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IN 1950 the John Rylands Library received on deposit from Major F. E. G. Bagshawe of Ford Hall the extensive muniments of the Bagshawes of Ford, one of the oldest families in Derbyshire. This collection is rich in eighteenth century material, among which two groups in particular stand out: the personal and military papers of Colonel Samuel Bagshawe (d. 1762) and the family papers of his brother-in-law Sir James Caldwell (d. 1784), 4th Baronet of Castle Caldwell, co. Fermanagh. The former are more circumscribed and compact, the latter, with which we are concerned here, more miscellaneous in nature, for Caldwell busied himself with many activities—political, military, social, economic and literary—and all are represented with varying degrees of fullness. His main interests were undoubtedly political and among his own writings, which are comparatively numerous, literary topics are not represented. Nevertheless, as an author himself, frequently in touch with publishers, and as one who engaged extensively in social life, notably in Dublin, London and Bath, he had a number of contacts in the literary world and his letters and papers provide some interesting footnotes to the general body of literary information of the time. He was, for example, a friend of Lady

1 I take this opportunity of expressing my thanks to Major Bagshawe both for the interest he has kindly shown in this article while it was in the course of preparation and for his readiness to assist with information relating to his family collections.

2 Colonel of the 93rd Regiment of Infantry, M.P. for Tallagh, co. Waterford, and for some years Second in Command in the East Indies.

3 Colonel Bagshawe married Catherine Caldwell on 25th March, 1751.
Mary Wortley Montagu, of Dr. Johnson and Dr. Hawkesworth, of Garrick and of Arthur Young, and corresponded with Garrick's friend Albany Wallis, with the would-be dramatist Gorges Howard and with Swift's 'prince of Dublin printers', George Faulkner. He was on particularly friendly terms with Johnson and Hawkesworth. Some thirty letters exchanged with the latter occur in the collection, either in originals or contemporary copies, together with other papers, while as regards Johnson himself perhaps the most interesting survivals are the Caldwell Minute, which Boswell cites in the *Life* as a source for his account of the famous conversation with George III, and a contemporary copy of the letter which accompanied the Minute when Johnson sent it to Caldwell at the latter's request.

Before describing this material, perhaps something should be said of Caldwell himself, for he is comparatively unknown and, with one exception,¹ the few scattered references which occur in printed sources tell us little of his career. He was the eldest son ² of the 3rd Baronet, Sir John, and his wife Anne, daughter

¹ The privately printed family history, *The Bagshaws of Ford* (1886), by W. H. G. Bagshawe, where (pp. 289-304) will be found an account of the Caldws and their relations; Mr. Bagshawe also left manuscript notes on the family. Unless otherwise stated, the outline biography of Sir James Caldwell given above is based partly on these and partly on Caldwell's own original letters and papers. In the latter case references are given to the relevant documents in the Bagshawe Muniments, which are cited throughout this paper as 'B'. As Caldwell's extensive correspondence is referred to frequently below, it may be noted that it has been arranged in two main blocks: Letter Books (B 3/6-3/12) and, secondly, originals and drafts (B 3/13-3/20). The Letter Books contain copies of his correspondence (1745-1783 *passim*), mostly in bound volumes, made either by himself, or, more frequently, by his amanuenses. The two blocks supplement each other; originals have survived which were not entered in the Letter Books and the Letter Books contain copies of letters now missing. Other Caldwell letters have survived elsewhere, e.g. British Museum Add. MSS. 23, 825-827 *passim* (seven to Sir Thomas Robinson, 1747-1748), 35, 126, f. 123 (to Arthur Young, 1772), 20, 733, f. 21 (to John Almon, 1779); the Forster Collection in the Victoria and Albert Museum (to Garrick, 1776). See also B.M. King's MS. 439. Portraits of Caldwell are in the possession of Major Bagshawe at Ford Hall. One is reproduced in *The Bagshaws of Ford*, pl. facing p. 291.

² His five brothers (Hume, Henry, Frederick, John and Charles) all had distinguished careers. For Hume Caldwell see *D.N.B.* A holograph manuscript of Sir James's 'Life of the late Colonel Hume Caldwell' which he presented to the King is now B.M. King's MS. 427.
of John Trench, Dean of Raphoe, and was born in or about 1720. After an education at Dundalk and Trinity College, Dublin, he, to quote his own words, ‘set out on his Travels and spent sometime in Foreign Courts and Acquainted himself with the Languages and Constitutions of different States.’ While abroad he rendered important military and diplomatic services to Maria Theresa who, in March 1749, created him Count of Milan; he was offered the post of Lord Chamberlain to the Empress but, as an oath of allegiance was necessary, refused it. He also served in Italy under the King of Sardinia, to whom he acted as aide-de-camp. It was during his early travels in France that he first met Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, probably in May 1746. In a letter of 26 May of that year to Montesquieu he refers at length to a conversation he had had with her the previous day and to her views on various subjects. Later the same year he arranged to accompany her to Italy and in one of his early Letter Books he has copied two sets of verses she wrote, one of which does not appear in Wharncliffe’s edition. That there was correspondence between them is clear from a letter which he wrote shortly after her death to her daughter Lady Bute, in which he mentions the ‘Friendship and Regard for me which she had honoured me with during our Stay together in the South of France, and of which she had frequently given me assurances by Letter after

1 To which, according to Burtchaell and Sadleir (Alumni Dublinenses, 1935 edn., p. 127), he was admitted on 22nd March, 1737, being then seventeen years of age.

2 From one of a series of Memorials (B 3/22/1-28) which he addressed to the King, various Lords Lieutenants of Ireland, and others, setting out his claims to an Irish peerage. They are invaluable sources of information for his career.

3 David Hume, who met him in Vienna, was, however, not impressed. See the comment in his letter of 15th April, 1748 to John Home (The Letters of David Hume, ed. Greig, i. 128; in the footnote to that page Caldwell, by a slip, is referred to as ‘3rd Bart.’).

4 B 3/7/1, fos. 24 seq. See also B 3/6/1, fo. 19v.

5 ‘I have made a party to go with Lady Mary Wortsly Montegu to Italy’, Caldwell to Lady Clifford (B 3/7/1, fo. 11); repeated in a letter to Henry Belasyse (ibid., fo. 9v).

6 ‘Verses wrote under General Churchill’s Picture.’ The other set, beginning ‘With toilsome steps I pass thro’ Life’s dull road,’ is printed by Wharncliffe, Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, ii. (1861), 504.
we quitted that Country'.

But in the present collection there has survived only a four-page draft, in rather general terms, of a letter which he wrote to her in or about September 1746. There is, however, in two other letters, evidence of the friendship to which he refers, which apparently lasted until her death. Caldwell remained abroad for some six years, returning to London in May 1749. Thenceforward his travelling appears to have been limited mainly to Ireland and England and he is found frequently in Dublin and London and, later in life, visiting various English watering-places. He began to concern himself more particularly with Irish affairs, so that the Duke of Northumberland could say of him, 'Sir James has made the political and commercial interest of that Kingdom very much his study and has distinguished himself for his zeal and public spirit in endeavouring to promote its trade, agriculture and manufactures and to bring them to a more flourishing state'.

These interests are reflected in the numerous pamphlets he wrote on various subjects and in his English and Irish Debates, for which he is perhaps best known. He also assiduously cultivated a wide circle of political and other friends, both in these islands and abroad, as his surviving correspondence shows. On 21 May 1752 he was made deputy governor of his own county,

1 B 3/16/127. A draft, in Dr. Hawkesworth's hand (v. infra, n. 3).
2 B 3/15/104.
3 In a letter to Lord Newtown, written shortly after her return to England, he states: 'My old acquaintance and agreeable friend Lady Mary Wortley Montague is arrived here [London] extremely well and in good spirits... I have been all this morning endeavouring to persuade her to publish something, but without effect, though I know she writes a great deal and has many excellent performances by her; I cannot tell whether I ever shewed your Lordship any of her MSS. which she did me the honour to give me when I was with her abroad' (B 3/10/595). The second letter (B 3/16/127), the draft mentioned above, made by Hawkesworth for Caldwell to send to Lady Bute, relates to assistance Lady Mary had offered him in his efforts to secure an Irish peerage. To this end he had placed 1,000 guineas in her hands, to lay out as she might think fit. Hearing in July (1762) of her serious illness he hastened from Castle Caldwell to London, but she was too weak to see him, although she sent him assurances through her physician, Mr. Middleton. The purpose of this long letter was to lay the whole case before Lady Bute with a view to recovering the money; it is undated but may be assigned to 1762, shortly after 21st August.

4 Northumberland to Townshend, B 3/10/247.
Fermanagh, and Colonel of a Regiment of Militia there. Four years later he served as High Sheriff. In 1760 he became Colonel Commandant of the 20th Dragoons (the Enniskillen Light Horse), revived at his own expense when invasion threatened; for this service he later (1764) received the Freedom of the City of Dublin. In 1753 he had been admitted as a Fellow of the Royal Society. On 30 January 1762, on the recommendation of the Duke of Devonshire, he was appointed a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber. He died at Castle Caldwell in February 1784, and was buried in the private chapel there. His wife, Elizabeth, whom he married in November 1753, was the eldest daughter of Dr. Josiah Hort, Archbishop of Tuam, by Elizabeth Fitzmaurice, who was sister of Mary, Countess of Shelburne and aunt of William, 2nd Earl of Shelburne, later 1st Marquess of Lansdowne.

Caldwell and Shelburne were on friendly terms and we may note in passing that when, encouraged by the latter, the agriculturist and social economist Arthur Young made his tour of Ireland in 1776, Shelburne wrote a letter recommending him to Caldwell. Young visited Castle Caldwell in August of that year and in his well-known *Tour in Ireland*, published in 1780, he acknowledges his host's hospitable reception and deals at length with Castle Caldwell and its husbandry. In fact, he

1 Papers relating to the Enniskillen Light Horse are now B 3/23. The services of 'Pitt's friend Sir James Caldwell' in this respect are mentioned in Basil Williams's *Life of William Pitt*, ii. 44-45, and Brian Tunstall's *William Pitt*, p. 289, quoting vol. 70 of the Pitt Papers.
2 The Casket presented to him with the Freedom is now at Ford Hall together with many other Caldwell relics.
3 Of their correspondence a few originals, some drafts and several contemporary copies have survived here. Shelburne's father, the 1st Earl, was a trustee under Caldwell's marriage settlement (B 3/25/7) and after his death Caldwell, at his widow's request, wrote his epitaph (B 3/10/154). A brief reference to Caldwell occurs in Fitzmaurice's *Life of William, Earl of Shelburne* (i. 359).
4 B 3/16/411 (1st June 1776). Caldwell and Young were corresponding before this (B.M. Add. MS. 35,126, fos. 123-4, Jan. 1772; B 3/10/360, April 1772).
5 See Arthur Young's *Tour in Ireland* (ed. Hutton), i. 188 sqq., and the index references. In his *Autobiography* (ed. Betham-Edwards) Young again mentions Caldwell's kindness (p. 75) and quotes a characteristic anecdote of him (pp. 69-70).
asked Caldwell’s advice concerning his book. ‘I am perplexed about the Publication of my Tour’, he writes on 28 January 1777,1 ‘I do not want to make it an object of literary profit, but I wish not to be a considerable loser by it. I am told the Dublin Booksellers will give very little for the Copy, but that may be because I do not know the right persons, and as to a Subscription, the difficulties of that would, I suppose, be equal. If they ever publish’d in Ireland, as I think they have, I wish you would give me some Information on this point.’ Caldwell’s reply is not in this collection but later in the year (5 June)2 we find Young informing him that ‘I am advised by all my friends to Publish my Tour of Ireland by Subscription. I have, therefore, taken the liberty to inclose some Subscription receipts which you will be so kind as to distribute.’ Caldwell gave him this assistance, but the latest surviving letter between them (12 July 1779) which remains here indicates that Young was finding this method of publication unsatisfactory.3

Caldwell’s most interesting literary connections, however, were with Dr. Hawkesworth and Dr. Johnson. Although hardly regarded as a major figure by modern scholars, Hawkesworth was of importance in his own day and he has attracted, and no doubt will continue to attract, attention if only by reason of his early intimacy with Johnson. The two had known each other from at least 1743 and so well that, according to Mrs. Thrale,4 Johnson recommended any future biographer of his to apply to Hawkesworth for anecdotes of his early years in London. Both had been members of the old Ivy Lane Club and their association in various projects, notably The Gentleman’s Magazine and The Adventurer, is part of the literary history of the time. So

1 B 3/10/486.
2 B 3/10/493. The Bagshawe Muniments contain three original letters from Young to Caldwell (B 3/16/410, 30th August 1772; 3/16/412, February 1778; 3/16/413, 12th July 1779) and some half-dozen contemporary copies (all in B 3/10, April 1772-July 1779) of which the originals have not survived here.
3 B 3/16/413. ‘It is with Concern that I shall be obliged to advertize to the subscribers I have had in Ireland that I cannot publish owing to a very few gentlemen taking receipts and not returning them.’
close had been their relationship that, Boswell informs us, it was probably 'the residence of his friend Hawkesworth at that place' which led Johnson to have his wife buried at Bromley.\(^1\) In later years they are said to have become estranged, but Caldwell remained on friendly terms with both throughout his life.

Of the two Hawkesworth is the more fully represented in the present collection, which contains twenty-eight\(^2\) of his letters and a number of other papers in his hand. The first surviving letter is dated February 1758, but he and Caldwell were certainly corresponding the previous year\(^3\) and they continued to do so at least until May 1771\(^4\) and very probably until Hawkesworth's death some two and a half years later. But the papers probably add more to our knowledge of him than the letters, for they reveal an entirely new side of his activities: the fact that he acted as a kind of literary adviser to Caldwell, assisting him with the drafting of his political and other pamphlets and even with the wording of his more important personal correspondence. Several of these drafts are still extant and from them we may learn something of their collaboration. In most of the cases Hawkesworth is responsible for writing out the first version, which Caldwell then revises, generally only slightly. Where the process is reversed, we find Hawkesworth revising Caldwell's wording drastically. Caldwell, in fact, seems to have given him full freedom to compose or alter at will, exercising only a general supervision. The draft of the letter\(^5\) which Caldwell sent to

\(^1\) *Life*, i. 241 (unless otherwise stated all references to the *Life* are to the Hill-Powell edn.) She was buried by the Rev. Thomas Bagshaw, perpetual curate there. There is nothing in the Bagshawe Muniments to suggest any direct connection between him and the Bagshaws of Ford.

\(^2\) Twenty-six to Caldwell, two to Lady Caldwell. Of the twenty-six, twelve are originals and the remainder copies which Caldwell had entered in one of his Letter Books (B 3/10); this Book also contains a copy of one letter (1759) from him to Hawkesworth. In addition to the above, there are three letters to Caldwell from Hawkesworth's widow.

\(^3\) The letter of 1758 (Hawkesworth to Caldwell, B 3/10/575) is in reply to one of 8th December 1757.

\(^4\) B 3/10/348. The contents of this lengthy letter—it fills a dozen pages of the Letter Book—indicate clearly that it was not intended to be the last they would exchange.

\(^5\) *Supra*, p. 214, n. 3. This draft runs to four large pages and is imperfect at the end.
Lady Bute concerning Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, for example, is entirely in Hawkesworth's hand. Some two years later (November 1763) he compiles a flattering letter for Caldwell to send to Pitt, but not without expressing his disapproval, for, after copying it out, he adds, 'In compliance with your Request I have now written the Letter to Mr. Pitt, though both my Feeling and my Judgment disapprove the Measure; it is paying Court with too minute an Attention . . . within the Rank of Gentlemen such a subserviency is due from no one Character to another.'

In another example, a letter to Lord Townshend (December 1772) requesting his good offices in the matter of an Irish Peerage, the first draft is in Caldwell's hand, but Hawkesworth's revision amounts almost to a rewriting and he cancels whole passages with which he disagrees. He gave similar help with the wording of two Memorials submitted to the King, one by Caldwell himself, respecting his peerage claim, the other by Caldwell's sister, Mrs. Bagshawe, drawing attention to the services of her late husband, Colonel Samuel Bagshawe.

More striking than the correspondence are the political papers. For example, Caldwell's well-known Account of the Speeches in Both Houses of Parliament, at the Opening of the Session in 1762, which is represented here by two manuscripts. Both are in Hawkesworth's hand and have clearly been read through by Caldwell, who also no doubt provided the basic material. The one, which is imperfect, has survived only in a single leaf, but each side is filled with Hawkesworth's small writing and Caldwell has done no more than strike through and mark 'not to be used' a quotation from Isaac Barre's attack on Pitt; it is omitted both from the printed version and from a fair

1 B 3/16/129. 2 B 3/19/72. 3 B 3/22/5.
4 B 3/16/130. This draft is entirely in Hawkesworth's hand. Cf. Scott and White's Cat. of the Manuscripts remaining in Marsh's Library, Dublin [1913], p. 29, no. cxiii. Colonel Bagshawe died on 16th August 1762.
5 Printed in the Appendix (pp. 563-575) to vol. 1 (1841) of Wright's edition of Cavendish's Debates, from 'two letters addressed by Sir James Caldwell to Lord Viscount Newton . . . contained in a manuscript volume of letters, presented by the writer, on the 30th of August 1763, to the right honourable William Pitt, afterwards first Earl of Chatham, "as a memorial of sincere gratitude and high respect".' See also ibid. p. vi.
6 B 3/21/3a.
copy which is also in the Bagshawe Muniments.¹ In the other,² the debate on Bedford’s motion to end the German war, which runs to over ten pages, there are only two minor emendations in Caldwell’s hand; this text, incidentally, is slightly fuller than either the printed one or another fair copy which Caldwell caused to be made.³ The association of Hawkesworth with work of this kind ⁴ is of particular interest in view of his previous experience, for it was he who, in 1743, had taken over the reporting of the parliamentary debates for *The Gentleman’s Magazine* from Dr. Johnson. In addition to the `Speeches’, he also provided for Caldwell drafts of the *Essay on the Character and Conduct of . . . Lord Visc. Townshend*, which the latter published in 1771,⁵ and for a treatise dealing with the defence of Ireland.⁶ That he gave other assistance in the same direction is clear from a letter he sent to Caldwell in January 1763, which also throws light on the way they worked together: `By the last Post’, he writes, `I sent you my own original, of which I now enclose you the Copy which I procured to be made. I believe in this Copy there are few trivial Improvements which you will discover and adopt upon comparing it with the original. I also enclose (as I did in my last) an account of the Reasons on which several deviations from your own Instructions are founded. It is a great disadvantage on these occasions not to have a personal Conference.’ However, being obliged to make my own Judgment

¹ Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 564; B 3/21/3, respectively. One page only of the latter has survived. ² B 3/21/2a. ³ B 3/21/2.

⁴ As regards its reliability, Caldwell prefaces the account in B 3/21/2 with the following statement: `As I never take notes, but depend upon my Memory for the Speeches, it is impossible but I must sometimes Blend in the Warmth of my Imagination [sic] some of my own thoughts with those of the speakers; I do all in my power to avoid it, but it may happen that I can not distinguish the one from the other. In the Courts of Law it is Necessary to take Notes as to Precedents and Statutes, but a Mere argument or declamation may be better remembered without; for taking Notes Necessarily fixes the mind so much and so long upon Particular parts that it is Impossible to preserve the chain that Connects the whole unbroken.’ Cf. the quotation from the preface to his later (1766) *Irish Debates* given in Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 563.

⁵ B 3/16/141. Part of one leaf only has survived, corresponding to pp. 22-26 of the printed pamphlet.

⁶ B 3/16/140, a fragment, endorsed by Caldwell *Defence of Ireland*. ⁷ Sic.
the Standard I have taxed it to the utmost.'

There is evidence, too, that Hawkesworth helped with the preparation of papers intended to be read by Caldwell before the Dublin Society and on one occasion, at least, he provided a lengthy criticism of a play which the author had forwarded to Caldwell for comment; in the latter case perhaps the circumstances were exceptional, for the play, Gorges Howard's *Almeyda, or the Rival Kings*, was adapted from Hawkesworth's own *Almoran and Hamet*.

Two other literary services performed at Caldwell's request may also be mentioned as they concern apparently unknown, although admittedly trivial, productions of Hawkesworth, a hymn and certain prayers for special occasions. The former, of no importance in itself, is not without interest in that Hawkesworth intended it to be set to music by Charles Burney, 'a very able and Ingenious man now rising into High Reputation . . . I shall be well pleased to see his name and mine stand together.'

The latter, the fruit of an idea of Caldwell that pilferers and other malefactors among his employés could be reformed by prayer, were composed and forwarded to him by Hawkesworth in May 1771. Caldwell's friend Skelton was invited to compose similar prayers but, with more cynicism, firmly refused, as 'the people woud [sic] pray and pilfer; pray with one hand

---

1 B 3/16/128. It is not clear to which particular work this refers, but Caldwell has endorsed it *Relative to the Light Horse*.

2 See B 3/21/9a, a four-page draft in Hawkesworth's hand, with some emendations by Caldwell, of a plan which the latter proposed to that Society in 1764 for encouraging the Dublin fish trade; this draft, with its many alterations, provides a good example of the thoroughness with which Hawkesworth performed these services. B 3/21/9 is a fair copy of the final version.

3 Hawkesworth's letter containing this criticism is B 3/16/134 (3rd October 1767). For Howard's letter to Caldwell see B 3/16/167. Writing to Caldwell on 24th July 1776 (B 3/10/461) Howard mentions that he has almost entirely rewritten his tragedy *The Female Gamester* upon the advice of Doctor Samuel Johnson.

4 B 3/26/54, a printed broadsheet. For Hawkesworth's authorship see B 3/10/604.

5 Hawkesworth to Caldwell, B 3/10/272 (2nd April 1769). For Hawkesworth's friendship with Burney see Percy A. Scholes, *The Great Dr. Burney*, i. 42, 133, 194-196. The setting of the hymn was finally done by John Stanley (B 3/10/280), who composed the music for his oratorios *The Fall of Egypt* and *Zimri*.

6 B 3/10/348. A small collection of these prayers is now B 3/26/56-65.
up, and pilfer with the other in the pocket of him who kneels next'.

Caldwell showed his appreciation of Hawkesworth's help in various ways. He recommended him to friends,\(^2\) for example, and promised to remember him in his will.\(^3\) Even stronger evidence of his confidence is the fact that he entrusted to him the supervision of the education of his two sons, John (his heir) and Fitzmaurice Caldwell, who had been placed with a tutor at Bromley where Hawkesworth lived.\(^4\) He advised him, too, concerning the dedication of his *Telemachus* to Lord Shelburne (Lady Caldwell's cousin)\(^5\) and obtained for him the influence of Shelburne's aunt Lady Arabella Denny.\(^6\) He also endeavoured to further the sale of his works. Thus he helped with the subscription list for *Telemachus*\(^7\) and, in 1769, we find him drawing the attention of a possible subscriber to a projected edition of Hawkesworth's works, 'ready to deliver in about Eighteen Months'.\(^8\) He went to even greater lengths when, in 1771, the

---

\(^1\) Skerton to Caldwell, 27th May 1771 (B 3/17/74). For the Rev. Philip Skerton, see *D.N.B.* Dr. Johnson, hearing that he had sold his library for the support of the poor, called him 'a great good man' (*Dr. Campbell's Diary of a Visit to England in 1775*, ed. J. L. Clifford, p. 86). The Bagshawe Muniments contain 12 original Skerton letters, together with some contemporary copies; they are concerned mainly with his personal relations with Caldwell and in them he expresses himself with considerable freedom.

\(^2\) Among them Mrs. M. Bernard, who writes to Lady Caldwell on 7th April 1768 mentioning that she has given Hawkesworth 'some hours, if not days, employment by putting into his hands many letters of my late Uncle's Hugh Bethell, the celebrated friend of Mr. Pope' (B 3/31/8).

\(^3\) On 25th May 1771 Hawkesworth thanks Caldwell 'for your affectionate attention to me in your Will . . . the Terms in which you have mentioned me do me honour and you have contrived your bequest so that it will be paid me whether I am living or dead' (B 3/10/348). Two drafts of Caldwell's Will survive here, made in 1771 and 1780 respectively (B 3/25/2 and 7), but Hawkesworth is mentioned in neither.

\(^4\) There are numerous references to this supervision in the Hawkesworth-Caldwell correspondence.

\(^5\) See B 3/10/234, 276. In March 1768 Hawkesworth complains to Lady Caldwell that her husband has taken 'the only perfect Copy of my Dedication to Lord Shelburne' to Ireland with him (B 3/31/27).

\(^6\) B 3/10/276.

\(^7\) B 3/10/237, 243; 3/31/27. In a contemporary list of various of Caldwell's receipts and bills occurs 'The cost of Doctor Hawkesworth's Telemachus' (B 3/27/7, fol. 17v.).

\(^8\) B 3/10/286, Caldwell to Dr. King at Oxford.
latter was appointed by Lord Sandwich to revise and publish an account of the late voyages to the South Seas, for, in an effort to protect Hawkesworth's rights, he wrote directly to Tisdal, the Attorney-General for Ireland, asking his opinion on copyright and piracy in that country and, in November of the same year, addressed a similar letter to another legal friend requesting him to make enquiries of a like nature among his law acquaintances.¹

These services did not end with Hawkesworth's death, for in 1776 and 1777 Caldwell, like Dr. Johnson, was consulted about the proposal to publish his Collected Works for the benefit of his widow. Johnson's letters on the subject to Hawkesworth's brother-in-law, John Ryland, may be supplemented by three in the present collection from Mrs. Hawkesworth to Caldwell. On 14 June 1776 she writes to him from Bromley, 'I hop'd before this time to have transmitted to you an Account of the Publication of my long expected Work, but have had it delay'd, as I fear'd I should, by our friend Dr. Johnston to whose Judgment I wish'd to commit the Papers for such a Selection as will I hope do Honour to the Author. I hope, however, as he says that he has almost gone thro' them, that I shall be able to print during the latter [end] of the Summer, so as to publish early in the Winter. I hoped to have received an Account of such things as you had by you and which you supposed would have in some degree been worth the Notice of the Publick, consequently fit to have included in my Miscellaneous Work. There will still be time to send them.'² On 20 July she writes again,³ thanking Caldwell for his interest and telling him that her intended publication remains 'just as when I last mentioned it to you, but I am in daily Expectation of receiving the Papers from Doctor Johnson'; once more she expresses the hope that

¹ These two lengthy and interesting drafts are now B 3/16/336 (Caldwell to Tisdal) and B 3/16/396 (Caldwell to a 'Mr. White'); in the latter Caldwell suggests another means of securing for Hawkesworth the profits of the sale in Ireland 'if nothing can be done in the legal way'.
² From the copy entered in Caldwell's Letter Book, B 3/10/457. Another copy, now B 3/16/143, reads 'Johnson' for 'Johnston' and supplies 'end,' omitted from the former.
³ B 3/10/459.
he will be able to find 'some Tract which will be worth communicating', as distinct from private correspondence, which it was apparently intended also to include. Meanwhile Johnson was in contact with Ryland on the subject and it was not until 27 August 1777 that Mrs. Hawkesworth was able to inform Caldwell that 'I have at length got the Papers from Doc'. Johnson and have enclos'd an Extract from his Letter which came with the Papers'. She felt, however, on general grounds, discouraged from proceeding with the undertaking and, after wondering whether she might not have to publish by subscription, stated that she had postponed her decision on the whole matter for a few weeks; this did not prevent her from suggesting to Caldwell that 'the Arabian Tale and several other Things will certainly make two other Volumes if I shoud find it eligible and publish more than the four Volumes above mentioned [i.e. in Johnson's letter to Ryland, which she quotes]; but I would not add a syllable for any purpose than that of doing honour to the Author, nor will I precipitatly determine in an Affair of such consequence'. The outcome is not clear, but it seems that her mood of discouragement prevailed, for apparently the publication did not take place.

Mrs. Hawkesworth's reference to 'our friend' Doctor Johnson in her letter of 14 June 1776 is only one of a number of indications of the relationship which existed between Caldwell and Johnson. How the two first became acquainted we do not

1 See his letters of 21st September, 1776 (Birkbeck Hill, no. 498), 14th November 1776 (ibid., 501) and, particularly, 12th April 1777 (ibid., 514). References to Johnson's letters throughout are to the numbers of Birkbeck Hill's edition (1892).

2 This is the letter which Johnson wrote to Ryland on 12th April 1777 (op. cit., no. 514). She quotes roughly half of it, omitting ll. 15-29, 40-41. Dr. R. W. Chapman has most kindly allowed me to see the page-proofs containing this letter from his forthcoming edition of Johnson's letters.

3 Sic.

4 Mrs. Hawkesworth to Caldwell, B 3/16/144. 'The Arabian Tale' is Hawkesworth's Almoran and Harriet; an Oriental Tale, referred to in Johnson's letter as 'the Novel' (Birkbeck Hill, no. 514). Mrs. Hawkesworth's discouragement, which had its origin in the circumstances of her husband's death, is also reflected in the letter of 20th July 1776, in which she stresses his Christian principles and, while admitting that his final publication, the Voyages, was financially advantageous, states that it delivered 'the Coup de grace to all my hopes of happiness on earth'.
know, although there are a number of possible points of contact. Several of Johnson’s friends, for example, were either friends or relatives of Caldwell. Among them we may mention Lord and Lady Shelburne,¹ Shelburne’s brother the Hon. Thomas Fitzmaurice, and Lord Marchmont (all relatives of Caldwell), Thomas Barnard, Dean of Derry,² Garrick,³ and, of course, a likely candidate, Hawkesworth himself. Some of these, however, may have become acquainted with Johnson or Caldwell at a date later than that at which these two became acquainted with each other. Exactly when that was we have no evidence to say, but the scattered references brought together here show that they were known to each other for at least twenty years. Thus, on 14 July 1763, in the course of a reply to a request for printed information dealing with the Irish woollen trade, the Dublin bookseller George Faulkner enquires of Caldwell, ‘How are Dr. Hawkesworth and Mr. Johnson? I hope they are both well and that you will be pleased to make my best Wishes and Respects to them, and should be glad to know if the former got my present of Swift’s works to him.’⁴ In or about the same year Caldwell invited Hawkesworth and Johnson to stay with him in Ireland. The former’s letter of thanks has survived and in it he states that should it prove ‘impossible for Mrs. Hawkesworth to accept your obliging Invitation, I shall not have fortitude enough to leave her. Johnson, who is with me, desires his Compliments but he has no thought of

¹ Caldwell married Shelburne’s cousin in 1753 and maintained the friendliest relations with him, often, as this collection shows, staying at his house in London. Johnson was well-known to Shelburne as early as 1762 (see Life, iv. 513-514) and was also friendly with his brother, the Hon. Thomas Fitzmaurice.

² The eight original Barnard letters in this collection (B 3/17/1-7, 9; no. 8 is a draft from Caldwell to Barnard) cover the years 1775-1778, but the two were well-known to each other before this; thus, in no. 1 Barnard refers to himself as ‘an Old Freind’ and in no 2. signs himself ‘Your very Sincere and Faithfull old Freind and Servant.’ On 8th June 1776, Barnard writes: ‘This night Garrick acts King Lear for the last time. He told me he had received a Letter from you lately (v. infra, p. 225), but I believe we shall not tempt him to Ireland. Mrs. B. and I are to be at his house at Hampton next week’ (B 3/17/2).


⁴ Faulkner to Caldwell, in London, B 3/16/88.
crossing the Channel.' 1 Again, Caldwell's brother John, writing to him from London on 22 April 1771, asks, 'Did not your friend Doctor Johnston's Pamphlet upon Falkland Islands give you great pleasure? It has been exceedingly admired.' 2 A further indication of their friendship occurs in a letter which Caldwell wrote to Garrick in 1776. In the Spring of that year he had invited Garrick to stay at Castle Caldwell and on 14 May Garrick sent him a reply 3 which, although very warm, was rather inconclusive. In the course of it Garrick mentioned that 'our poor friend Wallis' 4 was still greatly distressed by a recent bereavement, and Caldwell seized the opportunity to write again two days later 5 suggesting that Wallis should visit Castle Caldwell as a distraction from his grief and that Garrick should accompany him. The latter seems to have responded favourably, for on 3 June Caldwell sent him a long and detailed letter. 6

1 Hawkesworth to Caldwell, B 3/16/130 (imperf.); accompanying Hawkesworth's draft of Mrs. Bagshawe's Memorial to the King (v. supra, p. 218). According to Boswell, Johnson 'shewed upon all occasions an aversion to go to Ireland' (Life, iii. 410).
2 B 3/13/83, Caldwell being at Castle Caldwell. Johnson's Thoughts on the late Transactions respecting Falkland's Islands was published in March 1771 (see Courtney's Bibliography of Samuel Johnson, rev. Nichol Smith, pp. 115-16).
3 Garrick's original is now B 3/16/114—Caldwell had a copy of it entered in his Letter Book (B 3/10/450)—and his draft is in the Forster Collection in the Victoria and Albert Museum (Garrick Corresp., ii. fos. 85-6). It is printed in The Private Correspondence of David Garrick, ii. (1832), 150. I am obliged to Mr. Arthur Wheen, Keeper of the Library in the Victoria and Albert Museum, for his kind assistance with this and the two references below to the Forster Collection.
4 Albany Wallis, Garrick's friend and executor and the donor of the monument to his memory in Westminster Abbey, whose only son, an Abbey chorister, had been drowned in March; Garrick erected the memorial in the Cloisters. Wallis's reply to a letter of sympathy from Caldwell on this occasion is now B 3/16/386. The collection contains 3 other letters from Wallis to Caldwell (1775-1779), together with many of his business letters and papers, for he was the legal adviser to Mrs. Bagshawe, Caldwell's sister.
5 Caldwell to Garrick, 16th May 1776 (V. and A. Museum, Forster Coll., Garrick Corresp., ii. fo. 87).
6 Caldwell's original is now V. and A. Museum, Forster Coll., Garrick Corresp., ii. fos. 88-93, from which it was printed in Notes and Queries, 8th ser., i. (1892), 1; his draft is B 3/16/115. As Dean Barnard suspected (vide supra, p. 224, n. 2), the visit was never paid. In a letter of February 1779, written from Bath to Lord Townshend, Caldwell, mentioning Garrick's decease, refers
'marking out to you the rout which I so earnestly wish you and Mrs. Garrick to take', and describing the various places through which they would pass. Among them was Market Hill, and, Caldwell continues, 'it was at Market Hill, as you know, that Dean Swift wrote many of his poems, in particular "Hamilton's Bawn"... Doctor Johnson, who wished to insert in his "Dictionary" every word authorised by Swift, asked me what a bawn meant. I told him and yet he has neglected to insert it.' This interest in the Dictionary is shown in another letter, which has survived in draft form. Writing to a publisher (un-named) recommended to him by 'my particular Friend' Albany Wallis, concerning the reprinting of an Appendix to his Irish Debates, Caldwell suggests in a post-script that a work might profitably be published dealing with the various authors cited as sources in the Dictionary, adding 'you are the first person, as a Publick Spirited Man, that I have ever mentioned this scheme to, not even to Doctor Johnston, tho' I have the pleasure of being well acquainted with him.' He was also acquainted with Mrs. Thrale, for on 3 June 1780, in a letter to Johnson written from Bath, she mentions him as one known to both of them. Three days later, writing to her, Johnson has a reference to a 'Sir James' who may well be Caldwell.

However close the friendship between Johnson and Caldwell may have been, it was not sufficient to ensure the latter receiving to him as 'my most amiable and much esteemed acquaintance' and states that he has written to 'some literary friends in London' asking them to send an elegy or monody on his death, 'its being the subject for the Prize Poem next Thursday senight at Bath' (B 3/15/144, draft).

1 B 3/16/418. See also the bill from Faulkner, infra, p. 235, n. 2.

2 Rylands English MS. 540/98. 'Everybody is going. Mrs. Byron, Mrs. Lambert, all the folks. Sir James Coldwall [sic] has shone enough—he must go to his Aphelion now.' (See also the following note.) While at Bath Caldwell had been giving a series of concerts (B 3/15/149, draft letter to Townshend).

3 Letters, no. 675 (6th June 1780): 'And you think to run me down [apparently to Bath] with the Bishop [of Peterborough] and Mrs. Carter, and Sir James.' Birkbeck Hill comments, 'Sir James was probably the same man as Sir J. C— who invited far more people to his party than his rooms would hold; "a bawling old man".' His reference is to Mme. D'Arblay's Diary. In her own annotated copy of Johnson's letters to her, published in 1788, Mrs. Piozzi, as she then was, noted at the side of this letter: 'I have forgotten who Sir James was'.
a mention by Boswell in the Life, or rather in the body of that work. Many others, of course, with much stronger claims were also passed by and, as Birkbeck Hill has pointed out, an interesting paper might be written on the subject of such omissions. But although not mentioned in the body of the Life, Caldwell is referred to in a foot-note as being the former owner of a document which Boswell used as a source—and, as it appears, the main source—for his account of Johnson's conversation with George III in the Queen's House in February 1767. Now this conversation has an interest of its own, for Boswell himself considered it to be not merely 'one of the most remarkable incidents of Johnson's life' but also one of the two main attractions of his biography, the other being, of course, the Chesterfield letter. Although it extended only to eight pages, he had it printed separately in 1790 from the same type as the corresponding portion of the Life (then going through the press) and issued at the exorbitant price of half a guinea; the Chesterfield letter, which filled only four pages, had been similarly off-printed and priced earlier the same year. 'The intention',

1 Letters, no. 88. Other circumstances apart, Caldwell's association with Hawsworth (whom Boswell attacked for his 'provoking effrontery') would hardly be in his favour.
2 Life, ii. 34, n. 1. The account of the conversation with the King is on pp. 33-42.
3 'One of the most remarkable incidents of Johnson's life, which gratified his monarchical enthusiasm, and which he loved to relate with all its circumstances, when requested by his friends' (ibid. ii. 33).
4 Under the title: A Conversation between His Most Sacred Majesty George III. and Samuel Johnson, LL.D. Illustrated with Observations, by James Boswell, Esq. London: Printed by Henry Baldwin; for Charles Dilly, in the Poultry. MDCCXC., quarto, corresponding to i. 291-296 of the first edition of the Life. Both this and the off-printed Chesterfield letter are rare items. Professor Pottle, writing in 1929, knew only of copies in the British Museum, the Bodleian and the then Adam Collection (F. A. Pottle, The Literary Career of James Boswell, Esq., pp. 136, 137). To these may be added the copies, one of the Conversation, one of the Letter, bound at the end of vol. 2 of a first edition of the Life in the National Library of Scotland. Mr. W. Beattie, Keeper of Printed Books in that Library, has kindly provided photostats of both and informed me that the leaves of the Conversation measure 10 5/6 by 8 5/6 inches and were trimmed when the piece was bound in with this copy of the Life; there is no sign of 'stabbing', only sewing. Cf. the description of the British Museum copy in Pottle, op. cit., p. 137. I take this opportunity of expressing my thanks to Mr. Beattie for his help on this point.
as Professor Pottle has convincingly argued,1 'was clearly to have the extracts technically on sale, but not to sell any copies'. Boswell, that is, wished to prevent other biographers from anticipating him by publishing their own descriptions of these two outstanding incidents and thus detracting from the interest of his forthcoming *Life*. He informs us that he took particular pains to obtain an authentic account of the royal interview, and as proof of this care sets out his sources in a footnote.2 One of these, and the one which he describes at greatest length, was 'a minute, the original of which is among the papers of the late Sir James Caldwell, and a copy of which was most obligingly obtained for me from his son Sir John Caldwell, by Sir Francis Lumm'. This Minute is still among Caldwell's papers, which also contain, in a contemporary copy, the letter from Johnson which accompanied it when he sent it to Caldwell. The letter, it should be added, is not an entirely new discovery, for it was printed in 1886 by W. H. G. Bagshawe in his *The Bagshaws of Ford*,3 but, no doubt owing to the fact that that work was intended for private circulation only, it seems to have escaped notice. Mr. Bagshawe was concerned with it only as showing that Caldwell and Johnson were known to each other and accordingly it was sufficient for his purpose simply to print its text in modernized spelling without comment. The survival of the Minute, which he had, of course, no occasion to print or discuss, although he knew of its existence, appears likewise to have gone unnoticed. Both letter and Minute deserve examination.

**JOHNSON'S LETTER TO CALDWELL**

The letter, which is printed below (pp. 231-2), is, as already stated, a copy, and a search through the Bagshawe Muniments for the original 4 has been unsuccessful. Nevertheless it is a contemporary copy and we can trace both its background and the copyist's name. Caldwell, a methodical man with an eye to his future reputation, was interested in the arrangement and

---

2 *Life*, ii. 34, n. 1; *Conversation*, p. [4], note. Henceforward references will be given only to the *Life*.
3 P. 317.
4 Cf. infra, p. 231, n. 5.
preservation of his papers, and to this end he not only had reference lists of them compiled but also, and particularly where some correspondent of note was concerned, had the letters and documents themselves transcribed in full and arranged chronologically.¹ Several hundreds of these copies have survived, written either by himself or at his instigation, and among them is the Johnson letter. It is entered in one of his Letter Books, now bound in six volumes and numbered B 3/10, entitled *Letters Wrote to and from Sir James Caldwell*. These volumes contain copies made by various of his amanuenses, but mainly by Patrick and James Maguire, of 373 letters and papers sent and received between 1 May 1759 and 23 December 1772, the whole preceded by a note informing us that ‘These Copies are wrote fair and Bound up in a Volume. The Originals² are tyed up Each year in a Bundle and the Number of Each Copy and its date refers [sic] to the Original, which follows [sic] Each other;’ that is, the originals were arranged chronologically and then numbered consecutively from 1 to 373 and the copies were given the same order and numbers. Immediately following this note is a list of the letters copied, in which the number and page of each letter are given, the names of the correspondents and, sometimes, an indication of the contents. ‘Letter 213, Page 691’ is described as ‘Feb. y 12, 1767. Doctor Sam¹. Johnson to Sir Jaⁿ. Caldwell, to wᶜ’h. is annexed his Conversation with the King.’ Fortunately this portion of the Letter Book has survived and we find there a full copy of the letter (pp. 691-2) and the

¹ In a draft letter to Skelton, which may be dated 17 April 1778, he mentions ‘four Hundred Letters which I have caused to be Copied and bound up, as I think they do credit to my Publick and what I much more prize to my Private Character’, and which in certain circumstances ‘I intend publishing’ (B 3/17/75). It should be added that there is evidence that these are not the letters in B 3/10 mentioned below.

² Many of these originals are no longer in the present collection (cf. supra, p. 212, n. 1). Extensive as the Caldwell papers still are—they total some 4,000 items—there are several gaps. Numerous items were destroyed last century and we owe the preservation of those which have survived here entirely to the untiring efforts of the late W. H. G. Bagshawe, who acquired the bulk of them from the owner shortly before Castle Caldwell was sold in 1877; from that time until his death in 1913 Mr. Bagshawe made constant enquiries in the family and its various branches in the hope of making the collection more complete.
Both are in a hand which can be identified as that of James Maguire, who for many years acted as one of Caldwell's clerks. The exact date when the copies were made does not appear, but it was probably towards the end of Caldwell's life; he died, as did Johnson, in 1784. The original letter would probably have endorsed on it its number (‘213’) in this particular series of his papers; this number is also endorsed on the Minute, which, more fortunate than its companion, has survived.

Before printing the letter, it may be noted that there are references to it and to the Minute in three of the lists of Caldwell's papers mentioned above. The most interesting occurs in one which is entirely in his own hand and which, internal evidence suggests, was drawn up in the late 1770s. He heads it: ‘Letters and Original Transcripts which lie unfolded regularly over Each other in this Box. The Number in this List refers to the Number on the Letter.’ Number ‘102’ is ‘Doctor Samuel Johnson to the same [i.e. to Caldwell], with a very Circumstantial Account of his Conversation with his Present Majesty, in which it appears that the King is very well informed in Literary Knowledge’. Presumably the number ‘102’ also would be endorsed on the original letter; it is not, however, on the Minute. This list is an expansion of an earlier one, written in a more formal hand, in which this particular item again figures as ‘102’, being described as ‘Doctor Samuel Johnston to Sir James Caldwell, giving a very Particular and Circumstantial Account of a tete a tete Conversation he had with the King on political and literary Subjects, in which the King shewed a great deal of Knowledge’. Finally, a folio volume, 1

1 For the Minute vide infra, pp. 235 sqq.
2 To give him his full description, ‘James Maguire of Belleck [co. Fermanagh], land surveyor’ (B 3/24/38, a legal document of 10 Feb. 1774). There are 16 holograph letters of Maguire available for comparison in the Bagshawe Muniments (B 3/20/260-75). Among the other items which he entered in this Letter Book for 1767 are copies of four letters of Hawkesworth (B 3/10/209, 228, 229, and 234).
3 Vide infra, p. 238. In fact, by a slip the Minute was incorrectly endorsed ‘No. 216’. W. H. G. Bagshawe, who also noticed the error, has made the correction to ‘No. 213’.
4 B 3/27/5.
5 B 3/27/4.
6 B 3/27/7.
now broken and imperfect, which contains miscellaneous accounts (c. 1768-82) and various catalogues (leases, letters, music, plans and papers) has, on fol. 12, a list headed 'Curious Papers, Poems, etc.' in which 'Bundle the 5th, No. 19' is 'A Conversation between the King and Dr. Johnston'; the letter is not mentioned separately. This number, like the one mentioned previously, is also written on the Minute. Thus, the Minute has two numbers endorsed on it—'19' and '216' (rectius '213')—and the missing original of the letter may also have had at least two—'102' and '213'—corresponding to their positions in Caldwell's various lists.

The letter, then, is printed here from the copy entered in Caldwell's Letter Book in 1767/84 by his clerk James Maguire, who heads it, 'Doctor Samuel Johnson to Sir Jas. Caldwell. Feb'ry. 12th, 1767':—

'Dear Sir James,'

Our friend Doctor Hawkesworth acquaints me that you are very desirous to see a Paper reciting a Conversation with which his Majesty was pleased to honour me last Tuesday in his Library. The moment I left the King's presence I put it down in writing as nearly as I could recollect and send you a Copy of it inclosed.

The King's information of what is going on in the literay [sic] as well as Political world is much more Extensive than is Generally imagined.

1 Ten bundles of letters and copies are listed, each containing 50 items. The bundles are described out of numerical order (Nos. 2, 12, 36, 3, etc.). The Johnson letter may have been either in a bundle not described here or, perhaps, kept with the 'Conversation' in Bundle 5, No. 19. In the latter case it would presumably, like the Minute, have been endorsed '(19)'.

2 Vide infra, p. 238.

3 Cf. supra, n. 1.

4 Although these lists are useful guides to letters and papers which have not survived here, they do not by any means provide a complete check on his correspondence. No other Johnson reference has been found in them, but there has survived in this collection what purports to be an Extract of a Letter from Dr. Johnson at Buxton to a Friend in Scotland (B 3/26/2, four pages). It is subscribed 'Honble. Mr. T. Erskine Scrip'. and reads like a parody of Johnson's style.

5 B 3/10/213, p. 691. A copy, made from Maguire's copy last century by W. H. G. Bagshawe, is now B 3/26/1a; it was from this, in which Mr. Bagshawe had modernized the spelling, that the letter was printed in The Bagshawes of Ford, p. 317. That he had to draw on Maguire suggests that he also was unable to find the original.

6 10 February. The exact date is not given by Boswell.
I have read with pleasure what you have wrote to honest George in favour of poor Mrs. Williams's Subscription and shall return it to you with a little Amendment. You have taken the Hints I gave you and illucidated and enforced them with great ability. You know I never flatter. I am, my dear Sir, affectionately yours,

Samuel Johnson.

Don't forget the party we made to Dine at the Mitre next Tuesday. I have engaged Hool, the Translator of Tasso [sic], to be with us. Do not engage yourself and you and I will drink tea with Mrs. Williams and regale her with your Letter to Faulkner. I am in bed and I got Davis to write this. I hope it will overtake you before you go to Bromley.

This letter is, of course, twice removed from Johnson; not merely is it a copy, but the original from which it was made was in the hand of 'Davis'. Thus, the capitals and unusual spellings, which are reproduced faithfully above, may be due either to 'Davis' or Maguire. Similarly with the full Christian name 'Samuel' in the signature instead of Johnson's normal 'Sam:'. How 'Davis' treated his spelling and capitals we do not know, but there is ample evidence concerning Maguire, for in several cases we have available for comparison the actual documents from which he made other copies contained in this same Letter Book—among them, of course, being the Minute. The result of such a comparison is hardly surprising. In his copying Maguire varies a great deal. Some letters are accurately transcribed; in others there are dropped words and, where the writing of his exemplar is poor, misreadings. He may at any time substitute his own spelling for that of his original.

1 The Dublin bookseller George Faulkner (d. 1775). See further supra, p. 224 and infra, pp. 234-5.
2 Mrs. Williams's collection of Miscellanies in Prose and Verse had been published in 1766. See further infra, p. 234.
3 Hoole's translation of the Jerusalem Delivered of Tasso had appeared in 1763.
5 For Caldwell's connection with Bromley vide supra, p. 221.
6 E.g. in B 3/10/216 (his copy of 3/16/95) he has 'relogs' for 'relays', 'boopeep [sic] Publicum' for 'bonum Publicum' and 'do come to doubt' for 'do come to Lowth'. This is perhaps an extreme instance, but in 3/10/275 (his copy of 3/17/23) he has 'to Nilitate [sic] her service' for 'to militate in her service' and 'Encouragements' for 'engagements', while in 3/10/229 (his copy of 3/16/134) he reads 'prevent' for 'preserve'. Other examples could be given.
7 E.g. 'Publick', B 3/10/216 ('Public', 3/16/95); 'Melancholly', 3/10/273 ('melancholy', 3/16/96); 'forcibly', 3/10/216 ('forceably', 3/16/95); 'Steevins', 3/10/312 (Stephens', 3/16/222); 'Extream', 3/10/309 ('Extreme', 3/16/240).
and he uses capitals indiscriminately. He is also fond of expanding abbreviations where he understands them. This last point may be most conveniently illustrated by checking, for example, the text of the Minute against his copy of it. The former’s ‘K.’, ‘Dr.’ and ‘J.’, to give only three examples, he invariably writes out in full as ‘King’, ‘Doctor’, and ‘Johnson’. Similarly with the opening and closing formulae of letters: ‘y.r.’, ‘yrs.’, ‘dr.’ and ‘obed.’ he tends to copy as ‘your’, ‘yours’, ‘dear’ and ‘obedient’. Many other instances could be given. It may well be that if his exemplar had the signature ‘Sam: Johnson’, Maguire would expand it to ‘Samuel Johnson’ as, for example, he expands ‘Jn’ Hawkesworth in a similar position to ‘John Hawkesworth’. Spellings such as ‘Amendment’ or ‘Illucidated’, which incidentally are not found in that form in Johnson’s own Dictionary may be Maguire’s also, although possible idiosyncrasies of ‘Davis’ cannot be ignored throughout. It has unfortunately not been possible to identify ‘Davis’. The name is not uncommon and in the circumstances we can not be sure of the spelling. Possibilities are the bookseller Tom Davies and the Mrs. Davis ‘that was about Mrs. Williams’; there are difficulties with

1 Cf. for example B 3/15/4 and 3/10/219; 3/16/134 and 3/10/229; 3/17/49 and 3/10/220. Many instances occur throughout his copies.

2 The Minute is printed below, pp. 235-8. His copy is in B 3/10/213 (pp. 693-700) immediately following the letter.

3 He also has ‘Doctor Johnson’ for the Minute’s ‘Mr. J.’, ‘Doctor Hill’ for ‘Dr. H.’, ‘Review’ for ‘Rev.’.

4 E.g. ‘Ever yrs my Dr. Count’ (B 3/16/95) becomes ‘Ever yours my Dear Count’ (3/10/216); ‘Dr. St.’ (3/16/134) becomes ‘Dear Sir’ (3/10/229) and ‘yrs. most Obed.’ (3/15/133) becomes ‘Your most Obedient’ (3/10/274).

5 In B 3/10/311, copying an original Hawkesworth letter B 3/16/137. Hawkesworth normally signs his Christian name ‘Jn’. Other examples occur.

6 Although there are instances in the Letters of Johnson’s use of words not given in his Dictionary.

7 Who appears to be referred to under the spelling ‘Davis’ in a Johnson letter of 1782 (Letters, no. 791). But vide infra, pp. 241-2.

8 Johnson to Francis Barber, 16 September 1783: ‘As Thursday is my birthday, I would have a little dinner got, and would have you invite Mrs. Desmoulin, Mrs. Davis that was about Mrs. Williams, and Mr. Allen and Mrs. Gardiner’ (Letters, no. 881). Birkbeck Hill suggests that she is the Mrs. Davis who was at Bolt Court the day before Johnson’s death.
both and it is apparently not known whether the latter was even associated with Johnson at this date. But whoever ‘Davis’ may have been, this is not the first or the only instance of Johnson dictating while lying in bed.

Of the other persons mentioned in the letter, Caldwell’s relations with Hawkesworth have already been indicated. Nothing seems to be known of his relations with Hoole, although the fact that the latter has to be described as ‘the Translator of Tasso’ may possibly imply that they were not very close. Hoole’s friendship with Johnson is well known and it is hardly surprising to find another reference to them dining together. References, however, to dining at the Mitre are not common in Johnson’s letters nor are invitations to drink tea with Mrs. Williams. Caldwell probably owed his own invitation to the fact that he was assisting with the sale of her Miscellanies and on this point his papers provide a little more information. If, as would seem likely, his letter to George Faulkner on her behalf was written in 1767, it has not so far come to light bearing that date among the surviving drafts and copies of his correspondence. But in this same Letter Book there has been entered a copy of a letter dated ‘London, April the 7th, 1766’, addressed ‘To G. F. Esquire’, strongly recommending ‘a little Book Intitled Miscellanies in Prose and Verse by Anna Williams’, described as ‘lately Published here by Subscription’; it is followed by copies of Johnson’s Proposals for printing the work and by the Petition in verse concerning the same. Whether this is the letter mentioned by Johnson, assigned to the wrong year by Caldwell’s amanuensis, or whether it is in fact an earlier one, it reads like a first recommendation of the Miscellanies to Faulkner. In either case it provides other evidence of Caldwell’s connection with this affair. Caldwell and Faulkner were well known to each other—the latter was a

1 Vide infra, pp. 241-2.  
2 B 3/10/601.  
3 Printed in his Works, v. 354.  
4 It refers to the contents of the volume as though he were not acquainted with them. This letter is also listed in one of Caldwell’s inventories, B 3/27/8 (devoted to a list of his own writings), where, as item 34, it is described as ‘A Lre. to G. F. Esq’. recommending a Book of Poems lately Published by Subscription for the Benefit of a Blind Lady’.  
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Dubliner—and apart from Johnson's reference and the letter of 1763 mentioned above¹ in a different connection, there are other indications among these papers of their association.²

THE CALDWELL MINUTE

The Minute, which is discussed below, is written on a double leaf of paper³ in a hand so far unidentified;⁴ the copy which Maguire entered in Caldwell's Letter Book⁵ was made from it and, as indicated above, there are other references to it among Caldwell's papers. The text is as follows:—

¹ The King came in and after having walked by Mr. Johnson talked for some time to the other persons in the Library, turned to Dr. Johnson and asked him if he were not lately come from Oxford. Dr. J. answered that he was, upon which the K. again asked him if he were not fond of going to Oxford to which he replied that he was indeed fond of going to Oxford but was likewise glad to come back again.

² The King then asked him if he were writing anything at present to which he made answer that he had pretty well told the world what he knew, and

---

¹ For the letter of 1763 vide supra, p. 224.
² In a letter to Lord Newtown in February 1761 Caldwell mentions that he had sent a copy of one of his pamphlets 'over to George Faulkner the Printer, four posts before it was published here' (B 3/10/49). More interesting, in January 1762, Faulkner writes from Dublin that he has 'published M:Naughtin's Life with great reputation and success . . . I wish I had the liberty of telling your name for the Author; but that I shall not do without your consent, as I would not offend you in any shape' (3/10/86). One of Faulkner's bills has survived also (B 3/28/22, settled 6 July 1761) in which Caldwell is shown as having purchased from him paper, pens, ink and books. Among the books are Johnson's Dictionary (two copies, one purchased 19 Nov. 1759, the other 31 Jan. 1761) and Hawkesworth's Almoran and Hamet; in addition Caldwell paid him for certain advertising and for engraving his arms.

³ The water-mark is a suspended horn within a crowned shield beneath which are the letters 'LVG' and, under these, 'W'. Paper with this mark and the name or initials of the Dutch maker L.V. Gerrevink below is common in England at this time. Examples may be seen among Johnson's correspondence, and although one has not so far been found with the additional 'W', others of the many variants which follow this well-known maker's initials occur. Mrs. Mary C. Hyde has kindly examined her Johnson letters for me in this connection.

⁴ Vide infra, pp. 241-2.
⁵ B 3/10/213, pp. 693-700.
⁶ B 3/26/1. Unless otherwise stated all emendations, which, together with punctuation and capitals, are faithfully reproduced, are by the original writer.
⁷ A cross has been placed at the side of paragraphs 2 and 3 and the latter paragraph has been ringed, indicating that the order should be reversed. These markings are in a darker ink and were made by a different pen.
that he must now go and read for more. I do not think Dr. J. replied the King that you borrow from any one, upon which Dr. J. observed that he thought he had pretty well done his Share. I should think so too Dr. J. said the K. if you had not done so well.

The K. then proceeded to ask him what they were doing at Oxford. Upon which Mr. J. told him that they he could not indeed much commend their diligence but that in some respects they were mended for that they had put Press their under better regulations, and were at this time printing Polybius. He was then asked whether they had better Libraries at Oxford or Cambridge, to this he replied that he believed the Bodleian was larger at the same time observing than any they had at Cambridge, but at the same time added that he hoped whether we had more books or not, that we should make as good use of them as they did. He was then asked whether All Souls or Christ Church Library were the larger, to which he [f. l.v.] replied that All Souls Library was the largest we had except the Bodleian, Aye said the K. that is the Publick Library.

The K. then told him that he thought he must have read a vast deal. Dr. J. replied that he had thought more than he had read, that he had not indeed neglected reading, but having very early in life fallen into ill health he had not been able to read much compared with those who had, for instance he said he had not read much compared with Dr. Warburton. Upon which the K. said that he had heard Dr. W. was a man of very general knowledge, and that you could scarce talk with him on any subject upon which he was not qualified to speak. The K. then asked him what he thought of the Controversy between Dr. W. and Dr. L. To this he replied that he thought Dr. L. called names rather better than Dr. W. You do not think then said the King Dr. J. that there was much argument in the Case. He said he did not think there was. Why true said the K. when once it comes to calling names all argument is pretty well at an end. He then asked him what he thought of Lord Lyttelton's book just published. He said he thought his Style might be pretty good [but that he had blamed Rich 3. by wholesale rather too much]. Why says ye K. they seldom do these things by halves. No Sir said

1 Sic. 2 Written over ' that '. 3 Lowth, Bishop of London. 4 This cancellation is in a darker ink and by a different pen. 5 The square brackets enclosing ‘ but . . . much ’ are in the original hand, perhaps to indicate doubt concerning these words and as a preliminary to cancelling them. For the reference to Lyttelton and his book is confused. Firstly, the work is described as ‘ just published ’, whereas other evidence suggests rather June as the date of publication (see R. M. Davis, *The Good Lord Lyttelton*, p. 332) ; ‘ published ’ is, of course, often used loosely and copies would be in existence before the formal publication date. The circumstances of its printing were such as might cause confusion (see Davis, *op. cit.*, chap 5). Johnson himself draws attention to them in his essay on Lyttelton (*Lives of the English Poets*, ed. Birkbeck Hill, iii. 453) : ‘ The story of this publication is remarkable. The whole work was printed twice over, a great part of it three times, and many sheets four or five times . . . the charges and repeated operations of the press . . . cost [the author] at least a thousand pounds ’ ; he there places the first appearance of the work in 1764, a date now generally doubted, although his statement that printing had started in 1755 is accepted (Davis, *op. cit.*,
he not to Kings. But fearing that he might be misunderstood he proceeded to explain himself and immediately subjoined that for those who spoke worse of Kings than they deserved he could offer no excuse, but that he could easily conceive how some might speak better of them than they deserved without any ill intention, for as Kings had much in their power to give, those who were much obliged to them would frequently from Gratitude exaggerate their praises, and as this proceeded from a good motive it was certainly excusable as far as error could be excusable. He then asked what he thought of Dr. Hill, when he told him that he thought he was an ingenious man but had no veracity, and as an instance of it immediately produced that assertion of Dr. Hill's viz. that he had magnified to a much greater degree by looking using 3 or 4 microscopes at a time, now said he every one who has seen a microscope knows that the more he looks thro' the less he will see. Why replied the K. this is not only telling a falsehood but telling it clumsily for if this be the case, every one who can look through a microscope will be able to detect him. Dr. J. then proceeded to tell the K. that Dr. H. was notwithstanding a very curious observer and if he would have been contented to tell the world what he knew cut no more than he knew, he might have made a very considerable figure in the world, and needed not to have recourse to such mean expedients to raise his reputation. They then began to speak of Literary Journals the nature and use of which Dr. J. explained, and at the same time gave some account of the principal writers on that subject, he told who first begun the Journal des Scavans and said that it had been well written for many years, upon which the King asked if it were p. 329; see also Life, iii. 32). Secondly, and this may account for the square brackets, the work did not concern Richard III but was a 'History of the Life of Henry the Second'. When Boswell came to use the Minute for his Life, he noted this and made the necessary alteration, but not before he had first copied out the incorrect 'Richard the Third' (vide infra, p. 246). His awareness of the discrepancy is also shown by the fact that he first tried to associate the passage with Walpole's Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of Richard III, but no doubt remembering that the Historic Doubts did not appear until the following year—apart from the date of the conversation, the Minute is endorsed by Caldwell as having been received by him in August 1767—and that, far from having 'blamed Rich 3. rather too much', it was written with the deliberate intention of vindicating him, he struck through the whole passage (vide infra, p. 247, n. 1) and decided to keep to the text of the Minute, apart from making the alteration to 'Henry the Second' just mentioned. He also copied out the words 'Lord Lyttelton's book just published'; in fact, to allow for the passage of time, he emended to 'which was then just published', and altered 'book' to 'History' (vide infra, p. 246).

1 Sic.
2 Johnson's critical remarks on Hill's assertion seem to have been unfounded. Hill, an expert on the microscope, had referred not to the use of several microscopes but to the lenses combined in the compound microscope. See Clark Emery, 'Dr. Johnson and Dr. Hill', ap. Modern Language Notes, lxiv (1949), pp. 15-18 and the references there.
3 'the K' written over 'him'.
4 This substitution is in a darker ink and 'cut' may be in Johnson's hand.
5 Altered to 'Savans' by W. H. G. Bagshawe.
well written [f. 2v.] now? he said he had no reason to think that it was. The K. [were] then asked him the character of our two Reviews and whether there were any other literary Journals now published in England this Kingdom, he said there were no Literary Journals beside these, and that of these two the Monthly was written with the least care and the Monthly on the worst principles. For the authors of the this monthly Rev. were enemies to the Church, which the K. said he was sorry to hear. The Conversation next turned on the Philosophical Transactions when M‡. J. had observed that they had now a better method of sorting their materials, Aye said For the K. they are obliged to Dr. J. for that. This Circumstance his Majesty had heard and remembered this Circumstance which Dr. J. had himself forgot. This was I believe all the Conversation that passed between them, for about this time the Princess Dowager came in and put an end to the Conversation.

[Endorsed :] 12 Feb. (19) 1767
Conversation between the King & Dr. Johnson.
Red. the 22d of August 1767.
No. 216 9

1 Altered from 'of'. 2 'were' supplied by W. H. G. Bagshawe. 3 Nine years later, dining at Mr. Thrale's, Johnson mentioned what had passed upon the subject of the Monthly and Critical Reviews, in the conversation with which his Majesty had honoured him [and] expatiated a little more on them' (see Life, iii. 32). 4 Altered to 'D‡.' by W. H. G. Bagshawe. 5 Altered from 'forget'. 6 Sic. 7 For this number vide supra, p. 231. 8 'August' is written over another word, which is either abbreviated or uncompleted; more than this can not be distinguished. The words 'Red. the 22d of August 1767' are in Caldwell's hand. Why he should not have received it until that date can only be conjectured. It may be that the arrangements mentioned in the accompanying letter fell through (he was concerned in a law case at this very time, see B 3/14/91-95, 120) and that he was away until then. His frequent journeyings between Ireland and England may also have had a bearing on the matter. There is insufficient evidence to trace his movements in detail at this time, but in the middle of January he was in Dublin (B 3/16/133) on 11 April and 23 May he was at Castle Caldwell (B 3/14/93-94) and by 2 September back in London again (B 3/15/85). Frequently a month elapsed between the date of writing and the date of his receipt of a letter (e.g. B 3/15/70, 3/20/321) and, at least on one occasion, three months (B 3/20/336); Hawkesworth complains in February 1758 of a two months' delay (B 3/10/575). In October 1767 Johnson explains to William Drummond that he has only just seen his letter after an absence of near six months in the country (Life, ii. 30). 9 Corrected by W. H. G. Bagshawe to 'No. 213' (vide supra, p. 230). He also adds, in red ink, 'N.B. This is the original paper sent by Dr. Johnson'.
According to the covering letter, as soon as Johnson left the royal presence he wrote down an account of what had happened and the Minute is the 'Copy' of this which he sent to Caldwell. Perhaps this word should not be taken too literally here, for not only does the Minute lack the smoothness of a copy, it also contains, in the original hand, emendations which do not seem typical of one. For example, the opening sentence: 'The King came in and after having walked by Mr. Johno talked for some time to the other persons in the Library, turned to Dr. Johnson'; a superficial similarity between Johnson's initial 't' and 'w' might lead to a misreading of 'talked' but would hardly account for the rest. In the third paragraph: 'He was then asked whether they had better Libraries at Oxford or Cambridge, to this he replied that he believed the Boldleian [sic] was larger, at the same time observing than any they had at Cambridge, but at the same time added'; the attraction of the words 'at the same time' a little lower down could in part account for this, but would not explain why a copyist should introduce 'observing'. Again, in the fourth paragraph: 'He said he thought his Style might be pretty good but that he had blamed Rich 3. by wholesale rather too much' (ll. 36-38); this can not be due to any attraction of similarities, for 'wholesale' does not occur elsewhere. But perhaps the most striking alteration is in the concluding sentence: 'for about this time the Princess Dowager came in and put an end to the Conversation'. It is difficult to see how the necessity for emendations of this kind could arise in straightforward copying. They have the appearance not so much of corrected misreadings as of second thoughts—the second thoughts which might come, for example, to a person dictating. In this respect the rewording in the first and last of these examples is not without interest, for it will be noticed that in both cases it saves Johnson's dignity by removing the possible implications that the King deliberately walked by him or that the Princess Dowager deliberately put an end to the conversation. Some half-dozen other, minor, emendations which do not favour copying also occur: 'they-he' (l. 14); 'pretty well over at an end' (l. 35); 'the [for 'then'] proceeded' (l. 39); 'looking' (l. 49); 'with [an
uncompleted "without" and needed not (l. 56); "England this Kingdom" (l. 63), 'For' substituted for 'This Circumstance' (l. 69). These alone would suggest either a copyist who was constantly making incorrect guesses at what followed in his exemplar and as constantly correcting himself, or, as seems more probable, someone who was being prompted as he was writing. If the above emendations have the appearance of second thoughts during a dictation, others suggest the kind of improvement that might be made on a re-reading afterwards. For example, certain of the interlineations. One would expect a copyist's interlineations to make good the sense he had spoiled by misreadings or omissions, and there is certainly one instance of this nature, and possibly two. But other interlineations can not be explained on these grounds, such as the substitution of 'this' for 'which' in l. 66, or, in no less than three cases, the addition of several words which are not required to complete the sense. These have the appearance of intended improvements and as they are in the original hand, which is not Johnson's, they could be due to his prompting, as could the striking out of a few unnecessary repetitions, also no doubt with a view to improvement. Johnson, in fact, may have contributed directly, for in addition to the alterations in the hand of the original writer, who uses a light-brown ink, there are three markings and a substituted word made in dark-brown ink and by a different type of pen; namely, two crosses to indicate that the order of the second and third paragraphs should be reversed, the cancelling of a redundant word, and the substitution of 'cut' for 'made'. The darker ink, it may be noted, matches in colour that favoured by Johnson and the word 'cut' may be in his hand; these points are, of course, too slight to be more than ancillary. The relapse into 'we's during the discussion on Oxford Libraries is also worth noting, as Johnson was at Pembroke. But before

---

1 'Press', l. 16.  
2 'Critical', l. 64.  
3 'he was not for', l. 8; 'as an instance of it', l. 48; 'seen things', l. 48.  
4 'that he', l. 9; 'that', l. 15; 'he thought', l. 47.  
5 Vide supra, p. 235, n. 7. This revised order is followed by Boswell, but it was made before he saw the Minute, for it is also followed by Maguire (B 3/10/213, pp. 693, 694).  
6 l. 35.  
7 l. 55.  
8 ll. 20, 22.
the suggestion of dictation can be accepted, there remains the problem of the opening words of the last sentence: 'This was I bllieve [sic] all that passed between them'\(^1\) It may be that the intrusion of 'I' is, like the 'we' just mentioned, simply a relapse from the formal third person which is otherwise used throughout. If not, it stands in contradiction to all that we know, or would expect, of this Minute. The formality itself is not against the suggestion of dictation; on the contrary, for the Minute was written as the result of a request and Johnson would know quite well that Caldwell would show it to others. There is indeed evidence of this interest in the Minute in the form of at least two known copies to which it gave rise; the one which Boswell procured, which has survived in the body of a document at Yale,\(^2\) and one which is now in the possession of Dr. S. C. Roberts.\(^3\) Others must have been made and may yet come to light. If the contents of the Minute were in fact dictated by Johnson, it would be reasonable to assume that it was written by the same 'Davis' to whom he dictated the letter which accompanied it—that the accompanying letter was dictated should not be forgotten in considering the Minute—and in that case we should know that 'Davis' was not the same person as his old friend Tom Davies, the bookseller, for examples of the

\(^1\) l. 71.
\(^2\) Vide infra, pp. 242, n. 2, 243 sqq.
\(^3\) I am indebted to Dr. Roberts for his generous loan of this document and to Mrs. Mary C. Hyde for kindly drawing my attention to it. Dr. Roberts's Minute presents a smooth, unbroken text written in a neat, clear hand on a double leaf of paper bearing the Britannia water-mark. Although it differs in form, being arranged as a dialogue between 'K.' and 'J.', comparison leaves little doubt that, save for 14 lines out of the 99 it contains, it goes back to the Caldwell Minute. The 14 are accounted for by (a) an additional sentence at the end (ll. 96-99) reading, 'Dr. Johnson in reciting the above, observed, that he found his Majesty extremely Conversant both in the Characters of Men and Books, and that he discovered no inconsiderable share of general Knowledge'; (b) a reference to Walpole (l. 45), who is confused with Lyttelton; (c) Johnson's remarks on historians and Kings (ll. 49-57), which show, however, verbal differences only. A Walpole reference and Johnson's remarks with just these differences occur, interestingly enough, in an account which Boswell obtained from Strahan and originally intended using for this passage but discarded in favour of the corresponding passage in the Caldwell Minute (vide infra, p. 247, n. 1). In Dr. Roberts's Minute the endorsement, which is in the same hand as the rest, incorrectly describes Johnson's meeting with the King as having been 'by Accident in St. James's Library'.
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latter's writing are available for comparison. Unfortunately no examples of the writing of the other immediate possibility, Mrs. Davis, seem to be known.

The Caldwell Minute is apparently the only one of Boswell’s five sources for this incident which has survived and it is fortunate that it should prove to be the longest, providing him with more material than all the rest together. But in spite of its length, it does not add any new information to that already known; Boswell’s own interest in the royal interview was such that it would be surprising if it did. Its value consists rather in this: that it enables us, firstly, to follow through its various stages the evolution of the major portion of a passage which he himself considered one of the most important in the Life, and at the same time test the accuracy with which he handled a written source, and, secondly, to analyse his whole account of the royal interview.

The main stages which may be recognized in considering Boswell’s handling of this source are: the Minute itself; the copy of it which, he informs us in the Life, was obtained for him from Caldwell’s son, Sir John, by Sir Francis Lumm;¹

¹ E.g., Rylands English MSS. 536/9 and 537/7.
² ii. 34 n. 1. He refers to it there specifically as ‘a copy’, contrasting it with the original. The wording in his Journal is rather looser: ‘Then waited on Sir Francis Lumm [this was 1 March 1786], who had obligingly procured me from Sir John Caldwell a Minute of the conversation between the King and Dr. Johnson which was in the late Sir James Caldwell’s repositories’ (Private Papers of James Boswell from Malahide Castle, ed. G. Scott and F. A. Pottle, xvi. 173). But that it was a copy in the strict sense of the word is indicated by his Paper apart 320, now at Yale (for this document see the next note but one). Here (fos. 3-4), in compiling his account of his sources, he originally wrote: ‘a Minute, the original of which is among the Papers of the late Sir James Caldwell and which was at the spontaneous request of Mr. Berkeley, Grandson of the Bishop of Cloyne, most obligingly obtained for me from his son Sir John Caldwell ’ etc. He then added ‘a copy of’ above the line between ‘and’ and ‘which’. Incidentally, he also struck through the words ‘at the ... Cloyne’, with the result that Mr. Berkeley’s connection with the matter does not appear in the printed Life.
³ There is evidence in the Bagshawe Muniments of the friendship between Lumm and Sir James Caldwell in the form of three letters from the former to the latter (B 3/16/216-18, all of 1779), two from Lady Lumm to the latter (B 3/16/219-20, both 1779) and a draft from Sir James to her (B 3/16/215). Caldwell was able to call on Lumm’s good offices to have the King’s attention drawn to certain of his tracts (B 3/16/218, 21 June 1779). A miniature of Lumm is preserved at Ford Hall.
his own holograph account of the whole incident put together ready for inclusion in the main manuscript of the Life and now preserved at Yale among his Papers apart; his proofs; and, finally, the version which appears in the published Life. The differences between the third stage and the final version are negligible, so that we may concentrate on the first three. Of these the second is missing; but its loss is not serious for, as will appear from what follows, it was a fairly close copy of the Minute. It is, in short, only necessary to compare the Minute with the Yale manuscript in order to discover the relation of the original material to Boswell's finished work and to separate him from his source. For all his major modifications had already been introduced into the Yale manuscript, and introduced in such a way that they may clearly be picked out. His method, with one exception, referred to below, was simply to copy out the text of the Minute and then go over it making such verbal alterations as seemed to him to improve its effect; accordingly, in the Yale manuscript we see him actually at work on the text of the Minute, crossing out, interlining, introducing oratio recta, changing his mind on various points, changing it again, and then perhaps deciding to retain the original wording after all. The exception is the passage dealing with literary journals, where Boswell uses the same material as that provided by the Minute, but for the most part does not follow its wording; the reason for this departure is not clear, but it may, to some extent at least, be due to a desire not to cause

1 The full reference to this document (cited here as Paper apart 320) is 'Private Papers of James Boswell, Yale University Library, MS. of Life, Paper apart, p. 320'. For the documents which Boswell designated 'Papers apart' see Scott and Pottle, Private Papers, vi. 59; they may briefly be described as elements which he 'wrote up' separately and which tend to deal with isolated incidents; this particular one, concerned with Johnson's conversation with the King, is marked for insertion in p. 320 of the main manuscript of the Life. I take this opportunity of expressing my thanks to the Editorial Committee of the Yale Editions of the Private Papers, who have generously allowed me to quote not only from their printed volumes but also from this manuscript item, and in particular to Mr. Herman W. Liebert, Research Assistant at Yale and a member of that Committee, who has answered my queries with unfailing kindness and courtesy.

2 Minute, fos. 2-2v.; Paper apart 320, fos. 12-13. Corresponding to the paragraph beginning 'The King then talked' in Life, ii. 39.
offence. His different treatment of this passage, however, only serves to emphasize his normal practice for, as far as the rest is concerned, whether his subsequent alterations are numerous or nil, he always begins with the text of the Minute, not his own version of it or even a selection from it. It is indeed only necessary to ignore his alterations in the Yale manuscript in order to recover the text of the Minute, apart from a few insignificant differences which may be due to the intervention of the copy he used. The following examples, deliberately selected for the large number of alterations they contain, will perhaps make this clear:

(1) Caldwell Minute (supra, p. 235, l. 7–p. 236, l. 12): ‘The King then asked him if he were writing anything at present to which he made answer that he had pretty well told the world what he knew, and that he must now go and read for more. I do not think Dr. J. replied the King that you borrow from any one, upon which Dr. J. observed that he thought he had pretty well done his Share. I should think so too Dr. J. said the King if you had not done so well.’

Boswell, Paper apart 320, fol. 6: ‘The King then asked him if he was writing any thing? at present? He answered He was not, for he had pretty exhausted what little knowledge he had gathered to acquire more knowledge. well told the World what he knew, and must now [go] and read for more. The that he did not Dr. Johnson thought he had pretty well done his Share as a writer. I should have thought written so too said the King if you had not done so well.”

In the margin, for insertion between “King” and “having”, he adds: “and by thus then as it should seem from a des with a view to urge him to rely on his own stores as an original writer and to continue his labours.”

1 Notice, for example, how, by a reversal, Boswell modifies Johnson’s bluntness. In the Minute (fo. 2v.) Johnson is reported as saying that ‘the Critical was written with the least care and the Monthly on the worst principles’. In Paper apart 320, fol. 12 (and in the printed Life, ii. 40) this becomes ‘the Monthly Review was done with most care, the Critical upon the best principles’.

2 There are some 70 lines in Paper apart 320 in which Boswell, after following the Minute, makes no alterations at all, and many others in which he introduces only one or two minor changes.

3 By a slip Boswell omits ‘go’. It will be noticed that he follows the Minute as regards its interlineations and cancellations.
(2) *Caldwell Minute* (supra, p. 236, ll. 17-21): 'he replied that he believed the Bodleian [sic] was larger, at the same time observing, than any they had at Cambridge, but at the same time added that he hoped whether we had more books or not, that we should make as good use of them as they did.'

Boswell, *Paper apart* 320, fos. 5-6: 'He answered he believed [sic] the Bodleian was larger than any they had at Cambridge, but at the same time added that he hoped whether we had more books or not (than they have at Cambridge) we shall make as good use of them as they did.'

(3) *Caldwell Minute* (supra, p. 236, ll. 24-7): 'The K. then told him that he thought he must have read a vast deal. EX. J. replied that he had thought more than he had read, that he had not indeed neglected reading, but having very early in life fallen into ill health he had not been able to read much compared with those who had.'

Boswell, *Paper apart* 320, fos. 7-8: 'His Majesty said to him that he thought he must have read a great deal. Johnson answered that he thought more than he read a great deal early in life but was soon attacked by sickness which stopped read that he had not indeed neglected reading but having very early in life fallen into ill health he had not been able to read much compared with those who had.'

In the margin, to follow "reading", he adds: 'he had read a great deal in the earlier part of his life'.

(4) *Caldwell Minute* (supra, p. 237, ll. 47-51): 'he told him that he thought as an instance of it he was an ingenious man but had no veracity, and immediately produced, that he had read a vast deal, that he had had seen things magnified to a much greater degree by looking using 3 or 4 microscopes at a time, now said he every one who has seen a microscope knows that the more he looks through the less he will see. Why replied the K. this is not only telling a falsehood but telling it clumsily'.

Boswell, *Paper apart* 320, fos. 10-11: 'Johnson answered that he was an ingenious man but had no veracity, and immediately produced as an instance of it that assertion of Dr. Hill’s viz. that he had seen things magnified to a much greater degree by using three or four microscopes at a time. Now said he every one who has seen a microscope knows that the more he looks through the less he will see. Why replied the King this is not only telling a falsehood but telling it clumsily'.

Boswell adds 'n' to the 'a' before 'falsehood'.

(5) *Caldwell Minute* (supra, p. 236, ll. 35-8): 'He then asked him what he thought of Lord Lyttelton’s book just published. He said he thought his Style
might be pretty good [but that he had blamed Rich 3. by wholesale rather too much."

Boswell, *Paper apart* 320, fo. 8v: 'His Majesty then asked him what he thought of Lord Littleton's *Book of History* just published. Johnson said he thought his style pretty good but that he had blamed Richard the Third rather too much.'

Finally, the Minute assists us in analysing his whole account of the royal interview. His narrative, we are told in the *Life*, was compiled from five sources: 'from Dr. Johnson's own detail to myself; from Mr. Langton, who was present when he gave an account of it to Dr. Joseph Warton, and several other friends, at Sir Joshua Reynolds's; from Mr. Barnard; from the copy of a letter written by the late Mr. Strahan the printer, to Bishop Warburton'; and from the Caldwell Minute. But although the names and number of Boswell's sources have been known, the extent to which he relied on each has not; nor does he even mention them all in the course of his narrative. But given the Minute we may by a process of elimination discover the rest, for, that removed, it can be seen that what remains contains for the most part its own indications of source in the form of words such as '*'Johnson observed to me*';* 'at Sir Joshua Reynolds's', 'said Johnson to his friends', 'he said to Mr. Barnard', and 'he afterwards observed to Mr. Langton'. Built into and around the Minute, his main source, and previously obscured by it, the passages dependent on these indications can now be clearly recognized. Together with the Minute they account for all his sources save one, Strahan's letter, and cover the whole of his account of the royal interview save ten lines. Of these ten, four deal with the King's suggestion that Johnson should write the literary biography of this country; their origin is not clear, unless, like the passage immediately following, they are from Barnard. The remaining lines occur in the discussion concerning Warburton and Lowth and it seems probable that these

---

1 *Life*, ii. 34, n. 1.
2 *Ibid.* ii. 35, l. 27.
3 *Ibid.* ii. 35, l. 30; 41, l. 4; 42, l. 12.
5 *Ibid.* ii. 40, ll. 21-22. The end of the Minute corresponds to l. 11 of this page.
8 Namely, 'and that his learning resembled Garrick's, acting, in its universality' (*ibid.* ii. 36, l. 11) . . . which he seemed to have read (37, l. 3) . . .
came from Strahan's letter to Warburton, which, apart from being a likely source, is also the only one not yet accounted for.

It may be noted in conclusion that Boswell originally intended to include more material from Strahan's letter. As his *Paper apart* 320 shows, his entire account of the discussion on historians and Kings was first taken from it. But he changed his mind, struck it through and marked it 'see oppos[il]te', a reference to the verso of the preceding leaf where, under the heading 'Caldwell', he copied out the corresponding passage from the Caldwell Minute which replaces it both there and in the version he finally printed in the *Life*.

Johnson answered, 'Warburton has most general, most scholastick learning; Lowth is the more correct scholar. I do not know which of them calls names best'. The King was pleased to say he was of the same opinion; adding (37, ll. 4-7).

1 *Paper apart* 320, fos. 9-10, where, marked 'Strahan', is the following: 'His Majesty observed that Historians are in general very partial when they characterise Kings for they make them either very good or very bad. (This was introduced by speaking of Mr. Walpoles Historick Doubts: *these words have been added later by Boswell in a reserved space which they do not fill*). Johnson answered, Kings, Sir, are generally spoken of in extremes. I have indeed no excuse to make for those who speak worse of Kings than they deserve; but as Kings have it much in their power to confer happiness it is easy to account how they happen often to be praised to excess from the gratitude of those upon whom their favours have been conferred, and though it was an errour to depart from truth upon any occasion, yet as far as errour was allowable it was so in this instance.' The few alterations Boswell made to these lines before he cancelled the whole are not noted here as in this case his source is more relevant than his alterations. Dr. Roberts's Minute follows the wording of this passage (vide supra, p. 241, n. 3).

2 Fo. 8v.; copied from the Caldwell Minute, fos. lv.-2. Boswell makes very few emendations.

3 This is the only occasion in the Yale manuscript in which he copies out alternative accounts of the same incident and in no other place there does he indicate his sources in this way ('Strahan'; 'Caldwell').