



The Lennox Collection (continued)

Citation

Isles, Duncan. 1971. The Lennox Collection (continued). Harvard Library Bulletin XIX (1), January 1971: 36-60.

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:41965777>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

The Lennox Collection*

Duncan Isles

(Continued)

9

Saturday 9 May 1752. John Boyle, 5th Earl of Orrery.⁴⁷ Marston House.⁴⁸

It is with great pleasure, Madam, I shall undertake any part you will assign to me in your intended work.⁴⁹ I heartily wish that (any) the hints I may chance to give, might prove of future benefit to you in any shape. You may depend upon the zeal of my friendship.

You are entirely in the right, Madam, to translate, and not to epitomize or imitate.⁵⁰ You have cleared my doubts. Only I wish you to translate no part foreign to Shakespeares story, unless the part be unavoidably connected.

* For key to abbreviations, see HARVARD LIBRARY BULLETIN, XVIII (October 1970), 332-333.

⁴⁷ 1707-1762. As great-grandson of a dramatist and romance-writer (Roger, 1st Earl of Orrery) and son of the scholarly editor of the Phalaris epistles (Charles, 4th Earl of Orrery), O came of literary stock, and followed the family tradition by producing an edition of Pliny's letters, a *Life* of his friend Jonathan Swift, and other works. He contributed "hints" to Lewis Theobald's edition of Shakespeare (1733), which was dedicated to him, as was CL's *SI* twenty years later (see John Duncombe's Preface to his edition of O's *Letters from Italy in the Years 1754 and 1755, 1773*, pp. i-xxxvii, esp. p. ix). SJ valued his friendship, but thought little of his literary or conversational ability (*BLJ*, V, 238 *et passim*). SJ excepted, however, O was CL's most constant and useful helper. He was originally introduced to her by SJ, and took her part in the *FQ* negotiations discussed in Nos. 2-7 above (SJ *Letters*, I, 44; G. B. Hill, ed., *Letters of Samuel Johnson*, Oxford, 1892, I, 26, where — *pace* Hill — "Charlotte's Book" is probably *FQ*; and *The Orrery Papers*, ed. E. C. Boyle, Countess of Cork and Orrery, 1903, II, 100, where the "fair Enchantress" is probably CL). After the participation in *SI* referred to in the present letter, O helped CL with *Brunoy* (see No. 20 below), and finally made extensive contributions to *LM* (see his annotated copy of *LM* in the Folger Library — AP/3/L2/Cage — pointed out to me by Kenneth O'Leary).

⁴⁸ O's residence in Frome, Somerset.

⁴⁹ *SI*.

⁵⁰ See n. 51 below.

I send you some papers relative to Macbeth: as a specimen, that may determine you, whether to order me to go on, or to stop me & point out some new road. I keep no copies of my papers; They are entirely your own. I have already forgot 'em. Burn them, alter them, Do with them as you please. They can be of no use ever to me: if they are of any to you, my wishes are answered.⁵¹

Remember, Madam, Friendship knows no ceremony, no distance, no compliments. Treat me accordingly. I have often wished to see the work you are going to undertake. I think it may be a fine one, in such hands. If you approve of what I now send, I shall transmit some scraps concerning Harry the 8th. I am obliged to go into Hampshire for some days, in all places, Madam,

Marston house your obedient and faithfull humble Servant

May 9 1752

Orrery

10

Tuesday 6 March 1753. Samuel Johnson.

Address: To Mrs Lennox over against the King's Bakers in Berry Street St James's

Postmark: Penny Post Paid [remainder obliterated]

Dear Madam⁵²

⁵¹ Further information about the "papers" is found in SJ's letter to O of 9 July 1752 (*SJ Letters*, I, 44-45) and O's reply of 12 July (*The Orrery Papers*, II, 112-114). The information given to CL by O was "historical." O had originally thought that CL was preparing "a complete Commentary on Shakespear," but SJ informed him (superfluously) that she was concerned with "translations and Extracts from such Writers as he [Shakespeare] appears to have made use of." In his reply to SJ, O said: "The papers which I sent to Mrs. L. have long lain by me: were thrown aside because I would not walk into Mr P[ope] and W[arburton]'s province, who seemed to think that Shakespear was the *Sanctum Sanctorum* where they only were sufficiently holy to enter. . . . they [the papers] are hers, and she has a right to do with them as she pleases." The Macbeth material referred to must have contained what became "The *History of Macbeth, collected from Holingshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*" in *SI*, I, 251-268. O may therefore also have contributed or assisted with the remaining chronicle material used in CL's discussions of *Cymbeline* in *SI* 53 and of *King Lear* and the history plays (1-2 *Henry IV*, *Henry V*, 1-3 *Henry VI*, *Richard II*, *Richard III*, and *Henry VIII*) in *SI* 54. O may also have been the "Friend" who supplied the Saxo Grammaticus translation for the *Hamlet* chapter (*SI*, II, 241-267). He later contributed a critical note on *Macbeth* to *LM* (No. 6, August 1760, pp. 9-13).

⁵² No additional information relating to the incidents referred to in this letter has so far been found. "Mr Lenox" is presumably CL's husband. The "Marriage"

I am very sorry for what happened, but cannot find that I was the cause of it, for the effect had been the same had he been out on any other occasion.

The reason for which I said nothing to Mr Lenox was no less than that I had nothing to say. The Marriage is not yet solemnised or not owned, and as it would be improper for the young Gentlemen to ask a favour beforehand, it would be fit for me to propose it. To ask it I have promised you, and I will ask it in such a manner as I think most likely to succeed, for I shall sincerely rejoice if [to do]⁵³ you any good can be within the little power [of]⁵⁴

Madam Your most humble servan[t]
March 6. 1753 Sam: Johnson

II

[1753].⁵⁵ Samuel Johnson.

Address: To Mrs Lenox

Madam

I hope you take great care to observe the Doctor's prescriptions, and take your physick regularly, for I shall soon come to enquire. I should be sorry to lose Criticism in her bloom. Your remarks are I think all very judicious, clearly expressed, and incontrovertibly certain.⁵⁶ When

is certainly not that of the Lennoxes, who contracted a runaway but perfectly legal marriage at St George's Chapel, May Fair, London (popularly known as "Mayfair Chapel," and used for the performance of clandestine marriages) on 6 October 1747 (*The Register of Baptisms and Marriages at St George's Chapel May Fair*, ed G. Armytage, *Pub. Harl. Soc., Registers*, XV, 1889, pp. viii-x and 92).

⁵³ The MS is torn at this point.

⁵⁴ The MS is torn at this point.

⁵⁵ This letter appears to have been written shortly before the publication of *SI* 53 (Friday 18 May).

⁵⁶ As SJ's only surviving critical assessment of *SI*, this statement is particularly important in relation to the vexed question of the extent to which SJ participated in the work. As soon as *SI* 53 was published, the literary world knew (or surmised) that SJ had written the Dedication (see, e.g., Thomas Birch's letter to Philip Yorke, later Viscount Royston and Earl of Hardwicke, 23 June 1753; British Museum Add. MS. 35, 398, ff. 120-121), an attribution which is still accepted (Hazen, pp. 104-110), although this question needs further consideration. Thomas Percy's enigmatic MS note, in his copy of Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, that "B. does not know what encouragement^t if not assistance Johnson gave to M^{rs} Lennox in her Shakesp^r. illustrated [*sic*]" (Bodleian MS. Percy d.11, f. 7^r), suggests that SJ's participation went beyond the Dedication. Karl Young suggests that SJ has proposed

Shakespeare is demolished your wings will be *full summed* and I will fly you at Milton; for you are a bird of Prey, but the Bird of Jupiter.⁵⁷

I am, Madam, Your most obedient Servant

Sam Johnson.

the *SI* project to CL (*Samuel Johnson on Shakespeare: One Aspect, University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, No. 18, 1923, p. 181). One feels that SJ's critical ability is a strong argument against his having been *deeply* involved in a work so full of illogical and imperceptive argument (see n. 61 below). The present statement has a superficial appearance of eulogy, but the whole letter appears to have a playful tone (as in the use of "demolished" and "incontrovertibly") which ought to prevent our full acceptance of the statement as a serious, objective judgment.

The "full summed" quotation is particularly apt with regard to both the Miltonic context and the (teasing?) way in which *SI* is being regarded as an important stage in CL's development as a critic. SJ probably has in mind Raphael's account of the Creation in *Paradise Lost*, where the "callow" fledglings of the high-flying birds—such as the eagle—soon "summed their pens," (i.e., their wings reached their full state of development) "and soaring th' air sublime / With clang despised the ground, under a cloud / In prospect"—*P.L.*, VII, ll. 421-423; see D. Bush's edition of Milton's poems, *Oxford Standard Authors* series, 1966, p. 350). Alternatively (or probably simultaneously, knowing SJ), Milton's invocation to the Spirit at the beginning of *Paradise Regained* is being alluded to: ". . . inspire / . . . my prompted song . . . / And bear through highth or depth of nature's bounds / With prosperous wing full summed to tell of deeds / Above heroic, though in secret done" (*P.R.*, I, ll. 11-15; *ed. cit.*, p. 464). In itself, "full summed" is a technical term taken from falconry and meaning, when applied to a falcon, "lacking none of its feathers." The "Bird of Jupiter" is, of course, the eagle. The "fly you at Milton" suggestion is more problematical. Taken at its face value, this would imply that SJ envisaged a *Milton Illustrated*, wherein CL would present Milton's source-material and comment on his use of it. This seems dangerously close to *An Essay on Milton's Use and Imitation of the Moderns* (1750), by William Lauder, the unscrupulously dishonest attack on Milton as a plagiarist on the basis of forged evidence in which SJ had been very embarrassingly, though innocently, involved (see *SJ Bibliography*, pp. 36-38). Perhaps SJ, over-estimating CL's abilities in this field, genuinely felt that she should go back over Lauder's ground, thereby concluding the Lauder controversy in an objective and scholarly manner. Indeed, Garrick's "Mrs. Lauder" taunt (No. 12, note 61) suggests that SJ had such a project in mind, and that this was known to the London literary world. Again, however, what appears to be the playfulness of this letter suggests to the present reader that more objective evidence for such a scheme would have to be found before it could be regarded as SJ's serious intention. If SJ *was* serious, he was extremely fortunate that CL did not take up his suggestion, as her methods in *SI* indicate that she would certainly have caused another Miltonic *furor* by her unjustified harshness. Finally, the suggestion strongly implies that it was SJ who had originally flown CL at Shakespeare by suggesting the *SI* project to her—a possibility that the present writer considers to be very likely, even although (one suspects) SJ neither became actively involved in the work nor read the finished version very carefully until a later period.

Sunday 12 August [1753].⁵⁸ David Garrick. Londesburgh, Yorkshire.⁵⁹

Londesburgh in Yorkshire
Augst 12th.

Madam,

Yesterday I receiv'd Yours, which I find has been at Chiswick⁶⁰ some time, & by some Mistake was not sent to me till y^e last post — I should certainly have sent You y^e letter according to your desire, had I not destroy'd it; The Remarks I had made were written as I read y^r. Book,⁶¹ & were perhaps stronger Proofs of my Zeal for Shakespear,

⁵⁸ The year is deduced from the references to *SI* and Londesburgh.

⁵⁹ This residence was owned by Richard Boyle (1695–1753), Earl of Burlington and Corke, the cousin of CL's friend Orrery (Nos. 9 above and 20 below), the Garricks' friend and Mrs. Garrick's former patron. Burlington also owned Chiswick House, Middlesex. The Garricks were guests at Chiswick House in June and early July 1753. From there they moved to Londesburgh Park, arriving on Monday 16 July. They arrived back in London c. 21 August (*Garrick Letters*, I, xxxvi–xxxvii, 96–97, notes, 108, n. 2, and 191–199 *passim*).

⁶⁰ Chiswick House (see n. 59 above).

⁶¹ The "Book" is *SI* 53. The destroyed "Remarks" were apparently criticism of the work, and CL had demanded to see them. According to Thomas Birch (letter to Philip Yorke, 23 June 1753; see No. 11, note 56), DG had already manifested his disapproval of *SI* by nick-naming CL "Mrs. Lauder"—an extremely sly multiple jeer which implied that CL had treated Shakespeare with dishonest injustice, mocked her position as SJ's protégé, and possibly alluded to SJ's possible intention of encouraging CL to work on Milton (see n. 57 above). CL naturally resented this, and the letter to DG referred to here can scarcely have been polite. DG was only one of many Shakespeare-lovers who—with some justice—resented CL's irreverent and illogical condemnations, not only of Shakespeare's lack of invention, but also of his alleged incompetence in handling the source-materials that his poverty of invention obliged him to borrow. CL made the fatal mistake of criticizing Shakespeare on the basis of the versions of his source-materials that she herself had found, without considering whether Shakespeare had actually used the same version, to the extent of comparing the Italian *novelle* in their original tongue directly with Shakespeare's plays whilst simultaneously asserting that he could not read Italian. Among DG's fellow-complainers were his friend Claude Pierre Patu (1729–1757), who, in a letter to DG dated 23 September 1755, re-christened the work "*Shakspear . . . illtreated*" (René Huchon, *Mrs. Montagu and her Friends*, 1907, pp. 112–114, and J. Roaden, ed., *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, 1832, II, 405). Patu wrote the most perceptive and crushing contemporary review of CL's misguided efforts, in *Journal Etranger* (December 1755, pp. 29–90; here *SI* was more conservatively re-titled *Shakspear Eclairci*). Samuel Richardson, too, wrote very bitterly about *SI* (letters to Lady Bradshaigh, 5 October and—especially—8 December 1753, *Richardson Letters*, pp. 246 and 250). In the English periodicals, *MR* attacked through irony (IX, 145; August 1753).

than of my Judgment.⁶² In the Whole, I imagin'd that you had betray'd a greater desire of Exposing his Errors than of *illustrating* his Beauties⁶³ — there appeared to me (and indeed to many others) a kind of severe Levity & Ridicule, which might with Justice have been exercis'd upon Tom Durfey, but (I think) is somewhat unjustifiable, when us'd against so great and so Excellent an Author⁶⁴ — let me assure you of my best Wishes for your success in Every undertaking, & let me desire You in behalf of my best friend, & in y^e words of an old saying, that as *You are brave, be mercifull.*

I am Madam Y^r. very hum^lc Serv^t

D: Garrick

13

Monday 16 December 1754. Mary Jones.⁶⁵ Oxford.
Mad^m.

although GM, possibly through SJ's influence, had come out strongly in her favor (XXIII, 255–256; June 1753). The controversy seems to have stimulated sales, as, on Birch's authority (letter to Yorke, cited above) the work sold so well that Andrew Millar, its publisher, had by June 1753 already commissioned CL to add a third volume (SI 54), which was published on Friday 22 February 1754.

⁶²The practical manifestations of DG's well-known veneration for Shakespeare played an important part in stimulating both popular and scholarly response to Shakespeare's plays — see G. W. Stone, "David Garrick's Significance in the History of Shakespearian Criticism," *PMLA*, LXV (1950), 183–197; and R. W. Babcock, *The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry* (Chapel Hill, 1931), *passim*, esp. Chs. VII (82–89) and XIV (199–208).

⁶³As has been indicated above, DG's objection is valid. In addition to the shortcomings mentioned in n. 61 above, CL applied the criteria of eighteenth-century fiction, rather than of seventeenth-century drama, to the plays, and intensified the resultant distortion by an unusually rigid application of the familiar "neoclassical" standards of unity, probability, poetic justice, and decorum. Taking all three volumes together (53 and 54) we find that her condemnations (notably of the comedies, the more brutal histories, and *King Lear*), tend to overshadow her praise (her favorites being *Romeo and Juliet*, *Macbeth*, *1 Henry IV*, and *Troilus and Cressida*). A useful summary of her arguments is found in Small and in Augustus Ralli, *A History of Shakespearian Criticism* (1932), I, 26–32.

⁶⁴This is another valid complaint. CL's misplaced facetiousness (carried over from her novels, where it was one of her strongest weapons) is a striking feature of SI 53, and is impenitently continued in SI 54. Outstanding examples are her observations that the Bear in *The Winter's Tale* shows commendable good nature in devouring Antigonus but ignoring Perdita (II, 80), and that a dog was included in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* in imitation of the classical Mutes (III, 46). The "Tom Durfey" cited as a legitimate target is Thomas D'Urfey (1653–1723), a minor poet and dramatist, chiefly remembered for his popular songs and ballads.

⁶⁵Miss Mary Jones (fl. 1740–1761) was the sister of Oliver Jones, Chanter of

I was favour'd wth. a Letter from you about ten days ago, w^{ch}. equally surpris'd & pleas'd me, & w^{ch}. I shd have acknowledg'd immediately, but y^t. my Bro^r. was then ill of a Fever, & is but just got abroad. I was surpris'd to find my self still more oblig'd, for having only shewn my Sense of an Obligation; & pleas'd wth. Sentiments y^t. seem to flow so naturally & so gracefully, & yet so much above y^e. common Level. Few Creditors think y^m selves oblig'd by y^e. bare Acknowledgm^t. of a Debt; but Mrs. Lennox, like other superior Beings, seems to penetrate y^e. Heart, & takes her Estimate from y^e. Intention, rather than y^e. Act. By w^{ch}. means she makes me y^e greatest Complim^t. imaginable, & herself, deservedly, none of y^e. least. Indeed, Madam, you soar so much beyond me, y^t. even at first setting out, I despond, finding my self unequal to y^r. Wing; & if I was to to [sic] carry on y^e. Metaphor of y^e. Feather, shd at this very Period drop my Quill. You have convinc'd me y^t. tis possible to endure a Competitor (under certain Circumstances) without Envy; but how is it possible ever to rise again, after once sinking in Despair? This w^d. require a Spirit equal to any Quixotism you've painted,⁶⁶ & none but y^e. ingenious Author of Shakespeare illustrated c^d. set our Judgments right again, in so humiliating a Situation.

For y^e. rest then, I will creep after you as well as I'm able, in acknowledgm^t. of y^r. distance; confessing however at y^e. same time, y^t. from y^e. benignity of y^r. Aspect, & y^e. Influence you heavenly Bodies naturally have over us sublunary ones, I hope to feel, I already feel my self cherish'd wth. y^r. Rays, tho their Light has (you own) been so long travelling down to me. And now I'm got among y^e. celestial Signs, pray, where is that Meteor,⁶⁷ that *Rambler*, y^t. shew'd

Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford, hence SJ's affectionate references to her as "the Chantress" (*BLJ*, I, 322, n. 4). She published poetry and prose (*BLJ*, I, 545-546), and apparently excelled in cultivating friendships among the nobility—see the memoir, "Mrs. [sic, this being a courtesy-title for unmarried ladies of a certain age] Mary Jones," prefixed to her poems in *Poems by Eminent Ladies* (1755), I, 254. She may have had a slight social link with CL in that she was particularly friendly with the family of General Jasper Clayton, in whose regiment (Clayton's, or 14th Foot, now part of the Prince of Wales's Own Regiment of Yorkshire) CL's father, Captain James Ramsay, had spent most of his military career. Several of MJ's poems addressed to the Claytons appear in *Poems by Eminent Ladies* (e.g., I, 261 and 283-291).

⁶⁶ A flattering allusion to *FQ*.

⁶⁷ The "Meteor" is SJ, who had spent about five weeks in Oxford during July and August 1754 (*BLJ*, III, 451).

himself in our Hemisphere last Summer, & has never been heard of since, except among y^e. Transactions of y^e. Literati? If he is often at y^r. Elbow (a Situation he had y^e. Confidence to boast of to me) I shd be oblig'd to you if you'd make my Complim^{ts}. to him. He's so restless a Companion, y^t. twas impossible to take my Observations of him, wth. any Accuracy, in his Company; but now he's got Abroad, & exhibits himself fairly to y^e. (public) Eye, I doubt not of contemplating his Magnitude wth. y^e. greatest Satisfaction.

You enquire when I go to Town. I've been talking of it these two Months, but have been prevented. Whenever I do go, twill be a high Gratification to me to have an Opportunity of paying my Respects to Mrs. Lennox, & of assuring her how much I honour her, as well as think my self,

her greatly Oblig'd & most Obed^t. Humble serv^t.

M. Jones.

Oxford. Dec^r. 16 1754

14

Friday 30 April 1756. John Hawkesworth.⁶⁸ St John's Gate.⁶⁹
Address: To Mrs. Lennox at Mr. Cooper's in Gerrard Street Soho
Madam

I know not with what Apology to introduce my request that you would accept the packet⁷⁰ (that) which accompanies this Letter. I would indeed have sent it long agoe but hopcd I should be able to appoint a Time by the Messenger when I might have brought Mrs Hawkesworth to wait upon you this has never yet been in my power

⁶⁸ John Hawkesworth (1715?–1773), miscellaneous writer, best remembered as the editor of the *Adventurer* (1752–54), Swift's *Works* (1775), and — particularly — the best-selling *Voyages Undertaken in the Southern Hemisphere* (1773). At this time (1756) he was co-editor of *GM*, in collaboration with David Henry (A. Sherbo, "Samuel Johnson and The Gentleman's Magazine, 1750–1755," *Johnsonian Studies*, ed. M. Wahba, Cairo, 1962, p. 155). He had been closely associated with *GM* since the early 1740's, and his work as compiler of the poetry section in the late 1740's (J. L. Clifford, *Young Sam[uel] in London* ed.] *Johnson*, 1955, p. 293; see No. 1, notes 3–4), and as a reviewer, had probably brought him into early contact with CL, whom he later assisted with her proposed subscription edition of *FQ* in the 1770's (see No. 28 below). He was one of SJ's most intimate friends.

⁶⁹ The editorial office of *GM*.

⁷⁰ The contents of the "packet" are unknown. As CL had no known connection with *GM* in this year, this "packet" is probably of a personal rather than professional nature.

tho' almost continually in my thoughts. another Vacation⁷¹ is coming on of which I will not say any thing for I have already made my promises cheap

I am Mad^m. with sincere Respect Y^r most obed^t humble Serv^t
J^{no} Hawkesworth

St. John's Gate 30th. April 1756

15

Friday 30 July 1756. Samuel Johnson.

Madam

The Letter which you sent me some time ago, was rather too full of wrath for the provocation.⁷² I read both the reviews, and though

⁷¹ Presumably the vacation of his wife's boarding-school for girls in Bromley, Kent.

⁷² The main topic of this letter is the unfavorable critical reception of *Berci*, which had been published on 10 April 1756. The *MR* (XIV, 516-520; June 1756) and *CR* (I, 312-314; May 1756) notices appeared promptly. Both—with good reason—disapproved of the content, but were favourably impressed by CL's language. *MR* commented that "the work bears a strong resemblance to the *romantic Romances* of the last century," but that "the language . . . is very passable," and that CL "is a much better writer than most of her cotemporary [*sic*] Novelists." *CR* adopted a more sarcastic and crudite tone. One of CL's main (and unacknowledged) sources, *Lysander and Calista*, was correctly identified, no doubt to CL's great annoyance. *Berci* was correctly described as "an old romance newly vamped up." The considerable anachronism involved in up-dating the work by altering the names of the characters while preserving the tournaments and other such medieval activities of the action was frowned upon; thus, the re-christened characters are said to "cut as indifferent a figure as SANCHO [Panza] in his government." Here again, however, the harsh criticisms were modified by the statement that CL had performed the actual task of translating from the French "extremely well," and her general use of language was described as "lively and spirited." CL's reaction to the reviews certainly appears to have been excessive. In addition to her habitual over-sensitivity to criticism, an added source of aggravation on this occasion was probably the marked contrast between the reviewers' speedy mention of *Berci* and their less urgent treatment of the far more substantial and important *Sully* 55, which had been published more than eight months previously (8 November 1755); *CR*, in fact, ignored *Sully* completely, but *MR*'s lengthy and enthusiastic discussion began in the same month as the offending *Berci* discussion (XIV, 561-573, and XV, 97-106 and 209-216; June, August, and September 1756). Incidentally, CL eventually contrived to salvage some benefit from the wreckage of *Berci*. The sub-plot borrowed from Mme. de Tencin's *Memoires du Comte de Comminges* (see n. 74 below), which escaped detection by the reviewers then and ever since, was smuggled into *LM* (Nos. 2-9, April-November 1760) as *The History of the Count de Comminge*. A third and altered version was subsequently published under CL's name in Dublin (*The History of the Marquis of Lussan and Isabella*,

the Critical Reviewers, according to their plan, showed their superiority of knowledge with some ostentation, they mentioned you with great respect, and the other Reviewers⁷³ though less ceremonious, said nothing that can excite or justify much resentment. They have both answer[ed] the original rather than the translation. All that either has said is now forgotten except by those who have some particular motive to remember it, and therefore it will be best to leave Berci to his chance, without a vain attempt to vindicate upon principles, what was not upon any principles of judgment undertaken. The choice, if choice it might be termed, when you took the first book which was recommended to you, was unlucky. Your Stile is commended which is all the part, that I would wish you to claim[,] for by mentioning the alterations, however excellent,⁷⁴ you become answerable for that which you did not alter.⁷⁵

I do not believe that either of the Reviews, intended you any hurt, it is certain that if they meant to hurt you they will be disappointed,

1764), and, through frequent reprints in the magazines of the 1770's and 1780's, *Comminge/Lussan* became one of CL's most frequently published works.

⁷³ MR.

⁷⁴ The work was derived from two sources, the main plot coming from *Lysandre et Caliste* (c.1616), the most popular work of Vital D'Audiguer (1569-c.1624); see Gaspard d'Ardenne de Tizac, *Étude Historique et Littéraire sur Vital D'Audiguer . . .* (Paris, 1887), pp. 142-143 *et passim*, and the sub-plot from *Memoires du Comte de Comminges* (1735), by Mme. de Tencin (1682-1749). The uniting of two such disparate works is very neatly done (*Berci*, II, 129 ff.), and is a major alteration in itself. In the translations, CL makes few alterations to *Comminges*, although the translation becomes freer as the story progresses. When *Berci* is compared with *Lysandre*, however (I have used the 1622 edition), major alterations are found. The names of the characters are changed, many minor characters are eliminated, the plot is streamlined, and the translation is fairly free, with CL frequently adding or omitting passages and, in particular, changing the emphasis by such devices as stressing mental, as opposed to physical, beauty and inserting a Richardsonian attack on duelling. These alterations certainly did not come from the earlier English translation (*A Tragi-Comical History of Our Times, under the Borrowed Names of Lisander* [, in some editions] *and Calista*, of which I have seen editions of 1627, 1635, and 1652).

⁷⁵ SJ's remark "you . . . alter" is somewhat ambiguous. He probably means that if CL stressed the extent of her alteration she would simply be blamed for not altering even more. The phrase could also, however, be taken as meaning that either all or some of the alteration had been done by someone else, either in an earlier translation or in collaboration with CL. The evidence outlined in n. 74 above makes me favor the first alternative, but the second cannot be entirely ruled out; CL may have had assistance, or another English translation of *Lysandre* (now lost) could have existed.

and if you were not too proud already, I would tell you, that you are now got above their malice, and though you cannot expect to be always equally successful, have such a degree of reputation as will secure you from any neglect of readers or Stationers.⁷⁶

When Mr Lennox brought me *Berci* he said *you desired me to say something about it*, which I promised without hesitation, but I did not then understand the request, nor imagined that he had any thoughts of the pamp[h]let,⁷⁷ I conceived that you wanted me to say something to Millar.⁷⁸ There is so little room in the monthly book,⁷⁹ that I believe no mention will ever be made in it but of originals, or books of science or learning. This rule, however, I would gladly break to do you either service or pleasure.

If there be any episode or little story, more your favourite than the rest, that can be separated and will fill about four or five columns, I will press its insertion, and let it have its natural weight with the publick.⁸⁰ But I do not think it worth your while, our readers are few, and I know not when they will be more. [blank space] to Sully I am in debt.⁸¹ If you can point me out a passage that can be referred to the present times, I will press for a place in the Gentleman's Magazine, and write an Introduction to it, if I can not get it in there I will put it in the new book,⁸² but their readers are, I think, seven to one.

I have seen Mrs Brookes, and Miss Reid,⁸³ since I saw you, and I

⁷⁶ "Stationers" is an eighteenth-century synonym for "booksellers" (i.e. book-seller/publishers in modern usage).

⁷⁷ Presumably the monthly *Literary Magazine*, first published in May 1756, of which SJ was at this time editor (SJ *Bibliography*, p. 75).

⁷⁸ Andrew Millar (see No. 3, note 13 above), who published *Berci*.

⁷⁹ Again, the *Literary Magazine*.

⁸⁰ No such "insertion" from *Berci* was ever made.

⁸¹ The approving reference is to *Sully* 55, by far the most interesting, useful, popular, frequently-published, and longest-lived of all CL's translations. SJ's indebtedness has been shared by historians ever since. Part of CL's translation was reprinted by the Peace Book Club as recently as 1940 (*Erasmus, Sully, Grotius: Three Peace Classics*, ed. J. H. Joyce). For modern discussion of the significance of the original *Memoires*, see E. C. Lodge, *Sully, Colbert, and Turgot* (1931), and D. Buisseret, *Sully and the Growth of Centralised Government in France 1598-1610* (1968).

⁸² SJ's approach to *GM* was either unsuccessful or unattempted, as no extract from *Sully* appeared there. The *Literary Magazine* published an extremely flattering review, probably by SJ, in October 1756 (II, 281). This review did indeed stress the relevance of the memoirs to contemporary politics, and included an extract (not in itself a particularly good example of this relevance) from the work.

⁸³ Both unidentified.

heard of you at bothe houses, yet, what much surprised me I heard no evil.

I am, Madam, Your most obedient and most humble Servant

Sam: Johnson

July 30. 1756.

16

[Wednesday 23 February 1757].⁸⁴ David Garrick.

Address: To Mrs. Lennox.

Madam,

I have read over Your Pastoral Opera⁸⁵ with great attention — but it can't possibly be of y^c. least Service to You or y^e. Managers⁸⁶ <to> /y^t. it sh^d. / appear upon our Stage — All y^c Musical performances w^{ch}. we have Exhibited since y^e. Chaplet & Lottery have not paid half y^e Expences of getting 'Em up —⁸⁷ Nothing can Support a

⁸⁴ The year is conjectured from the assumption that *Philander* is under discussion. In 1757, Ash Wednesday fell on Wednesday 23 February.

⁸⁵ Probably *Philander: A Dramatic Pastoral*. This work is an unimpressive adaptation of Guarini's *Il Pastor Fido*, fully deserving MR's lukewarm assessment as "poetical, romantic, and pretty enough, upon the whole" (XVII, 568; December 1767). It embodied sixteen songs, some of which were in turn adaptations or unacknowledged reprints from CL's own earlier publications. At least the first part of Baker's statement that it was a "Piece not intended, nor indeed of Merit sufficient for the Stage" (*The Companion to the Playhouse*, 1764 edition, unpaginated, 1, sig. Q5^r) seems erroneous. As the CR review points out, "Very few dramatic performances have of late been favourably received, without first appearing on the stage. This is the criterion of merit with the generality of readers" (IV, 468; November 1757). In fact, this review hints that *Philander* had been rejected by some theatre, and the possibility of inside information on the reviewer's part is enhanced by his having apparently written and published his piece — mentioning no price or publisher — before *Philander* was officially published (3 December 1757).

⁸⁶ Since 1747, the co-managers at Drury Lane had been James Lacy and DG himself.

⁸⁷ None of the musical afterpieces specifically mentioned in the remainder of this letter are referred to in *Garrick Letters*. The highly popular *Chaplet* was written for Drury Lane by the stockbroker-poet Moses Mendez (d.1758) and set to music by William Boyce (c.1710–1779, organist, composer, musical editor, Master of the King's Music, and a frequent contributor to Garrick's musical productions). It was first performed on 2 December 1749, and frequently staged thereafter, the most recent performance in relation to the present letter being on the previous Friday, 18 February 1757; see *The London Stage 1660–1800* — hereinafter referred to as *LS* — no general editor (Carbondale, Ill., 1960–), Pt. 4 (1747–1776), ed. by G. W. Stone, Jr. (1962), pp. 135, 158 ff., 582, *et passim*.

The Lottery could be either Henry Fielding's ballad-opera of that name, with

Musical Drama upon our Stage, but great Spirit (&) /with/ Songs of a Comic Cast — We are Engag'd to two performances of this Kind y^e *British Enchanters*, w^{ch}. is set by Mr. Arne, & to a Pastoral Drama (from y^e Italian I believe) but greatly Enliven'd with Songs of Humor — If we can possibly be Excus'd from these or one of 'Em, we certainly shall,⁸⁵ for not one Musical Performance has Answer'd to us but y^e *Chaplet*, w^{ch}. was y^e first, & written by Mr. Mendes — I sh^d. have answer'd y^r. Letter sooner but my Business & Illness together have prevented Me.

I am Mad^m Your most obed^t hum^le Serv^t

D: Garrick

PS. My objections to y^r. opera are, that there is a dramatic Spirit &

music originally by a Mr. Seedo, first performed at Drury Lane on 1 January 1732 (rev. version 28 September 1732; see W. L. Cross, *The History of Henry Fielding*, New Haven and London, 1918, I, 116-117, and LS, Pt. 3, ed. A. H. Scouten, 1961, pp. 180 and 234) or the less popular *Shepherd's Lottery*, again by Mendez and Boyce, written for Drury Lane and first performed 19 November 1751 (LS, Pt. 4, pp. 258, 272-278, *et passim*). Fielding's *Lottery* had been frequently performed at Drury Lane during DG's regime until the writing of Mendez' work. Although from then — 19 November 1751 — until the date of the present letter it was performed far more often at Covent Garden than at Drury Lane, Garrick staged it six times (once in 1751, thrice in 1753, once in 1755 and on 13 November 1756). Mendez' *Shepherd's Lottery* appeared twenty-four times at Drury Lane within the same period (thirteen times in 1751, four times in 1752, five times in 1753, twice in 1754 — last performance 18 April — and not at all thereafter), but was never performed at any other theatre (LS, Pts. 3 and 4, *passim*). Although the total profitability of Fielding's work throughout its theatrical life would be far greater than Mendez', one suspects that DG had *The Shepherd's Lottery* in mind in the present letter.

No play called *The British Enchanters* was performed either at Drury Lane or at any other London theatre during the period 1747-1776, and the only known drama of that name is Sir George Lansdowne's verse tragedy, *The British Enchanters; Or, No Magick Like Love* (1706), which is hardly appropriate. Thomas Augustine Arne (1710-1778, the leading English composer of the period, who until his 1760 quarrel with DG did much work for Drury Lane), never appears to have written any musical work of that title. One must conclude, then, that the DG/Arne *British Enchanters* project was abandoned. Either its name or its content was revived in 1760, when a new musical entertainment called *The Enchanter*, with words by DG and music by John Christopher Smith (1712-1795, organist and composer, best remembered for his oratorios and his close association with Handel) was first performed at Drury Lane on 13 December (LS, Pt. 4, pp. 808 and 830).

⁸⁵ Garrick apparently succeeded in being excused. The 1757-1758 Drury Lane program described by Stone as "varied but solid" (LS, Pt. 4, p. 607), contained no new musical afterpieces. The "Pastoral Drama" is unidentified.

Interest wanting thro y^e whole — Not but there are many detach'd beauties w^{ch}. gave me great Pleasure.

Ashwednesday.

17

Thursday 10 March [1757].⁸⁹ Samuel Johnson.

Address: To Mrs Lenox at Mr Cooper's in Gerard Street Soho

Postmark: [illegible]

Madam

March 10

I saw last week at Mr Dodsly's⁹⁰ a Book, call'd *Histoire des Conjurations par P. Tertre*⁹¹ which I told him was a good book, so far as could be judged by the title, for him to publish, and for you to translate. He seem'd not to dislike the proposal, but had not then all the volumes, I think he had only the Second. Now you have ended *Maintenon*⁹² you may perhaps think on it. I never saw it before, and saw little of it then but fancy it likely to succeed. Mr Dodsly will lend you his volume if you send for it.

I am, Madam, Your most humble Servant

Sam: Johnson

I have no servant,⁹³ and write therefore by the post.

⁸⁹The year is deduced from the *Maintenon* reference.

⁹⁰Robert Dodsley the bookseller (see No. 8, note 44 above).

⁹¹*Histoire des Conjurations, Conspirations et Révolutions Célèbres, tant Anciennes que Modernes . . .*, 10 vols. (Paris, 1754-60). The first eight volumes were written by the former Jesuit François-Joachim Duport du Tertre (1715-1759); SJ's "P." is presumably an abbreviation for "Père." The last two volumes were by Joseph-L. Ripault Desormeaux. I can find no other Johnsonian reference to the work, nor does any English translation appear to have been published.

⁹²According to the financial arrangements for *Maintenon* (preserved in British Museum Add. MS. 38730, f. 126), the project was under way by June 1756, and the sole edition (five volumes duodecimo; 1,000 copies printed) at least partly printed by the end of December. The work was published on 12 March 1758. CR (III, 347-361; April 1757) complained of misprints and gallicisms. Oliver Goldsmith's review in *MR* (XVII, 80-81; July 1757; reprinted in Goldsmith's *Collected Works*, ed. A. Friedman, Oxford, 1966, I, 80-82) provided an important discussion of the "amphibious" factual/fictional nature of historical memoirs, but said nothing about CL. The *Literary Magazine* (II, 427-431 and 469-473; October and November 1757), possibly at SJ's instigation, paid glowing tributes to CL's knowledge of nature, good taste, and skill as a translator.

⁹³SJ's Jamaican servant Francis Barber (c.1742-1801) attended him from 1752 until SJ's death with only three breaks of service. The first break is the one alluded to here, and occurred when Barber quarrelled with SJ c.1757 and left to serve an apothecary called Farren for some two years. On subsequent occasions, Frank left to join the Navy (7 July 1758 — 8 August 1760), and was sent by SJ to study at a

Sunday 23 April 1758. Gregory Sharpe.⁹⁴

Address: To Mrs. Lenox at Mrs. Wilks's in Hubbards buildings
Kensington

Postmark: Penny Post Paid W/MO.

Madam,

I receiv'd your kind invitation, and assure you nothing but the Gout, w^{ch}. threatens me, shall hinder me from paying my respects to you on Tuesday; when I am glad to find I have a better chance of meeting Mr. Scott⁹⁵ than at my house or his own. My Compliments wait on Mr Lenox from,

Madam, y^r most obed^t. hum^{ble}. Serv^t.

April 23. 1758.

G Sharpe

Friday 6 April 1759. William Robertson.⁹⁶ Edinburgh.

Madam

I had the pleasure, a few days ago, of receiving from you (of) a very obliging letter. I am extremely sensible of the indulgence of the

school in Bishop's Stortford, Herts. (1768 and 1770); see *SJ Letters*; *BLJ*, I, 239, n. 1, and 350, n. 1; and — especially — the Barber/Boswell correspondence, 15 July 1786, in *Correspondence of James Boswell and Other Papers relating to the making of the Life of Johnson*, Yale edition of Boswell's private papers, *Correspondence*, vol. II, ed. M. Waingrow (1969), 163–169. The passage under consideration is important in being the most accurately dateable extant reference to Frank's 1757 escapade (cf. Barber to Boswell, "about 1757," Waingrow, *op. cit.*, 165 and n. 12; and "my Boy is run away," SJ's letter to Lewis Paul conjecturally dated [18 December 1756], *SJ Letters*, No. 100, I, 94).

⁹⁴ Gregory Sharpe (1713–1771), the author of various theological and classical writings, was at this time Prebendary of Yetminster secunda, Salisbury Cathedral. He was later to become Master of the Temple, and Director of the Society of Antiquaries. His only known association with CL is his role as one of her helpers in the *Brunoy* project (No. 20, note 104 below).

⁹⁵ This may be the husband of the "Mr. Scot" referred to in No. 42 below. His identity is most uncertain. He could conceivably be George Lewis Scott (1708–1780), lawyer, mathematician, musician, and antiquarian, a friend of SJ (*BLJ*, IV, 45, n. 3), who was the (estranged) husband of the novelist Sarah Scott (1723–1795) — see W. M. Crittenden, *The Life and Writings of Sarah Scott, Novelist*, Philadelphia, 1932. CL must have known Sarah Scott, though no evidence of their relationship has been found.

⁹⁶ As the endorsement points out, this is "Doctor Robertson the Historian" (1721–1793), whose first major work, *The History of Scotland*, had just been published by Andrew Millar.

publick, in the favourable judgment, which it has passed upon my book.⁸⁷ The approbation which you are so good to bestow upon it, flatters me very much. I should be very happy if it were in my power to contribute any thing towards rendering your *Age of Queen Elizabeth*⁸⁸ as perfect, as the splendor of the subject merits. But my attention to the reign of that Queen was confined (whol) almost wholly to those transactions which related to Scotland. As I am scrupulously exact in referring to my authorities, you will easily find what printed books or Manuscripts I have consulted. My friend Mr Hume⁸⁹ has

⁸⁷ *The History of Scotland* was published on 1 February 1759, and sold exceptionally well (*BLJ*, IV, 78, n. 2, and III, 334). The "favourable judgment" is exemplified by the praise given to WR's impartiality, accuracy, and style in *CR* (VII, 89-103; February 1759). SJ, on the other hand, consistently disparaged it, particularly on account of its long-windedness (*BLJ*, II, 53 and 236-237, also III, 173), although he came to be on very good personal terms with WR (*ibid.*, III, 331-332).

⁸⁸ This proposed work, never published, was presumably abandoned. CL's interest in the project is possibly reflected in her letter of 16 March 1759 to Thomas Birch (1705-1766, historian and miscellaneous writer, Secretary to the Royal Society, and a protégé of the Hardwicke family, *q.v.*, n. 100 below), where she thanks him for his "agreeable present" (Small, p. 25; MS in the British Museum, Sloane 4312, f. 135). In the light of the present letter, it seems most likely that Birch had given her a copy of his *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (1754), and that the Proposals referred to in the letter were for *The Age of Queen Elizabeth*, which CL was attempting to publish by subscription. It should be noted that about this time CL was probably beginning to feel the effects of her nine years of incessant "slavery to the booksellers," as she put it, on both her health and her spirit. She had to be helped with *Brunoy*, her current major project (see No. 20 below). We know that she was ill throughout the winter of 1759/60, and moved to a house in the country until at least October 1760 (CL's letter to the Duchess of Newcastle, 6 October 1760, British Museum Add. MS. 33067, f. 230, and Small, pp. 27-28). *LM*, her periodical, was kept running for eleven numbers, March-November 1760 and January-February 1761, largely through a great deal of surreptitious reprinting of extracts from her former works, combined with generous anonymous contributions of copy from Orrery and others, with the added possibility that the day-to-day work of editing was conducted by Hugh Kelly (see No. 9, note 47, and No. 15, note 72); my analysis of the content of *LM*, with Kenneth O'Leary's comments thereon and on Kelly's participation in *LM*, will be found in O'Leary's unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, "Hugh Kelly, Contributions towards a Critical Biography," Fordham University, 1965, pp. 24-27 — cf. *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXVI (1966), 2190. Another project may have been abandoned c.1760; a newspaper advertisement of a translation by CL of Voltaire's *Histoire de L'Empire de Russie sous Pierre le Grand*, to be published "In a few Days," appeared in the *Public Advertiser* for 1 and 2 August 1760, after which nothing more was heard of the work.

⁸⁹ David Hume (1711-1776), philosopher and historian. WR is referring CL to Hume's recently-published *History of England under the House of Tudor* (1759).

taken a larger view of Elizabeth's reign & character, & has displayed, in my opinion, all that elegance of composition, & depth of reflection, for which his writings are remarkable. In this work, he quotes the Author's he follows with great care, so that you will learn from him what books it is proper to consult with regard to English transactions. Lord Royston has a very large Collection of papers with regard to that Reign, & all of them transcribed from the originals in a fair modern hand, which is a circumstance of no small advantage; I suppose you will find it no very difficult matter to get access to these.¹⁰⁰ By the title which you give your work, I imagine that you do not propose to confine yourself wholly to historical transactions, but will treat at some length, the taste, the authors, the manners &c of that age. This last is a curious subject. The influence of the English nobles was still considerable in that age, & they endeavoured to maintain (by) it by continuing that profuse hospitality which was of so much consequence in more remote times. The country & not the town was the place where they displayed their splendor. The condition of citizens appears not to have been honourable. The standard of fashion & taste was taken from the Spaniards & Italians & not from the French. Hence the pomp of dress & ceremony, the stately demeanour, & the spirit of chivalry remarkable in those days. Of all these, & of many other peculiarities in manners you'll find hints not only in Shakespeare, & other dramatic writers of the time, but many facts with regard to this article may be picked up in the numerous Collections of Papers published concerning Elizabeth's reign. These things I make no doubt have already occurred to yourself in a better manner than I can point them out. I mention them only to shew my willingness to obey your commands. If in carrying on your plan you find that I can be of the least use, you have nothing more to do than to lay your injunctions upon me I am with great regard

Madam, Your most obedient & most humble Servant

Edinburgh 6th April 1759

William Robertson.

¹⁰⁰ Here WR is referring to Philip Yorke (1720-1790), created Viscount Royston in 1754 and 2nd Earl of Hardwicke ten years later. Royston would probably have already heard of CL's work through the medium of his faithful informant Thomas Birch (n. 98 above; cf. No. 12, note 61). He was currently in the process of accumulating the enormous collection of historical manuscript material which is now preserved among the Hardwicke Papers (British Museum). The transcripts referred to by WR (now British Museum Add. MSS. 35841-35844) are described in the *Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the years 1894-1899*, pp. 347-348.

Monday [7 May 1759].¹⁰¹ John Boyle, Earl of Corke and Orrery.¹⁰²
Madam,

I now can work for you, and I will. Whilst I was in that dismal disagreeable house in Marlbro' Street,¹⁰³ my thoughts were locked up, and totally immersed in gloom and melancholy, new objects, my books, & a very convenient house have released them, and I begin to be again myself. I am going over the Preface,¹⁰⁴ correcting, and altering it. I shall enlarge it very much & I hope in a manner you will like, but I must beg M^r Lenox to bring me his transcript that I may make

¹⁰¹ The date is derived from the endorsement "Earl of Corke May 7. 1759," which is in accord with the *Brunoy* reference.

¹⁰² In December 1753 (since writing No. 9 above) John Boyle had inherited — from Garrick's friend Lord Burlington (see No. 12 above) — the additional title, Earl of Corke, which he uses here. As he is normally referred to as "Orrery" by modern scholars, however, his name will be initialled as "O" throughout the following annotation.

¹⁰³ Unidentified. O's town-house was in Great George Street, Westminster (*Letters from Italy*, see No. 9, note 47 above, p. xxxii).

¹⁰⁴ This is the Preface — an original essay, not a translation from the existing French content — to *Brunoy*. O was CL's most active helper, supplying translations of "A Discourse upon the Theatre of the Greeks," "A Discourse upon the Original of Tragedy," and "A Discourse upon the Parallel of the Theatres," as well as the Preface. This prefatory material fills more than a quarter of Vol. I. O was unfortunate in that his portion was badly affected by printers' errors (see CL's apology in *Brunoy*, III, 479). Both the Preface and the "Parallel" were given detailed criticism, not all complimentary, in *MR* (XXIII, 287-302 and 452-467, esp. 462-466; October and December 1760). The remainder of Vol. I — summaries, translations, and discussions of Greek plays, and comparative discussions of the treatment of certain characters, such as Oedipus, by ancient and modern dramatists — was translated by CL herself. She also dealt with all Vol. II (mainly devoted to the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides). In Vol. III, however (dealing mainly with comedy), almost half of the translation was contributed by others. SJ translated the preliminary "Dissertation upon the Greek Comedy," and the oddly-placed penultimate section, the "General Conclusion." James Grainger (1721-1766, physician and poet) translated *The Cyclops*, the prefatory Discourse upon which was supplied by his West Indian friend and would-be patron John Bourryau. Gregory Sharpe (No. 18 above) dealt with *The Frogs*, and an unidentified "young gentleman" with *The Birds* and *Peace*. The Dedication was written — as usual — by SJ, and addressed to the Prince of Wales. The completed work was published on 16 February 1760 by a syndicate including Millar, Dodsley, and several others. CL was very warmly praised in the ensuing *CR* notice (IX, 116-127; February 1760). At the age of about thirty, CL had published her last major translation, and her effective literary career (in the sense of producing major literary works) was almost at an end.

it answer my own. I could wish to know exactly what plays that are in the *Theatre Grec* have been imitated on our stage. I dare not ask you to come to see me, least I offend your too great delicacy: Orders & attendance on workmen will I fear hinder me from waiting upon you: yet the Park is pleasant but y^r pleasure is always the wish of

Y^r most humble servant

Monday

Corke

21

Tuesday 29 May [1759].¹⁰⁵ David Garrick

Address: To M^{rs} Lennox at Kensington.

Postmark: Penny Post Paid W/TM

Madam.

Tuesday May 29th

In my Multiplicity of Business at the Close of our Acting Season,¹⁰⁶ I forgot to Acknowledge the receipt of y^r. Letter:

I always deliver my Sentiments wth. freedom when I like, & with caution when I dislike — *Henrietta*¹⁰⁷ pleas'd me much, & wants, I

¹⁰⁵The endorsement, "M^r Garrick May 29. 1758," conflicts with DG's "Tuesday May 29th," as 29 May fell on a Monday in 1758. Given this contradiction, it seems safer to rely on DG rather than on the anonymous endorser, who was probably influenced by the fact that *Henrietta* was published in 1758. Taking Garrick's date in conjunction with the *Henrietta* reference, we find that the possible years of writing are 1759 or 1764. As DG lived abroad from September 1763 until April 1765 (*Garrick Letters*, I, xli-xlii), 1759 emerges as the most likely conjectural date.

¹⁰⁶Drury Lane's season ended two days later, on Thursday 31 May (*The London Stage*, Carbondale, Ill., 1960-, Pt. 4, p. 732). As always DG had endured many "Troubles & Disappointments" during the season (see, e.g., DG's letter to Hawkesworth, Thursday 19 [April 1759], *Garrick Letters*, No. 230, I, 306).

¹⁰⁷CL's novel *Henrietta* was published by Andrew Millar on 28 January 1758, and was hailed by the reviewers — MR taking its cue from CR; see CR, V, 122-130; February 1758, and MR, XVIII, 273; March 1758 — as "one of the best and most pleasing novels that has appeared for some years" (CR, V, 130). CL's eviscerated and sentimentalized dramatization of *Henrietta* was disastrously staged under the title of *The Sister* at Covent Garden eleven years later, on Saturday 18 February 1769 (see Nos. 25-27 below). This is probably the play that CL had unsuccessfully offered to DG in October 1768 (CL's letter to DG, 25 October 1768; British Museum Add. MS. 29300, f. 45, printed in Small, p. 36). In her letter CL thanked DG for "a hint you gave me some years ago, which has furnishd [*sic*] me with one of the most interesting incidents in the whole piece." It is most unlikely that CL would ask DG for advice about prose fiction, but equally likely that she would go to him (in spite of their differences over *SI*; see No. 12 above) if she wanted guidance on the writing and staging of drama. The most reasonable interpretation of the *Henrietta* reference is therefore that CL had dramatized her novel by May 1758, had sent her MS (entitled *Henrietta*) to DG for criticism (cf. Nos. 2-3 above), and subsequently abandoned the project (cf. No. 19, note 98) until 1768.

think /only/ some little alterations to compleat /it./ — I am much flatter'd that the Author approves of the little hints I gave.

I am Mad^m. Your most hum^{le} Serv^{vt}

D Garrick

22

Tuesday 7 July 1761. Saunders Welch.¹⁰⁸ Long Acre.

Address: To M^{rs} Lenox the first House on the right Hand on Camberwell Green with a Basket

Dear Mad^m.

Long Acre 7 July 1761

I am vry well thank heaven — which I think better placed in the front than in the rear; as it settles the material point. — Indeed the heat of the day, the anxiety naturally arising from the first riding a Horse of spirit whose dispositions (are) /were/ were [*sic*]¹⁰⁹ totaly

¹⁰⁸ Saunders Welch (1710–1784), with whom SJ “maintained a long and intimate friendship,” had been appointed as a Justice of the Peace for Westminster on the strong recommendation of Henry Fielding (W. L. Cross, *The History of Henry Fielding*, New Haven and London, 1918, III, 12–14; *BLJ*, III, 216–218), and established a widespread reputation as a faithful and able magistrate. By 1761 he was a widower. According to Lætitia-Matilda Hawkins (*Memoirs, Anecdotes, Facts, and Opinions*, 1824, I, 53–54 and 70–71), SW’s daughters Mary and Anne lived with CL for some time, Mary as CL’s pupil and Anne in an undefined capacity. Miss Hawkins strongly disapproved of the arrangement, describing CL’s household as lacking “all order and method, all decorum of appearance, and regularity of proceeding,” and CL herself as being “of too eccentric a genius to render any service to a young person of less than moderate intellect . . .” The elder daughter, Mary (d.1817), was a celebrated beauty of limited understanding, said to have been the original of SJ’s Pekuah in *Rasselas* (Hawkins, *op. cit.*, I, 57). She married Joseph Nollekens the sculptor in 1772, apparently taking with her the only known traces of CL’s educational influence in the shape of copies of *Sully 55*, *Henrietta*, and *LM* (sale-catalogue of Nollekens’ library, 18–19 December 1823, items 30, 70, and 86). In married life she was accused of keeping low company (into which category Miss Hawkins would no doubt have put CL), such as opera-singers and servants. She naturally had a wide circle of acquaintances, too (including a Miss Moser; cf. Introduction above p. 321), in the artistic world, and it is probably through her that CL made contacts in this group (particularly Lady Frances Chambers), which were extremely important to her in her old age. SW’s younger daughter Anne (d.1810) was a formidable intellectual, mistress of seven languages, who cultivated unusually masculine habits such as dressing as a man (complete with sword and manservant) while travelling, and — unsurprisingly, perhaps — died unmarried. For the above and other biographical information relating to the sisters, see *BLJ*; Hawkins, *op. cit.*; and J. T. Smith, *Nollekens and his Times*, ed. W. Whitten, 1920.

¹⁰⁹ This MS has deteriorated slightly since I first saw it in 1965, so that the passage after “whose” now reads: “dispositions [MS damaged] /were/ were.”

unknown, added to the length of the ride, after three months disuse of that exercise, made me quite Crop sick¹¹⁰ — and to mend the matter I eat an immoderate dinner — this I may justly place to the account of a certain Lady, but to accuse her of a fault will gain no Credit I shall therefore bury my resentment at present, but there will come a time I hope for reprisals. — But whatever my resentments may be, that Lady will see that I scorn to make use of them *to save my Bacon*.¹¹¹ Love respects and a thousand wishes for the health and prosperity of Mr & Mrs Lenox, not forgetting the two Girls¹¹² & c

I am Mad^m. most sincerely your Friend & humble Serv^t
Saunders Welch

23

Wednesday 5 June 1765. Sir William Musgrave.¹¹³ Cleveland Court.
Address: To Mrs Char: Lennox.

¹¹⁰ "Crop-sick" (now obsolete) meant "Disordered in stomach, esp. as a result of excess in eating and drinking" (*OED*), in which case SW's self-medication by consumption of "an immoderate dinner" seems scarcely wise.

¹¹¹ The "certain Lady" must be CL, and his "crop-sickness" had been incurred while riding back to London after visiting CL and his daughters in the country, at Camberwell. SW's playful reference to CL's oversensitivity to criticism (cf. No. 15 above) is yet another statement of what was (along with her impetuosity, quarrelsomeness, and general sensitivity) one of her leading traits. His intriguing hint of "reprisals," taken in relation to the general tone of the letter, might suggest that his relationship with CL was not entirely innocent, but no evidence of any such impropriety survives. The "*Bacon*" allusion surely implies that bacon was included among the contents of the "Basket" (see *Address*).

¹¹² SW's daughters (see n. 108 above). CL's new role as governess is a further indication of her moving away from full-time professional writing during this period (No. 19, note 98 above).

¹¹³ Sir William Musgrave, Bart. (1735-1800), barrister, antiquarian, biographer, bibliophile, and outstanding public servant, is now best remembered by eighteenth-century scholars as the compiler of the extremely useful "General Nomenclature and Obituary," better known as *Musgrave's Obituary Prior to 1800* (ed. Sir G. J. Armytage, *Pub. Harl. Soc.*, XLIV-XLIX, 1899-1901). Armytage's Preface (*op. cit.*, XLIV, v-vi), the British Museum catalogues, and the manuscript catalogues of WM's own library, British Museum Add. MSS. 25403 (Methodical) and 25404 (Alphabetical), demonstrate his outstanding zeal for the acquisition of both learning and public office. Among his many appointments (such as Treasurer of the Middle Temple, Commissioner for auditing Public Accounts, Vice-President of the Royal Society, and Trustee of the British Museum) was a Commissionership of the Customs, in which capacity he was most likely to have come in contact with CL's husband (WM is mentioned as a Commissioner in Public Record Office Documents Cust 18/315-320, 1768-1770, and in E. E. Hoon's *The Organisation of the English Customs System 1696-1786*, 2nd edition, introduction by R. C. Jarvis, 1968, *passim*).

St. W^m. Musgrave makes his Compliments to M^{rs}. Lennox & is much obliged to her for the very agreeable present of her writings¹¹⁴ which he accepts & values for their Intrinsic Merit — He is sorry she sho^d. think any acknowledgements necessary for the little Distinctions which he may have had it in his power to shew M^r Lennox & which are entirely due to the very good Character he has heard of him.¹¹⁵

Cleveland Court 5. June 1765

24

Wednesday 8 February 1769. James Murray.¹¹⁶ Stanhope Street.
Madam

I beg pardon for not answering your letter sooner, but I was very much Indispos'd when I had the pleasure to receive it, & was confined for a week after, I very much applaud the goodness of your scheme, in providing for your little girl,¹¹⁷ & I heartily wish it m[a]y

¹¹⁴ The "writings" presented in 1765 appear to have escaped inclusion in the MS catalogues of WM's library (see n. 113 above). The "Methodical" catalogue lists *FQ* "with Cuts" (i.e. illustrated), *The Sister*, and *OCM*, and the second ("Alphabetical") catalogue *Henrietta* "with Cuts." The first illustrated editions of *FQ* and *Henrietta* were not published until 1783 and 1787, respectively (see Small, pp. 249 and 257), so none of the four works listed could have been included in the present referred to. WM presented his copies of *The Sister* and *OCM* (bound with two other plays, shelfmark 643.c.2) to the British Museum on 23 July 1790.

¹¹⁵ The "Distinctions" were presumably shown in connection with Mr. Lennox' "place" (see n. 113 above and No. 24, note 121). The complimentary reference to his character is most unusual, as other surviving comments by CL and others tend to be either neutral or hostile.

¹¹⁶ His relationship to Lady Gower (n. 120 below) and the correlation of the date and circumstances of his death with the content of No. 40 below, identify this correspondent as James Murray of Broughton (1727-1799), a wealthy Scottish landowner and politician. JM sat in the House of Commons as Member of Parliament, first for Wigtownshire (1762-1768), and subsequently for Kirkcudbright Stewartry (1768-1774). Politically, he was a personal friend of the Duke of Newcastle, and a member and "place-man" of the pro-Newcastle Rockingham faction, which was at this time in opposition to the current Grafton/Bedford administration. His wife, Lady Catherine (née Stewart) and her sister, Lady Gower, were daughters of Alexander Stewart, 6th Earl of Galloway. JM died on 30 April 1799 without a legitimate heir, leaving his estate to a natural son — see Sir L. Namier and J. Brooke, *The House of Commons 1754-1790* (1964), III, 184-185; G. E. C[okayne], *The Complete Peerage*, 2nd revised edition, 1910-1959, XII, Pt. 1 (1953), 199-200.

¹¹⁷ The "girl" is CL's daughter Harriot Holles (1765-c.1783/4), who appears to have been ill about this time (No. 27 below). The "scheme" (which is also hinted at in CL's letter to Garrick in October 1768; see No. 21, note 107) is apparently an attempt — subsequently unsuccessful or abandoned — to publish *The Sister* by subscription (see No. 27 below). CL was notably unsuccessful at this kind of activity;

answer your most sanguine expectations, but I must acknowledge myself the worst judge in the world of the propriety of your Intentions, with respect to the great personage you mean to dedicate your performance to, ¹¹⁸ I neither /know/ whither its a uswell ¹¹⁹ /thing/ or the proper method of doing /it/ or if done, whither it will be attended with any advantage to your self, & unless there is a probability of the latter I should think, its not worth the trouble of soliciting such fine Ladys to accomplish your purpose, but of this you are best judge, Lady Gower ¹²⁰ I never care to prevail upon to embarque [?] in an[y] solicitations & My Wife has no Interest, for the same reason that the protection of a Noble Lord was withdrawn from you /viz:/ on account of Mr Lennox having got a Place from the late Duke of Newcastle ¹²¹ so all I can say is, that when your performance is to [be]

no known subscription edition of any of her works exists, despite her numerous attempts over a period of more than forty years (cf. Nos. 31, 38, 39, and 47 below).

¹¹⁸The published version of *The Sister* carried no dedication. See n. 121 below for discussion of the possible identity of CL's intended patron.

¹¹⁹"uswell" is presumably a mis-spelling of "usual."

¹²⁰JM's sister-in-law Susanna Leveson-Gower (née Stewart), Countess Gower (1743-1805), third wife of Granville Levison-Gower (1721-1803), at this time 2nd Earl Gower (later Marquess of Stafford) and, as Lord President of the Council, one of the leading Government ministers. Gower was a member of Staffordshire's most influential family, had been Member of Parliament for SJ's home town of Lichfield for a brief period in 1754, and incurred the wrath of SJ (who wanted to use him as a living definition of "renegado" in the *Dictionary*) by his political manoeuvring in 1749. In the 1760's, he, with his brother-in-law the Duke of Bedford, was leader of the powerful, anti-Newcastle, Bedford faction. As Lady Gower would follow her husband's political allegiance, she and JM therefore belonged to opposing political factions. The Bedfords, as opponents of Newcastle during his lifetime, were in opposition during the Newcastle/Pitt administration which ended in May 1762. They took office throughout the (anti-Newcastle) Bute and Grenville administrations (1762-1765), went into opposition during the first brief (pro-Newcastle) Rockingham administration (1765-1766), and chose to remain out of office for the first part of the Chatham/Grafton administration, but eventually agreed to join it in 1768. When Chatham resigned later in the same year, leaving the administration in the hands of Grafton, the Bedfords became the dominant political group of the 1768-70 period, with Grafton virtually "the prisoner of the Bedfords" (J. Steven Watson, *The Reign of George III 1760-1815*, Oxford, 1960, pp. 67-131 *passim*, esp. pp. 129-130). Lady Gower's power of patronage was now therefore at its height, and her love of wielding it was notorious. According to Horace Walpole, "her life was a series of jobs and solicitations, and she teased every Minister for every little office that fell in his department. She made a thousand dependants and enemies, but no friend" — quoted in G. E. C., *Complete Peerage*, XII, Pt. 1 (1953), 199-200, notes.

¹²¹For the sake of clarity, the discussion of this section of the letter must begin

with a brief mention of "the late Duke of Newcastle." Thomas Pelham-Holles, first Duke of Newcastle (1693-1768), was "the greatest electioneer and manipulator of personal allegiances of the century" (Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 68). He held high government office almost continually from his appointment as Secretary of State in 1724 until 1762. Within this period he established complete control of political patronage, civil, military, and ecclesiastical, down to the lowest levels: "he made certain that the meanest government official in the Customs and Excise [the area in which CL's husband was probably involved], or in the service of the Admiralty or the Post Office, had to use his vote, if he had one, in accordance with instructions or lost his job" (J. H. Plumb, *England in the Eighteenth Century*, Harmondsworth, 1950, pp. 39-40). When CL dedicated *Sully* to him in November 1755, he was leader of the current administration. Under pressure from Grenville and Bute, he resigned from office on 26 May 1762, and stayed out during the Bute and Grenville administrations (1762-1765). Bute carried out a purge of Newcastle's place-men, or "Pelhamite Innocents," in 1763 (Watson, p. 89). Newcastle returned briefly to office as Lord Privy Seal during the administration of his supporter Rockingham (1765-1766), but was forced out again for the last time by his former colleague William Pitt (now the Earl of Chatham) in July 1766. His wife, Henrietta, with whom CL had a good deal of contact, died in 1776.

According to the present letter, JM's wife (presumably a Rockingham supporter, like himself) had no "Interest" (i.e. influence) with whomever CL wished her to approach because Mr. Lennox was known as a Newcastle "place-man." Unfortunately, the exact nature of Mr. Lennox' connection with Newcastle is—like most of his career—far from clear. Our evidence of this connection begins after the publication of *Sully* 55. According to the fullest and probably most reliable contemporary biography of CL (namely, the anonymous "Memoirs of Mrs. Lennox," *Edinburgh Weekly Magazine*, LVIII, 33-36; Thursday 9 October 1783, hereinafter referred to as *EWM*), Newcastle then offered CL a pension, but she "very politely [and unwisely] declined in favour of her husband, for whom she solicited a place, which the Duke promised to procure him at the first opportunity." Nothing more is heard of this until CL's letter to the Duchess of Newcastle, 6 October 1760 (see No. 19, note 98), in which CL says she has heard that the Duchess "continues [her] favourable intentions with regard to Mr. Lennox." *EWM* states that the Duchess procured a place for Mr. Lennox after the publication of the second edition of *Henrietta* (published 20 March 1761), and this is seconded by J. W. Croker's statement that the Duchess procured Mr. Lennox "the place of tidewaiter in the customs" besides acting as godmother to CL's daughter Harriot (Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, ed. Croker, 1831, I, 208, n. 2). Finally, Musgrave's letter (No. 23 above) also suggests that Mr. Lennox had a post in the Customs by 1765. One would therefore conclude that Lennox became a tidewaiter through the influence of the Duchess some time between October 1760 and June 1765. We know that he was a Deputy King's Waiter in the Customs from 1773 to 1782 (Séjourné, p. 20), but so far the Customs library staff, M. Séjourné, and I have been unable to find any record of previous service. The possibility that he might have been the Alexander Lennox involved in a foolish attempt to become recognised as Earl of Lennox in 1768 also complicates matters, but cannot be gone into here; see Séjourné, *ibid.*, and Agnes Kynaston, "Life and Writings of Charlotte Lennox" (M.A. thesis, Birkbeck College, London, 1936), pp. 26-27.

CL's difficulties as outlined in the present letter are as follows. First, she has

Acted,¹²² I shall with pleasure attend it, with as many of my acquaintances as I can prevail upon to go & I most sincerely wish it may meet with the most favourable Reception & I am

Madam Your Most Ob^t. Serv^t.

Stanhope Street Jas. Murray.

Feb: 8th 1769

pray excuse this scroll but I am obliged to go out in five minutes & much hurried

(To be continued)

lost the "protection of a noble Lord" because of Lennox' political affiliations. The "Lord" is most likely to have been the Earl of Bute, who (with his wife; see No. 32 below) may have given CL assistance before Lennox became committed to Newcastle. Second, for the same political reason, Lady Murray is said (truthfully or otherwise) to have no "Interest" (i.e. influence) in helping CL to solicit certain members of the aristocracy. These desired supporters must therefore have belonged to a faction — probably the currently-dominant Bedford group — which was hostile to Newcastle's place-men. Our knowledge of CL's social contacts brings no such people particularly to mind. If CL had wanted to dedicate *The Sister* to one of the Gowers themselves, one would have expected JM's response to be rather more specific. CL may, of course, have cast her eye on another member of the Duke of Bedford's family, or on the Graftons. At any rate, CL's third problem is that, for personal reasons, JM refuses to trade on his relationship with the influential Lady Gower. As Lady Gower was in a sufficiently powerful position to over-rule the political scruples of lesser mortals, this refusal must have been a particularly annoying set-back for CL — but these political considerations might have made Lady Gower hostile to CL in any case, even if she had won JM's intercession. As the current administration's political problems — such as the Wilkes affair — were at their height at this time, the timing of CL's solicitations appears to be exceptionally bad. It also seems odd that CL did not circumvent the impediment of her husband's place by seeking a patron from the Royal Family, as she had done with *Brunoy* and was to do again in 1775 (see Nos. 20 above and 30-31 below). That CL was in the Queen's favor at this time is shown by the fact that by October 1768 — possibly through the Duchess of Newcastle's influence (Croker, *ibid.*) — she had been given accommodation in Somerset House, "a sort of aristocratic almshouse" (J. B. Chancellor, *The Annals of the Strand*, 1912, p. 195) belonging to the Queen (see CL's address in Nos. 26-27 below).

¹²² See Nos. 25-27 below.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

MARCIA ALLENTUCK, Associate Professor of English at The City College, New York, is the author of *The Achievement of Isaac Bashevis Singer*, which was published by the Southern Illinois University Press in 1969.

MYRON P. GILMORE, who is the author of a number of books and articles, has taught at Harvard since 1937. He was appointed Professor of History in 1954 and Director of I Tatti in 1964.

HELEN E. HAWORTH is Associate Professor of English at the University of Waterloo.

DUNCAN ISLES teaches at Birkbeck College of the University of London; his "Johnson, Richardson, and *The Female Quixote*" appears in the new edition of *The Female Quixote* (ed. M. Dalzel) that was published in the *Oxford English Novels* series during 1970.

ERNST KITZINGER is A. Kingsley Porter University Professor at Harvard and a Member of the Board of Scholars for Byzantine Studies at Dumbarton Oaks. He is the author of numerous monographs and articles.

MERLIN W. PACKARD is Librarian of the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library.

FRITZ REDLICH has contributed articles to two previous issues of the BULLETIN; an autobiographical sketch appears (pp. 11-42) in his *Der Unternehmer, Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichtliche Studien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964).

EDWARD F. J. TUCKER, who was awarded a Ph.D. in English by Harvard in 1970, is now teaching at Southern Methodist University.

WILLIAM R. TYLER has been Director of the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection since 1969.