

Clyde E. Dankert

TWO EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY CELEBRITIES

IN THE INITIAL NUMBER of the original *Edinburgh Review*, covering the first six months of 1755, there appeared a review of Samuel Johnson's recently published *Dictionary of the English Language*. A remarkable feature of the review is that it was written by Adam Smith.

At the time, Smith was thirty-two years of age and Professor of Moral Philosophy at the University of Glasgow. Though he had been building up a reputation as a teacher and a scholar, he could still hardly be called a celebrity. The date of publication of his *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, the book that was first to bring him into prominence, was four years off; and his great classic, *The Wealth of Nations*, a work to which he devoted long years of effort, was not to appear until 1776.

Johnson was forty-six years of age when the review appeared, and was thus Smith's senior by fourteen years. He had already written the *Rambler* essays, *The Vanity of Human Wishes*, *Irene*, *The Life of Richard Savage*, and *Parliamentary Debates*. Now he had completed his voluminous *Dictionary*. As author of these diversified productions, Johnson was well on his way to becoming a commanding figure in the English literary world—"the great Cham of literature", as Tobias Smollett was to call him a few years later.

The appearance of Smith's contribution to the *Edinburgh Review* was an interesting episode in the relationship between the famous Scottish economist and his renowned and incomparable English contemporary. Since the purpose of the present essay is to enquire into this relationship, a logical starting point is to give attention to Smith's review of the *Dictionary*. First, however, it should be noted that Smith and Johnson in 1755 were not personally acquainted. Not until 1761 did they come together, and then it was under circumstances that have been both the sorrow and amusement of later scholars. It might also be added that the Smith-Johnson meeting took place about two years *after* James Boswell, as a young student, had

met Smith and attended his classes, and more than a year and a half *before* he, the hero-worshipping Boswell, met Johnson.

What qualifications, it might be asked, did Adam Smith have for reviewing Johnson's *Dictionary*? A number of facts about his early training and career indicate that he was not unfitted for the task.¹ At Oxford, where he spent six secluded years, following a period at the University of Glasgow, Smith gave a great deal of attention to Greek and Latin authors; he studied the works of Italian and French writers; and he improved his knowledge of English literature.

In 1748, two years after he returned to Scotland, Smith with the encouragement of Henry Home (Lord Kames) began in Edinburgh a series of public lectures which continued for three years. He gave three courses of lectures in all, two of which it seems were on literature and literary criticism.² Unfortunately, these lectures were not preserved. Before his death in 1790 the great economist asked that they be destroyed.

While he was lecturing at Edinburgh, Smith apparently collected and edited the poems of his friend William Hamilton of Bangour, author of "The Braes of Yarrow." Although a number of writers have made cautious statements concerning his performance of the task, John Rae, the economist's chief biographer, and N. S. Bushnell, a comparatively recent writer on Hamilton, believe that he was responsible,³ and we shall so regard him.

In 1751 Smith was appointed to the Chair of Logic at the University of Glasgow, a post that included the subject of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres. At the same time he acted as a substitute for the Professor of Moral Philosophy, who was ill. In both of these positions he found his Edinburgh lectures useful. Early in 1752 he was permanently appointed to the Chair of Moral Philosophy and there continued to give expression to his literary interests.

In addition to his review of Johnson's *Dictionary*, Smith contributed an article (in the form of a letter) to the second and last issue of the *Edinburgh Review*. The article relates to the prevailing condition of European literature. After commenting briefly on the state of learning in a number of continental countries, Smith discusses French literature at some length, comparing it with that of England and giving special attention to the writings of the Encyclopedists and of Rousseau.

The preceding facts suggest that Smith was not without qualifications for reviewing Johnson's work. Certainly a much less capable person could have been selected for the task. But what of the review itself?

In the first place it is rather brief. True, it totals eleven pages; but only two of these pages are taken up with a general discussion of the *Dictionary*. The other nine are devoted to a description of how Johnson treats the two words "but" and "humour", and how he, Smith, wishes he had dealt with them. The two examples are used to show what the reviewer felt was the essential weakness of Johnson's voluminous compilation.

Smith has some words of praise for the *Dictionary*. "When we compare this book with other dictionaries," he says, "the merit of its author appears very extraordinary." He feels that the *Dictionary* is "highly useful, and the execution of it entitled to praise", but nevertheless he has some criticism to make of it. The chief defect, he declares, is in the plan of the book, "which appears to us not to be sufficiently grammatical." Though Johnson presents the different meanings of a word, these meanings, Smith affirms, "are seldom digested into general classes, or ranged under the meaning which the word principally expresses." Moreover, the reviewer feels that Johnson has not been careful enough in distinguishing words that are "apparently synonymous." He himself demonstrates how such a distinction should be made in a number of examples, including "but" and "however," and "humour" and "wit." Among a few further observations, he points to the indebtedness that dictionary or rather "grammar" makers will owe to Johnson and declares that the usefulness of the *Dictionary* will soon be felt in the country, "as there is no standard of correct language or conversation."

Six years after Smith reviewed Johnson's *Dictionary* the two men met. The first contact between them, which took place in London in September, 1761, at the home of William Strahan the publisher, was far from cordial. It was marked, in fact, by a bitter quarrel. What words actually passed between the two celebrities it is difficult to say, at least with absolute certainty. No written, eye-witness record of the quarrel has come down to us. But there does exist an account of a verbal clash between Smith and Johnson in which some of the words they used (or supposedly used) are recalled. This account, which is invariably mentioned when the great economist and the great moralist are discussed, owes its popularity largely to Sir Walter Scott. Although Scott's recital of the clash is the best known, the story of the quarrel is also told by William Wilberforce's sons (who, presumably, heard it from their father), and by William Jeffrey, who learned of it, according to his own testimony, from one who saw Smith immediately after the encounter took place.⁴

Sir Walter, who obtained his information from Professor John Millar, sets

forth the famous story in his anecdotal and amusing letter of January 30, 1829, to William Croker.⁵ Croker published the letter in his edition of *Boswell's Life of Samuel Johnson*, thus giving the story a degree of currency that it would not otherwise have had.

According to Sir Walter's account of the quarrel, Johnson and Smith met at a party in Glasgow. Johnson immediately took Smith to task about a statement he had made in a laudatory letter concerning his late friend David Hume. (Since Hume's non-religious attitude was very distasteful to Johnson, his attack might have been expected.) After Johnson's outburst, and the answer it evoked, Smith left the party and went to another one. Here the persons who were present were anxious to learn what had happened when the two men met, since they were aware that such a meeting was to take place. But now let us follow Scott directly in his telling of the story:

Adam Smith, whose temper seemed much ruffled, answered only at first, "He is a brute! he is a brute!" Upon closer examination it appeared that Dr. Johnson no sooner saw Smith than he brought forward a charge against him for something in his famous letter on the death of Hume. Smith said he had vindicated the truth of the statement. "And what did the Doctor say?" was the universal query: "Why, he said—he said—*You lie!*" "And what did you reply?" "I said, You are a son of a b—h!" [In the Wilberforce account the complete word is spelled out.]

Thus ends the story of the quarrel and its immediate aftermath as related by Sir Walter Scott. But Scott's concluding observation on the incident must of necessity be quoted: "On such terms did these two great moralists meet and part, and such was the classic dialogue betwixt them."

There are some gross inconsistencies in the preceding story, a fact that was long ago pointed out. Croker, whose edition of *Boswell's Life of Samuel Johnson* was so vigorously (and somewhat unfairly) criticized by his political adversary, Macaulay, declared that the story "is *certainly* erroneous in the important particulars of the *time, place, and subject* of the alleged quarrel." He expressed his disbelief in the whole account.⁶ John Rae, more than half a century later, also declared that "Time, place and subject are all alike wrong", though he felt that otherwise the story was basically true.⁷

The factual inconsistencies in the Scott anecdote (and in the Wilberforce and Jeffrey versions too) are evident from the following pieces of information. The encounter between Johnson and Smith was supposed to have occurred in Glasgow on October 29, 1773, the only occasion on which Johnson was even in that city. He and Boswell were then on the return leg of their journey to the Highlands and

the Hebrides. At that time, however, Smith was really not in Glasgow but in London, finishing *The Wealth of Nations*. Another glaring inconsistency in the anecdote is the fact that Hume did not die in 1773, when the clash between the two men was supposed to have taken place, but in 1776. A very good story thus turns out to be seriously at fault. However, it is still presented to the public in the general form in which Scott first told it, and without any reference to its internal inconsistencies. (One can find the story in this form in Holbrook Jackson's *Bookman's Holiday* and in Hesketh Pearson's *Sir Walter Scott*.)

Although the Scott story in its details will not stand up under analysis, many persons who have heard it undoubtedly feel like asking, with Leslie Stephen, "Should we regret or rejoice to say that it involves an obvious inaccuracy?"⁸ Under any circumstances, the story is now well imbedded in English literary lore and, with or without corrective explanations, it will long continue to be told.

Johnson and Smith did not quarrel in Glasgow in 1773, but it nevertheless seems true that on one occasion they did have a sharp verbal encounter—what Rae calls "a personal altercation of an outrageous character", an altercation "at which, if not the very words reported by Scott, then words quite as strong must manifestly have passed between them."⁹ The occasion appears to have been the September, 1761, meeting of the two men in London, although it could conceivably have been at another time.

A number of reasons can be given for the 1761 quarrel between Johnson and Smith and for their other and more moderate verbal skirmishes—reasons that go beyond Johnson's general "bearish" attitude. For one thing Smith was a Scotsman, and Johnson seemed at times to be prejudiced against the Scots. Boswell suggests why this was, or at least may have been, the case. "If he was particularly prejudiced against the Scots", he declares, "it was because they were more in his way; because he thought their success in England rather exceeded the due proportion of their real merit; and because he could not but see in them that nationality which I believe no liberal-minded Scotsman will deny."¹⁰

But this particular prejudice of Johnson's must not be exaggerated. It is of significance to note that not only was Boswell a Scotsman but so were five of the six amanuenses whom Johnson used in compiling his *Dictionary*. Johnson's rather frequent jibes at the Scots (including the aspersion contained in his celebrated definition of "oats") should therefore not be taken too seriously, though, on the other hand, they should probably not be wholly dismissed as bits of playful vindictiveness.

Johnson's early lack of enthusiasm for Smith may have been due partly to certain derogatory remarks that Smith had made in his review of *The Dictionary of*

the English Language. It is also possible that there had come to Johnson's ears the opinion Smith had expressed in his Glasgow lectures concerning "the Heaviness, weakness, and affected Pedantry" of the author of *The Rambler* essays.¹¹ Moreover, Smith had said (in paraphrased terms) that "Of all writers, ancient and modern, he that keeps off the greatest distance from common sense is Dr. Samuel Johnson."¹² Certainly, if Johnson knew of this latter remark he would not feel strongly inclined to "take to" Smith. And, finally, the very close friendship that existed between Smith and David Hume did little to endear the economist to Johnson—or to Boswell.

In the years following the 1761 quarrel, the relationship between Smith and Johnson became much more amicable. On December 1, 1775, a few months before *The Wealth of Nations* was published, Smith became a member (the twenty-fourth, following Edward Gibbon) of the famous Literary Club of London. In view of Johnson's prominence in the Club, this could hardly have happened had there existed any strong feelings of bitterness between him and Smith. At the meetings of the Club and at the homes of common friends the two men occasionally met and apparently treated one another with respect. They were still not averse, however, to making strong remarks about one another to other persons.

C. R. Fay has well stated that the differences between Johnson and Smith should not be permitted to overshadow the admiration they felt for "each other's forte, as expressed to third persons, however much they might snap at one another when face to face" (*Adam Smith*, 130). Expressions of this admiration are not difficult to find, but before examining them let us consider a few more examples of snapping. There was snapping after 1775, when Smith became a member of the famous Club, as well as before, and some of it, probably most of it, was done when the two celebrities were *not* face to face.

First there is the so-called Brentford incident about which Boswell tells us, on the basis of information from John Anderson (Hill-Powell, IV, 186, 513; V, 369). The date of this incident is not definitely known, but it could have been 1761. At whatever date it occurred, Smith, in Johnson's presence, was apparently boasting of Glasgow; he was "expatiating on the beauty" of the city. Johnson was not impressed and rebuked him with the question, "Pray, Sir, have you ever seen Brentford?" Since Brentford was the "town of mud" in James Thomson's *Castle of Indolence*, the question was obviously a very unkind one.

Johnson had not seen Glasgow when he asked his question, a fact which

makes the query all the more unkind and unmerited. In 1773, however, as we noted earlier, Johnson visited the city when he and Boswell were returning from their northern tour. On that occasion Boswell reminded him of the retort he had made to Smith: "I put him in mind of it today, while he expressed his admiration of the elegant buildings, and whispered him, 'Don't you feel some remorse?' " In his *Tour* Boswell does not indicate any answer to the question; but in his *Life of Johnson*, where the story is somewhat amplified, he says that Johnson replied, "Why, then Sir, *You* have never seen Brentford?" Not an especially compelling retort, one must admit.

Another episode involving a direct clash between Johnson and Smith—and here the clash is of a very minor nature—has to do with the verses of one Dr. Bentley. Again we learn from Boswell—he is our chief informant in most of these matters—that Johnson praised the verses highly in Smith's presence, and recited them "with his usual energy." Smith thereupon remarked, "in his usual professorial manner, 'Very well—Very well.' " Johnson remarked back, "Yes, they *are* very well, Sir; but you may observe in what manner they are well. They are forcible verses of a man of strong mind, but not accustomed to write verse; for there is some uncouthness in the expression" (IV, 23-24).

As an example of some snapping done at a distance, there is Smith's "block-head" statement, which seems to refer to Johnson as well as to certain other persons. In his *Journal* entry of February 23, 1766, Boswell tells of a conversation he had with Goldsmith in which he referred to a story of "Johnson and Goldsmith and those Blockheads" (*Private Papers*, VII, 83). Boswell attributed the story to Smith: "I told him 't was Smith *who said it*." From Goldsmith's reply—"Well, by telling me it was he, you have given me a plaister for the Sore"—it seems clear that he interpreted Smith's story to imply that he, Goldsmith, was a blockhead. If this is true, then it follows that Johnson too was covered by the epithet.

On April 2, 1775, Boswell called on Smith in London, when the economist was nearing the end of his work on *The Wealth of Nations* (the book was published on March 9, 1776). Among other remarks that Smith made on the occasion was one about Johnson. It was the economist's view that the latter's "roughness" was due "to a certain degree of insanity which he thought he had" (X, 176). (Perhaps one should look upon this statement as a charitable rather than an unkind remark—a remark which implied that Johnson's roughness was unintended and non-vindictive.)

Another snap coming from Johnson is the one mentioned in Boswell's *Journal* entry for March 17, 1776. Boswell notes that Johnson had said to him the day

before that "Adam Smith was a most disagreeable fellow after he had drank some wine, which, he said, 'bubbled in his mouth' " (XI, 148). This personal observation could well have been the truth, but it was an unkind one to make, especially by a person whose manner of eating left much to be desired.

Less than a month later, on April 13, 1776, Boswell makes another *Journal* entry which appears to be a statement uttered by Johnson, and one again concerning Smith. The reader cannot be absolutely certain on the point, however, since Boswell removed a number of pages from his records to use as copy. His narrative, continuing on the preserved pages, has these words: ". . . said Adam Smith was as dull a dog as he had ever met with" (XI, 250). If Johnson made this statement, it should be pointed out in all justice that about the same time, as we shall see shortly, he also paid a tribute to Smith.

Two final snaps, these by Smith, may be cited. First, in the account of his 1780 talks with the economist, a young interviewer who wrote under the pen name of *Amicus* declares that Smith had "a very contemptuous opinion" of Johnson, and then goes on to mention a number of examples Smith had given of Johnson's peculiar behaviour.¹³ Again, in 1789, the year before his death, Smith made an observation to Samuel Rogers, who was visiting Edinburgh, that *may* have been an unkind reference to Johnson (who had died in 1784). Rogers inquired of Smith if he knew Mrs. Piozzi (the former Mrs. Thrale, a close friend of Johnson), who was living in Edinburgh at the time. Smith said he had not met her and then added that he thought she had been spoiled "by keeping company with odd people."¹⁴

But now we must turn to the other side of the picture and see some instances in which the two men spoke approvingly of one another. Following the sentiment expressed by Professor Fay, we must not let these examples of admiration and goodwill be overshadowed—completely overshadowed—by the critical and uncomplimentary statements the men made about each other.

A fine bit of testimony in support of the contention that Smith and Johnson admired "each other's forte" is found in the tribute Smith pays to the Preface to Johnson's famous edition of Shakespeare, which was published in 1763. In Smith's estimation, so Boswell tells us, the Preface was "the most manly piece of criticism that was ever published in any country" (Hill-Powell, I, 496). This tribute may be unduly generous, but the merit of Johnson's Preface, and of his edition of Shakespeare in general, has been recognized by other critics.

Smith also paid a high compliment to Johnson's knowledge of books. Discussing the breadth of Johnson's reading, Boswell declares that "we may be absolutely certain, both from his writings and his conversation, that his reading was exten-

sive." And then he adds, "Dr. Adam Smith, than whom few were better judges on the subject, once observed to me that 'Johnson knew more books than any man alive' " (I, 70-71).

If on occasion Smith spoke kindly of Johnson, Johnson on the other hand sometimes spoke kindly of Smith. Smith's strong preference for rhymed rather than blank verse struck a very responsive chord in Johnson, and his statement on the matter is often quoted. It may be recalled that when Johnson learned from Boswell of Smith's view he said: "Sir, I was once in company with Smith, and we did not take to each other; but had I known that he loved rhyme as much as you tell me he does, I should have HUGGED him" (I, 427-428). What a tragedy it was that Johnson was not thus informed! Instead of witnessing a notorious quarrel, the friends of the two men would have seen a happy demonstration of amiability.

A stronger expression of kindness on Johnson's part was his defence of Smith's qualifications for writing a book like *The Wealth of Nations*. Smith's great work had just been published and Boswell mentioned it to Johnson, saying that Sir John Pringle had stated to him that "Dr. Smith who had never been in trade, could not be expected to write well on that subject any more than a lawyer on Physick." Johnson did not share Sir John's opinion. "He is mistaken, Sir: a man who has never been engaged in trade himself may undoubtedly write well on trade, and there is nothing which requires more to be illustrated by philosophy than trade does" (II, 430).

As we have already noted, Smith and Johnson first met in September, 1761. The meeting place was the home of William Strahan in London. Smith was again in London in the early part of 1764, before he and the young Duke of Buccleuch set out on their extended trip to the continent. His visit on this occasion was brief, and apparently he did not see Johnson. Johnson may not have been in the city at the time—he could well have been with the Langton family in Lincolnshire. On his return to England with the Duke in November, 1766, Smith once more stopped in London and remained there for six months, devoting some of his time to turning out a new edition of his *Theory of Moral Sentiments*. During this period the paths of the two men appear not to have crossed.

In the first part of 1773, Smith journeyed to London again and spent most of the next four years there, devoting much of his time to finishing *The Wealth of Nations* and seeing it through the press. During this period he certainly came into contact with Johnson. Rae mentions a dinner on January 11, 1775, at which both

Smith and Johnson were present. And at the end of the year on December 1, as we noted earlier, Smith became a member of the Literary Club, of which Johnson was the principal luminary. Johnson himself, however, was not present at the meeting at which Smith was admitted.

According to Dugald Stewart, Smith spent the greater part of the two years following the publication of *The Wealth of Nations* (early in 1776) in London, "enjoying a society too extensive and varied to afford him any opportunity of indulging his taste for study." But, says Stewart, this time was not lost, "for much of it was spent with some of the first names in English literature."¹⁵ Johnson, of course, would figure in that category, and he and Smith were undoubtedly together intermittently during these months.

Did they discuss Smith's great book on any of the occasions at which they met? This is a good question to ask, but it is a question to which no definite answer can be given. If they talked about the book no record exists of what they said concerning it. Similarly there is no record of any correspondence between the two celebrities in which *The Wealth of Nations*—or any other matter—is discussed.

Though Rae makes no mention of the fact,¹⁶ Smith apparently visited London again in 1782. According to the records of the Literary Club, he attended six of the sixteen dinners held by the group during that year.¹⁷ Johnson was present at three. We are not told, however, whether the two men were at any of the dinners together.

In 1787 Smith, now a very sick man, made his final visit to London. During his stay in the city, he met a number of famous persons, including Pitt. Johnson, of course, he could not meet, for the Great Cham had died in 1784.

The figures below, based on the records of the Literary Club, show the frequency with which Smith and Johnson were present at the dinners of the Club. The years covered are only those during which Smith attended one or more of the gatherings:

Year	Number of Dinners	Times Present	
		Smith	Johnson
1775	6	1	2
1776	15	6	3
1777	15	8	3
1782	16	6	3
1787	15	1	—

If these figures are correct, the times Smith and Johnson met at the dinners of the club could not have been more than nine (it is to be remembered that John-

son was absent when Smith joined the club in December, 1775) and might well have been less. For Croker to say, therefore, that the two men met "frequently" and on civil terms at the club is an exaggeration. Smith and Johnson also met, however, at the homes of mutual friends. How often, one cannot say, though the likelihood is that the number of such meetings was not large. Rae's remark that they met "constantly" would also seem to be an exaggeration.

It is clear, therefore, that though Johnson and Smith were contemporaries and acquaintances, they were not close friends. No "hoops of steel" bound them together. In one sense of the term it might be said that they were not friends at all. They were certainly not very friendly friends.

Regardless of how one describes the relationship between the two men, however, a study of the contacts between them and of the attitude that each assumed toward the other is of interest and value. Such a study throws a few rays of indirect light on a truly exciting period in British intellectual history, and contributes directly to our understanding and enjoyment of two of the period's greatest figures.

NOTES

1. A longer discussion of Smith's literary interests will be found in the present writer's article, "Adam Smith—Man of Letters", in the University of Texas *Studies in Literature and Language*, III (Summer, 1961), 212-222.
2. Smith's lectures are dealt with by William R. Scott in *Adam Smith as Professor and Student* (Glasgow: Jackson, Son & Co., 1937, Glasgow University Publications, XLVI), Chapter V.
3. John Rae, *Life of Adam Smith* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1895), 30, 34-41; Nelson S. Bushnell, *William Hamilton of Bangour* (Aberdeen: The University Press, 1957), 6, 53, 132. Leslie Stephen, *The Dictionary of National Biography*, article on Adam Smith, declares that Smith "probably" edited the poems; and C. R. Fay makes a cautious statement on Smith's having written the first Preface to the collection: "If the ascription is correct . . ." See *Adam Smith and the Scotland of His Day* (Cambridge: the University Press, 1956), 21.
4. For the Wilberforce version of the story see *The Correspondence of William Wilberforce*, ed. Robert I. and Samuel Wilberforce (London: John Murray, 1840), I, 40. The editors have Smith himself tell the story to Wilberforce and others in the spring of 1787. Rae, *op. cit.*, 156-157, characterizes this way of relating the story as absurd. The Jeffrey reference to the story is contained in his review of the Wilberforce Correspondence in the *Edinburgh Review*, LXXII, American edition (October, 1840), 27. Jeffrey said he could "vouch for the conformity" of the Wilberforce account "in every particular", though, according to his recollection (he heard the story almost fifty years previously), "Dr. Johnson's first address was even more rude and insulting than as there represented."

5. The letter is printed in *The Croker Papers*, The Correspondence and Diaries, ed. Louis J. Jennings (London: John Murray, 1894), II, 28-34. It is also in *The Letters of Walter Scott*, ed. Herbert J. C. Grierson (London: Constable & Co., Ltd., 1936), XI, 110-120. Rae says that Smith himself told the anecdote to Millar the night the quarrel occurred, but he does not cite the source of this information.
6. *Boswell's Life of Samuel Johnson, L.L.D.*, ed. William Croker (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1857), V, 115.
7. *Op. cit.*, 157-158.
8. *Samuel Johnson* (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1914), 115.
9. *Op. cit.*, 157.
10. *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, ed. George B. Hill, revised and enlarged edition by Lawrence F. Powell (Oxford: the Clarendon Press, 1934-1950), V, 20. Hereinafter referred to by the names of the editors.
11. *Private Papers of James Boswell from Malahide Castle*, ed. Geoffrey Scott and Frederick A. Pottle (Privately Printed, 1928-1934), I, 70. Hereinafter referred to as *Private Papers*. The quoted words are Boswell's and refer to the view held by a number of other named persons in addition to Smith.
12. The statement concerning Johnson and common sense was included in some biographical anecdotes concerning Smith, printed in the *London Times* (July 24, 1790) at the time of his death. Fay, *op. cit.*, 32-35, reprints the *Times* item.
13. *The Bee*, III (May 11, 1791), 2-3.
14. W. Forbes Gray, *An Edinburgh Miscellany* (Edinburgh: Robert Grant & Son, 1925), 40-41.
15. *The Collected Works of Dugald Stewart*, ed. William Hamilton (Edinburgh: Thomas Constable and Co., 1858), X, 71.
16. In his account of Smith's 1787 visit to London, Rae, indeed, refers to the economist's "last" visit in 1777. *Op. cit.*, 404.
17. *Annals of The Club, 1764-1914* (Oxford: Printed at the University Press, Printed for the Club, London, 1914), 27. This edition of the *Annals* embodies the study made by Sir Mountstuart Elphinstone Grant Duff and published in 1905. If Smith attended six dinners during the year, his visit in London was of long duration or else he made more than one trip to the city.