

Cambridge University Press & Assessment

978-0-521-83218-2 — Correspondence Primarily on Sir Charles Grandison(1750–1754)

Samuel Richardson , Edited by Betty A. Schellenberg

Frontmatter

[More Information](#)

THE CAMBRIDGE EDITION OF
THE CORRESPONDENCE OF
SAMUEL RICHARDSON IO

CORRESPONDENCE PRIMARILY ON
Sir Charles Grandison (1750–1754)

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-0-521-83218-2 — Correspondence Primarily on Sir Charles Grandison(1750–1754)
Samuel Richardson , Edited by Betty A. Schellenberg
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

THE CAMBRIDGE EDITION OF
THE WORKS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF
SAMUEL RICHARDSON

GENERAL EDITORS

Thomas Keymer *University of Toronto*

Peter Sabor *McGill University*

Thanks are expressed to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Leverhulme Trust, the Chancellor Jackman Professorships Program, the Canada Research Chairs Program and Le Fonds québécois de la recherche sur la société et la culture for providing research funding towards the creation of this edition.

Advisory board

Paula R. Backscheider, David Blewett, Margaret Anne Doody, David Fairer,
Isobel Grundy, Jocelyn Harris, John Mullan, Claude Rawson, John Richetti,
Kathryn Sutherland, Janet Todd, Howard Weinbrot

THE CAMBRIDGE EDITION OF
THE WORKS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF
SAMUEL RICHARDSON

THE WORKS

1. *Early Works*
2. *Pamela*
3. *Pamela in her Exalted Condition*
- 4–7. *Clarissa*
- 8–11. *Sir Charles Grandison*
12. *Later Works and Index*

THE CORRESPONDENCE

1. *Correspondence with Aaron Hill and the Hill Family*
2. *Correspondence with George Cheyne and Thomas Edwards*
3. *Correspondence with Sarah Wescomb, Frances Grainger and Laetitia Pilkington*
4. *Correspondence with Sarah Chapone, Hester Mulso Chapone and their Circles*
- 5–7. *Correspondence with Lady Bradshaigh and Lady Echlin*
8. *Correspondence with Edward Young, Johannes Stinstra, Eusebius Silvester and Lady Barbara Montagu*
9. *Correspondence Primarily on Pamela and Clarissa (1732–1749)*
10. *Correspondence Primarily on Sir Charles Grandison (1750–1754)*
11. *Correspondence of Richardson's Final Years (1755–1761)*
12. *Additional Letters, Appendices and General Index*

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
 978-0-521-83218-2 — Correspondence Primarily on Sir Charles Grandison(1750–1754)
 Samuel Richardson , Edited by Betty A. Schellenberg
 Frontmatter
[More Information](#)



Samuel Richardson by James Macardell, after Joseph Highmore (1750).
 Given by Sir Herbert Henry Raphael, 1st Baronet, 1916. © National
 Portrait Gallery, London.

SAMUEL
RICHARDSON



CORRESPONDENCE
PRIMARILY ON
SIR CHARLES GRANDISON
(1750–1754)

EDITED BY

Betty A. Schellenberg



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
 978-0-521-83218-2 — Correspondence Primarily on Sir Charles Grandison (1750–1754)
 Samuel Richardson, Edited by Betty A. Schellenberg
 Frontmatter
[More Information](#)



CAMBRIDGE
 UNIVERSITY PRESS

Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom
 One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
 477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
 314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India
 103 Penang Road, #05–06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment,
 a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of
 education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521832182

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2015

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions
 of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take
 place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press & Assessment.

First published 2015

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data

Richardson, Samuel, 1689–1761.

[Correspondence. Selections]

Samuel Richardson : Correspondence Primarily on *Sir Charles*

Grandison (1750–1754) / edited by Betty A. Schellenberg.

pages cm – (The Cambridge edition of the correspondence of Samuel Richardson; 10)

ISBN 978-0-521-83218-2 (hardback)

I. Richardson, Samuel, 1689–1761 – Correspondence. 2. Novelists,
 English – 18th century – Correspondence. 3. Richardson, Samuel, 1689–1761.

History of Sir Charles Grandison. I. Schellenberg, Betty A. II. Title.

III. Title: Correspondence primarily on Sir Charles Grandison (1750–1754).

PR3666.A4 2014b

823'.6–dc23

[B]

2014010866

ISBN 978-0-521-83218-2 Hardback

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence
 or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this
 publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will
 remain, accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press & Assessment

978-0-521-83218-2 — Correspondence Primarily on Sir Charles Grandison(1750–1754)

Samuel Richardson , Edited by Betty A. Schellenberg

Frontmatter

[More Information](#)

CONTENTS

General Editors' Preface *page* ix

Acknowledgements xxxiii

Chronology xxv

List of Abbreviations xxxiii

General Introduction xxxv

RICHARDSON'S CORRESPONDENCE PRIMARILY ON *SIR CHARLES GRANDISON (1750–1754)* I

Index of Richardson's Correspondents

in Volume 10 281

General Index 283

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

Thanks to the editorial labours of the twentieth century, there are few major British authors of the eighteenth century – the classic period of the familiar letter as a genre – whose correspondence is not available in a standard scholarly edition. Some of the most ambitious undertakings, such as the Yale edition of James Boswell and the Oxford/McGill–Queen's edition of Frances Burney, are still in progress, and some of the most long-standing, such as the Oxford and Chicago editions of Alexander Pope and Edmund Burke respectively, now require extensive supplementation, perhaps even replacement. But there is no more anomalous case than Samuel Richardson, whose correspondence holds special interest, beyond its extraordinary scale and range, as that of a practising epistolary novelist who thought longer and harder than any contemporary about the letter as a form. Almost half of the surviving Richardson correspondence, which totals almost 1,700 letters, has never appeared in print, and barely a quarter of it is represented – with silent abridgements, conflation, and other interventions – in the early edition on which scholars have had to rely until now, Anna Laetitia Barbauld's six-volume *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson* (1804).

The process of publication got off to a good enough start. Individual items began appearing in print within Richardson's lifetime, and in his last years he took practical steps towards preparing a selected edition. Even before the success of *Pamela* propelled him to fame in the early 1740s, a reply he wrote in humorous couplets to a guild invitation – emphatically a rhyming letter, not a verse epistle – found its way into the *Gentleman's Magazine* for January 1736. The epistolary commentaries he printed about later novels, such as his *Answer to the Letter of a Very Reverend Worthy Gentleman, Objecting to the Warmth of a Particular Scene in . . . Clarissa* (1749) or his *Copy of a Letter to a Lady, Who Was Solicitous for an Additional Volume to . . . Sir Charles Grandison* (1754), were formal versions of actual letters, written and sent in response to letters he received. Richardson also included as an appendix to *Sir Charles Grandison* extracts from his acrimonious correspondence with George Faulkner, the Dublin bookseller, about literary piracy and property. Fourteen complete or abridged letters from the poet Aaron Hill, Richardson's closest literary adviser for many years, appeared in print before this time, either in the expanded second edition of *Pamela* or, more extensively, in *The Works of the Late Aaron Hill* (1753). By 1757, when a Leipzig bookseller named Erasmus Reich approached Richardson requesting to publish a selected edition in German, he had

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

already been at work for at least two years in sorting his correspondence files for family use, and he considered Reich's proposal very seriously. Surviving manuscripts are marked up for publication in his tremulous late hand, with names disguised and wordings improved, and he discussed the project with at least two correspondents, Lady Bradshaigh and Sarah Wescomb Scudamore. The following year he abandoned the idea, largely because of scruples about confidentiality. But he continued to think of the correspondence as publishable after his death, subject to permission from the writers involved, if necessary as a subscription edition to support his daughters. A venture of some such kind seems to have been in prospect in about 1780, when Richardson's nephew William issued proposals for a new edition of the novels to contain, among other addenda, 'a collection of letters written by him on moral and entertaining subjects, never before published'.¹ But the edition in question never materialized, and it was not until the death of Richardson's last surviving daughter in 1803, and the subsequent acquisition of his manuscripts by the radical bookseller Richard Phillips, that publication was at last achieved.

The edition that Barbauld prepared for Phillips has been widely criticized for its undeclared editorial freedoms. Yet Barbauld's treatment of manuscript sources was within the publishing conventions of her day, and the many small-scale changes made to punctuation and other accidentals were not her own but the work of compositors in the five printing-houses among which Phillips, in his haste to recoup his outlay, distributed production. Thanks to the researches of Barbauld's modern biographer, William McCarthy, we now know the constraints under which she produced her edition, in at most three months between receiving the original manuscripts and delivering copy to the press, and under relentless harassment from the impatient Phillips.² That said, it remains the case that many if not most of the 442 letters represented in Barbauld's edition are silently abridged and otherwise revised, with quite serious chronological scrambling of key correspondences (notably with Edward Young and Lady Bradshaigh), frequent misdatings elsewhere, and at least twenty-five cases in which apparently single letters in fact splice together two or more different sources; hence the total of 442 letters represented in her edition, though she appears to include only 411. Barbauld edited directly on to the manuscripts she received, many of which had already been edited by Richardson himself, and no doubt the printers worked from these originals, almost three-quarters of which later went missing. The result is that Barbauld's six-volume

¹ John Nichols, *Anecdotes of Bowyer* (1782), p. 157. On these abortive early attempts and the later transmission of the manuscripts, see T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), pp. 436–9, and Louise Curran, "Into Whosoever Hands Our Letters Might Fall": Samuel Richardson's Correspondence and "the Public Eye", *Eighteenth-Century Life* 35 (2011), 51–64; also Curran, 'Samuel Richardson: The Author as Correspondent' (diss., University of London, 2011).

² William McCarthy, 'What Did Anna Barbauld Do to Samuel Richardson's Correspondence? A Study of Her Editing', *Studies in Bibliography* 54 (2001), 191–223.

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

edition is, for all its defects, the only surviving witness for 324 letters;³ similar uncertainties surround the text of other letters now known only from early printed sources.

Barbauld's slashing deletions in green ink can still be seen on the manuscripts that survived this process, and she was defensive about the haste of her selections. No one should find fault, she wearily declared, 'unless he had submitted to his inspection, not only the letters that are taken, but those also which are left'.⁴ It was clear on all sides, however, that much more than mere chaff remained unpublished. The first supplement to Barbauld appeared in the *European Magazine and London Review*, which serialized a number of Richardson's letters to Sarah Wescomb over three volumes in 1808–9. Phillips's *Monthly Magazine* followed suit with its own selections of unpublished correspondence: first between Richardson and the poet and translator Elizabeth Carter (1813), then a lengthy, important series between Richardson and the poet Edward Young, published over a six-year period (1813–19), and finally a brief exchange between Richardson and his fellow novelist Tobias Smollett (1819), from a somewhat longer correspondence that Barbauld had missed or ignored. Items from other correspondences, not all of them in Phillips's hands, appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (1816–17), Rebecca Warner's miscellany *Original Letters* (1817), and posthumous collections of works by various writers, notably the bluestocking feminist Hester Mulso Chapone (in 1807) and the German poet Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock (in 1821).

This process had more or less run its course by 1828, when Phillips ran into financial difficulties and was forced to sell his manuscript collection at auction. A single purchaser, William Upcott, was able to keep much of the collection together, but important parts of it were dispersed (in some cases now untraceably), and publication seems not to have been the motive for any of the buyers involved. The letters not bought by Upcott, and some he sold by private treaty before his death in 1845, are now scattered among numerous archives, many of these in England, Scotland, and the United States, with smaller collections in Germany, the Netherlands, Ireland, and Canada, and a few in private hands. The bulk of Upcott's purchase eventually found its way into the South Kensington (now the Victoria & Albert) Museum, where it has been publicly available since the death in 1876 of its last private owner, the literary journalist John Forster, as part of a much larger bequest. Catalogued as the Forster Collection, it contains about half of the surviving correspondence: some 850 letters arranged and mounted in six massive volumes (probably the work of Richard Forster Sketchley, Assistant Keeper of the Museum, whose published guide to the entire Forster Collection appeared in 1893). But although the letters were extensively consulted there and in other depositories

³ McCarthy reports that 'of the 442 letters represented in the *Correspondence*, manuscript texts are known (as of 2002) to survive for 111' ('What Did Barbauld Do', p. 208); seven further manuscripts of letters used by Barbauld are reported in Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor, 'Samuel Richardson's Correspondence: Additions to Eaves and Kimpel', *Notes & Queries* 50 (2003), 215–18.

⁴ *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, ed. Anna Laetitia Barbauld, 6 vols. (London, 1804), 1, vi.

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

by pioneering Richardsonians such as Clara Linklater Thomson and Austin Dobson, and by more recent generations of scholars, no significant advance was made on Barbauld's edition until 1943, when the physician George Cheyne's letters to Richardson, none of which had appeared in Barbauld, were published in a scholarly edition by Charles F. Mullett. Another substantial addition to the corpus was made in 1969, with William C. Slattery's publication of Richardson's correspondence with his Dutch translator, Johannes Stinstra: Barbauld had included three of their letters, but Slattery's edition contains twenty-three, among them Richardson's now celebrated autobiographical letter of 2 June 1753. Modern scholarly editions of letters by independently important correspondents of Richardson such as Samuel Johnson (1952, 1992–4), Tobias Smollett (1970), Edward Young (1971), Sarah and Henry Fielding (1993), Edward Moore (1996), and Charlotte Lennox (1970–1, 2012) have also made available hitherto unpublished letters, or in some cases improved texts of published letters. So too has John Carroll's pioneering *Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson* (1964), which provides lightly annotated texts of 128 letters to 33 different correspondents, many of them published for the first time, though often in excerpted form. For half a century, Carroll's selection, alongside Barbauld's, has been the edition cited by Richardson's critics, as well as by many other scholars of the period. More recently, Carroll and Barbauld provide the basis for Donatella Montini's *Lettere su Clarissa*, a more fully annotated selection of thirty-one letters by Richardson, published in 2009. Two and a half centuries after Erasmus Reich's original proposal for a selected edition in translation, it was in Italian, not German, that something resembling his plan came to fruition, though without adding new letters to the published corpus.



In a well-known letter to Sarah Wescomb of September 1746, Richardson celebrates 'the familiar correspondences of friendly and undesigning hearts', and extols the epistolary mode as 'indicative, generally beyond the power of disguise, of the mind of the writer'. It was for this offer of intimate access to authentic personality that the private letters of published authors were so prized in the eighteenth century, even before – as the subterfuge surrounding Pope's *Letters* of 1737 makes clear – their publication seemed fully legitimate. For the same reason, alongside the obvious value of letters as repositories of day-to-day information, they remain an indispensable resource for biographers. The six hundred or so letters by Richardson now known to survive in manuscript or early printed versions are far from conforming in every case to the ideal of artless transparency that he urged on Wescomb. Much of their fascination comes from the ways in which, as the letters of a major epistolary novelist, they reflect his self-consciousness about his chosen form, including its potential for disguise as well as disclosure. Even so, Richardson's letters exhibit a private identity unavailable from any other source, and one that proves, in light of his surviving correspondence as a whole, far more complex and multifaceted than the notorious caricature that Samuel Taylor Coleridge derived from his reading of

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

Barbauld: 'so very vile a mind – so oozy, hypocritical, praise-mad, canting, envious, concupiscent'.⁵ In other contexts, Richardson was consistently reluctant to write in his own voice, to the point on several occasions of procuring prefaces to his works from other hands. Letters gave him, by contrast, a protected space for more or less direct self-expression, and those that survive provide unrivalled evidence of his personal life, his moral, social, and religious opinions, and above all his thinking about literature and the book trade, the art of fiction, and his own practice as a novelist. No other writer of the period has left such a rich, detailed, and sustained account of the composition, reception, and revision of his own works.

Inevitably, the biographical picture is not complete. No epistolary trace survives of some of Richardson's most intriguing relationships: with, for example, the unidentified high-born patron who befriended him in his apprentice years, though 'Multitudes of Letters passed between this Gentleman & me', he told Stinstra decades later (2 June 1753). His close and enduring friendship with the distinguished parliamentarian Arthur Onslow, Speaker of the House of Commons, is only indirectly glimpsed in surviving exchanges with mutual acquaintances, notably the poet and critic Thomas Edwards. Fewer than eighty traceable items are extant from the 1730s, mainly letters to Richardson from Hill and Cheyne, his most prominent friends of the period, but his own side of these correspondences is very sparse. It was not until achieving fame with *Pamela* (1740) at the age of 50 that he seems to have begun systematic efforts to preserve, copy, and file his correspondence, though these files were apparently depleted by the time they reached Barbauld, and certainly depleted further before the 1828 auction, after which more items disappeared. Like Boswell's Johnson, Richardson is a figure we witness in sometimes crushing detail for the last twenty years of his life, but one whose youth and middle age are more distantly, patchily seen. Later letters give valuable insights into otherwise irretrievable aspects of his early career, notably the famous letter to Stinstra, an epistolary memoir comparable, as an exercise in short, informal autobiography, with Laurence Sterne's 'Memoir' and David Hume's 'My Own Life'. But it is above all in Richardson's creative maturity, and at his professional peak, when his range of correspondents grew alongside his fame, that he becomes truly present – vividly, copiously so – in epistolary sources.

Yet it is not only for information about Richardson himself that the correspondence is an important resource. Thanks to his celebrity as an author, his standing and influence as a book-trade professional, and above all his unrelenting fascination with epistolary dialogue and debate, Richardson was able to draw into the circle of his correspondence numerous leading figures in the literary culture of his day. Little now survives of the strictly professional correspondence he conducted in his capacity as a master printer, including the enormous traffic that must have arisen from the branch of work that distinguished his business, that of parliamentary printing. There are a few business exchanges with prominent trade colleagues such

⁵ *Coleridge's Notebooks: A Selection*, ed. Seamus Perry (Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 82 (4–8 March 1805).

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

as Andrew Millar and William Strahan, but these are only the tip of an iceberg lost to view. Even so, from his earliest letters to Hill and Cheyne to some of his very last, notably to Catherine Lintot, granddaughter and successor of the printer Bernard Lintot, book-trade concerns are recurrently to the fore, most of all where Richardson is acting as printer for the correspondents involved, or otherwise advising them about publication matters. In this respect his correspondence ranks alongside that of the bookseller Robert Dodsley, or other storehouses like the Bowyer ledgers or Nichols's *Anecdotes*, as one of the richest and most wide-ranging sources in the period for the history of authorship and the book trade. It crucially illuminates the lives and works of the significant but now non-canonical authors to whom he was closest, whose correspondence does not otherwise exist in print. Young is the obvious exception in this category, though some new material has come to light since Henry Pettit's 1971 edition of Young's correspondence; more typical are Hill, Edwards, and Sarah Chapone, a key intermediary between Mary Astell and the bluestocking generation who is now best known for her pioneering tract *The Hardships of the English Laws in Relation to Wives* (1735).

Significant bodies of correspondence also survive involving Elizabeth Carter, the novelist Sarah Fielding, the memoirist Laetitia Pilkington, and other literary friends such as the Delanys, Patrick and Mary, and the Sheridans, Thomas and Frances, all four leading figures in the cultural life of eighteenth-century Dublin. There are also surviving caches of letters to and/or from, among other significant writers of the period, Thomas Birch, Colley Cibber, Jane Collier, Henry Fielding, David Garrick, Samuel Johnson, Charlotte Lennox, Edward Moore, Sarah Scott, Joseph Spence, and William Warburton. It is not entirely an optical illusion, as one reviews these and other names, to see Richardson as inhabiting the very centre of the period's cultural web, not least as it expanded to accommodate women writers.⁶ His strenuous promotion of female authorship and learning makes the correspondence an especially important resource for the history of women and print. In 1750 Richardson sent Frances Grainger a list of thirty-six intellectually accomplished women, 'almost all of them of my intimate Acquaintances' (8 September 1750), and it was to an overlapping group that Barbauld referred when she wrote of the 'female senate' among whom *Sir Charles Grandison* was composed;⁷ few of these women fail to feature in the surviving correspondence.

Little less attention is focused today on another category of correspondent, unknown except by virtue of their association with Richardson. Several otherwise obscure figures have become familiar points of reference for scholars, partly for their inherent interest as letter-writers, and partly for the rich evidence they provide about reading and reception. Soon after *Grandison* appeared, Richardson was approached by an obscure provincial attorney named Eusebius Silvester, whose

⁶ See Pat Rogers, "A Young, a Richardson, or a Johnson": Lines of Cultural Force in the Age of Richardson', in Margaret Anne Doody and Peter Sabor (eds.), *Samuel Richardson: Tercentenary Essays* (Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 203–22, 284–7.

⁷ *Correspondence*, ed. Barbauld, 1, cxxiii.

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

opening letters combine discussion of the novel's philanthropic themes with a history of his own condition of impoverished virtue. Five years later, following Silvester's persistent failure to repay two generous loans, Richardson broke off relations and assembled the correspondence, with explanatory notes and connecting passages, into what he called 'a Warning Piece to Posterity' (to Silvester, 21 August 1759) – though he later altered this phrase, with his usual uncertainty about publication, to 'a Warning Piece to his Friends and Family'. Much happier was the outcome of an earlier unsolicited approach, made during the publication of *Clarissa* by an anonymous reader who, after extended games of anonymity and misdirection, at last identified herself as Lady Bradshaigh, thereafter the most cherished friend and literary adviser of Richardson's last years. Surveying the Richardson–Bradshaigh correspondence, Barbauld estimated that it was large enough to fill all six of her 1804 volumes, which indicates that much of it is now lost (as does a reference in the 1828 auction catalogue to 'many hundred letters of each', whereas 110 manuscript letters now survive).⁸ Even so, this remains the lengthiest of Richardson's surviving correspondences, much of it on literary matters, and comprising in particular, as he observed when considering the Reich proposal, 'the best Commentary that cd. be written on the History of Clarissa' (to Lady Bradshaigh, 19 November 1757). Of great related interest is the correspondence that ensued with Lady Echlin, Lady Bradshaigh's Dublin-based sister, part of which concerns a wish-fulfilling alternative ending to *Clarissa* that Lady Echlin privately composed.

Other correspondences arising from the novels failed to take off, and just single letters survive from readers such as 'Philo-Paideias', 'Philaretus', and 'Philopamela', who all wrote pseudonymously to Richardson during the *Pamela* vogue. Further letters of the same kind were lost at an early stage, as in a well-known episode during the publication of *Clarissa*, when Richardson responded to two readers' letters, one accusing Clarissa of coquetry, the other of prudery, by sending 'each the other's letter for a full answer of her's. And so I lost, at setting out, two correspondents, and what was worse, my two letters, for I never could get them back, and had taken no copies' (to Lady Bradshaigh, February 1751). Normally he took greater care, and many of the manuscripts in the Forster Collection and elsewhere are not autograph or holograph letters but early copies, made not only by Richardson's daughter Martha and his nephew and amanuensis William, as Barbauld reports,⁹ but also by Aaron Hill's brother Gilbert, whom Richardson seems to have employed in some secretarial capacity, and perhaps also by other professional copyists. Thanks to his obsessive interest in the vagaries of reception and interpretation, and to the compelling, controversial nature of the texts themselves, three

⁸ *Catalogue of Manuscripts, Autograph Letters . . . Also the Richardson Correspondence . . . Sold by Auction by Mr. Southgate* (1828), p. 22; for other evidence from the catalogue of lost material, see Peter Sabor, "'The Job I Have Perhaps Rashly Undertaken': Publishing the Correspondence of Samuel Richardson", *Eighteenth-Century Life* 35 (2011), 9–28 (at pp. 17–18).

⁹ *Correspondence*, ed. Barbauld, 1, iii.

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

substantial archives survive of general correspondence arising from the three major novels, each with a descriptive index by Richardson himself. (Like the auction catalogue, these indexes list various intriguing items that are now missing.) At a time when literary reviewing was in its infancy and formal critical attention was rarely bestowed on novels, this body of material, which Richardson worked hard to expand by provoking his correspondents into debate, often in devil's-advocate mode, provides an unusually full and detailed archive of literary reception. In the case of the early novel, it is simply unique, not only as historical evidence of reading, but also for its traceable impact on authorial revision.

All told, in the surviving correspondence, Richardson's letters are outnumbered almost two to one by those addressed to him. Yet there is a sense in which he is always present in the correspondence, whether as writer or as addressee. Often he and his interlocutors are pitted in close discussion of one another's ideas or arguments, sometimes with extensive direct quotation, and obviously with previous items from an exchange to hand for consultation. When Sarah Wescomb complained on 23 November 1750 that Richardson had 'pulled [her previous letter] in Pieces', she merely described his standard practice, and his more robust readers responded in kind. One result is that in cases of incomplete survival, such as Richardson's debate with Hester Mulso about *Clarissa*, lost items (here, everything on his own side) can be partly reconstructed from the evidence of surviving replies. In other cases, published text can be seen to emerge from the crucible of the correspondence, as when a protracted debate between Richardson and Lady Bradshaigh, in their letters of 1750–3, over the appropriate balance of power between husband and wife feeds demonstrably into *Sir Charles Grandison*. It has only recently been noticed that an essay contributed by Richardson to Johnson's *Rambler* in 1751 began life the previous year as a letter to Frances Grainger concerning the ethics of courtship.¹⁰

No less interesting is the overall character conferred by these habits of conversation and debate on much of the correspondence. As each individual exchange unfolds, meaning is mutually developed and incrementally extended through a kind of epistolary dialectic, and properly resides not in any individual letter, and certainly not on any one side of a correspondence, but rather within the transaction as a whole. Not infrequently, new layers or wider circles of meaning are created when, in a practice deliberately cultivated by Richardson as a way to 'mingle minds and concerns' (to Anne Dewes, 17 August 1750), letters or whole sequences are transcribed and circulated within adjacent correspondence networks, so giving rise to further material. The sources exhibit a vigorous manuscript culture in which correspondences commingle, overlap, and interact, generating fresh debate and additional writing through the mechanisms of epistolary sociability. Some writers resisted Richardson's inveterate practice of manuscript circulation, and he was admonished for it by Mary Delany; she had been 'open and free when I write to

¹⁰ John A. Dussinger, 'Samuel Richardson's Manuscript Draft of *The Rambler* No. 97 (19 February 1751)', *Notes & Queries* 57 (2010), 93–9.

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

you, at all times incorrect, interlining, making blunders', she told him on 24 April 1751, and was now minded to suspend the correspondence. Other writers benefited, however. Long before reaching print in 1807, Mulso's trenchant, learned correspondence about liberty and authority in *Clarissa* was widely known, apparently in the highest political circles. Richardson even speculated that it influenced the passage of Hardwicke's Marriage Act a few years later: 'Things done in private have sometimes . . . been proclaimed on the house-top', as he put it to Elizabeth Carter (17 August 1753).

These various characteristics of the surviving archive – the prominence within it of important interlocutors whose letters are otherwise inaccessible; its value as evidence of the book trade and literary culture of mid eighteenth century, and as a capacious record of debates about major novels; the profoundly transactional or dialogic nature of the epistolary sources involved – have two main consequences. Most obviously, they dictate the publication of a full *Correspondence* in twelve volumes, as opposed to a one-sided *Letters* in four or five. They also argue strongly for the retention, albeit with necessary modifications, of a principle of organization, correspondence by correspondence, that was first established and implemented by Richardson himself. The obvious advantages of a single chronological sequence of letters notwithstanding, more would be lost than gained by fragmenting individual correspondences and scattering them across multiple volumes, which would mean as many as eight or ten respectively for key correspondents such as Bradshaigh or Young. For this reason, the Cambridge Edition observes the correspondence-specific methodology used by editors in comparable cases elsewhere, including the multi-volume Yale editions of James Boswell, Thomas Percy, and Horace Walpole. A complete calendar of the correspondence will be added in the concluding volume to facilitate retrieval by date; building on roughly 1,600 letters listed as appendix in T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel's monumental 1971 biography of Richardson, this calendar will incorporate various corrections and changed locations, the seventy-nine new findings announced at an earlier stage in the present project, and a number of more recent discoveries.¹¹ Other finding aids in this volume will be an index of Richardson's correspondents and a general index to the entire edition. The volume will also include Richardson's own indexes to his files of letters on *Pamela*, *Clarissa*, and *Sir Charles Grandison*; other miscellaneous non-epistolary documents from the Forster Collection; any additional letters found during the publication of the previous volumes; posthumous correspondence about Richardson, especially that between his daughters Anne Richardson and Martha Bridgen, and between Anne and her niece Sarah Crowther Moodie; and an annotated transcription of the 1828 Southgate auction catalogue.

Richardson's exact organization of his files is not recoverable in detail, but the principle is clear from surviving evidence that includes apparently original foliation numbers (now overlaid on the manuscripts by later referencing sequences);

¹¹ Eaves and Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson*, pp. 620–704; Keymer and Sabor, 'Samuel Richardson's Correspondence'.

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

prefatory sheets and connecting passages (as in the Hill and Silvester correspondences respectively); notes describing the compilation of a particular correspondence into bound books (Cheyne, Hill) and epistolary exchanges on this subject (Bradshaigh); memoranda restricting access to certain appropriate readers or categories of reader (Cheyne, Edwards). There are also original indexes in Richardson's hand, not only to the files of letters about the novels (which correspond roughly to the chronologically organized volumes of general correspondence in Volumes 9–11 of the Cambridge Edition), but also to the Edwards correspondence. Broadly speaking, Richardson's organization continues to be reflected in the Forster Collection at the Victoria & Albert Museum, and the same principle governed Barbauld's 1804 selection and the subsequent magazine editions. Inevitably, the page length of a modern volume does not always perfectly match the size of a particular correspondence. In these cases, materials have been juxtaposed or combined, either with reference to a broader social network (a volume is devoted to Sarah Chapone, her daughter-in-law Hester Mulso Chapone, and their overlapping circles) or on grounds of thematic congruence. The correspondences with Cheyne and Edwards in Volume 2 of the Cambridge Edition are linked, for example, not only by their pronounced medical content but also by a more generally unguarded, at times frankly defamatory, character that gave unusual intensity to Richardson's anxieties about future circulation. He stopped short of burning Cheyne's letters, as Cheyne had requested, but the correspondence was not to fall 'into such Hands, as that it may be printed, or published' (note dated 11 August 1744). His cover sheet to the Edwards correspondence carries a stern instruction: 'No Extracts to be taken from it or Letters copied.'



The formidable practical difficulties posed by Richardson's letters in both their printed and manuscript forms have often been remarked on by scholars. Eaves and Kimpel describe the many letters to and from Lady Bradshaigh for 1751, of which only printed texts in Barbauld survive, as being 'in utter confusion', and painstaking efforts have been made by John August Wood to disentangle this particular problem.¹² William McCarthy, Barbauld's biographer, remarks that the texts available to her after their various revisions by Richardson and his correspondents and heirs were already 'a thorn patch of multiple copies and different handwritings, with cross-outs and insertions enough to puzzle any would-be editor'.¹³ Barbauld's interventions, and those of later owners or curators, introduce further layers of complication, but even letters untouched by later editorial markings can be hard to decipher. Richardson's hand was cramped and unsteady from an early date, and in the 1750s, from which most of the surviving correspondence dates, he frequently

¹² Eaves and Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson*, p. 657; John August Wood, 'The Chronology of the Richardson-Bradshaigh Correspondence of 1751', *Studies in Bibliography* 33 (1980), 182–91.

¹³ William McCarthy, *Anna Letitia Barbauld: Voice of the Enlightenment* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), p. 413.

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

complains about paralysis or tremors, or about the pain and even on occasion the impossibility of writing. Parkinson's disease is usually assumed, and scientific analysis of Richardson's remains has revealed a prior condition of diffuse idiopathic skeletal hyperostosis, which 'would undoubtedly have limited extension at the wrist'.¹⁴ Obliterations by Richardson and by some of his correspondents, especially Lady Bradshaigh, whether at the time of writing or at later stages, make matters much worse. These obliterations are sometimes heavy enough to make retrieval of the text impossible, even after protracted examination not only of the manuscripts but also of digitally enhanced photographs and scans. In other cases, problems stem from blots or tears in the manuscript causing obscurity or absence of text, and further illegibility results from the heavy cardboard mountings pasted over the extremities of letters in the unwieldy Victorian volumes of the Forster Collection. Not all the texts are quite so hard to establish as that of Richardson's first known letter to Erasmus Reich, of which only a German translation survives, in a manuscript, housed in a library in Leipzig, which was substantially damaged by allied bombing in World War II. But there is something symptomatic about this case.

In the face of all these obstacles and confusions, the aim of the Cambridge Edition is to bring order to the chaotic condition in which Richardson's massive correspondence comes down to us. It seeks to reproduce, as closely as possible, the state of the text in which each letter was sent and therefore first read. Letters are transcribed from manuscript whenever a manuscript (autograph draft, autograph letter, or contemporaneous file or letterbook copy) has survived. When a letter exists in both manuscript and a printed version, or versions, the manuscript in almost all cases takes precedence (one exception being the few cases in which the surviving manuscript is a very rough or vestigial draft and the printed version more accurately records the letter as sent and first read). The printed version may, however, contain material not in the manuscript: the manuscript may be a fragment, or the printed version may stem from a different manuscript copy. In such cases, the printed version is used together with the manuscript in an effort to recreate (though without silent conflation or other eclecticism) the letter as first received. Printed versions are also used to supply words illegible in the manuscript. When more than one manuscript version survives, the manuscript received by a correspondent takes precedence over others, though rough drafts and transcribed copies also come into play where the original text is defective. If a letter survives in both the form of a draft by Richardson and a fair copy, by an amanuensis or a proxy, sent to a correspondent, the fair copy provides the copy-text. If the letter as received does not survive, the surviving manuscript likely to resemble it most closely is used as the copy-text.

When a printed version is used as the copy-text (because no manuscript survives), the letter is not necessarily reproduced in its existing state. In

¹⁴ J. L. Scheuer and J. E. Bowman, 'The Health of the Novelist and Printer Samuel Richardson (1689–1761): A Correlation of Documentary and Skeletal Evidence', *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 87 (1994), 352–5 (at p. 354).

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

Barbauld's edition, some letters have demonstrably been conflated from different manuscript sources. In such cases, the text of the letter as originally received is reconstructed as far as possible. Where an alternative early printed version exists (such as Aaron Hill's *Works* (1753) for the Hill correspondence or the *Monthly Magazine* for the Edward Young correspondence) a hierarchy between this version and Barbauld's is established; if both were set directly from the manuscript, the earlier publication does not necessarily take precedence. Standardized headings precede each letter. These headings provide, so far as possible, the day(s) and date(s) of writing, the name of the recipient(s), the source and location of the text, a record of all extant documentary states of the letter, manuscript and printed, before 1830, the address, any endorsement (stating in whose hand, if known, or 'undetermined' if not), and the postmark (although these rarely survive).

Many of the problems posed by the texts of Richardson's correspondence resemble those of the letters and journals of Frances Burney, which also survive in a combination of manuscript material, copiously edited by various hands, and a printed edition prepared by a nineteenth-century editor, Charlotte Barrett, who made heavy use of scissors and paste in assembling her edition. Our textual policy is based, with some variations, on that in Peter Sabor's edition of *The Court Journals of Frances Burney, 1786–1791* (6 vols., Oxford University Press, 2011–), which in turn derives from Lars Troide and Stewart Cooke's *Early Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney, 1768–1783* (5 vols., McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988–2012) and Joyce Hemlow's *Journals and Letters of Fanny Burney (Madame d'Arblay), 1791–1840* (12 vols., Oxford University Press, 1972–84). While recognizing the importance of reflecting the state of the copy-text in each case, we aim to produce an edition in which fidelity to the sources is reconciled with clarity for modern readers. We also recognize that the special character of particular correspondences means that local adjustments to textual policy will be required in certain volumes; if so, these adjustments are outlined in the volume editor's introduction to the correspondence in question.

Texts are reproduced literally, for the most part, with retention of original paragraphing, punctuation, period spellings, and misspellings, and neologisms (e.g. *objectible*). Richardson uses both curved and squared brackets, sometimes for distinct purposes; we have retained both forms. The original use of lower case and capitals is also generally reproduced, although beginnings of sentences and names of people and places are always capitalized. Final periods are supplied when inadvertently omitted at the close of sentences, but not where sentences are informally separated by dashes or other punctuation or where the general practice of the writer (such as George Cheyne or Sarah Wescomb) is to use minimal punctuation. Parentheses and quotation marks are completed when required. Running marginal quotation marks are omitted. Underlinings are represented by italic type. Double and triple underlinings are designated by a footnote. Superscript letters are lowered. Obvious slips of the pen, as opposed to misspellings, are silently corrected. Obviously inadvertent omissions are supplied within {shaped} brackets. The long 's' has been modernized and the length of dashes has been regularized. Word fragments and inadvertent repetitions are omitted.

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

As David Fairer observes in his edition of Warton, 'obsolete abbreviations are by far the largest obstacle to the readability of a text'.¹⁵ Like Fairer, we expand or normalize all abbreviations not in standard use today. In particular, 'y^e' and 'y^v' (where the 'y' is strictly speaking a thorn) are expanded to 'the' and 'that'. The term 'thrō' is also expanded to 'through', and 're'd' to 'read' or 'received', with the addition of a note if the context leaves the meaning of the word ambiguous. Exceptions to the rule are the names of people, the titles of books, the direction, and date line as appearing on the manuscript, the abbreviated past participle (*criticiz'd*, etc.), and borderline cases between abbreviation and period spelling such as *cou'd*, *'tis* and *tho'*, all of which are transcribed as they appear in the copy-text.

We have not attempted to reproduce the visual appearance of the original manuscripts in terms of layout. If, for example, a postscript is inserted at the beginning of a manuscript, for lack of space at the end, it is printed here in the normal position, with an accompanying note. Regardless of their position in the manuscripts, all salutations are printed flush left, and signatures flush right. Complimentary closes appearing on separate lines in the manuscript are run on as continuations of the last line of text, with conventional punctuation supplied when necessary. Datelines occurring at the head of the manuscript are printed flush right, and those occurring at the foot of the manuscript are printed flush left. Postscripts are printed flush left. Richardson occasionally uses hanging indents as an alternative form of paragraphing for specific purposes, and these are retained.

The following symbols are employed in the texts:

◁ ▷ Text conjecturally supplied by the editor in cases of obliteration, damage, or uncertain legibility. If a word or character has been torn or cut away from the manuscript, or rendered wholly illegible by slurring, blotting, or other damage, but can still be conjectured from the context, it is printed thus: 'Lady ◁Bradshaigh', 'Grandis◁on'. If a word is not certainly legible, but can be deciphered as a reasonable likelihood, the same symbol is used.

◁xxxxx 3 lines▷ Three lines have been obliterated and cannot be recovered. Sometimes individual words are legible within generally obliterated passages and if so, these words are recorded.

◁xxxxx 5–6 words▷ Five or six words have been obliterated and cannot be recovered.

◁ ▷ Blank space left in manuscript by writer or copyist.

{ } Text supplied by the editor in cases of inadvertent omission. If a word has been omitted, it will be printed thus: 'I am now {at} Parson's Green'.

¹⁵ *The Correspondence of Thomas Warton*, ed. David Fairer (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995), p. xlviii.

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

The Cambridge Edition of the Correspondence of Samuel Richardson is designed to become the uniform scholarly edition. It has extensive introductions, providing authoritative accounts of each of Richardson's sets of correspondences. Textual and explanatory notes are numbered in a single, combined sequence. This practice makes it possible (where evidence of revision needs explanation in itself, or where it clarifies interpretation of a passage) for textual and explanatory points to be discursively combined. Textual notes normally record only those substantive changes made by the letter-writer at the time of writing, whether to a draft or to the version sent; later revisions, deletions, and additions (most of which date from the later 1750s) are not recorded unless they add significant new detail or information. In recording textual changes we have taken a different approach from that of John Carroll, whose *Selected Letters* uses an elaborate system of symbols (to signal insertions, deletions, and conjectural readings) that has led to some confusion in subsequent scholarship; we have aimed instead to create a readable text, with variant readings at the foot of the page. Explanatory notes identify the numerous quotations and allusions, literary, historical, and personal. All persons named are identified, as far as possible, although exact birth, marriage, and death dates are not always available.

Standard encyclopaedias, biographical dictionaries, peerages, baronetages, knightages, school and university lists, medical registers, lists of clergy, town and city directories, army and navy lists, road guides, almanacs, and catalogues of all kinds have been used but are not specifically cited except in exceptional cases. Also consulted were a variety of online resources, including the Oxford English Dictionary, the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, the English Short Title Catalogue, Early English Books Online, Eighteenth-Century Collections Online, Literature Online, InteLex Past Masters, the Burney Collection of Newspapers, British Literary Manuscripts Online, the British Book Trade Index, British History Online, Access to Archives, and the Electronic Enlightenment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A project that has taken all too long to complete offers the compensatory pleasure of reflecting on the many individuals who have so generously shared their editorial expertise, historical knowledge, and sage advice along the way. Chief among these are the general editors of this correspondence, Tom Keymer and Peter Sabor. The opportunity to work under their leadership was a major incentive for me in undertaking this volume, and I am deeply grateful for their erudite and patient guidance. I have learned much from them. My fellow volume editors, particularly Christine Gerrard, John Dussinger, Shelley King, William McCarthy, and John Pierce, have shared not only research finds but also editing tips and the occasional comradely lament over a pint – it’s been such a pleasure! Over the years, the Richardson edition assistants at the McGill Burney Centre – especially Gefen Bar-on Santor, Sarah Skoronski, and Laura Cameron – have been unfailingly helpful. Linda Bree and the staff of Cambridge University Press have, as always, lent their expert support to the volume’s preparation.

In the early stages of this project, Gordon Fulton made a valuable contribution to tracking down, organizing, and preparing annotations for the complex Skelton, Kennicott, and Clairaut exchanges, and I remain grateful. Thanks also to Adam Budd, Susan Carlile, Alison Conway, Leith Davis, Hilary Havens, Stefan Heßbrüggen, Keith Maslen, Andrew Piper, Nicole Pohl, Fiona Ritchie, Norbert Schürer, Lisa Shapiro, members of the C18-L and SHARP-L discussion lists, and any others I may have inadvertently omitted, for their help with thorny challenges of transcription and annotation. Underpinning all that this volume has to offer is the enabling foundation laid by previous Richardson scholars, in particular T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel’s authoritative 1971 biography.

For almost seven years, Anna Miegon kept me on track, transcribing, formatting, proofreading, and tactfully pointing out inconsistencies as the body of letters took shape; this volume is much the better for her care and commitment. In the final eighteen months, Sarah Creel ably took up the task of research assistant, lending her creative problem-solving skills to bring the volume to completion. Other members of the team, at various points, were Phil McKnight, Emma Pink, David Weston, and Heath Wood; I am grateful to them all. I wish also to acknowledge the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences of Simon Fraser University, for research grants enabling travel to work with the manuscripts and supporting research assistants.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The miscellaneous nature of this volume entailed work with archival materials from many sources. I gratefully acknowledge permission from the following institutions and individuals to publish transcriptions of manuscripts in their possession: the Biltmore Company of Asheville, North Carolina; the Trustees of the Boston Public Library/Rare Books; the British Library Board; the Deutsches Buch- und Schriftmuseum der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek Leipzig; the Harris family (Malmesbury papers in the Hampshire Record Office); the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; the Houghton Library of Harvard University; the Huntington Library, San Marino, California; the National Art Library of the Victoria & Albert Museum; the Henry W. and Albert A. Berg Collection of English and American Literature at the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations; the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York; the Manuscripts Division of the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library; the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin PK, Handschriftenabteilung; the Poetry Collection of the University Libraries, University at Buffalo, State University of New York; the University of Pennsylvania Rare Book and Manuscript Library; William Zachs; and the Woodson Research Center, Rice University. Other transcriptions are published courtesy of the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, and courtesy of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne (Northumberland Record Office).

The archivists and librarians of the above-named institutions who have smoothed the processes of gaining access to manuscripts are too many to name, but I wish to acknowledge in particular the assistance of Jill Hawkins of the Biltmore Company library; John Overholt, Susan Halpert, and Denison Beach of the Houghton Library; and Carola Staniek of the Leipzig Buch- und Schriftmuseum. Jane de Gruchy of the Somerset Archives, Sally England of the Hackney Archives, Susan Hood of the Church of Ireland RCB Library in Dublin, and Ulrich Hunger of the Universitätsarchiv Göttingen offered valuable responses to research queries.

Finally, my greatest debt, as always, is to Christian, Samuel, and Luc, who have uncomplainingly accommodated my research absences and my absent-minded researches, and then welcomed me home again.

CHRONOLOGY

- 1682
2 June Marriage in London of SR's parents, Samuel Richardson, Sr (d. 1727), a master joiner, and Elizabeth Hall (d. 1736)
- 1687 Family leaves London for Derbyshire at about this time, perhaps for political reasons
- 1689
July–August Born and baptized in Mackworth, near Derby, the fourth of nine children from the marriage
- 1695–9 Family returns to London during this period, settling in the Tower Hill district
- 1701–2 Probably educated at the Merchant Taylors' School, where his schoolfellows know him as '*Serious and Gravity*'
- 1706
1 July Apprenticed to John Wilde, a printer of Aldersgate
- 1713
2 July Completes apprenticeship with Wilde, where SR has become 'the Pillar of his House'
- 1715
13 June Made freeman of the Stationers' Company and a citizen of London
- 1715–20 Works as a compositor and corrector in Wilde's business
- 1720 Manages the printing business of the Leake family on the corner of Blue Ball and Salisbury Courts; begins printing private bills for James Blew, a lawyer and parliamentary agent
- 1721 Buys 'Printing Presses and Letter Utensils of trade' from the Leakes and sets up as master printer in their former premises,

CHRONOLOGY

- where he resides until 1736; remains in the Salisbury Court district for his entire career
- 23 November Marries Martha, daughter of John Wilde; five sons and a daughter from the marriage die in infancy
- 1722
 5 March Granted the livery of the Stationers' Company
- 6 August Three Leake apprentices turned over to SR, the first of twenty-four apprentices bound to him during his career
- 1722–4 Denounced to the ministry by Samuel Negus, a printer, as one of the 'disaffected printers . . . Said to be High-Flyers'; continues printing Tory-Jacobite material, including the Duke of Wharton's periodical *The True Briton* (1723–4)
- 1725
 December Begins printing *The Daily Journal* (to 1737), one of several newspapers and periodicals printed by SR until the mid 1740s
- 1727
 11 April Elected to junior office as Renter Warden in the Stationers' Company
- 1728 Rents a second Salisbury Court house, opposite the first, for *Daily Journal* operations (to 1736)
- September Identified to the ministry by Edmund Curll as printer of a seditious number of *Mist's Weekly Journal*
- 1730
 December *The Infidel Convicted*, possibly by SR
- 1731
 23 January Death of Martha (Wilde) Richardson
- February Becomes a junior shareholder in the Stationers' Company, purchasing progressively more senior levels of stock in 1736, 1746, and 1751
- October Incurs financial losses on the collapse of the Charitable Corporation; embroiled until mid 1733 in related legal proceedings
- 1733
 3 February Marries Elizabeth Leake (d. 1773), sister of the Bath bookseller James Leake