

A

LETTER TO A FRIEND,

TOUCHING THE QUESTION

“ WHO WAS THE AUTHOR

OF

ΕΙΚΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ ?”

---

BY

WILLIAM GRANT BROUGHTON, M.A.

CURATE OF HARTLEY WESPALL, HANTS.

---

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR C. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD; WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;  
AND 148, STRAND.

AND ALSO FOR C. KNIGHT, PALL-MALL, EAST.

1826.

LETTER TO A FRIEND

THE AUTHOR

BY

THE AUTHOR

A

## LETTER,

&c.

MY DEAR SIR,

To become interested in the question, "Who was the author of *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*?" it is not necessary to possess your intimate acquaintance with the history and literature of England. The celebrity of the work itself, the long contest which has been carried on as to its real author, the mystery which still surrounds that question, and the eminency of the characters involved in its determination, are sufficient to excite the curiosity of all; unless it be of those "grosse-spirited gentlemen who live like a great earth-worm in a fat dunghill," (Bishop Gauden's *Epist. Prefat. to Hieraspistes*). The republication of Gauden's letters to Lord Bristol, the publications of Dr. Wordsworth specially devoted to the enquiry, with the notice taken of them by the *Quarterly Review*, will probably

B

excite, in the public at large, that attention towards this question which studious enquirers have never ceased to bestow upon it. If, while the letters to Lord Bristol were alone considered, there could have been any doubt as to the secret service to which the writer alludes, and for the performance of which he claims so high a recompense, there can no longer be any hesitation when those letters are taken in connection with the correspondence with Lord Clarendon. The first impression received by every reader of that correspondence must be that it decides the controversy; because it appears to be impossible that any man in Gauden's situation should prefer a false claim of this nature, much less that he should insist upon the investigation of its justice, and refer for confirmation to those who would certainly expose him if the whole were a fiction. Even if this difficulty could be surmounted, it would still remain to be explained how two prime ministers successively, who held discordant opinions upon most other subjects, should be brought to agree in admitting the justice of this claim, unless, upon strict and impartial examination of the evidence, they were satisfied of its correctness. If they were so satisfied, is it credible that they could be deceived? Can we hope to substantiate the contrary persuasion? This, which appears to me the natural and involuntary conclusion to be

drawn from a perusal of the correspondence, remains, I think, unshaken by the voluminous evidence now produced, and commented upon with a refinement often bordering upon that of the special pleader.

In thus avowing my persuasion that Charles the First was not the writer of *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*, I must lay claim to the praise at least of that rigorous impartiality, which admits the claims of justice to prevail over the most fondly cherished prepossessions. A captive king, in the most trying moments of his eventful life, from the midst of his solitude and sufferings, sending forth this “protraiture” of his inward soul, presents a spectacle too solemnly pathetic to be willingly given up as a delusion. When I consider the nature of Gauden’s claim, and review the evidence in its favour, remembering that with the substantiation of his pretensions, the great charm of the *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική* must vanish, I deeply regret my inability to be any longer deceived, and am ready to exclaim

———Pol! me occidistis, amici,  
Non servavistis cui sic *extorta* voluptas,  
Et demptus *per vim* mentis *gratissimus* error.

The light in which we are to consider the subject, it appears to me, is in that of a case already decided; decided in favour of the claimant by competent judges, to whom he at the

same instant tendered his claim, and the means of detecting its falsehood, if his were nothing more than a vain pretension. Gauden, I say, by the references which he furnished in his letters to Clarendon, laid himself open to detection if he meditated an imposition; and since he received not censure but a splendid reward, the plain conclusion—a conclusion not to be overthrown by laboured and ingenious arguments—is, that his judges were satisfied, upon a view of the evidence, that his pretensions were founded in truth. There are, therefore, but two grounds, apparently, upon which it can be attempted to set aside a decision so clearly pronounced, and to grant a new trial of the cause. These are, either that Lord Clarendon, and his successor Lord Bristol, too hastily yielded their assent to the proofs furnished on the part of Gauden, or that there was other evidence, of which they were not cognizant, and which, if brought before them, would have induced them to decide differently: the judges were credulous, or they were not sufficiently informed. If, upon a re-hearing, either of these points can be established, I am ready to admit that the claim of Gauden to have written *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική* must proportionably suffer: but if upon the evidence first produced there can be but one opinion formed, and if, in the additional testimony with which we are now furnished, there be

nothing contained which impeaches the correctness and the adequacy of the former, then I am at a loss to discover upon what grounds the sentence once pronounced in Gauden's favour can be disturbed, or even attempted to be meddled with.

The conduct of Gauden himself must first be carefully considered.

I shall not assume that he was a man of probity, or that, to carry an object, he might not be willing to incur a certain degree of risk; but it is necessary that between a point to be carried and the danger to be incurred, there should be some reasonable proportion. I assume as undeniable that no man of Gauden's sense and experience would be content to expose himself to an unknown and indefinite risk for the sake of a very trifling object. What then *was* his object in asserting this claim so importunately to Clarendon? It was *not*, be it remembered, to obtain any higher dignity; it was *not* to obtain any thing which he might not hope for by other means. All that he had in view, as appears from the correspondence, was to *hasten* the performance of a promise *already made to him*. "Your Lordship commanded mee," he says, "to trust to your favour for an honourable maintenance, and some such additional support as might supply the defects of the Bishopric:" (*Docum. Suppl.* v. 9.) and Clarendon, in reply,

fully acknowledges the obligation. "I do well remember that I promised you to procure any good commendam to be annexed to that see, which I heartily desire to do, and long for the opportunity," (p. 22.) In this relative situation of the parties, can it be believed that a mere impatience to be put into the receipt of an additional £500 a-year, for more he did not ask, would have induced Gauden to write that remarkable series of letters to the chancellor, if he had, at the same time, been conscious that every word which he uttered was an odious lie? You will agree with me, I am well assured, in thinking that it was utterly impossible for him to calculate beforehand to what *degree* of hazard he was hereby exposing himself. If he were *not*, and believed that the late king *was*, the author of *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*, then, for aught which it was possible for him to tell, there might be in the hands of Clarendon, and of twenty other persons, such documents in support of the real author's claim, as, if produced (which in such an emergency they were sure to be) would involve the pretender in disgrace and ruin. Gauden, it may be said, might calculate that his adventuring upon such a claim would not expose him to the danger of such a countercheck, because he might be sure that, if any testimonial respecting the work had been left by the late king, or if any conclusive evidence attributing

it to him had been in the hands of his adherents, it would have been produced upon a former occasion, when, shortly after its first appearance, some doubts were thrown upon its authenticity. But this reasoning can hardly appear satisfactory to us, and must have been much less so to Gauden, if his purposes were those of deceit. Guilt is naturally full of fears. Only ten days before the first letter to the Chancellor was written, Charles the second had given a patent to Royston, securing to him the exclusive right of printing his father's works, and among these the *Icôn Basiliké* was mentioned, and specially claimed as his, (*Docum. Sup.* p. 7). The declaration contained in this instrument, compared with those which he had heard from the king in private, (*Who Wrote Εἰκὼν Βασιλική?* p. 408.) must have filled the mind of Gauden, if he did compare them, with doubt and indecision. Instead of this, we find him fearless, direct, uncompromising, like a man who knew that he stood upon solid ground, which, under the stated circumstances, I can account for only by supposing that he *knew* the declaration in the patent to be false, and the private impressions of the king to be near the truth. With respect to the non-appearance of evidence in favour of the late king, soon after the book was first published, a calculator must have felt that this did not by any means prove its non-existence. The

controversy had been feebly prosecuted on the part of the republicans, and had been suffered to terminate without any public or authorized contradiction to the king's title to the authorship of the book. It might therefore have appeared to the royal party, that to produce this evidence where no case had been made out to call for it, would be a waste of strength, and an undue acknowledgment of the importance of their adversaries. Charles the Second might have thought that he adopted a more dignified course by publishing the *Icôn Basiliké* among his father's collected writings, without deigning to notice the trivial objections to which its authenticity had been exposed. It was therefore possible, as Gauden must have felt, that there might be still extant, in the hands of those to whom he preferred his claim, such full and complete evidence of its falsehood, as would render him, ever after, an object of scorn and abhorrence.

With respect to the supposition, that, at the time of advancing his claims, Gauden might be in a state of doubt, unable to form a decided opinion for the king or for Symmons, it is plain that this leaves the foregoing observations within one degree of their original force. If in claiming the work as his own, he believed it to be the king's, then he left himself no expectation of escaping detection; if he doubted, he had then *one* chance, though but feeble: it *might* happen

that Symmons was the author of the work, and that all evidence to that effect had died with him. Still I must think that the hazard was incalculably too great for any man in his senses to encounter; especially, as appears, for so unimportant an object as was proposed.

There remains, therefore, only one other supposition,—that Gauden believed Symmons to be the author of *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*. Now *if* Gauden *believed* this, it was, almost to a certainty, *true*; that is, Symmons *was* the author. My reason for thinking so is, that the impression upon Gauden's mind must have been produced, chiefly if not exclusively, *by Symmons himself*. But Symmons was too devotedly loyal to wrong his master by an unjust assumption of this kind, or to arrogate to himself the credit of a work entrusted to him under such peculiar circumstances, that it might be deemed a sacred deposit. If Gauden, then, *believed* Symmons to be the author, Symmons must have *told* him that he was; and therefore it was *true*. But can this be? Does our evidence allow us to consider Symmons as the author of the "Pourtraiture of his Sacred Majesty?" On the contrary, the evidence leans all the other way. His wife, when interrogated upon the subject, declared that "it was not her husband's, but the king's, and her husband was only employed to get it printed."—(*Who Wrote Εἰκὼν Βασιλική?* p. 407.)

Fortunately, or, may we not say providentially, for the correctness of history, it can seldom occur that every memorandum as to a particular fact shall so utterly perish, but that the industry of after ages, if directed to the question, shall be able to recover some traces of the truth. Considering the anxious search for documents which the present enquiry has excited, it could not but be expected that, if Symmons had been the author of this book, some hint, some vestige, some allusion would have been preserved in some quarter or other, and would, ere now, have struggled into light.

We are compelled, therefore, to return to the supposition that, if Gauden were not himself the author of *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*, he must have written those letters to Clarendon under a full persuasion that it was the genuine production of the late king; or else under a total inability to decide *whose* it was. In either view of the case, it has been shewn that he exposed himself, for a very inadequate object, to such a risk as none but a madman would have ventured to encounter. He certainly must have felt that his pretensions, whether true or false, required to be supported by other testimony besides his own. We should, therefore, even in the latter case, have expected a great parade of references; but upon examination they would have proved to be greater in shew than in substance. If he had

been meditating piracy, he might have said, 'I should refer you for a confirmation of my statements to Lord Capel, or the Marquis of Hertford, but that both are dead:' or, 'I have my wife and my curate ready to testify that I wrote the book;' but would he, or could he have dared, in this case, to appeal to Dr. Duppa, Bishop of Winchester, the chaplain and attached servant of Charles the First, or to Dr. Morley, the confidential friend of Clarendon himself? It must certainly be admitted to speak strongly in Gauden's favour, that he makes no such suspicious appeals to witnesses out of reach, or necessarily biassed in his favor; but he rests his cause on the attestations of such only as were living, accessible, and above suspicion. Is this, then, the usual conduct of impostors? We have known, in our own times, a pretension advanced to royal descent, as well as to the more substantial advantage of a royal legacy. To whom then, in this instance, was an appeal directed? To his *late* Majesty King George the Third; to the *deceased* Duke of Kent; to the *great* Lord Chatham; to Lord Warwick, who is also in *his grave*; and to other persons who have, without one exception, quitted this mortal state. Let us suppose that the case had been reversed; that the truth of the statement in question had been made to rest on the knowledge of his present Majesty, or of any of his

surviving brothers. Would not the story have then produced a very different impression upon our minds? And if we had seen the ministers of the crown hastening to compliment and reward the claimant; if we had seen them in the present day doing what Lords Clarendon and Bristol did a century and a half before, would it not have conveyed to the world a strong impression that they were convinced of the truth and justice of the demand.

The full persuasion of Clarendon's mind shines forth in almost every line which he writes. "My Lord," he says, "I do assure you, upon my credit, all your letters make a deep impression on me." (*Docum. Suppl.* p. 22.) But what kind of an impression must this have been if he had believed every word in those letters to be false? Not such an impression, assuredly, as would cause him to say, in allusion to his promises of farther service,—"which I heartily desyre to do, and long for the opportunity." So again, in those often-quoted words, "When it ceases to be a secret, I know nobody will be glad of it but Mr. Milton." What is the meaning of *it*? How are we to fill up the chasm in the sentence? "When it ceases to be a secret, that you *assert yourself* to be the author of this book?" Assuredly not so: for the *assertion* of Gauden might be publicly disseminated, and yet would give no pleasure to Mr. Milton, unless

it were accompanied with convincing evidence of its truth. The minister clearly means to say, "When it ceases to be a secret that *you really are* the author, I know nobody"—and so forth. This discovery would indeed be welcome to the great opponent of the royal cause. But then Clarendon must himself have been satisfied with the evidence which Gauden tendered to him; for if it had not carried conviction to his own mind, how could he anticipate that it would work a greater measure of belief in the mind of any other person, especially of so acute a reasoner as "Mr. Milton?" Clarendon, therefore, was *convinced*. Another very important observation is, that he was *unwillingly* convinced; it was an unwelcome, a distasteful, an odious discovery; offensive to his feelings, his politics, and his honesty. "I have often wished," he says, and we may almost suppose ourselves to hear the sigh which accompanies the words, "that I had never been trusted with it." *Why* it was thus burdensome to him, it is not difficult to explain. He was thus become, to a certain extent, an accomplice in an imposition which, as a man, he could not approve, but which he was forbidden by political considerations to divulge; nay, was compelled to speak fair, and even to reward, the contriver of the deceit. Such, then, being the state of Clarendon's feelings, I cannot think it by any means

reasonable to suppose, as Dr. Wordsworth does, that he would suffer so unwelcome a conviction to be forced upon him, without having tried all means to satisfy himself that he was under no necessity of surrendering to the haughty summons of Gauden : to use a common expression, he would have left no stone unturned to escape from such a dilemma. Knowing his political bias, indeed, we should rather expect to find him holding out against the strongest evidence, than tamely acquiescing, without resorting to evidence of any kind. When, therefore, he employs such expressions as are contained in his letter to Gauden, the plain conclusion is, that he *had* enquired, and had found at every step accumulating evidence too strongly confirmatory of his worst apprehensions.

But, however loudly these considerations may speak in Gauden's favour, it must be borne in mind that this evidence is, from the very nature of the case, circumstantial. However connected and conclusive such evidence may appear, it must necessarily yield, if it can be proved contradictory to well-authenticated *fact*. Now there are two positive allegations advanced by Dr. Wordsworth ; and I have no hesitation in admitting, that if either of these can be substantiated, there is an end of the case : Gauden was an impostor : Clarendon and Bristol were deceived ; and the evidence of Morley and

Duppa, whatever were its purport, was not of the slightest importance. The first of these statements is, that a manuscript, containing the rudiments of the *Icon Basiliké*, the same papers in point of substance, though perhaps not finally revised or arranged, was taken by the rebels at the battle of Naseby, and some time afterwards restored to the king. The second is, that during the king's confinement in the Isle of Wight he was employed in copying and completing the work, at a period *preceding* the arrival of the commissioners for the treaty; and consequently before Gauden's manuscript, transmitted as he describes, *could* have been received by the royal prisoner. If either of these assertions can be made out in evidence, there is, I repeat, an end of the case. It will hardly be maintained that Gauden could be the author of the book, if that book were in the hands of the king at a period much earlier than that which the other claimant fixes as the date of his earliest communication with the king. Let this statement be confirmed beyond dispute, and no after explanation, supposing any to be attempted, can save Gauden from the effect of it; it must crush him and his pretensions at once. It remains, therefore, only to decide the question, Are these statements true? Can such evidence be adduced in their behalf as, if seen by Clarendon and Bristol, would have convinced those noblemen that they

were premature in surrendering the posthumous reputation of their late king? I cannot but think that the testimonies in favour of so early an existence of the book, when thoroughly sifted and fairly confronted, will greatly shrink in their dimensions, as things without solidity are generally found to do with handling. The first among the witnesses, and the authority principally relied on, is the celebrated antiquary Dugdale. It must, however, detract greatly from the credit he might otherwise be entitled to, that he has given two different and contradictory accounts of Major Huntington's share in this transaction. That officer, who had charge of the king at Hampton Court, having been informed by his Majesty of the value which he set upon a book taken among the booty at Naseby, and of his desire to have it restored, "did apply himself to General Fairfax, and by his means obtained it, it being bound up in a white vellum cover; and, as he *well* remembers, *all* the chapters in it were written by *the hand of Sir Edward Walker*, but much corrected by the king's own hand, (the prayers being all written with the king's own hand,) which, he says, he very well knew so to be."—(*Who Wrote Εικὼν Βασιλική?* p. 79.) In an account subsequently published, the same informant states, that the manuscript taken at Naseby, and restored at Hampton Court, was "written with *the king's own hand.*" (p. 80.) Dr.

Wordsworth conjectures that, in the interval between the delivery of these two opposite statements, Dugdale had discovered that, in the first account, he had attributed some circumstances to the copy of the *Icôn* which did not belong to it; principally, I suppose, the circumstance of its being in Sir Edward Walker's hand-writing, and only corrected by the king. It is plain, however, that Dugdale had a motive, an interested motive it must be called, in thus desiring to amend his evidence. The circumstance first stated, that the restored book was in the hand-writing of Sir Edward Walker, proved that this book was *not* the *Icôn Basiliké*, but a collection of Memorials respecting the events of the war, compiled by Sir Edward for the king's use. Respecting this collection, we have plain evidence to shew that it was taken at Naseby by Cromwell's division, and no less unexceptionable testimony that it was restored to the king through the agency of Huntington. This is evidently the book "bound in a white vellum cover," of which that officer speaks; and therefore, to make the two statements of Dugdale consistent, it is necessary that there should have been another book lost at the same time, and restored by the same interposition. This is, in truth, the explanation proposed by Dr. Wordsworth. "We may have a reasonable suspicion excited that he is necessarily speaking, (though

he perceives it not himself,) of *two* different manuscripts; and that while the second account is correct, and relates only to the *Icôn*, the first is not correct, because part of the circumstances mentioned refer to the *Icôn*, and part to quite a separate book, of which he had then no knowledge." — (*Who Wrote Εἰκὼν Βασιλική?* p. 84.) Let us look then to the testimony, and oppose proof to suspicion. It is *proved*, by Sir Edward Walker, that this *Collection of Memorials* was taken from the king's cabinet at Naseby, and was restored to the king at Hampton Court. The narrative of Huntington *proves* that he was the person who delivered to the king, at that place, *a book*, which he particularly describes as to outward appearance, and he asserts that *this* book was in the hand-writing of Sir Edward, much corrected by his Majesty. The Collection of Memorials was, therefore, beyond a doubt, restored to the king by Huntington. Did that officer then, at the same or at any other time and place, deliver *another* book to the king? Did the king lose *two* books, or apply for the restoration of *two*? If not, *could* Huntington restore to him the *Icôn Basiliké*, seeing that *one* which he *did* bring, is known and proved to have been Sir Edward Walker's *Collection of Memorials*? But Dr. Gorge says he was commissioned to apply for "certain papers." — (*Who Wrote Εἰκὼν Βασιλική?* p. 75,) and William Saun-

derson speaks of "*loose papers*" seized at Naseby. Now in the interval between the loss and the recovery, might not these *papers* have been bound up "in a white vellum cover," as Huntington describes his book? and thus, perhaps, the *Memorials* and the *Icôn* might form, at this period, but one single volume. But this pretext will not avail. Till better reasons for an alteration can be shewn, Dugdale must abide by his first statement, that *all* "the chapters were written by the hand of *Sir Edward Walker*;" and Dr. Wordsworth candidly admits, that "of all the transcripts mentioned of the *Icôn Basiliké*, he finds no where any other account of one taken by *Sir Edward Walker*; and there is other ground for thinking that he never took one." (p. 82.) Dr. Gorge, again, reports, or rather it is reported by another for him, "that having an opportunity to peruse the papers restored to the king, he found them the same, as to the *matters* preceding that dismal day, (of Naseby,) with those printed in the *Icôn Basiliké*." (p. 75.) But if the book restored to the king, and perused by Dr. Gorge, were *Sir Edward Walker's Collection of Memorials relating to the War*, then the *subjects* treated of were necessarily in some measure the same with those upon which the *Icôn Basiliké* also turns. Except upon the plainest evidence, a charge of intentional deceit ought not to be raised; nor is

there any ground for such a suspicion here. But of this I am satisfied, by many instances of the fact, that where memory, unassisted by memoranda, was relied upon, and it was possible for them unintentionally to deceive themselves, neither royalists nor republicans were to be implicitly trusted, upon points which involved the interest or reputation of their respective parties. Thus, in the instance before us, there was a distant resemblance, "as to the matters," between the book restored to the king, and the *Icôn*. This, acting upon Dr. Gorge's predisposition to believe that the king was the writer of the latter, might suffice to satisfy him that the very loose evidence which he gave was substantially correct. But in truth, whatever his persuasions might be, that evidence, repeated at second hand by bishop Bull, after an interval of 45 years, is too defective in circumstances to have much stress laid upon it. Dugdale, it is evident, even while by his twofold manner of telling the story he betrays his own cause, is anxiously desirous of confounding the book which Huntington restored, with the *Icôn Basiliké*: but unless he restored two books, one in the hand-writing of Sir Edward Walker, and the other *not* in his hand-writing, (for he, it is admitted, never copied the *Icôn*,) it is impossible that Dugdale's opinion should be correct, or his narrative consistent with truth. The only mo-

tive which can exist for the suggestion that a second book may be alluded to by him, is to reconcile him with himself; but if we may thus, without farther evidence, supply a remedy for every contradiction in the deposition of a tripping witness, and that deposition, when it makes against himself, may be so explained away, we abandon one of the most satisfactory tests by which evidence can be tried, and weaken, to that extent, the general credibility of human testimony.

Still there are assertions, many and confident, which represent Huntington as on more than one occasion declaring, that the book which he delivered to the king was the *Icon Basiliké*. But in the opinion that this evidence "is much better than Dr. Walker's," (*Who Wrote Εικὼν Βασιλική?* p. 89,) I find it difficult to coincide. Dr. Walker represents Major Huntington to have solemnly assured him that he "never read one line or word of the papers in the king's hand," and as unable to say "there was one passage in these papers which is in the printed book."—(p. 88.) Now if this testimony is to suffer in our estimation, because "we could have no subsequent answer or explanation, whether from Dugdale or from Huntington," (p. 86,) the same objection will undoubtedly apply to the whole mass of testimony collected by Mr. Long; whereby he labours to prove that Huntington

expressed himself to other persons in terms directly opposite to those which Walker represents him to have used in speaking to him. There is, however, one particular of great importance, in which the testimony of Walker is clearly entitled to the preference. *He* tells us what was related *to himself* by Huntington, and thus the relation, at all events, comes to us at only one remove from the original. Now let us contrast the other side. Concerning the statements collected by Long and Wagstaffe, it may be once for all remarked, that *not one* of them contains a syllable immediately derived from Huntington himself. It is, at the very best, only what the deponent heard from another person, who, in some instances, but not always, had the statement from the Major's own mouth. To shew the general complexion of the evidence here relied on, one very important part of it is founded on a conversation which took place in a mixed company, after dinner; not surely the season of the greatest accuracy to even the most accurate of men. One instance of the little reliance to be placed on this hearsay, after-dinner evidence, is pointed out by Dr. Wordsworth himself, in the instance of one Luke Eales relating a conversation which took place at Lord Manchester's table, (p. 93.)

It is not to be endured that evidence thus vague and indirect, evidence so manifestly false

that the party appealing to it is compelled to say, the speaker must have meant so and so, when he is reported to have said exactly the reverse, should be received in opposition to a plain fact, which other unexceptionable testimony enables us to establish. That fact is, as has before been stated, the king having complained of the loss of certain papers, Huntington procured the restoration of *a* book, which his majesty joyfully acknowledged to contain what he had desired to repossess. I say *a* book, *one single* book; no *more* than one. The most experienced casuist cannot so torture the admissions of any of the witnesses as to draw from them any mention of, or allusion to, more books than one; and that one, it evidently appears from Sir Edward Walker's evidence, compared with that of Huntington, was a collection of memorials by the former, in his own hand-writing. For argument's sake, let us attribute to the witnesses adduced by Long and Wagstaffe, a greater degree of credit than, in reality, I think them entitled to. Let it be admitted that Huntington did say something resembling what they impute to him. Is it difficult to explain this? Huntington, it appears from his conversation with Walker, had said, on the first appearance of the king's book, as it was confidently reported to be, "then surely these are the papers I see him so usually take out of his cabi-

net," (p. 88.) This, as he very fairly adds, was but his "*conjecture*;" and the train of his thoughts is easily to be traced. Having seen the king, while in his custody, possessing only a single book, which he was in the constant habit of perusing, and of making additions to, (for Walker's manuscript we know was much corrected and interlined by the king,) Huntington, on hearing that a book was published written by the king, was led to make the hasty, but not unnatural, inference that this must be the very book with which he had so often seen his majesty occupied. This was a conclusion certainly drawn from insufficient premises; and the hasty expression of his opinion put him, as he says, to much trouble. He was examined by one committee after another, and enjoyed the unenviable eminence of being regarded as a kind of public property, as a man whom all inquisitive persons were at liberty to examine and cross-examine to their hearts' content. Thus harassed, and tempted by all sorts of leading questions, by men of every party, and in whatsoever humour he might chance to be, is it wonderful that he should sometimes have varied in his testimony? He had formed a "*conjecture*;" and in certain states of his feelings that conjecture must have appeared to him more probable than it would do in others: and he may therefore have spoken now with more and now with

less confidence. But evidence he furnishes none whatever to contradict his first deliberate relation to Dugdale, that the book, the only book which he delivered to the king, was in the handwriting of Sir Edward Walker, and therefore beyond the reach of controversy was not the *Icôn Basiliké*. That work itself indeed furnishes internal evidence that it was not among the papers taken at Naseby. The twenty-first paper, it is well known, has for its title "Upon his majesties letters taken and divulged." If now the king had been the writer of this paper, and had composed it as a sequel to other similar essays, which had been taken on the same occasion with the letters, but respectfully returned instead of being divulged, can it be believed that some notice, though slight, would not have been taken of this circumstance? The twenty-first paper is written in a tone of high complaint against "the odious divulging" of private letters, and the "infamy" of those by whom the act was perpetrated. Would it not have been in character to offer, at the same time, some acknowledgment of the civility which had been shewn in restoring that very book wherein his discontent with their conduct in the business of the letters was thus recorded? A little farther on he says, "I wish my subjects had yet a clearer sight into my most retired thoughts?" Could he have written this, and have failed to

add "which clear sight they would have possessed if these my secret meditations and prayers, taken with the letters, had also been divulged with them?" At any rate, must we not have found some allusion to the unfairness of publishing what seemed to make against the king's sincerity, and withholding from equal publicity these papers, which afforded the strongest testimony to his uprightness? The royal cause never sustained a severer blow than from the publication of the king's correspondence; if then he did not think proper, as the surest means of sustaining his character, himself to publish his recovered meditations, it appears strange that he should on no occasion have taunted the opposite party with their neglect to do so. The conduct of the republican party was not distinguished by fairness or integrity: still, while the war was pending, it behoved them to support a character for honesty, and, therefore, upon being thus pressed, they must either have consented to print that part of the *Icon* which they had captured, or their declining to do so would have satisfied the world that the book would shew the king's character and acts in too favourable a light. In either case the bad impression produced by the letters would have been greatly counteracted. The neglect of any allusion of this kind, as well as of any to the capture and recovery of the papers,

if those papers were the *Icôn Basiliké* as far as then composed, and if the writer of them were the king, is so remarkable that it would require nothing less than the positive testimonies of many credible witnesses, deposing to their own knowledge of the fact, to convince me of that book's existence at the date of the battle of Naseby.

The statements tracing the existence of the *Icôn*, in the king's possession and hand-writing, from this time until that of his captivity at Carisbrook require little notice. They exhibit but a sorry appearance in themselves, and no one will be hardy enough to affirm, that, if the rest of the evidence be swept away, the claim of the king can be supported upon this fragment. I hasten, therefore, to a consideration of the attestations which have respect to the time of his abode in the Isle of Wight. This is a most important period, and the affirmations of Gauden are here subjected to a wringing scrutiny. The well known declaration of Mrs. Gauden is as follows: "to come to speake to his magisty in privat was then impossible, in regard of the strickt gard which they then kept about him: now immediately after this there was a treaty with his magisty at the Isle of Wight; wher upon my husband went to my Lord Marquis of Harford that then was, and to him delivered that manuscript; and he delivered it to his magisty at the Isle of Wit: he lickwise tould his magisty who

the author was," (*Docum. Sup.* p. 43.) Nothing can be more precise than the assertion as to the time at which the king was first made acquainted with the existence of Gauden's work; and by the truth of this assertion his cause must stand or fall. The purport of the evidence amassed by Dr. Wordsworth is to shew that this assertion *cannot* be true; for that the *Icôn* was seen in the king's possession, and parts of it were copied by his hand, and read by many *before* the time fixed by the Gaudens for his first becoming acquainted with its existence; that is, before the copy could have been conveyed to him by the Marquis of Hertford. This, therefore, is a question of *dates*, and it is important to ascertain with perfect accuracy the proceedings of every single day at this most interesting crisis. This, I persuade myself, we shall be enabled to effect, and the result which I deduce is this; that every thing stated by Dr. Wordsworth's witnesses may be true without impeaching the veracity of Mrs. Gauden. The opposite statements, when confronted and minutely examined, are not in the slightest degree inconsistent with each other.

In proof of this, I shall take the depositions of the several witnesses in order, and shall hope to shew that, supposing every word which they utter to be true, as in reality I think it is, they offer no contradiction to Mrs. Gauden's state-

ment. For the sake of distinctness, the letters of reference prefixed by Dr. Wordsworth are here retained.

(G. H.) (*Who Wrote Εικὼν Βασιλική*, p. 118—120). Lieutenant-general Hammond, the former governor of Carisbrook, deposes to his own persuasion that the king was the author of the book; for which persuasion he gives the following reasons: “When I had the order for viewing and searching his papers, I found amongst them many sheets of the rough draught of that book in his own hand-writing which I have at this time by me:” and again, “Part of that book, if not the whole, was writ when he was my prisoner in Carisbrook castle; where I am sure he had nothing but a Bible, pen, ink, and paper: and going to call him out of his closet to dinner, which I always did, I found him still a-writing; and staying behind to see what he writ, the paper being still wet with ink, I read at several times most of that book which now bears that title.” Now it is obvious, that this evidence in itself amounts only to this; that the king committed to writing great part, or the whole, of the *Icon Basiliké*, while he was Hammond’s prisoner; but it certainly will not prove than he did more than *copy* from a manuscript, supplied by Gauden in the manner stated by his wife, unless it can be further shown that the circumstance of which Hammond speaks

took place *before* the king *could* have *so* received the book. It is, as was before said, an affair of *dates*, and they must be narrowly looked at. The day on which the king quitted Carisbrook, preparatory to the treaty at Newport, is said by Dr. Wordsworth to be September 5. It certainly was not far from this, since there is a letter from him dated September 8; "from our court at *Newport*." How long, then, previously to this removal was freedom of communication with him granted to his friends? After the first vote of "No more addresses," we know that there was an entire obstruction of intercourse, both personal and by letter, as far as the vigilance of his jailors could effect it; this Mrs. Gauden herself states. We have, it is true, the authority of Clarendon for affirming that the king by his gracious affability still wrought upon the soldiers and others about him to perform some offices of trust in conveying *papers* to and from him, (*Hist. of Reb.* vol. 3. fol. ed. p. 87). Nevertheless I cannot think that we are authorized, reasoning candidly, to suppose that Gauden's manuscript could be conveyed to him by any such channel. The assertion is precise, that the Marquis of Hertford was the bearer of it. The question, therefore, must be put in this shape: how many days previously to Sept. 5. *could* Lord Hertford communicate personally with the king at Carisbrook? Sir Edward

Walker relates, Sept. 2d, several resolutions of both houses; one of which was, "That the Duke of Richmond, *Marquis of Hertford*, Dr. Juxon, *Dr. Duppa*, &c., have liberty to go to the king to attend him during the treaty," (*Perfect Copies of all the Votes, &c, relating unto the treaty held at Newport*, p. 6). Under this permission, therefore, the parties here spoken of could not reach the king's presence before the 4th at the soonest; that is, one day only before he was removed. This interval would be too short to produce an accordance between Mrs. Gauden's assertion, that the king never saw the book until it came to him by the hand of Lord Hertford, and the evidence of Hammond; particularly that part of it which states that he read "at several times," and "in Carisbrook castle," the king's newly written extracts from *Icôn Basiliké*. Unless, therefore, an earlier access can be made out for Lord Hertford and Dr. Duppa, Colonel Hammond's evidence is still opposed to that of Mrs. Gauden. I am fully persuaded, however, that the vote preserved in Walker is designed to give not the right of personal access for the first time, but a permission to the parties mentioned in it to act with the king as his assessors and advisers upon the business of the treaty, to be present at the conferences, and perhaps to deliver their sentiments. Freedom to approach the king's person, it appears to me, had been

given to his friends in general by a previous resolution of both houses. It was to this effect, "That his majesty should be at Newport, in the same freedom that he was at Hampton Court; that the instructions to Colonel Hammond, by which the king had been in that manner restrained, and all persons forbid from going to him, should be recalled; that all those persons who were named by the king should have free liberty to repair to him, and remain with him," (*Whitlocke*, p. 325). This was proposed by the Lords, August 16th; and agreed to by the Commons on the 21st; and on the 22d of August, *Whitlocke* says, "Orders were sent to Colonel Hammond that the king be in the same condition and freedom as at Hampton Court," (p. 326.) Considering then their lengthened separation from the king, and the urgent state of his affairs, it cannot be thought that his loyal servants would be slow in availing themselves of this permission; and therefore the Marquis of Hertford and Dr. Duppa may have visited him, and he consequently may have received Gauden's manuscript, *a fortnight* before his removal from Carisbrook. Under such circumstances, therefore, Hammond's declaration might be, and probably was, perfectly true, without in the slightest degree impeaching Gauden's claim or the credit of his witnesses. The only reason which Hammond could have for asserting that the

king, at this time, was furnished with pen and ink, and a Bible *only*, must have been that he himself *saw* no other book in his possession. But this affords no proof that the king had not also by him a copy of the *Icōn*, from which the loose sheets inspected by Hammond were merely transcripts. Considering the circumstances under which the MS. had been conveyed to his Majesty, it was not probable that he would leave it open to the notice of the spies and traitors who surrounded him. It may be more naturally supposed that, upon quitting his chamber, he would conceal the original about his person, as from the evidence of Levett it is plain he was afterwards accustomed to do.

There is, however, it must be admitted, one part of Hammond's evidence which still requires to be explained; that in which he says, "When I had the order for viewing and searching his papers, I found amongst them many sheets of the rough draught of that book in his own handwriting, which I have at this time by me." When then, it may be asked, was this search instituted? Dr. Wordsworth says, "in March 1648, six months before the journey of the marquis of Hertford and bishop Duppa." (p. 119.) I am inclined to think not. Hammond unquestionably in March received and acted upon an order to search the king's papers; but there is every reason to think that, subsequently to this,

namely, on giving up the charge of the king to colonel Ewers, when the negotiations were broken off, (November 25,) he would be required finally to inspect the papers left by the king at Carisbrook. No sooner was the treaty at an end than the design of bringing the monarch to a judicial trial, appears to have been determined upon, and evidence upon which to found a charge of high treason was earnestly sought for. Is it then to be supposed that they would neglect that most obvious measure of examining the private papers of their prisoner? Would it not be their first step to secure those papers, and not to suffer them to be scattered into they knew not what hands, without having previously ascertained what were their contents? I am satisfied that at this period a search would be instituted, and Hammond would naturally be the agent to whom it would be committed. One thing, moreover, persuades me that Hammond was referring *not* to the examination instituted *in March*, but to one *subsequent* to the king's removal from his custody. "I found," he says, "many sheets of the rough draught, *which I have at this time by me.*" Now if the search which led to this discovery had taken place at any time while he had the king in his custody, could any man in Hammond's situation have had the indecent boldness thus to purloin the private papers of his sovereign? I cannot

suspect him of it. Hammond, upon principles of public duty, acted sometimes with a great, perhaps unnecessary, degree of harshness; but nothing is recorded respecting him which can make us think he would descend to private pilfering. Of this, however, he can hardly be acquitted, unless it be supposed that he found these sheets of the rough draught after the king was removed from his custody to Hurst Castle. At this time it was impossible to convey the papers to their owner, who appeared to be given up to his fate, and to have abandoned to the first comer whatever property he had left behind at Carisbrook. Hammond, therefore, *at this time*, might and would take possession of papers which nine months before he must have regarded as sacred. I do not know what can be said against this, unless it be that no trace of any such order to search for papers in November can be found, while that in March is regularly recorded. But let us remember under what different circumstances the two orders stand. The first, in March, was a resolution of the existing executive government; and therefore remains recorded among their acts: but by whom was the supposed order in November given? Hammond says, "I had the order;" but from whom? from the same person, most probably, who commanded him to give up to Colonel Ewers the custody of the king; that is, from Cromwell. As soon

as the treaty was over, Cromwell appears to have resolved upon taking the powers of government into his own hands, and to pursue the king to death. By his *private authority* he ordered Hammond to resign his charge to Ewers, and to repair to Windsor. The house remonstrated against this, as a departure from their resolutions, and ordered Hammond to return to Carisbrook; to prevent which Cromwell put him under a nominal arrest and persisted in his purpose. It is, therefore, most reasonable to think that, with the order to resign the person of the king, Hammond would receive directions to examine his papers, previously to his coming to Windsor; and the probable reason why this order has not been preserved is, that it never had any existence except in the written or verbal communication from Cromwell to his creature Hammond. The evidence of the latter thus interpreted contains nothing inconsistent with the statement that the king first saw the Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ in the hands of the Marquis of Hertford. The copy sent by Gauden may have been in his Majesty's possession as early as the 23d of August; he would, therefore, be enabled to copy in his own handwriting the greater part, if not the whole of it, during the last fortnight of his residence at Carisbrook; and, leaving behind him those sheets which afterwards came into the hands of Hammond, he might convey the original to Newport,

and afterwards to Hurst, and finally dispose of it, as we shall hereafter see, before his last removal to London in the custody of Harrison.

(I.) Anthony Mildmay, on being removed from attendance on the king, received from him "a Bible in which were a great many verses marked with a pen, more especially in the Book of Psalms." "I compared those marked verses with his majesty's meditations in the *Icôn*, and they did exactly agree." (p. 120.) Unless it can be made to appear that this took place before the arrival of Lord Hertford it amounts to nothing. But the Bible, it appears, was presented when Mildmay was to be removed. Now this was not until a very late period; since it is shewn by Levett (p. 132.) that this gentleman accompanied the soldiers, who came, after the treaty was broken off, to convey his majesty to Hurst castle.

(K.) The circumstances deposed to by Dr. Fowler are said to have taken place while the king "was a prisoner in the Isle of Wight:" which admits of our supposing the scene of them to have been Carisbrook, subsequently to the arrival of Hertford and Duppa, or else Newport or Hurst. The expression "a prisoner" may direct our thoughts to either the first or the last of these places; but it is not inapplicable even to Newport. There, though comparatively free from restraint and treated with outward re-

spect, the king was subject always to the vigilant inspection of his jealous enemies, in as great a degree, at least, as he had been at Hampton Court; and would never be without a parliamentary sentinel "to stand every morning at his bed-chamber door." In neither case does this evidence occasion the slightest difficulty.

(L.) "Serjeant Brown, one of the parliament commissioners," one morning making search in the king's chamber, during his absence, found "within the hangings next the wall many sheets of his book written with the king's hand," (p. 122). This is said to have happened at Carisbrook. If any of the parliamentary delegates came thither, it could obviously be only during the very last days of the king's residence there, and *after* he had seen and conversed with his own friends. I am disposed, however, to suspect a slight inaccuracy in this report of Brown's evidence; which, it is to be remembered, we have only from his servant. I find it stated that, "Sept. 13, the commissioners to the king," one of whom was Serjeant Brown, "took leave of the house;" and "Sept. 16, Letters from the Isle of Wight stating the commissioners were come to Newport," (*Whitlocke*). It seems, therefore, doubtful whether Brown could have been at Carisbrook while the king was there. The circumstance stated must more probably have happened at Newport. I notice this, not as

being of any importance to the case; but to shew how easy it is for slight inaccuracies to creep into this second-hand hearsay evidence; by which, under some circumstances, the discovery of truth might be greatly impeded.

(M.) In the evidence of Reading, (which we have at the *third* hand,) there is no specification of that in which the whole force of his testimony, if it had any, would lie; namely, *the precise time* at which the recorded circumstances happened. There is nothing to forbid our supposing that it may have been even after the king quitted Carisbrook. I am, therefore, quite at a loss to conceive upon what grounds Dr. Wordsworth can affirm "that this whole chain of sundry, various, independent, yet consistent testimonies is every particle of it *prior* to the time when Gauden says that he sent down the manuscript to the Isle of Wight by the hands of the Marquis of Hertford," (p. 123). This it appears to me is a very hasty and gratuitous assumption.

(N.) The directions of the king, which appear to relate to some manuscript to be printed for his service, have been conjectured to allude to the *Icon Basiliké*. This is very uncertain: but, were it otherwise, in this, as well as in other cases, we must *look to the date, August 31st*. At this time more than a week had passed since Lord Hertford, &c. were enabled to communicate personally with the king. These direc-

tions, therefore, even if the *Icôn Basiliké* were the subject of them, can prove no more than that "hys majesty graciously adopted, owned, and accepted it as hys sense and genius," and had determined to print that book which Gauden had conveyed to him for this very purpose.

(O.) "The testimony of such a man as Lord Capel," observes Dr. Wordsworth, "would have been of the utmost importance, and we should have been disposed to have given it every possible degree of credit," (p. 124.) Although the testimony of Lord Capel would unquestionably add credit to which ever side it favoured, the want of that testimony could not be fairly considered to weaken the case of Gauden; because it does not appear that, during the short interval by which that nobleman survived the king, he had any opportunity of publicly attesting what he is said to have known respecting the true history of the *Icôn*. But it may surprise some readers to learn that *virtually*, and through a private channel, we have the testimony of Capel himself conveyed to us. Among the declarations made by the Gaudens, one of the most remarkable is that which attributes to Morley, afterwards Bishop of Winchester, an acquaintance with the great arcanum, derived from the communication of some other person than Gauden himself. By one writer, indeed, an attempt is made to nega-

tive this asserted fact. We are told of "the uniform absence of any hint on Gauden's part as to the source from which Morley could have gained his intelligence," (*Quarterly Rev.* No. lxiv. p. 483.) and again, "all that Gauden ventures to affirm of this prelate on any occasion is that, at the king's return, he was acquainted with the great secret, and represented Hyde as knowing it also. Such assertions are easily made, and although Morley might contradict them, it would be hard to convict the promulgator of intentional falsehood," (p. 486). To convict him legally of a falsehood, uttered in a private conversation between two individuals, might not perhaps be easy; but to convict him to the satisfaction of Clarendon could not have been so difficult. If Morley had been able to contradict the assertions of Gauden as to what passed at their interview, it surely would have been the direct and natural course for the Chancellor in his reply to say—It surprises me to find that the Bishop of Worcester is unable to recollect the occurrence of any such conversation, as well as utterly ignorant of that great secret with which you describe him as representing me to be acquainted. Instead of this he returns an answer in which he virtually admits the correctness of Gauden's assertions. I must, therefore, insist upon this as a point satisfactorily established, that at the king's return

Morley *was* acquainted with the great secret ; and that he had obtained his knowledge from an independent source ; evidently from some other person than Gauden. This fact is worthy of much notice. The Reviewer wonders how Morley could have attained this important knowledge. The narrative of Mrs. Gauden, though very undesignedly, enables us to furnish a very plausible solution of the difficulty. Among the first, if not the very first, whom she describes as made acquainted with the existence of the book, and with the manner and purpose of its production, is Lord Capel ; the friend and patron of Morley. Dr. Wordsworth, it is true, raises an objection against her fidelity, upon the ground that she says the interview between that nobleman and her husband took place *immediately* before the treaty at the Isle of Wight in *September*, whereas from the notes of time which he discovers, it appears that it must have occurred as early at least as *June* in the same year. This is indeed to require a degree of precision in the use of words which human testimony can seldom be expected to exhibit ; nor can I think that Dr. Wordsworth seriously designs to repose so much credit upon this objection as to collect from it that the story of an interview, and of what passed at it, between Lord Capel and her husband, is a pure fiction. What purpose was such an invention to answer ? for neither during Capel's

life, nor yet after his death, could it, as far as appears, in any manner assist the reception of her other statements. On the other hand, between Mrs. Gauden's assertion that *Capel* was informed, and the well authenticated circumstance of *Morley's* possessing the same intelligence, there is an undesigned compatibility which pleads strongly in favour of the entire Narrative. In the testimony of *Morley* I must think that we possess the testimony of his patron: for after the king's death, and shortly before that of Lord *Capel*, when the *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική* was the subject of universal attention and discourse, it can hardly have happened but that this brave nobleman should have communicated his acquaintance with its true history to *Morley*, who attended him during his confinement, and accompanied him to the scaffold, (*Clarendon*, vol. 3. p. 209.)

(P.) Great stress seems to be laid on the evidence of *William Allen*, a former servant of *Gauden*; but to what, in reality, does it amount? He certifies that on a particular occasion *Gauden* sate up one whole night to transcribe the book; telling this *Allen* that he did so because he had borrowed the book, and was obliged to return it by such a time. Now, supposing that *Gauden* really was the author of the *Icon*, is it reasonable to expect that he should betray the secret to his own servant?

especially when the entire success of his design depended upon that secret being kept. The copy from which he transcribed might very possibly have been really received from Symmons, to whom the progress of the printing might render it necessary to return it by the time he mentioned. In what he said to his servant, therefore, he spoke as explicitly as the situation of the parties rendered necessary, or as his own safety would justify him in doing. Gauden, we have many proofs, was a wary man. His letter, for instance, seized at the printer's was, the Quarterly Review says, "*happily* anonymous." I have little doubt that it was so in compliance with his general system of strict caution. Another instance of the same kind is made known to us by Dr. Walker, who shews that Gauden had the precaution to interpose *three persons*, at least, between himself and the printers, (*Who Wrote Εικὼν Βασιλική?* p. 25). Again, the same disposition is displayed in the erasure of the words "*Dr. Gauden,*" &c. from the direction of Clarendon's important letter, (*Docum. Suppl.* p. 21.) with the intention, as I conjecture, that if it should ever fall into improper hands, no discovery might be made of the person for whom it was intended.

A still greater degree of caution appears in what Mr. Fletcher notices respecting the rough draught of Gauden's letter to the Lord Chan-

cellor: "It has had a seal." Dr. Wordsworth does not enter into Gauden's character when he enquires, "how comes it to have been sealed? We are not in the habit of folding, directing, and sealing, the *first draughts* of our letters." (*Docum. Suppl.* p. 27) But we probably should do so, if we were as careful of our secrets as Gauden was of his; or if we were in the habit of writing letters, the contents of which we were as desirous as he was of guarding from the prying eyes of "a dangerous curiosity." This, there can be little doubt, was the object of that precaution which so much excites Dr. Wordsworth's surprise: and, such being the character of Gauden, it is little likely that, if he were the author of *Icôn Basiliké*, he should make a discovery of the truth to his own servant. It has been clearly shown then, I trust, that Gauden's manuscript might be conveyed to the king sufficiently early to admit of his transcribing great part, or the whole, perhaps even more than once, before he removed from Carisbrook. The evidence, therefore, which attests his having done so, comes to nothing when directed against Gauden. That of Levett, for example, is clearly in this predicament; if indeed the whole which he witnessed did not occur at Newport. I shall therefore close my examination of the witnesses with a few remarks upon the testimony of Herbert; and these I am tempted to

offer for the sake of comparing what he says with some of Mrs. Gauden's assertions. Speaking of her husband's work, at the time of his interview with Lord Capel, she says, "the title which hee then gave it was, *Suspiria Regalia*." (*Docum. Suppl.* p. 43) And from what follows, we must necessarily conclude, that the copy sent to the king bore that title. Now from the evidence of Herbert, (*Who Wrote Εικὼν Βασιλική*, p. 134) it appears that the copy found by him, among the papers left by the king, and which I verily believe to have been the actual copy forwarded by Gauden, bore this very title: *Suspiria Regalia*. This is a minute coincidence which she could not possibly anticipate; and the occurrence of which strongly confirms my persuasion that she was speaking truth. The copy bequeathed to Herbert, I have supposed to be the same with that of which the Marquis of Hertford had been the bearer; and it appears that, upon the appearance of the work in print, this very manuscript was laid before the Committee appointed to enquire into the subject. They decided that it was not in the hand-writing of the king. It must, however, have borne some considerable resemblance to it, because Herbert, after some hesitation, is inclined to believe that it was his majesty's writing. This may furnish a key to an expression in one of Gauden's letters, wherein he says,

“ my wife had a hand in *disguising* the letters of that copy which I sent to the king.” (*Docum. Suppl.* p. 16) I cannot understand what he means by *disguising*, unless the sense, be that pains were taken to make the hand-writing as much as possible resemble that of the king. There are obvious reasons why this should be attempted; and the imitation seems to have been so far successful as to have deceived Herbert, though not the more keen-eyed Committee men. Before I quit this subject, I must say one word upon the Frontispiece to the *Icôn*. This, it was asserted by Symmons, “ was drawn by the king’s own hand.” (*Who Wrote Εικὼν Βασιλική*, p. 139) When could this have been done? and if it were so, how can it have happened that they who bear such precise and copious testimony to his *writing*, should make not the slightest allusion to their having ever seen him employed upon the *painting*. Another deficiency in the evidence for the king, which it is impossible not to notice, is the absence of all information how the work was finally conveyed to the press. It does not appear except from his own assertion, (and he was evidently an incompetent witness) that Symmons had any personal communication with his sovereign after the latter was immured at Carisbrook; all evidence, indeed, leads rather to the conclusion that he had not. By whom then was the manu-

script transferred from the king to Symmons? The go-between, if any there were, must almost necessarily have been one of those few attendants on his majesty whose evidence we possess; and it has therefore a most suspicious appearance that not one of these should have been at any time employed in this confidential undertaking. Charles the Second denied having received the letter addressed to him, which now forms the 27th paper in the *Icôn*. Whence did this arise? I know not, in truth, which would be the least incredible of the only two suppositions to which we can have recourse for explaining it: either that the agent employed by the king, whether it were Symmons or any other, should faithfully execute that part of his commission which related to printing the king's papers, and neglect the charge of conveying his last solemn sentiments to his son; or that the king, having an opportunity of conveying the book to the press, should not avail himself of the same to transmit "these papers" "to the Prince of Wales;" "for whom they were chiefly designed."

The statements respecting what happened during the printing of the work, do not appear to require much notice. If Symmons were the agent of Gauden in bringing out the *Icôn* under the ostensible person of the king, then, in order to support his assumed character, it was abso-

lutely necessary that he should make those representations to Royston and others, which from their evidence we learn that he *did* make. But what weight can we attach to this testimony when we recollect that Royston and the rest were but the "mouth-pieces" of Symmons, (to borrow an expression from Dr. Wordsworth,) and spoke from the "after-infusion" of a man who is stated to have had a clear interest in putting them, and keeping them, upon a wrong scent?

The mention of the above epithets reminds me of Dr. Walker's evidence, to which they are, I think unjustifiably, applied. Walker, it is certain, derived most of his information from Gauden; but then he tells us some things which Gauden *did*, as well as what he *said*, and therefore is not his mere "*mouth-piece*;" he relates some circumstances which occurred before Gauden can possibly be thought to have conceived the bold design of claiming the *Icôn* as his own, and therefore Dr. Walker's statement cannot have been entirely an "*after-infusion*." He asserts, for instance, a particular fact; namely, that of his having gone, in company with Gauden, to the house of Duppa, then Bishop of Salisbury, before the book was published. Are we then under a necessity of admitting this relation to be true? I think we must do so when we remember the solemn attestations of Walker,

a man whose uprightness of principle and regard for truth we have no right or reason to call in question. These asseverations, made under the strongest sanctions of religion and the prospect of approaching death, cannot without a breach of justice and of charity to his memory be regarded otherwise than as sufficient and satisfactory. Such, indeed, they are admitted to be by Dr. Wordsworth. "I am disposed," he says, "to acquit Dr. Walker, in regard to the *main object* of his book, of any *intention to deceive*." In the particular instance now before us he also acquits him by acknowledging that some intercourse did take place about this time between Gauden and Bishop Duppa; only it is supposed that the former herein was the agent of Symmons, (*Who Wrote Εικὼν Βασιλική?* p. 404). I cannot forbear remarking by the way, how singularly it happens that Gauden and Symmons should so shortly afterwards have found it necessary to exchange characters. First, according to Dr. Wordsworth's supposition, Gauden becomes the ostensible agent, because the primary agent, Symmons, is exposed to suspicion; but no sooner is the work in the press, than, by some unknown agency, all is changed. Without any one circumstance having occurred which could remove suspicion from the one, or fix it upon the other, Symmons takes upon himself the dangerous task of superintending the press while

Gauden takes his turn to lie concealed in the country. This leads me, however, from my purpose; which was, to observe that as Walker's account of an intercourse between his patron and Bishop Duppa is admitted to be true, there is no more reason to question the accuracy of what he says respecting that Bishop's being the writer of two chapters in the *Icôn*. All which Dr. Wordsworth objects against this account is, that it is inconsistent with what Gauden himself says to Clarendon: "This book and figure were *wholly* and *only* my invention, making, and design," (*Who Wrote Εικὼν Βασιλική?* p. 156.) and a little farther on it is asked, "if it was true, why did he not tell it to Clarendon? Why did he not tell it to Mrs. Gauden?" To this it might be a sufficient answer to ask in return, if it were *not* true, why *did* he tell it to Dr. Walker? but in reality I suppose he did not enter into this minute detail with Clarendon, because it could not be thought necessary that he should do so. Suppose that Oliver Goldsmith had applied to the Chancellor of his day for a pension, upon the ground of his having written the "Travel-ler;" would he have abstained from asserting that it was *wholly* and *only* his invention and making, because Dr. Johnson had revised the whole poem, and had even added to it an inconsiderable number of lines? Gauden told Clarendon the truth; *substantial* truth; all that bore

upon the *merits* of the question; and that (especially as he referred him to *Duppa*) is sufficient to acquit him of deceit and inconsistency. But did the Bishop really supply the two chapters in question? The reasons assigned by Walker in favour of the affirmative, though not conclusive, are certainly deserving attention.

The chapters themselves, moreover, furnish some internal evidence that they were both drawn up by the same hand, though not by that of Gauden. Both of them, it is very observable, dwell strongly upon the superior advantage of prescribed over extemporary forms of prayer; a point upon which Gauden, from his opinions and practice, was not likely so forcibly to insist. The similarity between these chapters, the 16th and 24th, seems to be more than casual, and at an early period was noticed by Milton, who was, however, far from suspecting the cause. In his remarks on the 24th Paper, "Upon denying his Majesty the attendance of his Chaplains," Milton thus expresses himself: "To let go his criticising about the *sound of prayers, imperious, rude, or passionate*, modes of his own devising, we are in danger to fall *again* upon the flats and shallows of *Liturgy*. Which if I should *repeat again* would turn my answers into responsories, &c." (*Iconoclastes*, p. 165). The subject of animadversion here is that expression in the 24th paper of the *Icôn*, "I am equally scandalized

with all prayers which sound either imperiously, rudely, or passionately, &c.”; and from the turn of expression employed by Milton it evidently appears that he is referring to certain *similar* expressions which had *already* occurred in the *Icon*, and which he had already *criticised*. It is of some importance, therefore, to ascertain *where* those expressions occur; and if they shall be found in the 16th number of the *Icon*, this will afford presumptive evidence that Walker was correct in attributing the 16th and the 24th to one and the same hand. Now, first, it appears as if Milton, by his emphatic employment of the word *Liturgy* in his remarks on the 24th number, directed his own attention, and intended to direct ours, to that especial number, (the 16th) “On the ordinance against *the Common Prayer*.” In the second place it is in the 24th that we meet with sentiments on extemporary prayer, very similar to those in the 16th; I mean in that passage where the writer speaks of “the affectations, emptiness, impertinency, rudeness, confusions, flatness, levity, obscurity, vain and ridiculous repetitions, &c.”; and, what is still farther to the purpose, Milton *had* animadverted upon this passage, saying, “we have a remedy of God’s finding out, which is not *Liturgy*, but his own free spirit.” (*Iconocl.* p. 130.) The evidence, therefore, certainly preponderates in favour of the opinion that Bishop

Duppa was, as Walker asserts, the author of the two papers in which these coincidences occur. If so, to what conclusion does or can this lead, but to the conclusion that Duppa, even at this period, firmly believed and was quite certain that Gauden was the author of the book; or at any rate that the king was *not* the author? If he had believed it to be the king's production, in what light must we regard his presumption in proposing to add, and in actually adding, two chapters to his sovereign's book? This was a liberty which no man of taste, of delicacy, of loyalty, or of common discretion could willingly contemplate, much less assume. Duppa, who had all these qualities, might possibly consent for a moment to personate that *imaginary* regal character to which Gauden had already given existence; but he had too sincere a veneration for the royal dignity to snatch the pen, as it were, from the hand of the *real* sovereign, if he had believed *him* to be the writer of the other papers.

The evidence of Dr. Walker, therefore, as it makes us acquainted with the early conviction of Duppa, furnishes a fact of great importance. He spoke, indeed, from the information of Gauden, and according to Dr. Wordsworth's theory was tutored to utter exactly that which would best forward the plans of that great designer. But what object or motive could Gauden have

in conveying to Walker the persuasion that Duppa wrote those two particular papers, if that persuasion were not true?

And with respect to this whole system of after infusion, which Dr. Wordsworth has imagined in order to blunt the force of Walker's testimony, I have great difficulty in understanding for what purpose it could have been resorted to by Gauden. He never appeals to his wife or to Walker; he never calls for their testimony to strengthen his claim; that testimony, in fact, was not heard of, was not delivered even until long after it was become impossible that it should render Gauden any service. In the opinion of posterity, but even this is by accident, it has mainly contributed to establish his claim. But could this be the view with which his wife and curate were so cautiously tutored? Assuredly not; for the opinions of posterity were little, or not at all, in the thoughts of Gauden. His mercenary object was to make good his pretensions at the critical moment, and to *profit* by them; and having done this, to sink them in oblivion during all succeeding ages. Independently, therefore, of the difficulty of instilling into others exactly such persuasions as he wished, independently of the difficulty of consistently settling at what period he would begin this system of *drilling* his wife and his curate, there is this farther and still more inexplicable circumstance to be sur-

mounted; he had no sufficient motive for engaging in so wild a scheme; he made no attempt to derive any aid or advantage from the testimony thus factitiously elaborated; his knowledge of the world must have told him *a priori* that he could never *hope* to appeal to it with any probability of making a single convert.

When it is thus manifest that Gauden wrote the book, it seems an unnecessary extension of the dispute to enquire whether he was *capable* of writing it. Since, however, Dr. Wordsworth asserts the negative, that he was incapable, and as the prosecution of this enquiry seems to furnish fresh evidence in Gauden's favour, it may not be amiss to devote a few pages to it. The style of Gauden in general, it must be admitted, is much more diffuse and redundant, not to say inflated, than that of the  $\epsilon. \beta$ . Still it appears to me to contain the rudiments, or rough draught of a mode of writing very similar to that which prevails in the book supposed to be the king's. If subjected to the revision of a judicious censor, who would prune away redundancies, correct some offences against good taste, shorten the sentences, and disconnect them from their involution with one another, there are few pages in his Hieraspistes, or his *Ἱερα Δακρυα*, which would not bear a comparison, in any point of view, with as many pages of the work which he claimed as his. Wherever, in-

deed, the subjects treated of in the *Icôn* correspond with those to which the acknowledged writings of Gauden are devoted, there prevails such a similarity, nay, identity of sentiments, allusions, and expressions, as makes the one production appear like a shadow or counterpart of the others. To any one who will institute the comparison, this fact will so evidently appear as to occasion great surprise that it should never before have been noticed. My limits do not permit me to enter very largely into this division of the subject; but, for the further elucidation of this much-debated question I subjoin such specimens and instances as a very cursory inspection has afforded me.

The first peculiarity is the very frequent use, by both writers, of some not very common words and idioms. The word *odium*, for instance, is a distinguished favourite with the writer of the *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*.

“The *odium* and offences,” &c. No. I.

“It will be a meanes to take away the burden and *odium* of affaires,” &c. No. XVII.

“The sole exposing them to public *odium*.” No. IX.

“Laying the *odium* of those sad events on others.” No. XII.

“Many envious exhalations which, condensed by a *popular odium*,” &c. No. II.

Nor is Gauden less partial to the word;

“ To remove the *popular odium*,” &c. *Hieraspistes*, p. 260.

“ The Apologist, therefore, hath purposely declined to bring the *odium* or envy of Dedication,” &c. *Id.* Pref.

“ Rough oppositions, implacable *odiums*,” &c. *Id.* *ib.*

Another such term is *populacy*.

“ As to the *populacy*, you may hear from them.” E. B. XXVII.

“ They think to keep the *populacy* fast to their parties.” XIV.

“ Not only with greatest securitie, but with applause as to the *populacy*.” XXVII.

The counterpart has the family resemblance ;

“ To engage the better sort of common people—and so in effect the whole *populacy*.” *Ἱερα Δακ.* p. 378.

“ To be aware how they or the nation fell under the discipline of any *populacy*.” p. 382.

“ Neither exciting the optimacy and nobility, nor the *populacy* and commonalty.” p. 567.

Another observable peculiarity is the practice of beginning many of their sentences in a manner not very common ; for example,

“ *Not that* I resolved to have employed him.” E. B. No. II.

“ *Not but that* some lines may happily need.” XXVII.

“ *Not that* I am ignorant how the choice of many.” XI.

“ *Not that* I had many with me.” XV.

“ *Not that* I am against the managing of this presidency.” XVII.

The genuine Gauden does not desert the pseudo-king in his fondness for this idiomatic phrase; *ex : gr :*

“ *Not that* I believe your well-grounded,” &c. *Hierasp.* p. 142.

“ *Not that* all mutation is the companion of folly.” p. 28.

“ *Not but that* I do highly approve.” p. 122.

“ *Not that* every man that is ordeined is presently.” p. 328.

“ *Not that* we deny but that Christians.” p. 299.

“ *Not but that* I know many men.” *Ἱερα Δακ.* p. 341.

“ *Not that* I repeat these differences.” p. 313.

Proceeding with this train of proof I subjoin some examples of that accordancy in *sentiment* and *expression* which exists between the *Icôn Basiliké*, and the acknowledged writings of Gauden. The extent of the uniformity can be adequately understood by those alone who will take the pains to institute a comparison with the works themselves before them. That I may not overload the question with quotations, I confine my extracts to the only two of Gauden's

publications which happen to be in my possession. Even these extracts are not the fruit of any careful collation, but are such as struck me, in the course of reading, as bearing a more than accidental resemblance to certain well-remembered passages in the *Icôn Basilike*.

EXTRACTS FROM Εἰκὼν  
Βασιλική.

EXTRACTS FROM GAU-  
DEN'S WRITINGS.

But no Antiquity must plead for it; Presbytery, like a young Heyre, thinks the Father hath lived long enough. No. xiv.

Not having so studied its genealogy and descent as to be assured of the legitimation, right and title of sole Presbytery to succeed, nay to remove, its ancient Father Episcopacy. *Ἱερα Δακρυα*. p. 376.

Former religious and legall engagements bound men sufficiently to all necessary duties—certainly all honest and wise men ever thought themselves sufficiently bound by former ties of Religion, Allegiance and Lawes

Every true and conscientious Christian knows and owns himself to have upon his conscience far more strict and indissoluble ties, not only of nature and creation but of the Law and Word of God; —All which strictly

to God and man. No. xiv. (Upon the Covenant.)

binde the conscience of all good Christians to all duties of piety and charity according to the relations (private or publick, civil or sacred) wherein they stand to God and man. *Hieraspistes*. p. 108. (Of Church-Covenant.)

Nor can such after contracts, — be ever thought, by judicious men, sufficient either to absolve or slacken those morall and eternall bonds of duty which lie upon all my Subjects' consciences both to God and me. No. xiv.

Nor private fraternities in families nor corporations — can vacate those more publick and general relations, or those ties of duty and service which each member owes to the Publick. *Hierasp.* p. 110.

Which cords and wythes. — No. xiv. (Speaking of the Covenant.)

These sorry withs— *Hier.* p. 108. (Speaking of the Covenant.)

I find it impossible for a prince to preserve

It being very hard for any sovereign prince

the State in quiet, un-  
 lesse he hath such an  
 influence upon Church-  
 men, and they such a  
 dependence upon Him,  
 as may best restraine  
 the seditious exorbi-  
 tances of ministers'  
 tongues; who with the  
 keyes of heaven have  
 so far the keys of the  
 people's hearts, as they  
 prevaile much by their  
 oratory to let in or shut  
 out both peace and loy-  
 alty. No. xvii.

to govern such a head-  
 strong people unlesse  
 he have power over  
 their minds as well as  
 their bodies. This a  
 prince cannot have but  
 by preachers, who, as  
 the weekly musterers,  
 orators and command-  
 ers of the populacy, do  
 exercise, by the scep-  
 tre of their tongues, a  
 secret swasive yet po-  
 tent empire over most  
 people's soules. 'Iep.  
 Δακ. p. 582.

I must now in chari-  
 ty be thought desirous  
 to preserve that govern-  
 ment (by Bishops) in  
 its right constitution, as  
 a matter of Religion;  
 wherein both my judg-  
 ment is fully satisfied  
 that it hath of all other  
 the fullest Scripture  
 grounds, and also the  
 constant practise of all

There is nothing now  
 can be suspected to  
 move me to touch with  
 respect those goodly  
 ruines (of Episcopacy)  
 but onely matter of  
 conscience, and the in-  
 tegrity of my judgment.  
 ——— — Which are  
 best set forth and dis-  
 cerned in innate princi-  
 ples of order and poli-

Christian Churches.  
No. xvii.

cy; also in Scripture precepts and precedents; and lastly by the Catholic custome and practice of the Church of Christ. *Hierasp.* p. 259-60.

Since the first age, for 1500 years, not one example can be produced of any settled Church, wherein were many ministers and congregations which had not some Bishop above them, under whose jurisdiction and government they were.  
No. xvii.

For the reverence due from posterity to the venerable piety and wisdom of all antiquity; which alwayes had president Bishops; ——— who (Christians) afterwards increasing to many congregations, had so many presbyters, ordained placed and governed by the eminency of his vertue and authority who was Bishop there. *Id.* p. 263.

It cannot in reason or charity be supposed that all Churches in the world should either be ignorant of the rule by them (the Apostles)

From which (Apostolicall precept) the Catholic Church could not suddenly erre in all places.—It is not among the things comely or

prescribed, or so soone deviate from their divine and holy patterne. No. xvii.

praiseworthy, either in charity, modesty, humility or equity, for as in after or worse times to cast upon all those holy primitive Christians and famous Churches either the suspicion of a generall Apostasy by a wilful neglect, or universally falling away from that Apostolical way. *Hierasp.* p. 264.

Whose constant and universall practice agreeing with so large and evident Scripture directions and examples, are set down in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, for the settling of that government not in the persons only of Timothy and Titus, but in the succession; the want of government being that which the Church can no more

This is undeniably evident by Scripture in Timothy and Titus; the validity and authority of which examples were esteemed by antiquity, and followed as warrantable divine precedent,—by preserving such an ordinary succession of power in Bishops, among and above Presbyters, both in ordination and jurisdiction.—It makes no-

dispense with, in point of being. No. xvii.

thing against a personal superiority of power and authority in them over their respective churches; which was to succeed to others as well as their ministry did; both these being always necessary for the Church.—The use of such order and power is in all reason necessary for Church societies. *Hierasp.* p. 268.

Those shorter characters of the qualities and duties of Presbyters, Bishops and Deacons are described in some parts of the same Epistles; who in the latitude and community of the name were then and may now not improperly be called *Bishops* as to the oversight and care of single congregations. No. xvii.

To the second, as Presbyters, or a lesser kind of Bishops and Apostles over private and particular congregations, they gave power to preach the Gospel &c.—unlesse men list for ever to play the children, and cavil with the identity or sameness of the names used of old; which calls Apostles *Presbyters*, as a word of honor, and

Presbyters *Bishops* as overseers. . . Ἱερ. Δακ. p. 468.

And not onely in Religion, of which Scripture is the best rule and the Churches universall practise the best commentary, but also in right reason and the true nature of government, it cannot be thought that an orderly subordination among Presbyters or Ministers should be more against Christianity than it is in all secular and civill governments where parity breeds confusion. Nor is it likely that God, who appointed severall orders and a Prelacie, in the government of his Church, among the Jewish Priests, should abhor or forbid them among

As then right reason tells us, beyond all reply, that neither natural nor civil nor religious common gifts, endowments or abilities instate any person in the office of magistrate, judge, &c. the same right reason requires a right derivation or conveyance of all supernatural ministerial Church power.—I may adde, by way of confirmation of that common equity and rules of order, which must be among men in all things and most necessarily in things truly religious, the inviolable function and peculiar office or order of the Priests and Levites, which were the Minis-

Christian  
No. xvii.

ministers. ters of the Lord in the  
antient Church of the  
Jews; which is a most  
convincing instance to  
prove the equity, cor-  
rectness, and exempla-  
riness of a peculiar mi-  
nistry, for holy things,  
among Christians under  
the Gospel. *Hierasp.*  
p. 163, 4.

'Tis most evident, in  
most learned and godly  
men's judgments, that  
it (Episcopacy) hath  
the neerest resemblance  
to that antient patern  
at least which God set-  
tled, the government of  
his Church among the  
Jews. P. 266.

Nor was it any poli- He (Charles First)  
cy of state or obstinacy that could, as to regall  
of will, or partiality of and civil concernments,  
affection either to the much deny himself,  
men or their function, why should he chuse,  
which fixed me: who upon the Churche's ac-  
cannot, in point of count, to suffer so long

worldly respects, be so considerable to me as to recompense the injuries and losses *I and my dearest relations* with my kingdomes have sustained and hazarded chiefly at first upon this quarrell. No. xvii.

a war, so many wounds, so tedious prisons, so sad tragedies living and dying? For however differences at last were inflamed upon other accounts in the procedure of the war, yet certainly the maine purpose and motion, first of the Scots and then of the English Presbyterians was this, Destroy the temples of Episcopacy, and set up the synagogues of Presbytery. Which any politick prince would speedily have done, at least when he saw so terrible a tempest pressing upon him, yea and prevailing against him. What prince was ever so in love with any Bishops of any Church as to love them better than himself?—in point of secular advantages, his own peace and preser-

vation, the public tranquillity, the increase of his revenue by the confiscation of Bishops' and Cathedral lands, would have amounted to much more benefit than ever *he or his* could expect from a few Bishops, Deans and Prebends.

*Ἰερ. Δακ. p. 606.*

As for those obtruded examples of some late Reformed Churches (for many retain Bishops still) whom necessity of times and affaires rather *excuseth* than commendeth for their *inconformity* to Antiquity, I could never see any reason why Churches orderly reformed and governed by Bishops should be forced to conform to those few.

No. xvii.

No learned and godly men ever thought it cause enough to separate from any Church because it had Bishops. Such as have them not in a constant presidency yet count this no part of their Reformation, but rather deplore it as a defect involuntary; pleading the law of necessity, or some grand inconveniences and difficulty, to *excuse* thereby their *inconformity* so far to other

Churches and to all Antiquity. *Hierasp.* p. 265.

Nor is it any point of wisdom or charity, where Christians differ, (as many do in some points) there to widen the differences, and at once to give all the Christian world (except a handfull of some Protestants) so great a scandall in point of Church government. No. xvii.

For the avoyding of scandall giving to so many Christian churches remayning in the world; who for the most part are still governed by Bishops in some respects distinct from and eminent above the Presbyters; it is not the work of Christian prudence or charity to widen differences between us and other churches. *Hierasp.* p. 265.

I am firme to Primitive Episcopacy not to have it extirpated. No. xvii.

I am vehemently for the ancient and holy customes of the Catholic Church. I never saw any thing of right reason or religion produced for the extirpation of Primitive Episcopacy. *Hierasp.* p. 284-7.

I would have such men Bishops as are most worthy of those encouragements (viz. secular additaments and ornaments of Authority, civill honor and Estate) and best able to use them. No. xvii.

If any man ask me then what kind of Bishop I would have, I answer such an one for age as may be a Father &c.—I would have him most deserve and most able to use well, but yet least esteeming, coveting or ambitionating the riches, pomp, glory and honour of the world. I do not much consider the secular parade and equipage but as encouragements of merit.

*Hierasp.* p. 273, 4.

And some Bishops, I am sure, I had, whose learning, gravity, and piety no men of worth or forehead can deny. No. xvii.

Many such Bishops have been antiently in the Church, and not a few here in England; some still are such in their merits amidst their ruines. *Hierasp.* p. 275.

For those secular additaments and ornaments of authority, civill honour and estate,

Nor can it but ill become any ordinary minister that is worthy of that name and office,

which my predecessors but worst of all will it  
 and Christian princes suite with those who  
 in all countries have affect to be, or indeed  
 annexed to Bishops and are or ought to be chief  
 Churchmen, I look up- Governours and Bi-  
 on them but as just re- shops of the Church,  
 wards of their learning whose publick enter-  
 and piety who are fit to tainment ought to be  
 be in any degree of such as might extend be-  
 Church government; yond their private and  
 also enablements to domestick necessities to  
 works of charity and hos- something of publick  
 pitality, meet strength- hospitality, charity, and  
 enings of their authority magnificence, which  
 in point of respect, and were the proportions  
 observance; which in heretofore allowed by  
 peacéful times is hardly the noble and generous  
 payed to any Gover- temper of the English  
 nours by the measure nation to its clergy,  
 of their vertues so both Bishops and Pres-  
 much as by that of byters, the better to  
 their estates. No. xvii. bear up their dignity  
 and authority among  
 the people. The words  
 of a poor man, though  
 wise, are forgotten or  
 unregarded. *Ἱερ. Δακ.*  
 p. 522.

Some men's zeale for      After this great pat-

Bishop's lands, houses, and revenues hath set them on worke to eate up Episcopacy: which (however other men esteeme) to *Me* is no lesse sin than *sacrilege*, or a robbery of God. No. xvii.

tern of King James (whose learned arguments were more prevalent than his arms in Religion) followed his unfortunate son the last King; who amidst all his reproaches and in-prosperities cannot be denied this honour, that he seemed not inferiour to any king that ever lived in his regard to the Church's ancient order estate and honour; although few princes ever sustained greater difficulties and necessities as to his estate yet never had any greater antipathies against what he thought *sacrilege*, nor a less longing to tast of the priest's portion which he esteemed sacred, because it was God's, dedicated to Him and so vested in Him both by law and conscience, by

true divinity and just humanity, that he judged no power on earth could, without manifest sin and robbery, alienate it from God and his Church. 'Iερ. Δακ. p. 605.

You have already tasted of that cup whereof I have liberally drank, which I look upon as God's physick, having that in healthfulness which it wants in pleasure. No. xxvii.

Affliction, like God's physick, hath that in healthfulness which it wants in pleasantness. 'Iερ. Δακ. p. 77.

The Serpent will devour the Dove. No. xxvii.

The Serpent in them will devour the Dove. 'Iερ. Δακ. p. 385.

You may hear from them Jacob's voice, but you shall feele they have Esau's hands. No. xxvii.

How is thy voice changed from that of a lamb to the roaring of a lion? from Jacob's smoothness to Esau's roughness? *Hierasp.* p. 135.

As soon as discontents draw men into sidings (as ill humors fall to the disaffected part which causes inflammations) so did all at first who affected any novelties, adhere to that side. No. xxvii.

Whensoever opportunity is given by any negligence, offence, or distemper in government or governours; upon the least bruise, the ill humours as in foul bodies, will have such influence to the disaffected part as easily causes terrible inflammations. 'Ιερ. Δακ. p. 374.

When these mountains of congealed factions shall by the sunshine of God's mercy and the splendour of your virtues be thawed and dissipated. No. xxvii.

If bare force be applied to remove them, then they are as ponderous as the congealed mountains, or northern heaps of ice, which no engines can remove, but the warmer sun will secretly thaw and easily melt them. 'Ιερ. Δακ. p. 396.

Of these instances some will be thought more convincing than others; but taken collectively, in connection with many hundred similar correspondencies which might be readily produced

if necessary, they certainly tend strongly to confirm the various other kinds of evidence by which the claim of Gauden is supported. If in what I have here alleged, there were nothing observable but a mere correspondency of words, phrases, and allusions, it might perhaps be thought that Gauden had borrowed these from the king's writing, wherewith to adorn his own. But that on which I principally rely is the identity of *sentiments*, even where the expression of them differs. These I cannot believe to be merely copied from the *Icôn*, because Gauden, in the Hieraspistes especially, supports his opinions by numerous and laboured references to the sources from which they are derived, and to the authorities by which he thinks they may be confirmed. Now it is far less probable, that he should model his sentiments upon those of the king, and afterwards seek to confirm them by laborious and learned research, than that, having laid up a certain store of principles in the course of his reading, he should introduce them into that work of which he was the real, though concealed author, as well as into those other works to which he set his name. It is not possible indeed, from such a partial view as I have been able to afford, to comprehend the full extent of the similarity, nay identity, which prevails in the three works from which I have quoted. To any one who will take the pains to

read them conjointly, such a sameness of views, wishes, and principles, and of similar conclusions from given premises, will present itself, as will satisfy nineteen out of every twenty persons, that the books are the offspring of one mind and of the same pen. The style of the *Icôn Basiliké*, it is admitted, is less rambling; and a better taste is discovered rather in what is omitted, than in what is preserved. Now the avowed works of Gauden present us with *his own* conceptions in *his own* expressions; while the *Icôn*, we know, was subjected to the revision of Bishop Duppa; a prelate of such confessed ability as scarcely to stand in need of Gauden's attestation that he was "equally grave, good, learned, and religious; so eminent in many things that he was worthy to be not onely a tutor to a prince, but a counsellor to a king." (*Ἐρ. Δακ.* p. 615) The fault of Gauden, as a writer, is that he overlays every subject, he never thinks he has said enough; *metuit lituram*. All then which Duppa could be called to do would be to *retrench* these superfluties; and any of my readers who will undertake this same office, with one of Gauden's books before them, may easily be satisfied that, without the *addition* of a single word, the style in almost every page may be brought to a very striking similarity with that of the *Icôn Basiliké*. In proof of this assertion I subjoin the following extract, in which *every*

*word* is Gauden's; all which I have done having been to *omit* what appeared superfluous. I have the less scruple in making this long extract, as the work from which it is taken is not of very common occurrence, and the subject must interest every lover of virtue and learning. It is the character of the truly great and admirable Usher.

“ I crave leave to insist a little more largely upon the name, worth, and memory, of one of our Bishops, very well known not onely to the British Churches, but to all the Christian world that hath any correspondency or commerce with learned men. It is Dr. James Usher, late Archbishop of Armagh, and Lord Primate of Ireland, whom I reckon as ours, because not onely his ashes and mortall remains are deposited with us, but he lived his last yeares of exile, and ended his mortality among us in England. Besides his constant paines in preaching even to his last, he hath left us many of his learned works which are enjoyed by, and highly esteemed of, all worthy men who were blest with the example of his great and unspotted worth: which no envy, no malice, I think, can be so impudent as to blemish.

“ With this rare and reverend Prelate, I was rather happy than worthy to be many yeares acquainted, so far as to be able to discover his

genius and temper. His real excellencies, every way, were such that they exceeded all ordinary measures of humane commendation and capacity. None but those whose minds are enlarged to some proportions of his accomplishments can be able to comprehend his worth and amplitude. So vast, so transcendant, so astonishing was his understanding in all kinds of knowledge divine and humane, that he was as the *Cynosure* by which all great divines steered, and as the sundial by which all great scholars set their watches. Much of this treasure was discovered in his writings, printed, and not yet printed, of all sorts, both of greener and riper studies; in all which he was exact and complete. He wrote, as he studied, not in the beaten paths of plagiarious compilers or systematicall collectors, but he brought forth out of his large heart and vast reading, things new as well as old, of rare, hidden, and untrodden observation, even out of manuscripts which scarce any but his eagle eye had seen, and but few could read. All which he judiciously collected, methodically disposed, clearly explained, and aptly applied: yet it was with him as with copious and living springs, the least part of his innate, acquired, and unexhausted fulnesse, was to be discerned by any of his outward emanations.

“So accurate was he in all usefull and learned languages Occidentall and Orientall, so cleare a prospect he had of all History and Chronology,

of all controversies ancient and modern, that nothing escaped him; nor was he onely as a reader and spectator, but as a judge and censor, as an arbitrator and dictator in disputes, as one that sate in a tribunal of soveraigne learning above all. Nothing was new or hidden to him in Philology, Philosophy, Geography, Astronomy, Mathematicks, and least of all in Theology or Divinity. He had conquered all others, but in this he triumphed, which was the trophee, crown, and center of all his other studies.

“ There was scarce any book, printed or manuscript, worth reading, in private or public libraries, throughout all Christendom, which he had not read, either in the copy or originall, and digested into the method or designe of his studies; yea, and to a miracle remembered, as to the maine contents of it. To the immensity of his learning, these were added excellent principles of politick prudence, as a governour of the Church, and as a counsellour of State; wherein he was conspicuous, not for the crafty projects and practises of policy, nor for the sinister waies of artifice and subtilty. No: the measure and rules of his politicks were taken from that great experience he had gotten, and many excellent observations he had made, out of all histories, as well humane as divine; though he alwaies laid the greatest weight upon the grounds and instances of Holy Scripture, which gives the truest judgment of wisdom or folly.

“As to his personall policy, domestick subtilty, or private cautiousness, truly he had little enough of the serpent; but as to his harmlesse innocency he had very much of the dove; ever esteeming piety the best policy, and sanctity the safest sanctuary.

“If any thing might seem to have been as a veniall alloy in him, it was a kind of charitable easinesse and credulity which made him prone to hope good of all, and loth to believe evill of any, especially if they made any profession or shews of piety. He did not think there could have been so much gall and vinegar mixed with the shewes or realities of some men's graces, untill he found, by sad experience, some godly people, and presbyters professing much godliness, who formerly were prone to adore him as a god, now ready to stone and destroy him, with all his brethren, the British Bishops.

“He was most prone to erre on the right hand of charity, and to incline to those opinions, in things disputable, which seemed to set men furthest off from pride, licentiousness, and profaneness, of which he was better able to judge than of hypocrisie, being more jealous of irreligion than superstition. He had not, til of late yeares, felt the scalding effects of some men's over-boyling zeal, or the dreadful terrors of their righteousness who affected to be over-righteous; who despised his learned, wise, and

moderate counsels, touching the settling of peace, order, and government in the church.

“ The rare endowments of this pattern of a perfect Bishop were both wrapped up and set forth, as occasion required, with such tender piety, such child-like humility, such unfeigned sanctity, such unaffected gravity, such an angelick serenity, and such a heavenly sweetness, as made all his writings perspicuous, though profound, his preaching plaine, yet most prevalent. His fervency, discretion, and sincerity, alwaies set his prayers far from any thing, either of a verball and vaine repetition, or a flat and barren invention. He ever highly esteemed and devoutly used the Liturgy of the church.

“ Indeed he prayed, or preached, or practised, continually the scholar, the Christian, and the divine. His whole life, as to the conversable part of it, was so civil, so sacred, so affable, so amiable, so usefull, so exemplary to all persons of any worth, ingenuity, or honesty, that nothing ancient or modern that ever I knew or read of in these British Churches, or any foreigne nation, was more august, venerable, imitable, and admirable. Such candor yet power, such largeness yet singleness of heart, such majesty, with meekness, appeared in all that he seriously said or did. I never saw him either morose or reserved, much lesse sowre or supercilious. If he were sad, it made him not silent but onely

more solemn, as night-pieces, which have admirable work of perspective in them though not so much light. If he were cheerful, he abhorred not such facetious and ingenious elegancies of discourse, as shewed holiness was no enemy to cheerfulness, but great graces might safely smile, and innocent virtues sometimes laugh without offence.

“To add to the further weight and crown of this excellent Bishop, (who deserved to be esteemed one of the primates of all learning, piety, and virtue,) he was, by God’s wonderfull dispensations, to be made a primate in sufferings; to be more illustrious by those darknings which on all hands were cast upon his person and profession. He lived to see, yea, to feel his venerable person by some men shamefully slighted, his function, as a Bishop, exautorated, decryed, depressed, his revenues first stopped, then alienated and confiscated; his moderate stock of moveables (all except his excellent librarie) seized and swept away. After this, the profits of the bishoprick of Carlisle, then vacant, being conferred upon him by the late king, for the support of his age and exile, even these were taken from him by those who took all church-revenues from all Bishops. A pension of four hundred pounds a year, as his Lordship hath told me, was promised to him when he was forced to yield up his interest in the revenues of

Carlisle, which pension after a year or two was never paid him. At last this great personage, whom Cardinal Richelieu, with many other great princes and states, had invited with very honorary propositions to make onely his residence with them, was reduced to a small stipend or salary of about two hundred pounds a year, which he was to earn by preaching as long as his sight and strength served him. These failing him (and in him all the learned and better world) he lived upon God's providence, and the contributions of some noble personages, wherein I was happy to do him some service. None hath merited and erected a more lasting monument of honour than the Countesse of Peterborough, under whose gratefull and hospitable roof he left the world, which was not worthy of him; having of later years treated him with so little value, that, while merchants, military men, and mean mechanicks, either get fair estates, or have good pay, pensions, and gainful employments, this aged Bishop, this brightest star of the British Churches and the Christian world, was suffered to be so eclipsed, that with St. Paul he knew what it was to want as well as to abound. He had not, with our blessed Saviour, any house to rest his head in, nor a foot of land which he might call his own. He seemed to be careful in nothing save only to discharge a good conscience to God and men; esteeming this the

greatest treasure to those that are daily dying to the world even while they live in it. A person so rich in all excellencies, and yet so poor, even to an annihilation in his own spirit, partakes, no doubt, of that first great Beatitude, the kingdom of Heaven.

“As for the many sufferings or indignities he had sustained, I never perceived the least regret or sigh, much lesse any bitter and revengeful replies. A very great sense, indeed, he expressed, and very often with sadness and compassion, for the distractions of this Church, and the feared future desolations which he often and earnestly seemed to presage as neer at hand, alwaies jealous that our religious feuds and factions would at last end in Papall superstition and mutuall oppressions. Against both these this good Bishop, and most of his brethren, were, I believe, as much enemies as the most anti-episcopal Presbyter or Independent in the world; being much better able to give a reason of his distance from them than they can for their defiance of him and of all Bishops.

“Against the deluge of whose partiality and passion I have thus opposed this one great instance of a most unblameable Bishop, purposely to vindicate the consistence of Episcopacy with piety, and the vast distance between Primitive Prelacy and after-Popery. He was as truly worthy to be honoured, admired, and imitated,

of all good men in all ages, as any one person that ever I knew; which, as Plato said of Socrates, I think much the more blessed of God, because I lived in those dayes which gave me the opportunity, honor, and happinesse, both to know and to be known to this great pattern of Bishops, Preachers, Scholars, and Christians.

“ Nor was it the least cordial I had in the difficulties and horrors of later years, to remember that I was not far from such an open Sanctuary, that I might have frequent recourse to such a full and free magazine of all Christian graces and gifts. I did not think we could be completely miserable, and utterly desolated as to the Church, while this great genius was yet alive and in England; in whom, by a rare conjunction, such high abilities were mixed with unparalleled humility, such candor and gentleness did temper his gravity, and such serenity did sweeten the severer sanctity of his life, that he seemed to me not so much a man as a kind of miracle or prodigy of humane perfections: especially when I remember, not long before his death, those unfeigned tears which I saw, and those humble complaints which I heard, not for his losses, but for his sins and omissions; earnestly deprecating God’s displeasure and dreading his exact Tribunall. Who will not fear and tremble? Who will not wax wan and discoloured, when he sees a rubie of so great price and orient

lustre contract pallor and amazement?" *Ἰερα Δακρυα*, p. 639—649.

This extract confirms what I have before alluded to, the impossibility of opening Gauden's works without discovering traces of the *Icôn*. Here we have repeated the favourite allusion to the *Serpent* and the *Dove*; and the well known character of Lord Strafford, that he was a gentleman whom a prince might be "rather afraid than ashamed to employ," has its parallel in the antithesis, "with this reverend Prelate I was rather happy than worthy to be acquainted."

This leads me, however, from my purpose, which was to present the above extract (in which I have changed nothing but by omission and transposition) as a specimen of a pure, manly, and agreeable English style. The sentiments which prevail in it are highly creditable to the writer; the points of commendation on which he fixes are judiciously chosen, and the entire panegyric, though certainly elaborate, is not overstrained. Dr. Wordsworth questions whether the talents of Gauden were adequate to the composition of the book which he claimed. I oppose the above quotation from his works; and fearlessly assert that the man who could thus appreciate, and thus describe a character such as that of Usher, must have had ability enough to devise, and to execute with success, even so ex-

cellent a work as the *Icon Basiliké*. In fact, whatever my earlier prepossessions and wishes may have been, I am compelled, after examining the case, to admit that few historical facts are established upon clearer evidence, or the admission of them attended with fewer difficulties, than this—that Bishop Gauden was the author of “The Pourtraiture of His Sacred Majesty in his Solitudes and Sufferings.”

The only part of the question which requires a short concluding notice is that which relates to the morality of the transaction; the most unpleasing division of the whole. If Gauden were the author of the work, then he was the contriver of a forgery; and many others, who ought never to have been associated in such transactions, were guilty, either before or after the fact, of endeavouring to make it pass upon the world. Before, however, we severely condemn them, let us call to mind into what inconsistencies men have been betrayed by acting upon mistaken principles; even to hope that the Christian Religion itself might be benefited and extended by the influence of what are strangely called *pious frauds*. The deceit, in the case before us, was formal rather than essential; the portrait bore an accurate resemblance to the king, the falsehood consisted in attributing it to his own hand; the sentiments were such as he was known and acknowledged to hold; but the

world was to be falsely persuaded that he himself had given them utterance and a visible form. Duppa, Morley, Clarendon, and the rest, unquestionably acted upon a maxim, even now scarcely exploded from the world, that in politics and in private life two different standards of morality were to be used. In their individual transactions there was not one of them who would not have shrunk back from the very suggestion of a fraud, but, looking at this as a public question, they appear to have thought that, if by the appearance of this book the fate of the king could be averted, and the nation be thus preserved from the fatal consequences of his murder, it was better that the people should be deceived to the extent which I have laid down. I say not this with any view of palliating their error; there was a dishonesty in their purpose of which a good cause can never stand in need. And what benefit arose from it? The king's life was not spared; the Restoration, there is every reason to believe, would as assuredly have taken place if the *Icôn* had not been printed; its sole effect is that it remains as a reproach to be cast in our teeth who have succeeded to the support of the great cause of Monarchy and the Church; we are compelled to make common cause with sceptics, calumniators, and regicides, the Tolands, Oldmixons, and others of the same stamp; men with whom it is painful to be associated even

in the conduct of a just argument. Let the error (to give it no harsher name) of so many otherwise venerable and venerated characters be to us for a warning and not for imitation. To whatever straits we may be reduced (and God knows we are not without some threatening intimations) let us never put our hands, for our protection, to unhallowed arms; but remember, the only rule applicable on *all* occasions, small or great, public as well as private, is this, "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue and if there be any praise, think of *these things*."

Amidst the pain arising from the discovery of this imposture, a single, but that a powerful, consolation remains. It is, that we find *one* character rising in unclouded though solitary brightness above the clouds which involve so many of inferior loftiness. THE MARTYR is here without reproach; "faithful only he" to those principles of probity and truth, which, when banished from the world, should find their resting place in the hearts of kings. It is in evidence that this book reached his Majesty in the very scene of his "solitudes and sufferings;" at a moment when every earthly hope appeared to fail; and when a mind of less firmness might have been tempted to grasp at even a possible

chance of favourably influencing the public opinion. But our evidence imputes not to Charles so much as even a mental compliance with the suggested imposture; it stops short at the very point where every friend of kings must wish that it *should* stop. It too plainly appears that a desire for the monarch's preservation betrayed his friends into a departure from the strict line of honesty; but no fear of consequences, however fatal, could influence him who was to be the chief sufferer. There is not the slightest reason to believe that he ever contemplated, much less that he ever sanctioned, the publication of his fictitious meditations. The sentiments and devotions he acknowledged and adopted; nor in this assumption did he demean himself unworthily. The character pourtrayed in the *Icôn Basiliké* is invested with the truest heroism, that of patience under unmerited persecution; and, in its chief lineaments, exhibits a model of Christian perfection. Whatever of a solemn and almost sacred character has been attached to this book, by all who could sympathize with virtue and greatness in affliction, it may still, in a great measure, retain. Those sentiments of piety, resignation, and forgiveness, those moving acknowledgments of great unworthiness, those humble yet animated supplications for forgiveness, were actually placed before the eyes, adopted by the heart, and uttered by the lips of

Charles the First. Whatever delusion, on the other hand, may be implicated with the contrivance and publication of the work, the king is plainly acquitted from all participation and connivance. From this, as from all his other trials, he comes forth more than conqueror; and though truth requires us to deny him the literary merit of the performance, the same impartial arbitress awards to him the higher merit of resisting for conscience sake, a temptation of no ordinary force. She certifies the invariable uprightness of his resolutions, and exhibits his integrity without a stain. With a perfect confidence in your acquiescence in this conclusion,

I remain,

My dear Sir,

Your very faithful friend and servant,

W. G. BROUGHTON.

*December 6th, 1825.*