by 10 October, 1710, which could have allowed him to have been responsible either wholly or in part for only the last two or three numbers (pp. 71-72). Nichols insists that the 'original institutors of that paper seem to have employed Dr. King as the Publisher, or ostensible Author', and suggests that he was perhaps the author of No. 6, and 'pretty evidently' of Nos. 11 ans 12 (p. xxi). Later authorities have generally been prepared to accept the word of King's eighteenth-century biographers. Weeks, however, remains sceptical of King's having played any significant role in the enterprise, pointing to the dearth of concrete external evidence, and noting in particular that Swift has failed to mention him when recounting to Stella the names of the original editors. If King was involved, he claims, his part was a very minor one, perhaps being little more than that of a mere 'general expeditor and proof-reader' responsible directly only for the odd issue, with No. 11 being by far his most likely contribution (though he mistakenly refers to it as No. 12).

More recent studies of *The Examiner* and the Tory propaganda effort have postulated a more substantial role for him, both as an editor and an author. On the basis of internal evidence such as culinary metaphors, legal references, and personal attacks on Defoe and Steele, Julia Reinemeyer has detected King's hand in Nos. 2, 8, 9, 11, and 12, and suggests that his relationship with Bolingbroke was especially close. J. A. Downie has in effect acknowledged King as the earliest chief editor, a view endorsed by Frank Ellis in his edition of the paper war between Swift and Arthur Mainwaring, the editor of the rival Whig journal, *The Medley*. Ellis has unearthed a cryptic passage in *The Medley* (no. 21, 19 February, 1711) which describes the Examiner as 'sometimes...a Poet [Prior], sometimes a Priest [Atterbury], sometimes a Physician [John Freind], sometimes a silly Academick [King], and sometimes even an old Woman [Delariviere Manley]'.

As for internal evidence, there is one, admittedly slight clue to indicate that King did in fact serve as the earliest chief editor: that is, an advertisement for the second of the Tom Boggy tracts, which was carried in each of the first twelve numbers. One simple
explanation for this could be that the publisher, John Morphew, wished to promote another of his less saleable wares; but it may be that King took advantage of his position as editor to push his own works. It is perhaps no coincidence that the advertisement ceased to appear after the twelfth issue, when it would appear that Atterbury briefly took charge.

For what it is worth, my own opinion so far as his authorship of particular tracts is concerned is that the general view that he wrote No. 11 is probably valid. The references to Horace, Virgil, and Bacon in relation to the question of endurable 'extempore Conceitedness', and the criticism of Steele's inexcusable vanity (in the course of which a reference is made to a certain prominent 'Scholar', who is almost certainly Bentley), all suggest King's hand. Likewise the emphasis on Steele's stylistic flaws, and the ironic praise of Steele's 'great Civility and good Breeding', are features one would readily associate with him. Nos. 2 and 5 also might be King's, particularly the latter, with its references to The Rehearsal and to 'those little Animals (mention'd by grave Writers) that are born, and live, and dye within the Compass of a Day', and its ironic reflections on the fact that Steele, at the time both Tatler and Gazetteer, had covered exactly the same issues in both journals using only a slightly-altered form of expression. However, these elements in themselves are not sufficient to warrant a definite attribution, especially since Prior for one was just as capable of this sort of banter and shared the same general views.

Notes

7. Swift vs Mainwaring, pp. 253-54.
Appendix B

The Authorship of *A Vindication of the Reverend Dr Henry Sacheverell*

It has commonly been assumed that King was responsible (if only as the leader of a group of collaborators) for the satiric dialogue, *A Vindication of Dr Henry Sacheverell*, arguably the most important high church tract written in response to William Bisset's *The Modern Fanatick*. The basis of this attribution is surely its reprinting in the second volume of Nichols's edition of King's *Original Works*, together with the associated pamphlet *Mr. B--t's Recantation: in a Letter to the Reverend Dr Henry Sacheverell* and *An Answer to a Second Scandalous Book that Mr. Bisset is now writing* [...] I have already indicated that the last of these is almost certainly King's; however, the other two, one can be equally sure, are not. Why Nichols attributed the *Vindication* to King is difficult to guess, especially in view of the fact that his original source, Browne, mentions only the *Answer* in discussing King's contribution to the anti-Bisset campaign (pp. 11, 83-84). Moreover, Nichols himself is somewhat inconsistent on the matter. Although in his introductory biography he asserts categorically that King wrote all the three works (I, p. xxii), in a later note he is a little more guarded in respect of the first two. Providing a brief account of the dispute, he writes that Bisset's book was followed by the "Vindication" here re-printed; and by another piece of irony, a pretended "Recantation of Mr. Bisset"....Mr. Bisset prepared a reply,...but it did not appear soon enough to prevent the publication of Dr. King's "Answer to a Second Scandalous Book [etc.]"....It is obvious that the facts on which the Vindicator formed his arguments were supplied by Dr. Sacheverell himself, to whom the whole pamphlet has by some by some been attributed (II, p. 181).

Nichols in this case seems considerably less convinced that King and 'the Vindicator' were one and the same man; and it almost appears that his reprinting of the *Vindication* among King's works is based on no other foundation than the assumption that the author of the *Answer* was the most likely candidate.

There is no reason, however, to attribute either the *Vindication* or the *Recantation* to King on internal grounds. As regards the former, neither the arguments nor the stylistic and formal features could be identified as being peculiar to King; and indeed in none of the controversial pieces which can safely be given to him does one find anything approaching the same degree of humourless sarcasm and even vicious spite that characterizes that work. Similarly, the *Recantation*, though marginally more witty in its use of ironic impersonation, still falls well short of the standards of wit and humour set by the *Answer*, the Tom Boggy tracts, and *Clemens Alexandrinus*; while a number of
features, notably its repetition of the cheap blackmail threats made in the *Vindication*, point to the same hand.

There is sufficient evidence, moreover, to establish with near certainty the true identity of the culprit responsible for both: the Reverend Charles Lambe. Almost invariably named as one of the collaborators, Lambe was a young high Church cleric who had already earned himself a reputation for demagoguery by the time the Sacheverell episode erupted; and it is significant that he was suspected of being the Vindicator by Bisset himself. In the Second Part of the *Modern Fanatick*, he describes his literary assailant as 'a very wild licentious Youth', before claiming with characteristic hyperbole that 'If I should be murder'd (as there is no Stone left unturn'd to procure it) my Death will, in great Measure, lie at young Mr. L---b's Door'. He insists that the same hand wrote the *Recantation*, 'as I am assured by their intimate acquaintance' (preface); though in a postscript he assumes mistakenly that the same 'Minister' was responsible for the recently published *Answer* as well.

Five years later, Bisset's speculation was confirmed by Lambe himself, by then a Whig. In a brief tract written to defend his switch of political allegiance in the face of a facetious Tory pamphlet which had named him as the former Vindicator, Lambe confesses to having played the leading part in the effort, that of the jester:

> If I recollect right, in that Season the Heads of our Polemical Friends partook deeply of their native Clay, their Pens went heavy, very heavy, in the Road of Controversy; and it was determin'd that this [i.e. the defence of Sacheverell] should be manag'd with an Air of Pleasantry, they gave it another Name; and indeed I must own, perceiving a general Incapacity in them to execute what they had projected, in pure Charity to them, I did lend them what they greatly mournd for; nay, I gave it them out and out, being well assur'd that they never could be able to pay me in the same Coin.

Even so, he denies full responsibility for the content of the book, claiming that he was always under the direct control of higher authorities, and that the 'Language of the Book was the Language of my Clients.' 'I was a young Pledger', he continues,

> and spoke in exact Conformity to my Brief, which was every Day handed to me; the Virulence of their Expressions was even then shocking; and I receiv'd the first Motion to leave them from that Opinion, which was gradually aggravat'd, and at last completed, by a well grounded Suspicion, that the Pretender had more of their Friendship than he had a right to (pp. 11-12).

The authorship of the *Vindication*, then, was certainly a collaborative process, but one in which King was seemingly not involved. The role one would normally have expected him to play in such circumstances was performed by Lambe, who apparently took his cue directly from the managers of the high-flying wing of the Tory party. And it was Lambe, still wearing his 'Fool's Coat', who probably also penned the closely-related
Recantation.

Notes

1. See, for example, the British Library Catalogue; the Eighteenth Century Short Title Catalogue; The National Library of Scotland Catalogue; and The University of Edinburgh Library Catalogue. Weeks also accepts the attribution, pp. 221-26.


5. The Possibility of Leaving the Tories, and Speaking the Truth afterwards. In a short Answer to an Impudent Stupid Pamphlet, Published by the Jacobite Faction...In a Letter to Bernard Lintot (London, 1716), pp. 10-11.
Appendix C

Some Unpublished Manuscripts and King's Dedicatory Poem to Ned Ward's
Don Quixote

A small number of manuscript verses attributed to King are to be found in the Portland Papers held in the University of Nottingham Library. They include three copies (one incomplete) in different hands of a brief poem entitled 'Upon Sir Salathiel Lovels passing sentence upon Whitney', one of which also contains a Latin version. The basis of the attribution is an autograph note (said to be in Edward Harley's hand) on PwV 283 stating that it is 'by Dr King'. However, the issue is confused by another Ms note on PwV30 fol. 338, which suggests that it is 'By Harrington'. Presumably this is a reference to James Harrington, one of King's contemporaries at Christ Church, who was to become a brilliant common law barrister before suffering a tragically premature death.\(^1\) An additional note on PwV30 fol. 337 complicates the matter still further by its rather cryptic assertion that the verses were to be presented 'to the Vice Chancellor when He was silenc'd by Dr King of Ch:Ch'. In relation to the meaning of this last remark, and the incident which occasioned the poem, I have been unable to locate any information. The extremely slight nature of the work also makes a definite attribution on internal grounds impossible. The poem reads:

The Wise Salathiel, our City Recorder,
thinks killing of Horses is no less than Murder;
and so it may be, for the Reasons hereafter,
for sure killing of Horses is not manslaughter:
Nor can we such killing call Se Defendendo,-
But ye rising up in judgmt is a strange Innuendo.

There are less grounds for ascribing to him the bawdy doggerel on the verso of PwV 281:

Tell, Son of Athens, Learned Bard,
Why Privy Member's call'd a Yard?
Is it oe [the?] Sex you would impose on?
A Yard, full inches is 3 dozen.
Or was't true length in ages past
When Man nigh thousand years did last?
Whose size might add, to world's Increase,
now shorter grows, near its decrease,
From 36 yee do decline
to Inches, now at best but Nine.

According to Dr Dorothy B. Johnston, the current Keeper of the Manuscripts\(^2\), the poem is included in the group attributed to King only by chance; and the suggestion that
it is 'very possibly by W.K.', apparently made by an earlier librarian, would seem to be unfounded. Though King was by no means averse to bawdy punning (e.g. 'Eunuch's Child'), his jokes are somewhat more subtle and witty than this, which could have been written by any number of gentlemen wits.

Another Ms attributed to him is PwV 30 fol. 335, 'On the King wounded in ye Shoulder at the Boyne. by D[or] King of Ch.Ch'. It too gives little reason for verifying King's authorship, though its humour is rather more Kingian:

There was a little Bullet ye Messenger of death,
Commission'd by Kg James to stop Kg William's breath.
This bullet has a Bayliff been, w[ich] made him much ye bolder,
And therefor in Kg James's Name He clapt Him on ye Shoulder

Ms PwV 284 is a copy of 'The Garden Plot', a poem formerly attributed to Swift; but as Harold Williams points out, 'a broadside edition of the poem in the Lambeth Library, dated 1709', carries an attribution to King 'in a contemporary hand'. Though this in itself does not establish King's authorship with any certainty, the ascription is to some extent confirmed by the character of the poem itself, which is very reminiscent of King's Miscellany Poems in terms of both its style and its serio-comic treatment of the themes of egoism and hypocrisy. While this is also some way from conclusive evidence, one can be considerably more confident about claiming the poem for King than any of the other Ms verses.

One printed poem belonging to King which Nichols failed to include in his edition of the Original Works is his dedicatory verse to Ned Ward's Hudibrastic version of Don Quixote, The Life and Notable Adventures of that Renown'd Knight, Don Quixote De la Mancha (London, 1711). King's verse appeared together with poems from his friends, Joseph Browne and William Pittis, and provides further evidence (if that were needed) of King's admiration for Cervantes's masterpiece. The poem, entitled simply 'To Mr. Edward Ward, on his Translation of Don Quixote into Hudibrastic Verse', reads:

Knight-Errantry the Spanish Genius rais'd,
And, tho' fantastick, was with Prudence prais'd.
Thus with the Fire of Glory carried on,
They mighty Empires o'er the Indies won,
And pass'd from rising to the setting Sun.
Cervantes brought true Wisdom to the height,
And taught the distance betwixt Vain and Great.
Then ANNA, Europe's just Protector, came,
And show'd their Monarchy true Paths to Fame.
You to Cervantes equal Spirit give,
And in the British Language bid him live.
Notes

1. DNB.
2. I should like very much to thank Dr Johnston and the staff at the University of Nottingham Library for their kind assistance during my visit to the library and my subsequent enquiries.
Appendix D

The Commemoration Essay of George Marshall

Lodged within the archives of Christ Church Library is a manuscript of a Commemoration Essay delivered by George Marshall in 1842, on the life of his fellow alumnus, Dr King. A student at Christ Church between 1837 and 1858 (B.A., 1840; M.A., 1842, Proctor, 1850), Marshall was to serve as the Vicar of Pyrton, Oxfordshire, from 1857 to 1875, whereupon he became Rector of Milton, Oxfordshire. 1 His essay is in many respects unremarkable, being highly derivative and rather biased, as well as occasionally erroneous and unperceptive (he claims, for example, that King wrote William Bisset's The Modern Fanatick, and seems oblivious to the real satiric intentions of The Art of Cookery). Even so, the fact that he should have paid tribute to so unfashionable a figure at the time is, in my view, to his credit; and his comments on King's personal and literary qualities are at times apt. He notes, for instance, that King's 'plain sense and turn of humour made him delight in exposing pretension and hypocrisy of which he was himself totally devoid: and few men whose circumstances placed them within the reach of temptation have ever been so uncompromising and consistent in their political principles'. His literary merits, Marshall observes, 'are considerable: but as the subjects on which he wrote were chiefly suggested by passing events, his works retained but little interest beyond his own time'. He himself is capable of the odd witticism: having observed that King's indolence apparently caused him to neglect his judicial duties in Ireland, he writes that on his return to London he 'gave free scope to these poetical talents which he had cultivated on the Bench in Ireland'. Though Marshall's essay in the end offers nothing that is new and little that is interesting, it is in itself a notable artifact.

I should like to thank H. J. R. Wing, Assistant Librarian at Christ Church, for his generous assistance in this matter.
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