ing. This was perhaps the firſt time that ever ſhe diſcovered a ſenſe of ſhame, and on this occaſion the power of wit was very conſpicuous: the wretch who had, with­out ſcruple, proclaimed herſelf an adultereſs, and who had firſt endeavoured to ſtarve her ſon, then to tranſport him, and afterwards to hang him, was not able to bear the repreſentation of her own conduct; but fled from reproach, though ſhe felt no pain from guilt; and left Bath with the utmoſt haſte, to ſhelter herſelf among the crowds of London @@(a).

Some time after this, Savage formed the reſolution of applying to the queen; who having once given him life, he hoped ſhe might farther extend her goodneſs to him by enabling him to ſupport it. —With this view, he publiſhed a poem on her birthday, which he entitled *The Volunteer-Laureat;* for which ſhe was pleaſed to ſend him 501. with an intimation that he might annu­ally expect the ſame bounty. But this annual allow­ance was nothing to a man of his ſtrange and Angular extravagance. His uſual cuſtom was, as ſoon as he had received his penſion, to diſappear with it, and ſecrete himſelf from his most intimate friends, till every ſhilling of the 501. was ſpent; which done, he again appeared, pennyleſs as before: But he would never in­form any perſon where he had been, nor in what manner his money had been diſſipated. —From the reports, how­ever, of ſome who found means to penetrate his haunts, it would ſeem that he expended both his time and his caſh in the moſt fordid and deſpicable ſenſuality; parti­cularly in eating and drinking, in which he would in­dulge in the moſt unſocial manner, fitting whole days and nights by himſelf, in obſcure houſes of entertain­ment, over his bottle and trencher, immerſed in filth and ſloth, with ſcarce decent apparel; generally wrapped up in a horſeman’s great coat; and, on the whole, with his very homely countenance, and altogether, exhibiting an **object the moſt diſguſting to the fight, if not to ſome**

other of the ſenſes.

His wit and parts, however, ſtill raiſed him new friends as faſt as his miſhehaviour loſt him his old ones. Yet ſuch was his conduct, that occaſional relief only furniſhed the means of occaſional exceſs; and he defeated all attempts made by his friends to fix him in a decent way. He was even reduced ſo low as to be deſtitute of a lodging; inſomuch that he often paſſed his nights in thoſe mean houſes that are ſet open for caſual wan­derers; ſometimes in cellars amidſt the riot and filth of the moſt profligate of the rabble; and not ſeldom would he walk the ſtreets till he was weary, and then lie down in ſummer on a bulk, or in winter with his aſſociates among the aſhes of a glaſs-houſe.

Yet, amidſt all his penury and wretchedneſs, had this man ſo much pride, and ſo high an opinion of his own merit, that he ever kept up his ſpirits, and was always ready to repreſs, with ſcorn and contempt, the leaſt ap­pearance of any flight or indignity towards himſelf, in the behaviour of his acquaintance; among whom he looked upon none as his ſuperior. He would be treat­ed as an equal, even by perſons of the higheſt rank. We have an inſtance of this prepoſterous and inconſiſtent pride, in his refuſing to wait upon a gentleman who was deſirous of relieving him when at the loweſt ebb of diſtreſs, only becauſe the meſſage ſignified the gen­tleman’s deſire to ſee him at nine in the morning. Sa­vage could not bear that any one ſhould preſume to preſcribe the hour of his attendance, and therefore he abſolutely rejected the proffered kindneſs. This life, unhappy as it may be already imagined, was yet ren­dered more unhappy, by the death of the queen, in 1738; which ſtroke deprived him of all hopes from the court. His penſion was diſcontinued, and the inſolent manner in which he demanded of Sir Robert

@@@ (a) Mr Boſwell, in his life of Dr Johnſon, has called in queſtion the ſtory of Savage’s birth, and grounded his ſuſpicion on two miſtakes, or, as he calls them, falſehoods, which he thinks he has diſcovered in his friend’s me­moirs of that extraordinary man. Johnſon has ſaid, that the earl of Rivers was Savage’s godfather, and gave him his own name; which, by his direction, was inſerted in the regiſter of the pariſh of St Andrew’s, Holborn. Part of this, it ſeems, is not true; for Mr Boſwell carefully inſpected that regiſter, but no ſuch entry is to be found. But does this omiſſion amount to a proof, that the perſon who called himſelf *Richard Savage* was an impoſtor, and not the ſon of the earl of Rivers and the counteſs of Macclesfield? Mr Boſwell thinks it does; and, in behalf of his opinion, appeals to the maxim *falſum in uno, falſum in omnibus.* The ſolidity of this maxim may be allowed by others; but it was not without ſurpriſe that, on ſuch an occaſion, we found it adopted by the biographer of Johnſon. To all who have compared his view of a celebrated cauſe, with Stuart’s letters on the ſame ſubject addreſſed to Lord Mansfield, it muſt be apparent, that, at one period of his life, he would not have deemed a thouſand ſuch miſtakes ſufficient to invalidate a narrative otherwiſe ſo well authenticated as that which relates the birth of Savage. The truth is, that the omiſſion of the name in the regiſter of St Andrew’s may be eaſily accounted for, without bringing againſt the wretched Savage an accuſation of impoſture, which neither his mother nor her friends dared to urge when provoked to it by every poſſible motive that can influence human conduct. The earl of Rivers would undoubtedly give the di­rection about regiſtering the child’s name to the ſame perſon whom he entruſted with the care of his edu­cation; but that perſon, it is well known, was the counteſs of Macclesfield, who, as ſhe had reſolved from his birth to diſown her ſon, would take care that the direction ſhould not be obeyed.

That which, in Johnſon’s life of Savage, Mr Boſwell calls a ſecond falſehood, ſeems not to amount even to a miſtake. It is there ſtated, that “Lady Macclesfield having lived for ſome time upon very uneaſy terms with her huſhand, thought a public confeſſion of adultery the moſt obvious and expeditious method of ob­taining her liberty. ” This Mr Boſwell thinks cannot be true; becauſe, having peruſed the journals of both houſes of parliament at the period of her divorce, he there found it authentically aſcertained, that ſo far from voluntarily ſubmitting to the ignominious charge of adultery, ſhe made a ſtrenuous defence by her counſel. But what is this to the purpoſe? Johnſon has nowhere ſaid, that ſhe confeſſed her adultery at