THE CAMBRIDGE EDITION
OF THE CORRESPONDENCE
OF SAMUEL RICHARDSON II

CORRESPONDENCE OF RICHARDSON'S FINAL YEARS
(1755–1761)

THE CAMBRIDGE EDITION
OF THE WORKS AND CORRESPONDENCE
OF SAMUEL RICHARDSON

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.

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*

SAMUEL RICHARDSON

CORRESPONDENCE OF RICHARDSON'S FINAL YEARS (1755–1761)

EDITED BY
Shelley King
Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario

and

John B. Pierce
Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, 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

79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521831888
DOI: 10.1017/9781139020305

First published 2019

Printed and bound in Great Britain by Clays Ltd, Elcograf S.p.A.

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

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
NAMES: Richardson, Samuel, 1689–1761, author. | King, Shelley, 1954– editor. | Pierce, John Benjamin, 1957– editor.
TITLE: Correspondence of Richardson's final years (1755–1761) / Samuel Richardson ; edited by Shelley King and John B. Pierce.
DESCRIPTION: Cambridge, United Kingdom ; New York, NY : Cambridge University Press, 2019. | Series: The Cambridge edition of the works and correspondence of Samuel Richardson. The correspondence ; 11 | Includes bibliographical references and index.
IDENTIFIERS: LCCN 2019011873 | ISBN 9780521831888 (hardback : alk. paper)
SUBJECTS: LCSH: Richardson, Samuel, 1689–1761 – Correspondence. | Novelists, English – 18th century – Correspondence.
CLASSIFICATION: LCC PR3666 .A4 2019 | DDC 823/.6–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2019011873

ISBN 978-0-521-83188-8 Hardback

CONTENTS

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 longstanding, 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 abridgments, conflations, 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 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

[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 and the Art of Letter-Writing* (Cambridge University Press, 2016).

[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.

result is that Barbauld's six-volume 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,

[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', 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 and Queries*, 50 (2003), 215–18.

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

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 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 thirty-three 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 multi-faceted than the notorious caricature that Samuel Taylor Coleridge derived from his reading of 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 fifty 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

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

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 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.

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

[7] *Correspondence*, ed. Barbauld, I, cxxiii.

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 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', 'Philaretes', 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

[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 17–18).

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 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

[9] *Correspondence*, ed. Barbauld, I, iii.
[10] John A. Dussinger, 'Samuel Richardson's Manuscript Draft of *The Rambler*, No. 97 (19 February 1751)', *Notes and Queries*, 57 (2010), 93–9.

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 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 the 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

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

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 Sally 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); 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

[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.

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 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

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

[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 354).

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 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.

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, 'ye' and 'yt' (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 dateline 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

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

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'.

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 lingered on as long as this edition accumulates many scholarly debts. Our first and deepest is to the General Editors, Peter Sabor and Tom Keymer, for Peter's enthusiastic faith that more information can and will be found, and Tom's keen nose on the trail of the obscure. The second is to our fellow editors, especially Linda Bree, John Dussinger, Gordon Fulton, Betty Schellenberg, and George Justice, for fruitful conversations and commiserations, and for passing along letters that found a home in our volume. Special thanks are due to two scholars: Marilyn Jacobus for sustained discussion of the life of Frances Sheridan and her children, and Patrick Spedding for his discovery of a new letter shared with us as our work was drawing to a close. We are also grateful for the practical aid rendered by the early Research Assistants for the project – Gefen Bar-On Santor, Katie Gemmil, Hillary Havens, and Sarah Skoronski – who provided much needed assistance with procuring copies of the manuscripts.

Scholarly editions such as this cannot be completed without the help of the librarians and archivists whose role it is to conserve and protect the documents from which we work. We offer our heartfelt thanks and respect to the library staff of the following organizations: Bath Municipal Libraries, Berg Collection, Bodleian Library, British Library, Columbia University, Derby Central Library, Freies Deutsches Hochstift, Hampshire Record Office, Harvard University, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Huntington Library, Hyde Library, University of Iowa, Johns Hopkins University, University of Kentucky (Peale), University of Leipzig, Liverpool Public Library, Main Historical Society, Pierpont Morgan Library, New York Historical Society, Princeton University, Rice University, Victoria and Albert Museum, Yale University, and the University of Arkansas. The other invaluable assistance to editors comes from the production team at the Press. Our sincere thanks to our copy-editor, Caroline Drake, for her incomparable close attention to inconsistencies and details throughout the manuscript.

Other debts are more personal in nature. Thanks go to an extended network of former Queen's University doctoral students for their enthusiastic assistance in figuring out aspects of the execrable writing of Psalmanazar, Richardson's will, and other paleographic conundrums: Patti Brace, Tanya Butler, Sean Henry, Janelle Jenstad, and Shannon Smith. To our friends and colleagues who for far too many years have listened patiently to our tales of the archives and the Richardson quest, especially Gwynn Dujardin, Claire Grogan, and Tracy Ware,

thanks for your kindness and support. And finally, our thanks to the scholarly communities that provide the rhythms of our studies – to the organizers of the annual meetings of the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, at which Richardson panels and an annual breakfast with the editors provided continuity and encouragement, and to the members of C18-L, under the leadership of Kevin Berland, who were always ready to share their expertise.

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,

	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

February	Appointed first official printer to the House of Commons (to 1761), responsible for public bills and committee reports; SR thereby becomes 'more independent of Booksellers (tho' I did much Business for them) than any other Printer'
December	*The Apprentice's Vade Mecum*
23 December	Baptism of daughter Elizabeth, d. 1734
1734	Expands business premises into a third house, in Blue Ball Court (to 1740)
1735	
2 January	Baptism of daughter Mary (Polly), m. 1757 (to Philip Ditcher), d. 1783
April	*A Seasonable Examination of the Pleas and Pretensions of the Proprietors of, and Subscribers to, Play-Houses*
June	Probably begins printing the pro-ministerial *Daily Gazetteer* (to 1746)
1736	Moves to 'House of a very grand outward Appearance' on Salisbury Square, which he occupies until 1756; also rents Corney House, a tenement of Sutton Court, Chiswick, as a weekend/summer retreat (to 1738)
January	*Gentleman's Magazine* publishes a light verse epistle by SR, noting that 'the Publick is often agreeably entertain'd with his Elegant Disquisitions in Prose'
16 July	Baptism of daughter Martha (Patty), m. 1762 (to Edward Bridgen), d. 1785
1737	
16 August	Baptism of daughter Anne (Nancy), d. 1803
1738	
Summer	Rents large semi-rural retreat at North End, Fulham (to 1754)
October	Edits and prints updated second edition of Defoe's *Tour*; also subsequent editions of 1742, 1748, 1753, and 1761–2
1739	
26 April	Baptism of son Samuel, d. 1740
10 November	Starts writing *Pamela*
20 November	*Aesop's Fables*
1740	
January	Completes draft of *Pamela*, revising the text over the ensuing months

29 March	*The Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe in His Embassy to the Ottoman Porte*, edited and printed by SR for the Society for the Encouragement of Learning
17 July	Baptism of twelfth and last child, Sarah (Sally), m. 1763 (to Richard Crowther), d. 1773
6 November	*Pamela; or, Virtue Rewarded*
1741	Expands his printing premises behind Salisbury Court
23 January	*Letters Written to and for Particular Friends*
28 May	Opening volume of John Kelly's *Pamela's Conduct in High Life*, a spurious continuation, published; SR starts planning his own authorized continuation
1 December	Elected to the Court of Assistants, ruling body of the Stationers' Company
7 December	*Pamela in Her Exalted Condition*, SR's continuation
1742	
8 May	Sixth edition of *Pamela*, in octavo format and with twenty-nine engravings by Hubert Gravelot and Francis Hayman: the first simultaneous publication of both parts
May	Wins large contract to print the *Journals* of the House of Commons (to 1761)
1744	Begins printing the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* (to 1761), one of several major projects for learned societies
June–July	Earliest references in SR's correspondence to *Clarissa*, which already exists in some form of draft
December	Sends part of the novel in manuscript to Aaron Hill; manuscript copies in various states of revision circulate among SR's friends until 1747
1746	
Summer	Assists the ministry in finding shorthand experts to help prosecute Jacobite rebels
December	Hill sends SR his 'Specimen of New Clarissa', a test abridgment of the novel's opening
1747	
1 December	*Clarissa*, vols. I and II
1748	
28 April	*Clarissa*, vols. III and IV
5 July	William Richardson, nephew, apprenticed to SR

2 August	Advertises in the *Whitehall Evening-Post* for contact with Lady Bradshaigh, who has been sending pseudonymous letters about *Clarissa*
6 December	*Clarissa*, vols. v–vii
1749	
June	Prints *Answer to the Letter of a Very Reverend and Worthy Gentleman*, a defence of *Clarissa*'s fire scene, for private distribution
August	Publishes notes responding to Albrecht von Haller's critique of *Clarissa* in the *Gentleman's Magazine*
December	Prints *Meditations Collected from the Sacred Books* for private distribution
1750	
6 March	First face-to-face meeting with Lady Bradshaigh, thereafter his closest literary adviser
August	Death of SR's brother Benjamin; household joined by Benjamin's 14-year-old daughter Susanna (Sukey), 'whom my Wife has in a manner adopted'
1751	
January	Sections of *Sir Charles Grandison* start to circulate in manuscript among SR's friends
19 February	Publishes an essay (No. 97) on courtship and marriage in Samuel Johnson's periodical *The Rambler*, based on SR's letter of 8 September 1750 to Frances Grainger
20 April	Expanded third edition of *Clarissa*; new material separately published as *Letters and Passages Restored from the Original Manuscripts of the History of Clarissa*
1752	
28 September	Fire at SR's printing house causes extensive damage and loss of stock; takes on additional Salisbury Court premises at about this time, probably as a warehouse and workmen's residence
1753	
May	Begins distributing printed sheets of *Sir Charles Grandison* among friends
2 June	Writes autobiographical letter to Johannes Stinstra, his Dutch translator
30 June	Attains rank of Upper Warden in the Stationers' Company

August	Learns that four Dublin booksellers have stolen most of *Sir Charles Grandison* in printed sheets and plan to publish an unauthorized edition; halts printing and fires suspected employees
14 September	*The Case of Samuel Richardson, of London, Printer; with Regard to the Invasion of His Property* printed for free distribution
13 November	*Sir Charles Grandison*, vols. I–IV, simultaneously published in duodecimo ('first') and octavo ('second') editions; vols. I–VI of the piracy appear in Dublin the same month, before SR can bring out his authorized vols. V–VI
11 December	*Sir Charles Grandison*, vols. V–VI (duodecimo) and vol. V (octavo)
1754	
1 February	Prints *An Address to the Public*, a further attack on the Dublin pirates and on George Faulkner, an Irish bookseller, with whom he had failed to negotiate a solution
14 March	*Sir Charles Grandison*, vol. VII (duodecimo) and vol. VI (octavo)
19 March	Revised third edition of *Sir Charles Grandison* (duodecimo)
April	Prints two commentaries on *Sir Charles Grandison*, *Answer to a Letter from a Friend* and *Copy of a Letter to a Lady*, for private distribution; the latter explains that there will be no further volumes
6 July	Becomes Master of the Stationers' Company for a one-year term
July–Oct	Rents and renovates new weekend house at Parson's Green, which his wife and daughters make their main home
1755	
February	Begins writing a fragmentary 'History of Mrs. Beaumont' (partly published in 1804), possibly as the basis for a new novel
6 March	*A Collection of the Moral and Instructive Sentiments, Maxims, Cautions, and Reflexions, Contained in the Histories of Pamela, Clarissa, and Sir Charles Grandison*
5 August	William Richardson completes apprenticeship and becomes SR's overseer
July–Dec	Builds expensive new business premises in Salisbury Court, renovating the adjoining house as a residence, which he occupies the following spring
1757	
June	Approached by Erasmus Reich, a Leipzig bookseller, with proposals to bring out a German edition of his selected correspondence, which he starts to prepare

1758	
May	Abandons the Reich project, but continues preparing letters for possible posthumous publication
August–September	Revises and corrects Urania Hill Johnson's novel *Almira*, which she publishes six months after SR's death, rejecting most of the revisions
1759	
May	Prints Edward Young's *Conjectures on Original Composition*, composed by Young with SR's collaborative involvement
Summer	William Richardson leaves SR's employment to start his own printing business
1760	
28 April	Revises and contributes to a translation of Marguerite de Lussan's *The Life and Heroic Actions of Balbe Berton*, printed by William Richardson
24 June	Enters partnership with Catherine Lintot, heir to the printer Henry Lintot, in a law patent with monopoly rights to print books on common law
1761	
March	Borrows Lady Bradshaigh's annotated copies of *Pamela* and *Clarissa* to make further revisions
28 June	Suffers stroke during a visit from the portraitist Joseph Highmore
4 July	Dies, leaving an estate of £14,000 and bequeathing manuscripts to his daughters; buried in St Bride's, Fleet Street, beside his first wife and infant children
September	William Richardson returns to Salisbury Court, taking over SR's business with a partner, Samuel Clarke
1762	
	Posthumous revised editions of *Pamela* and *Sir Charles Grandison*
1765	
March	'Six Original Letters upon Duelling' published in the *Candid Review and Literary Repository*

1771	
25 January	Publication of Anna Meades's *The History of Sir William Harrington, written some years since, and revised and corrected by the late Mr. Richardson*; SR's daughters contest the claim, but he had indeed advised Meades in 1757–8
1780	William Richardson issues proposals for a uniform edition of the novels, 'with corrections', but the edition does not materialize
1784	Anne Richardson and Martha Bridgen plan a new edition of *Pamela*, based on unpublished final revisions by SR, to be 're-revised' by themselves
1786	
January–February	Authorized 'Memoirs of Richardson', perhaps by Edward Bridgen, published in the *Universal Magazine*
1792	'New edition' of *Clarissa*, 'with the last corrections by the author', prepared with the involvement of Anne Richardson and SR's granddaughter Sarah Crowther Moodie
1801	Fourteenth edition of *Pamela*, prepared from Anne Richardson's copy, 'with numerous alterations … by the Author'
1803	Death of Anne, SR's last surviving child
1804	
July	*The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, edited, with a substantial biographical memoir, by Anna Laetitia Barbauld
1810	'New edition' of *Sir Charles Grandison*, probably from Anne Richardson's copy, 'with the last corrections by the author'; fifteenth edition of *Pamela*, with further 'numerous corrections and alterations', apparently from Anne's annotated copy of the fourteenth edition

ABBREVIATIONS

Barbauld	*The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, ed. Anna Laetitia Barbauld, 6 vols. (London, 1804).
Beinecke	Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
Berg	Henry W. and Albert A. Berg Collection of English and American Literature, New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations.
BL	British Library.
Bodleian	Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford.
Bradshaigh	*Correspondence with Lady Bradshaigh and Lady Echlin*, ed. Peter Sabor, 3 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 2016).
Clarissa	Samuel Richardson, *Clarissa. Or, The History of a Young Lady*, 1st edn, 7 vols. (London, 1747–8).
Correspondence … (1750–1754)	*Correspondence Primarily on* Sir Charles Grandison *(1750–1754)*, ed. Betty A. Schellenberg (Cambridge University Press, 2015).
Correspondence with Aaron Hill	*Correspondence with Aaron Hill and the Hill Family*, ed. Christine Gerrard (Cambridge University Press, 2013).
Eaves and Kimpel	T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).
FM	Forster Collection, Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
Harvard (Houghton)	Houghton Library, Harvard University.

Harvard (HTC)	Harvard Theatre Collection, Houghton Library, Harvard University.
Maslen	Keith Maslen, *Samuel Richardson of London, Printer: A Study of His Printing Based on Ornament Use and Business Accounts* (Dunedin: University of Otago, 2001).
McKillop	Alan Dugald McKillop, *Samuel Richardson, Printer and Novelist* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1936).
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online edn.
OED	*Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).
Pamela	Samuel Richardson, *Pamela, or, Virtue Rewarded*, The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Samuel Richardson, ed. Albert J. Rivero (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
Pamela II	Samuel Richardson, *Pamela in Her Exalted Condition*, ed. Albert J. Rivero (Cambridge University Press, 2012).
Princeton	Princeton University Libraries.
Princeton (Povey)	Kenneth Povey Collection of William Cowper, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
Princeton (Taylor)	Robert H. Taylor Collection of English and American Literature, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
Rice	Woodson Research Center, Fondren Library, Rice University.
Sale (1936)	William Merritt Sale, *Samuel Richardson: A Bibliographical Record of His Literary Career with Historical Notes* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1936).
Sale (1950)	William Merritt Sale, *Samuel Richardson: Master Printer* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1950).
SCG	Samuel Richardson, *The History of Sir Charles Grandison*, 1st edn, 7 vols. (London, 1753–4).
SR	Samuel Richardson.
Yale (Spence)	Joseph Spence Papers, Osborn Collection, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript, Yale University.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The correspondence for the years 1755 to 1761 offers a dual narrative of the final years of Richardson's life. One strand follows the literary affairs of an author, editor, and mentor, who is also a printer engaged in a wide range of activities, seeking out new opportunities and expanding his business. Richardson laments that a life of 'work' now rendered all these activities more challenging than in former days, but a review of his personal and private life through his letters demonstrates his ongoing ability to complete existing commitments and projects as well as a willingness to enter into new arrangements up until his death. The counter narrative to this story of progress and expansion comes in the form of disruptions or, perhaps more accurately, interruptions in his life in which events beyond his control have a cumulative impact, diverting him into conflicts which threaten to overwhelm what he calls the 'Spirit of Scribbling' which ordinarily sustains him. The twin narratives of progress on the one hand and disruption on the other appear forcefully in his work as author, editor, mentor, and printer throughout these final years.

Richardson as author

Although he did not produce any 'entirely new & unborrowed'[1] extended narratives after the publication of *Sir Charles Grandison* in 1753–4, Richardson did continue his work as an author well after 1755, as he reviewed and reworked each of his novels up until the time of his stroke on 28 June 1761.[2] Much of this work consisted of simple editorial corrections of tenses and punctuation, but he also revised his novels to improve matters of expression and propriety important to the aesthetic effect (and affect) of the works. During his writing career, an increasingly important element of Richardson's sustained creative

[1] In writing to Johannes Stinstra, 2 June 1753, SR described *Sir Charles Grandison* as 'entirely new & unborrowed, even of myself; tho' I had written so voluminously before' (quoted in McKillop, p. 225). Johannes Stinstra (1708–90) was a Dutch Mennonite preacher who translated Richardson's *Clarissa* into Dutch (1752–5), and later oversaw the translation of *SCG*. He was interested in the didactic elements of the novels and corresponded with Richardson.

[2] Eaves and Kimpel, p. 571.

art included his consultation with his circle of correspondents regarding their reactions to and opinions on both large and small matters in these novels, even at times long after their first date of publication. One such letter to Mary Watts offers interesting insight into the purpose and importance of these exchanges. The period of Richardson's correspondence with Watts was relatively brief, but the frankness of the exchanges makes these letters particularly interesting.[3] Richardson had asked Watts to comment on *Sir Charles Grandison*, but she hesitated, having begun the correspondence less than a year before and being reluctant to offer criticism of someone she had admired but not even met. He insists she cast off her reticence and explains why he seeks a full engagement with his works:

> All the Faults in the History of Sir Charles Grandison! How could my beloved Sister put down so very few; yet distinguish, by double scores, the word *All*. I have told our good Brother Jeronymo the Reason why I am sollicitous to have the Faults in my printed Writings marked by my kind Friends: It is this – I have laid by a Copy of each, with such Corrections in them, as my Friends, or my own Reperusal, have suggested to me, in Case, after my Demise, new Editions should be called for: and as any thing of this Sort occurs, I put it down in its proper Place. Hence it is that real Service is done me by the Task, performed, which I put upon my kind Friends; and the more Faults they find, the better they answer my Intention. I will not say to my *Sister*, that I should condemn my self were Affectation any Part of my Motive. Yet I have Tenaciousness and Implicitness, in considering the Faults they found. And this, in order to make them easy, and the less sparing in their Objections. Now my Sister knows my Motive, I hope she will be so good as to enlarge her List; and when she is so kind as to do so, I will turn to the corrected Books, and make them more perfect than they are at present, by the Attention I shall pay them, as well as those before me.[4]

A central concept stated in this letter is the idea that the act of making an aesthetic object, in this case a novel, 'more perfect' entails a gradual, ongoing process, one that takes place over the lifetime of the artist. Richardson's revisiting of the novels through conversations with a community of correspondents did not stop with publication but often carried on well after the novels had been through several editions. He would certainly be concerned to keep the works in print for financial gain and the emergence of new editions would also keep his name before the public, but it is clear that his creative life was ongoing and

[3] Eaves and Kimpel note, 'There is no other example known to us of such sudden and steady enthusiasm on Richardson's part as that for Mrs. Watts, though their recorded friendship was so brief – a little over two years of correspondence, with two short visits' (p. 452).

[4] SR to Mary Watts, 9 April 1755.

aided by the regular review of the works, often through the eyes of his circle of correspondents.

Although *Grandison* itself, for example, went through three editions within a year of its first appearance,[5] Richardson was still engaged fully with correspondents in 1755 concerning the beauties and 'Faults' of the work. His letters to Mark Hildesley are a case in point. Hildesley became a correspondent just after the publication of *Clarissa*, and he took on the 'Task' of reading *Grandison* with the kind of 'Tenaciousness' Richardson describes himself as having. Only 'lately returned from *Dover* with Sr Chs Grandison', Hildesley begins by considering the overall merits of the work:

> that so much true Spirit, so much Command of Sentiment, so much Delicacy, so much Nature, – so much Insight into the human passions, so much Elegance, so much – Everything that words (at least words at my Command) cannot Express, are not, I believe, to be found in any Vols. of our English Language, as are containd in the Said History.[6]

He qualifies his praise, however, continuing, 'And yet, after this, may I be allowed to add, 'tis by many degrees *not comparable* to Clarissa'. He then goes on to offer a range of comments from the general – 'I think you have inimitably executed your grand point in discrediting the enourmous Practice of *Duelling*. I could heartily wish you had said or would say something upon the no less heinous Sin of *Suicide*' – to specific comments related to omission of responses to particular letters.[7] Richardson answers acknowledging Hildesley's preference for *Clarissa* and seeing this as a sign of his ability to be impartial in his critique of *Grandison*:

> The kind, the friendly, freedom you are so good as to treat that History with, when you greatly prefer that of Clarissa to it, is an instance of your sincerity, that makes me the more depend upon the praise you give to some of its parts. I believe most men who have written a great deal at different parts of life, and are advanced in years, suspecting a failure of their faculties, are apt fondly to wish that their last published work shall be found equal to those written in the vigor of life. Many there are who

[5] The first and second editions of *Sir Charles Grandison* appeared simultaneously in a seven-volume duodecimo format and a six-volume octavo format respectively. Volumes I–IV of the first edition appeared on 13 November 1753, volumes V and VI on 11 December 1753, and volume VII on 14 March 1754. Volumes I–IV of the second edition appeared on 13 November 1753, volume V on 11 December 1753, and volume VI on 14 March 1754. A third edition, with extensive revisions, appeared on 19 March 1754. William Sale offers a detailed publication history of *Grandison* (Sale (1936), pp. 65–93).

[6] Mark Hildesley to SR, 8 February 1755.

[7] 'Lady G's Letter to Miss Byron Octr. 15 Vol. VI. p. 92. [of the Small Edition] – one of the longest &, in my opinion, most poignant of any She writes, – *Where answerd*? unless at the top of p. 138 Vol. VI. is just cursorily hinted at?' (Hildesley to SR, 8 February 1755).

> have contributed to this fondness in me; but, for my part, I submit my own opinion of what I have written to the judgment of my readers, as I ought; glad, upon the whole, that they approve of my design and main end in writing the respective pieces; and, looking upon myself as the common father of the three children, delighted that one prefers the elder, another the younger, as they are struck with their different features and complections.[8]

When he turns to Hildesley's wish that *Grandison* had somehow addressed the 'heinous Sin of *Suicide*', Richardson talks of a balance among the three novels, writing 'I have avoided in one history [*Grandison*] what I have endeavoured strongly to enforce in the others [*Pamela* and *Clarissa*]'. In this comment and in his comparison of his three novels to 'three children', Richardson offers a reflection on the works as a composite group. Such statements demonstrate Richardson's sense that all of his histories, as he called them, should be understood as a coherent and integral whole, and he establishes the idea of a completed canon of works, but his practice of revisiting these works and revising them for subsequent editions indicates that 'completion', like the attempts to 'make … more perfect', is not a static aesthetic state. It is not surprising to find that after 1755, he took on what appears to be an artistic review of all of his works with the object of preparing each for publication in new editions.

The comments of Lady Bradshaigh in her marginal notes to *Sir Charles Grandison* had a significant impact on Richardson's revisions to the novel after the publication of the third edition in 1754. Lady Bradshaigh sent her annotated copy to Richardson writing,

> You wish to see my corrections as you call them. I own I have taken the liberty (conscious at the same time that I presume too much) of *altering*, not *correcting*, as I went a long, here a scratch, there a word chang'd, or so, – and if I do not let you see what I have done it is not that I want *courting* to it, but that I am sure you cou'd not read the scroles I have interlin'd, nor understand my meaning, for upon casting back my eye, I found *myself*, under some difficulty. but when I am so happy to see you, that I can explain the uninteligible jargon, if it was ten times worse, and you desire it, you shall look it over.[9]

He responded quickly:

> A thousand thanks to your Ladiship for your returned Volumes with remarks in the margin. <I have had time but to dip into them. I shall be

[8] SR to Hildesley, 21 February 1755.
[9] Lady Bradshaigh to SR, 29 April – 21 May 1754 (*Bradshaigh*, II, p. 443).

> greatly improved by them, &> corrected in another edition, should the work come to another.[10]

This exchange demonstrates that both Richardson and Lady Bradshaigh saw an ongoing need to read through and 'perfect' the work further, but it also shows that Richardson was somewhat uncertain about when – or even if – the work would be 'corrected in another edition, should the work come to another'. He did, however, do more than 'dip into' the commentary in her copy during the following years. He kept the set until 1758, making notations alongside Lady Bradshaigh's comments, indicating where he had taken her advice and where he had not.[11] 'Perhaps when you have a little vacant time', he wrote to her, 'you will be amused with casting your Eye on your own Remarks, & on what I thankfully allow'd, & humbly disallow'd of them.'[12]

With respect to *Sir Charles Grandison*, Richardson's authorial desire to make his works 'more perfect than they are at present' was complicated by a line of criticism arguing that the work itself was unfinished. While Richardson considered the narrative of the novel complete, a number of individuals wrote to him complaining that several aspects of the novel seemed unfinished. He wrote to Thomas Edwards, 'I am pestered with Letters and Applications for another Volume of Grandison. The Women, in general, want to see Clementina's story prosecuted; Emily actually married; and to know how Sir Charles and his Lady will go on, and how they will educate their Children.'[13] Richardson took this set of concerns from his readership seriously and went so far as to develop a written response to this line of criticism, using the comments of one correspondent in particular – a Julian Bere, writing under the pseudonym 'Julia' – as a point of departure for his defence of the novel's completeness. Bere wrote,

> As, Myself, one of the Many, that waited with great impatience for the publication of the seventh Vol: of Sir Charles Grandison, (I cannot call it the last,) was greatly disappointed in the conclusion of it, As it, leaves us, in the very Crisis of so many interesting Events, particularly about Charming Clementina, whether she condescends to Marry the Count Belvedere, and has no return of her Malady, If Sir Chas. & his Harriet,

[10] SR to Lady Bradshaigh, 9 July 1754 (*Bradshaigh*, II, p. 467).
[11] Sale describes the movement of Lady Bradshaigh's copy of *Grandison* between her and SR: 'In July, 1754 – four months after the publication of the third edition – Richardson received from Lady Bradshaigh her set of the novel, containing marginalia by way of suggested revision. He professed his intentions of using her suggestions should the demand arise for another edition … But four years later he returned this set to Lady Bradshaigh, indicating which of her suggestions he allowed … In March, 1761, Lady Bradshaigh again sent the set to Richardson; and after his death in July 1761, Richardson's daughters returned the volumes to their owner' (Sale (1936), p. 90).
[12] SR to Lady Bradshaigh, 2 January 1758 (*Bradshaigh*, III, p. 711).
[13] SR to Thomas Edwards, 5 April 1754.

> Accompanies Jeronymo to Bologna, with many other's too tedious for me to enter upon. But give me leave to say that Unless you intend to publish a Succeeding Volume you will have Omitted one of the Most Shining as well, as usefull part of Your Hero's character, You will easily guess I mean the Tender, Affectionate Parent, will be wanting to render the Man, compleat.[14]

Richardson's answer first appeared as a pamphlet dated 25 March 1754, printed for circulation on 10 April 1754,[15] and he then reprinted his comments in an Appendix to *Sir Charles Grandison* itself and in a separate work, *A Collection of the Moral and Instructive Sentiments, Maxims, Cautions and Reflexions, Contained in the Histories of Pamela, Clarissa, and Sir Charles Grandison*, published in 1755. In his published response, he argues that 'a *single story*' typically finds its conclusion in 'some great decisive event; as a *Death*, or a *Marriage*', but that his novel is different, particularly because its setting is so close to the current day. He writes,

> But in scenes of life carried down nearly to the present time, and in which a *variety of interesting characters* is introduced, all events cannot be decided, unless, as in the History of *Tom Thumb the Great*, all the actors are killed in the last scene; since persons presumed to be still living must be supposed liable to the various turns of human affairs.
>
> All that can be expected therefore in such a work, if its ending is proposed to afford the most complete scene of felicity of which human life is capable, must be to leave the principal characters happy, and the rest with fair prospects of being so.[16]

[14] Julian Bere to SR, 14 March 1754 (*Correspondence … (1750–1754)*, pp. 182–3). See also the letter from 'Elvira, Philoclaea & Honoria', all commenting on how much they enjoyed the novel but asking the following:

> give me leave to expostulate with you why the Fate of Clementina is left undetermin'd … I am therefore very desirous to know if she arrived safe at Bologna; and how she has settled herself there; and in what manner she spends her Time. Sir Charles Grandison and the Lady are happy, and no doubt remain so. But as such Characters are very rare, you should have augmented the Pleasure of your Readers, by giving them another Volume. I should be very glad if Jeronymo is cured at the Bath; and what Lady he has given his Hand to.
> (Elvira, Philoclaea, and Honoria to SR <after Friday 15 March 1754>
> (*Correspondence … 1750–1754*, pp. 189–90)).

[15] The pamphlet version of the document appeared as *Copy of a Letter to a Lady, Who Was Solicitous for an Additional Volume to the History of Sir Charles Grandison* ([London]: [1754]). He sent this pamphlet to a number of his correspondents, including Miss Wescomb, who received a number of copies, which she probably sent on to her circle of acquaintances (Sale (1936), pp. 94–5).

[16] Richardson, *Copy of a Letter to a Lady*, p. 406.

The rest of his published response includes 'a survey of what is done for the … characters' in *Grandison* and seeks to demonstrate how characters are either provided for or made happy. The story of Clementina is the only one Richardson admits to being open-ended, but he notes there is some benefit among his readers, who he hopes will continue to discuss her potential fate:

> Do you think, Madam, I have not been very complaisant to my Readers to leave to them the decision of this important article? I am apt to think, from what I have already heard from several of them, of no small note, and great good sense, that a considerable time will pass before this point will be agreed upon among *them*: And some of my correspondents rejoice that Clementina is not married in the book; hoping that she will not marry; while others express their satisfaction in the time given her, and doubt not but she will.[17]

While Richardson did not have to defend *Pamela* or *Clarissa* against public dissatisfaction with their conclusions, he did still have in mind plans for future editions of these novels and would use this republication of his works as an opportunity for more authorial revisions. As late as March 1761, one of his daughters wrote to Lady Bradshaigh asking her to send her annotated copies of *Pamela* and *Clarissa* to her father:

> the four Vols. of Pamela being almost out of Print, and a new Edition called for, and being delighted to hear, that your Ladiship has remark'd upon that Piece and Clarissa, he directs me to express his earnest Wishes, that you will favour him with the Perusal of your Observations, with Liberty to add to new ones of his own such of your Ladiship's, as may make the future Edition more perfect than otherwise it can be. The Employment will be, my Papa says, a great Amusement to him.[18]

This request is consistent with Richardson's comments to Mary Watts in 1755, in which he seeks not only to improve his works but also to leave instructions for the correction of them in posthumous editions. His work on making *Pamela* more 'perfect' did not result in the publication of another edition before his death, but a modified eighth edition (dated 1762) with substantive changes appeared on 28 October 1761, only months after his demise, and another edition in 1801, also with some significant changes, was published under the direction of his daughter. While it is difficult to establish for certain which changes to *Pamela* were exclusively those directed by Richardson, there is sufficient internal evidence to indicate that a number of the revisions were authorial in nature.[19] Even with

[17] Richardson, *Copy of a Letter to a Lady*, p. 2.
[18] Martha Richardson to Lady Bradshaigh, early March 1761 (*Bradshaigh*, III, p. 783).
[19] The two posthumous editions show evidence of changes typical of Richardson. The eighth edition contains '251 changes, 27 of them in the introductory letters (the praises are further toned down and considerable cuts are made) and 19 in the conclusion (there are two large

some uncertainty about the degree to which Richardson's decisions on revising *Pamela* were carried out, the fact that in the last year of his life he still was engaged creatively with a novel first published some twenty years earlier is a remarkable testament to his ongoing commitment to this work. The request to obtain Lady Bradshaigh's annotated copy of *Clarissa* also speaks to the breadth of this engagement and commitment.[20] While it does not appear that he was able to undertake as full a review towards another edition of *Clarissa*, it does seem there was the intent to do so, but increasing ill health in the last year of his life and the myriad of other obligations he had undertaken prevented him from carrying out this part of his artistic plan.[21]

Richardson as Printer

Richardson's work as printer also continued largely unabated through his final years. His reputation as one of the leading printers in London was well established by the mid 1750s. He was made Master of the Stationers' Company on 6 July 1754. His move in 1755, however disruptive it was to his personal and professional life, allowed further expansion of his printing operations.[22] His reputation and high standing are evident in the fact that after William Blackstone became Delegate of the Oxford University Press in 1755 and began a campaign of reform at the press, he sent his first manifesto on the conditions of the University Press to

cuts, one of them of material which Volumes III and IV had long ago made superfluous)' and appear to follow a pattern of revision used by Richardson in earlier editions (T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel, 'Richardson's Revisions of *Pamela*', *Studies in Bibliography*, 20 (1967), 72). In the 1801 edition, 'The text literally does have "Numerous Corrections and Alterations", and it is impossible to imagine anyone except Richardson who would have taken such great pains' (Eaves and Kimpel,'Richardson's Revisions of *Pamela*', 76).

[20] An octavo fourth edition of *Clarissa* appeared in 1759, but Sale notes that this fourth was not influenced by Lady Bradshaigh's comments (Sale (1963), p. 63). Shirley Van Marter, 'Richardson's Revisions of *Clarissa* in the Third and Fourth Editions', *Studies in Bibliography*, 28 (1975), 145, notes that this edition has few changes in either accidentals or substantives and is therefore 'in startling contrast to all we know about each of the earlier editions, so scrupulously revised, page by page, by the author. It also rules out the need to consider the fourth edition as a serious source of evidence for Richardson's final intentions.'

[21] It should be noted that his engagement with *Clarissa* took on another form in this late period when he received Lady Echlin's rewriting of the novel in 1755 and was certainly faced with others who wanted some aspects of the narrative changed. In his introduction to his edition of Lady Echlin's rewriting of *Clarissa*, Dimiter Daphinoff in *An Alternative Ending to Richardson's* Clarissa (Bern: Francke, 1982), p. 21, describes the aim of Lady Echlin's version as 'reconciliation and poetic justice'. 'Lady Echlin's version of *Clarissa*', according to Daphinoff, 'means to show … the unfailing, unconquerable virtue of woman and its power to bring about the reformation of the misled and a general reconciliation between evil-doers and sufferers' (p. 26). Lovelace therefore repents and Clarissa, although she still dies, is reconciled with both Lovelace and her parents.

[22] Maslen, pp. 7, 10.

Richardson for comment. Richardson's reply in a letter of 10 February 1756 offers a detailed assessment of Blackstone's document, 'Some Thoughts on the Oxford Press', and reveals a remarkably precise and thorough knowledge of everything from the mechanics of printing to the organizational and wage structures needed to make a press successful. During the post-1755 period, he continued to meet his obligations as primary printer for all documents related to the operations of the House of Commons, including 'unofficial printing, consisting of private bills … and local bills … official printing, consisting of public bills, accounts and papers … and the retrospective volumes of the House of Commons *Journal*'.[23]

The correspondence shows him working to balance what appear to be the significant demands of these government printing activities against requests from individual authors and acquaintances for his printing services. Peter Peckard, a Huntingdonshire curate, married Martha Ferrar, a close friend of Elizabeth Pennington, and through his wife's connection to Pennington, he probably made Richardson's acquaintance. Additionally prompted by William Law, for whom Richardson had printed *A Serious Call,* Peckard wrote to Richardson in 1756, sending along some 'loose sheets' and asking if he would print them in the form of a cheap 'twelvepenny affair'.[24] Richardson seeks to oblige but notes that he is delayed in putting forward Peckard's 'loose sheets' for printing because of 'some business that is to be brought before the Parliament'; probably the need for the printing of public or private bills took precedence. The delay itself is a good instance of Richardson's concern for efficiency since he replies to Peckard within two weeks of receiving the materials indicating that he will be 'publishing soon the Dissertation' and already sends some suggestions about modifying specific passages on Lord Bolingbroke and Mr Hume which are too strongly worded.[25] Peckard consents, giving Richardson full permission 'to strike out whatever … [he dislikes] and to make whatever alterations … [he thinks] necessary'.[26] Peckard's *A Dissertation on Revelations … in Which is attempted to be Shewn that there is Some Reason to Believe This Prophecy is Completed by the Late Earthquake*, suggesting a connection between Revelation, chapter 11, verse 13 and the recent earthquake in Lisbon, appeared later that year. Richardson also printed Peckard's *Observations on the Doctrine of an Intermediate State between Death and Resurrection* (1756) and *Observations on Mr Fleming's Survey* (1759).[27]

While he had a relatively large-scale printing operation and employed an overseer 'to attend to typographical Errors' and to 'be a good Middle man between you and Authors, as well as between you and the Workmen', Richardson was

[23] Maslen, p. 2.
[24] Peckard to SR, 5 February 1756.
[25] SR to Peckard, 16 February 1756.
[26] Peckard to SR 19 February 1756.
[27] Richardson writes to Peckard on 15 February 1759 to reassure him that the manuscript of *Observations on Mr Fleming's Survey* is 'safe & it is in hand'. He goes on to say, 'I presume that no very great Haste is required; but it shall not be neglected.'

still deeply involved in direct negotiation with authors concerning the printing of their works.[28] Writing to Peckard about the *Observations on Mr Fleming's Survey*, Richardson spells out the specifics of the number of copies to be printed. In a postscript that sounds like a contractual statement, he writes, 'Printing No 500 will cost you no more than printing 300, Paper excepted. As you leave the Number to me, and many of the Subjects are very striking, if I hear nothing from you soon to the contrary, I propose to print No. 500.'[29] He also appears to have engaged directly with Sarah Fielding, although only part of Richardson's side of the correspondence has been discovered. Working with Andrew Millar, Fielding strikes a deal to publish *The History of the Countess of Dellwyn*, but she struggles to write a sufficient amount to fill two volumes. She complains to Richardson that 'it fell so short … that I have added above a hundred Pages since he [Millar] was here, and I hope the great Mouth of the Press will be satisfied … I am almost sure I never wrote so much for two Vollumes before.' She then goes on to ask for Richardson's help:

> I beg that you will be so very kind to cast an Eye on the printing of it if your Health will permit without injury and pray be not scrupulous to alter any Expressions you dislike, but if this will do you any hurt and you are overloaded with other business I will trust it to your Nephew, and the proof sheets not being sent about will prevent the Stoppage of the printing if it is necessary I must write a small Preface but I had rather not for I am quite weary.[30]

The mix of the personal and professional shows in the special kinds of demands that came from printing for his acquaintances. Richardson would gain personal stories and often gracious compliments from the correspondence; however, ongoing concerns regarding his 'Health' and the professional demands of editing work, establishing print runs and preventing 'the Stoppage of the printing' while personalized negotiations took place made such printing jobs more than routine business transactions and presumably more time-consuming.

Beyond the impersonal printing of government documents and the more personal oversight of the works of his acquaintances, Richardson was also involved in ongoing large projects such as the *Universal History from the Earliest Account of Time*. While it is not entirely clear who first developed the idea of compiling a *Universal History*, the proposal for such an ambitious work appeared in 1729 from a number of booksellers, and the work owed 'its execution to enterprising booksellers who paid a group of writers and carried the costs of launching the undertaking'.[31] The *Universal History* was intended to present 'a history of the world in four folio volumes, beginning from the Creation and dealing with the

[28] SR to Blackstone 10 February 1756.
[29] SR to Peckard, 15 November 1759.
[30] Sarah Fielding to SR, 14 December 1758.
[31] Guido Abbattista, 'The Business of Paternoster Row: Towards a Publishing History of the *Universal History* (1736–65)', *Publishing History*, 17 (1985), 9.

ancient and modern history of all the peoples of Europe, Asia, Africa and America'.[32] Unfortunately, the project was plagued by a number of challenges, including changes in the managing booksellers before and during the project, an inability to produce regular instalments on time and differences of opinion between the publishers and writers of the articles.[33] Ultimately, the challenge of producing a history of the world 'unrivalled in its accuracy, completeness and originality'[34] led to a decision to divide the work into two sections: the first, an outline of 'Ancient' history, and the second, a description of 'Modern' history. The 'Ancient History' was completed in 1750, appearing in eight folio volumes, and a version in twenty octavo volumes was published between 1736 and 1750. In 1758 a new proposal appeared outlining a plan to produce a set of volumes dedicated to 'Modern History'.[35] Richardson had been involved with the project from as early as 1736 and owned shares in the publication,[36] but the correspondence after 1755 suggests that he took on an increasingly active role in the printing and production of the 'Modern' part of the *Universal History*.[37] Working with Andrew Millar, Richardson placed Tobias Smollett in the role of writer and editor, responsible for the composing and editing of content, and used Smollett as the arbiter of the quality of the entries themselves.[38] Smollett

[32] Abbattista, 'The Business of Paternoster Row', 9.
[33] Abbattista, 'The Business of Paternoster Row', 12–16.
[34] Abbattista, 'The Business of Paternoster Row', 15.
[35] A rationale for dividing the project into 'Ancient' and 'Modern' parts is set out in the *Proposals for Publishing the Modern Part of the University History* (1758):

> The proprietors once hoped to have been able to proceed to the publication of the MODERN PART immediately after they had concluded that of the ANTIENT, and gave an intimation of that Hope to the public: But tho' they were even then furnished with copy for the far greater part of the work, they found, upon reflection, that they had not duly considered the matter, nor allowed for the time and pains necessary to be taken for supplying deficiencies, and paring off redundancies. These could not be avoided in the first writing, as several gentlemen wrote different parts, which yet had connexion with each other; nor could they be discovered until their respective copies came to be collated. It was moreover thought necessary, that when they *began* to publish, they should have several volumes ready, in order to avoid future interruptions. Their own *interest*, as well as gratitude to their kind encouragers, will induce them to forward the conclusion of the work, they having expended large Sums in materials and copy, for which they will not be reimbursed until their arduous undertaking shall be completed (p. 3).

[36] Eaves and Kimpel, p. 159; Sale (1950), pp. 101–5.
[37] 'The *Modern History* at completion filled exactly forty-four octavo volumes and sixteen folios, the fruit of six years' work which went from 1 January 1759, when the first volume was registered at the Stationers' Company, to 31 January 1765, registration date of the last' (Abbattista, 'The Business of Paternoster Row', 19).
[38] Louis L. Martz, 'Tobias Smollett and the *Universal History*', *Modern Language Notes*, 56, no. 1 (1941), 11, estimates that Smollett may have been 'responsible for nearly 3000 folio pages (almost a third of the work) and as a result edited or compiled a total of about three million words'.

writes to Richardson on 4 April 1759, after receiving a section from Richardson including an entry by William Shirley, a minor playwright and writer for the ancient and modern history:

> I have just now received from your House Eight printed sheets of the modern History; four of Vol. xv, & four of Vol. xvi, which I suppose have been written by Mr Shirley; but, I protest, I know not what I am to do with them. Pray, Sir, are these Proof sheets to be corrected for the Press; or are they already printed off?

While Smollett shows some uncertainty as to what he is to do with these sheets, Richardson's nephew William responds on behalf of his uncle saying that there is a 'Barrenness both of Style & Compilation' in this and all of Shirley's writing, and it is up to Smollett to review (and presumably rewrite) this material before it is 'laid before the Public'.[39] Smollett complains that he has a 'chasm' of material missing in other parts of the work that he must also write to complete the historical and national narratives. William responds that despite the 'want of Materials to finish the chasm you are upon … [his uncle] cannot but approve of your Proposal to fill it up with the Discovery & Description of the Straights of Magellan, &c. &c'. In addition, he will be sending 'all that was written by Mr. Shirley, that your Opinion might be obtained of that Gentleman's Part'. This exchange not only demonstrates Richardson's complete confidence in Smollett's powers of editing and composition but also shows how Richardson took a commanding role in the overall production of the *History*.

Richardson also entered into a particularly demanding new printing venture in the last year of his life. A codicil to Richardson's will, dated 5 July 1760, describes his acquisition of a half interest in a law patent owned by Henry Lintot, but passed on to Lintot's daughter Catherine after his death in 1758: 'I have engaged in an Equal partnership in the Law Patent as it is called with my Dear Miss Catherine Lintot, to commence June 24 1760, and have with her consent removed the printing house belonging to her in the Savoy to my own printing house in White Lyon Court Fleet Street Subject to dictates of Copartnership'. William Sale describes the nature of this law patent most fully, but it essentially gave the holder of the patent exclusive printing rights to all law books related to common law.[40] This new partnership entailed a significant amount of new work for Richardson's printing house, but acquisition of the law patent also provided a financial asset for his wife and daughters, who sold the patent after his death to Henry Woodfall and William Strahan at a reported price of 1250 pounds for the half-share.[41]

[39] SR to Smollett, 5 April 1759.
[40] Sale (1950), pp. 134–44.
[41] Maslen, p. 43.

Richardson as Mentor

As we have seen, Richardson's range of talents as author, editor, and printer attracted a number of individuals to his door, seeking advice or printing services or both. The correspondence with Anna Meades offers a tantalizing insight into how Richardson the established author also played the role of mentor, editor, and potential printer for an aspiring female author. While it may not be clear how typical these negotiations are, they do trace the progress of Richardson's engagement with an author from the early stages of composition on the way to publication. With the correspondence is a draft and fair copy of Richardson's comments on Meades's manuscript for a novel eventually titled *The History of Sir William Harrington*. These documents, as Eaves and Kimpel point out, 'are the only detailed comments by Richardson on a work of fiction which are extant'.[42] These letters and the commentary on the novel manuscript offer a vivid picture of Richardson's mentorship of a young female writer in which Meades tries to balance dependence on Richardson's fame and access to the means to publish her works against independence on the part of an author seeking her own self-determination as an artist. As we shall see, however, documentation of the final publication of Meades's novel does not complete this picture, since Richardson dies before the work is published and the latter years of Meades's life are almost completely anonymous.

The twelve extant letters begin with a somewhat bold self-introduction to Richardson after the publication of *Sir Charles Grandison* and after his declarations that he would write no further novels. Anna Meades, corresponding under the pseudonym Cleomira, introduces herself as part of the school of Richardson and as a potential heir to his manner of writing. She begins her first letter to him, dated 19 January 1757,

> Having been inform'd by some of your particular Friends, that *Sr. Charles Grandison* was the last performance of *that* kind you intended to oblige the World with; has made me, who am a very great admirer of *your* writings, attempt something in the same *way*.

The boldness of this introduction is balanced against her frankness about her lack of knowledge about publication and the life of an author. She comments,

> I have written a parcel of Letters, which if Printed in the common manner Books of that kind generally are; I believe would make two Vol:s. But how to get them Printed, & yet not discover myself to the World as an *Authoress*, has been the cause of much trouble to me.

[42] T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel, 'Richardson's Connection with *Sir William Harrington*', *Papers on Language and Literature*, 4 (1968), 276. See also Teri Doerksen, 'Richardson, Celebrity, and Editorial Mediation in Anna Meades's *Sir William Harrington*', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 29, no. 2, (2016), 221–40.

The mixed desire to be published set against the anxieties of public authorship shows a determination to gain the aid of Richardson but also the vulnerable position of a woman seeking to be 'properly introduced to Public notice'. She is explicit about the desire for applause bringing with it 'envy – Envy Provokes Malice; & what she may contrive to the injury of a *Woman*, is impossible to determine'. For the moment, therefore, she seeks 'to escape the *hazard* of provoking that subtle fiend, by remaining unnoticed in my Present obscurity'. Meades therefore has a powerful rationale for choosing Richardson as her editor, printer, and mentor. She writes,

> But to the Protection of *you* Sir, who have with so much justice gain'd the Title of *Guardian to the Female Sex*; I am determined to offer my Work; hoping in consideration of my *Sex*, you will lend that assistance I require.[43]

While seeking to fill the void left by Richardson's departure from the field of the novel – a very bold claim indeed – she also counterbalances any appearance of hubris by placing Richardson in the role of chivalric mentor and protector.

As she moves into the specifics of the nature of this guardianship, she indicates that her life of imagination and fancy has been well nourished by living 'at London or Bath; in each Place partaking very frequently of all the diversions either afford, *proper* for *Women* to engage in', but Meades continues with the qualification that her '*Judgement* received little or no improvement from such airy Scenes as these' and that 'Not understanding the rules of *Grammar*; I am at a loss to correct my Work; indeed wholly incapable of doing so'. While this request invokes a range of affective dimensions, from desire for public accolade to anxiety over the burdens of authorship to self-assertion to the request for guardianship, the closing of the letter turns this courtly negotiation ultimately into a business deal. For his technical assistance in matters of judgement and grammar, Meades offers an equal financial partnership as the outcome: 'whatever Profit arises from the sale, I offer you half of, by way of recompense for the trouble such an undertaking must necessarily cost you'.

Richardson's response is a very qualified one. He begins by wishing 'that it may be in my Power to do you either Services or Pleasure', but cites three areas which may compromise his ability to act rapidly on her behalf. First, at this time, his 'Business requires all … [his] attention'; second, he has been 'so greatly afflicted with Nervous Maladies, that … [he] has been advised to forbear any intense Application to Reading & Writing'; and finally, and perhaps most importantly, he notes that he is 'not a Seller of Books', he keeps 'no Shop' and is 'a mere Printer, & always put … [his] own Books into the hands of Booksellers, allowing them their customary Rates for Selling, & taking upon myself the Profit & Loss'. With these provisos in mind, however, Richardson agrees to

[43] Anna Meades to SR, 19 January 1757.

read her works, stating that 'I may assure myself of being both entertain'd & instructed by the Perusal of your two Vol:' and that 'I approve of your Desire to be unknown as an Authoress'.[44]

Through the next several months, the exchanges move forward, with Meades sending a copy of her first anonymous publication, *The History of Cleanthes, an Englishman of the highest Quality, and Clemene, the Illustrious Amazonian Princess*, to Richardson in March, then arranging a meeting to which she brings the proposed novel, and after some months' delay, meeting again with Richardson to hear his thoughts on the manuscript. Given the detailed correspondence between Meades and Richardson, it is especially unfortunate that written exchanges break off in mid 1758 and the novel does not appear to move closer to publication in Richardson's lifetime. In the last surviving letter, dated 17 August 1758, Meades reminds Richardson that 'When I last waited upon you Sir, in Salisbury Court, you promised at the same time you return'd me the MS: you were so kind to Honour with your inspection, to send likewise some written remarks of you<rs>'. She does have a copy of the manuscript with Richardson's 'Hand writing appearing in so many parts to the very great amendment of all the passages where it is found', but she requests further that he 'Oblige … [her] still farther by sending the promised remarks, & … [he will] add still higher occasion for thanks & gratitude'. Comments by Richardson do survive along with the correspondence in the British Library and are reproduced in Appendix I, but there is some doubt about who saw them and if they were used when the novel was finally printed thirteen years later.

The first edition of *The History of Sir William Harrington* is dated 1771 and it was followed by a second edition in 1772. The subtitle further indicates that the *History* was *Written Some Years Since, and Revised and Corrected by the Late Mr. Richardson, Author of Sir Charles Grandison, Clarissa, &c.* The handling of the printing appears to have fallen to Thomas Hull (1728–1808), an actor and dramatist, who edited the final manuscript and used the services of Bell and Etherington as booksellers.[45] The Editor's Preface begins with the statement, 'I think it necessary to the Satisfaction of every critical Reader, to assure them, the reputable Assertion in the Title-page, viz. that *Mr. Richardson Revised these Letters*, is Truth on, my own Knowledge. We both had an Intimacy of some Years with the Writer, and he paid this Claim of Friendship a short Time before his Death'.[46] The Editor's intention is to foreground Richardson's involvement in the work, but some questions arise from the circumstances of the novel's publication. It appears well after Richardson's death, and so there is little concrete evidence of his involvement in the novel after he first read and commented on the manuscript.

[44] SR to Anna Meades, 2 February 1757.
[45] John Dussinger, 'Anna Meades, Samuel Richardson and Thomas Hull: The Making of *The History of Sir William Harrington*', *New Essays on Samuel Richardson*, edited by Albert J. Rivero (New York: St Martin's Press, 1996), pp. 179–80.
[46] Anna Meades, *The History of Sir William Harrington*, 4 vols. (London: 1771), p. v.

There is also no clear explanation for the delay of more than a decade after the correspondence ceased between Richardson and Meades, leaving unanswered her request for written critiques of the *History of Sir William Harrington*. The draft copy of Richardson's written commentary has the statement 'Not sent to the Lady' written on it, and Meades's copy of the manuscript with Richardson's comments has not been traced. Finally, the later years of Meades's life are not well documented and the degree of her involvement in the publication of the *History* is also unclear. The Editor states that he has complete control over the final product in saying 'The Work has been very lately entrusted to my Care, to usher into the World. I make no Apology for so doing'.[47] There is no comment on the author's involvement. These various factors have led John Dussinger to suggest that 'for some reason during the time between August 1758, when she last wrote to Richardson, and early 1771, when this novel appeared, Meades never had the opportunity to revise her manuscript'.[48] He cogently argues 'that by the time her novel appeared, Meades was … possibly deceased' and that Hull took over all editing work and even became informally described as the author of the work.[49] The extent to which Richardson's commentary was used in revisions of the manuscript has also been debated, with Eaves and Kimpel contending that 'neither Miss Meades, nor the editor who published the book appears to have used it'.[50] However, Dussinger, in examining the comments and the novel closely, concludes that 'Far from being the unsung and unsent advice that Eaves and Kimpel had postulated, the British Museum notes are more than likely a transcript of the penciled marginalia on the manuscript of the novel that the editor had in his possession at the time of publication in 1771.'[51]

One final curiosity arises from an advertisement placed by Richardson's wife and daughters after the appearance of the novel:

> A Novel having lately been published under the title of 'The History of Sir William Harrington', said to be verified and corrected by the late Mr Richardson, author of Sir Charles Grandison, Clarissa, &c. To prevent any imposition on the public, we are authorized by the widow and daughters of Mr Samuel Richardson to declare, that he never revised or corrected any such work; and, likewise, that all his manuscripts, of every kind are in the hands of his widow and daughters only; and that no person has a right to publish any new work under his name, without their authority.[52]

[47] Meades, *The History of Cleanthes*, pp. v–vi.
[48] Dussinger, 'Anna Meades, Samuel Richardson and Thomas Hull', p. 187.
[49] Dussinger, 'Anna Meades, Samuel Richardson and Thomas Hull', p. 179.
[50] Eaves and Kimpel, p. 430; see also Eaves and Kimpel, 'Richardson's Connection with *Sir William Harrington*', 276–87.
[51] Dussinger, 'Anna Meades, Samuel Richardson and Thomas Hull', p. 187.
[52] *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, issue 13084, 5 February 1771.

While the advertisement at first appears to repudiate Richardson's involvement with the novel, it was more likely intended to make a statement about publication, publication rights, and ownership of Richardson's name. Richardson's business investments, particularly in the later period of his life, were designed to ensure the well-being of his wife and unmarried daughters. The free use of Richardson's name in the anonymous publication of *The History of Sir William Harrington* certainly trades on his fame and, judging from the serious admonition in this advertisement, was ultimately done without permission of the family.

Interruption: The Move across Salisbury Court and the Irish Pirates

While evidence from the correspondence largely supports the notion that Richardson's engagement and vitality in his role of author, printer, and editor were little diminished by age and his nervous malady, there are moments of interruption marked out in the letters that together produce a counter narrative to the story of progress, self-definition, and expanded enterprise. These interruptions come in the form of a series of events, some planned and some unplanned, that take Richardson away from his business as author, editor and mentor, and printer. As the letters progress from 1755 through 1758, these incidents take on a compounding effect and disturb what Richardson calls his 'Spirit of Scribbling'.[53] This particular 'Spirit' encompasses the literal act of writing, something that is increasingly compromised by his nervous disorder and its manifestation in his inability to write legibly or even to hold a pen for a lengthy period of time, and the figurative identity he holds as writer and editor. The ultimate effect is to undermine intermittently the productivity and engagement that characterize the main narrative of Richardson's life.

The first moment in this counter narrative emerges from Richardson's decision to move both his living and his working address from one side of Salisbury Court to the other. The decision is made to improve the working conditions in his press and to separate his living accommodations from the print shop. In the mid 1730s Richardson moved to a house on the west side of Salisbury Court, which, together with the 'backhouses' directly behind it, served until 1755 as both accommodation for his family and a location for his business operations.[54] By mid 1755, however, it became increasingly clear that this arrangement could not continue. Evidence of continued expansion of his printing business appears in 1752, when Richardson rented another house on the north side of the northeast corner of the square. While he appears to have left it vacant in

[53] SR to Samuel Lobb, 29 December 1755. The Nonconformist minister Samuel Lobb (1690–1760) was one of Richardson's oldest friends. For more details see Samuel Lobb to SR, [Early 1755].

[54] The details concerning SR's houses are drawn from T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel, 'Samuel Richardson's London Houses', *Studies in Bibliography*, 15 (1962), 135–48.

the first year, he then turned this space into a warehouse and a residence for his workers,[55] but increasingly he came to have other plans for this building only a few houses from what was then his main residence and principal place of business. Increasingly, the combination of heavy printing machinery and residential architecture began to require a change. He wrote to Lady Echlin that 'The house I live in, in Salisbury Court, has been adjudged to have stood near its time; And my very great Printing Weights at the Top of it, have made it too hazardous for me to renew an expiring Lease'.[56] His solution to this impending crisis is set out very systematically to Lady Echlin: 'I have taken a building lease of a court of houses, eight in number', he writes, 'which were ready to fall; have pulled them down and on new foundations, have built a most commodious printing-office; and fitted up an adjoining house, which I before used as a warehouse, for the dwelling house.'[57] In this new arrangement, Richardson's business and living arrangements were now separated, with his family to be accommodated in the 'adjoining house', probably the one rented in 1752, to be used as a 'dwelling house' and his business relocated into 'a most commodious printing-office' newly built on White Lyon Court. Running south from Fleet Street, White Lyon Court ended at the northwest corner of Salisbury Court, where the renovated Richardson 'dwelling house' was located. Richardson describes his satisfaction with the new separation between commercial and domestic spaces: he writes that he moves 'from the handsome and roomy house' where he formerly lived

> to a House less handsome and less roomy; but infinitely more convenient, it adjoining to, and as I have managed it, opening into, the paved Court that separates my double-winged Building, and at the same Time, giving me a very convenient Passage into Fleet-street; as I have another into Salisbury Court, next Door but one (tho' in a Corner) to the House I am to quit … I have a Sixty Years Lease of the Ground I have built upon, at an easy Ground Rent … Parson's Green must supply to my Wife and Girls the Difference, as to Appearance, between the two Dwelling-houses. Yet the new one will be a comfortable Dwelling; and as it will, tho' connected with the Business Part, be intirely separate from it, and no Part of the Business done in it, my Family will have more Convenience, than it had before; because a great Part of the other

[55] He wrote to Lady Bradshaigh, 'It is the Printing Office *only* that is new-built; That is distinct from, tho' adjoining to, the Dwelling-Part; which two Families of my Workmen occupied, for a few Years past, one on one Floor, the other on another, while I made use of the rest in my Business' (SR to Lady Bradshaigh, 22 March 1756 (*Bradshaigh*, II, p. 605)).
[56] SR to Lady Echlin, 15 December 1755 (*Bradshaigh*, II, p. 583).
[57] SR to Lady Echlin, 15 December 1755 (*Bradshaigh*, II, p. 583).

> larger House (and yet the new one is 45 feet deep) was taken up in the Business.[58]

Despite the optimistic tone of this description of the move, Richardson offers a range of comments in his correspondence attesting to the disruptive impact of changing his business and family accommodations. He writes to William Lobb at the end of 1755 rejoicing in the completion of the project but noting the detrimental effect on his letter writing: 'I have finished, thank God! the building that has engaged my attention for many past months; and now am collecting the letters of my kind correspondents, which I had not answered, because of that engagement, in order to perform that duty.'[59] One can imagine that this consequence – the interruption of written correspondence and the inability to perform this important 'duty' – is more than a casual interruption. He writes to Margaret Collier that 'If my dear Miss Collier knew how much I have been immersed in bricks, mortar, plasterers' and carpenters' work all the summer, and till within this month past, and in that month wholly engrossed by the removal of all my printing materials into the new building, she will think the less hardly of my long silence to a letter that I admire in every line of it.'[60] The language of immersion places the writer within this material project but immobilized by the very 'bricks' and 'mortar' he hoped would improve the writer's and printer's life and disentangle his professional from his personal working spaces.

The inertness suggested by these metaphors of immersion and engrossment expands as Richardson, in comments to other correspondents, connects the experience of the move with other disruptive events in his life. In response to one of the many enquiries about whether or not he will continue *Sir Charles Grandison* or begin a new fictional work, Richardson offers an intriguing answer:

> I attend to your Arguments, my dear Friend, for resuming my Pen: But what shall I do? The Spirit of Writing seems to have left me. The Irish Pyrates drawing me out to assert a Property so peculiarly my own, cooled me not a little. Engagements with Bricklayers, Carpenters, &c. that were made indispensably necessary the Year before last in the Country; and the last Summer, in Town, by building a new Printing-Office, my Dwelling-house there being overloaded by the vast Weights upon it, and in Danger; and I proposing to have the Business carried on, after my Decease, for the Benefit of my Wife and Girls, for their more commodious Maintenance: The necessary Attention I have been obliged to pay to these Works, hath

[58] SR to Lady Bradshaigh, 17 December 1755. He goes on to note, 'Every-body is more pleased with what I have done than my Wife: But that, I flatter myself, is because she has not seen either the Offices or the House she is to live in, *since* the former were little better than a Heap of Rubbish (8 Houses being demolished to make Room for them) and the latter was a dirty Warehouse' (*Bradshaigh*, II, p. 586).
[59] SR to William Lobb, 29 December 1755.
[60] SR to Margaret Collier, 24 December 1755.

> quite absorbed my Scribbling Spirit; and I am afraid extinguished it. I say *afraid*; for having now as good as finished my Building, I seem to be getting fast into a State of Supineness, for want of Employment to carry my Self out of my Self: And have I not in the History of Sir Ch. Grandison, executed my Plan?[61]

In this dense passage, Richardson develops a complex association of events compounding and collapsing his ability to write. Just as the planned move across Salisbury Court turned to an upheaval that caught Richardson by surprise and became something he could not seem to manage, the experience of the Irish piracy of *Sir Charles Grandison* was something he attempted to prevent but found himself powerless to control.

While preparing to print *Sir Charles Grandison*, Richardson took extreme care to protect his literary property. He planned to publish the novel in a sequence of volumes appearing at regular intervals. In his correspondence he wrote that he hoped to publish the first two volumes in October or November 1753, followed by volumes III and IV in December and the final volumes in February 1754.[62] As the work began to appear, he entered a contract with the Dublin bookseller George Faulkner in an attempt to protect the Irish rights to the book and to stay ahead of the Irish pirates.[63] However, correspondence between Richardson and Faulkner soon revealed that all attempts to protect this important literary property had failed and at least four other Irish booksellers obtained sheets of the novel prior to the completion of the printing by Richardson in England or Faulkner in Ireland.[64] Richardson sought to intervene through the auspices of a number of his correspondents including Lord Orrery, a Mr Sharpe, Dr Johnson and Philip Skelton. He also printed a pamphlet, dated 14 September 1753, entitled *The Case of Samuel Richardson, of London, Printer; with Regard to the Invasion of his Property*, in which he outlined his grievance and named two of his journeymen, Peter Bishop and Thomas Killingbeck as suspected accomplices in this act of piracy. After breaking with Faulkner as well, Richardson wrote a further pamphlet published on 1 February 1754, entitled *An Address to the Public*. In this *Address*, he extended his attack to Faulkner. Richardson went forward with publication of the novel with continued determination to protect his literary property. To secure his copyright, he registered *Sir Charles Grandison* with the Stationers' Company: the first two volumes of the octavo edition were registered on 1 October 1754; volumes three and four on 7 November; volume five on 5

[61] SR to William Lobb, 29 December 1755.
[62] SR to Elizabeth Carter, 4 July 1753; SR to Alexis Claude Clairaut, 5 July 1753 (*Correspondence … (1750–1754)*, pp. 89–96).
[63] This brief discussion of the Irish piracy of *Grandison* is indebted to commentaries by William Merritt Sale, 'Sir Charles Grandison and the Dublin Pirates', *Yale University Library Gazette*, 7, no. 3 (1933), 80–6; Sale (1936), pp. 65–70; Eaves and Kimpel, pp. 377–86.
[64] See George Faulkner to SR, 4 August 1753 – <November 1753> (*Correspondence … (1750–1754)*, pp. 101–29).

December; and the final volume on 11 March 1755. He also rushed his *Grandison* through publication 'by employing the services of seven other printing shops'.[65]

While Richardson appears to have done everything he could to protect his literary property prior to and after publication, it is clear that the impact of this plundering of his novel against his wishes was significant. The note to Lobb links the disruption of his tangible properties with the theft of his intellectual property and indicates that all of this is more than a minor distraction. These events, he asserts, have 'quite absorbed my Scribbling Spirit', but he qualifies the nature of this extinction by noting that he is '*afraid*' it would be extinguished. When the building was 'now as good as finished', Richardson may have hoped that this absorption and extinguishing of the power of writing might pass. However, the movement into 'a State of Supineness, for want of Employment to carry my Self out of my Self' introduces an odd state of torpor into the experience of an energetic entrepreneur like Samuel Richardson.

There is, of course, a self-mocking irony apparent in Richardson's description of his novelistic practices as 'Scribbling'. Johnson's Dictionary defines the verb 'to scribble' as 'To fill with artless or worthless writing' or 'To write without use or elegance'. A 'Scribbler', the Dictionary defines as 'A petty author; a writer without worth'. Every aspect of Richardson's 'Scribbling' runs counter to these notions. The care he took in bringing the works to his own press, the extensive consultations he undertook while composing and editing, and the regular revision of his novels are evidence of serious purposefulness in all his writing practices. Earlier he had written to Johannes Stinstra that 'My [printing] Business, Sir has ever been my chief Concern. My Writing-time has been at such times of Leisure as have not interfered with that',[66] a statement Keith Maslen has described as Richardson's 'protesting a little too much'.[67] The case is the same here, but the persistent impact of the piracy of his work demonstrates the underlying intensity of his engagement with a perceived value in his own writings. He experienced the piracy itself as a personal and professional attack, encompassing both his 'Business' and 'Leisure' activities. Thus, the description of the faculty behind this work as a 'Scribbling Spirit' appears as much an act of self-defence, an attempt at distancing himself – to however small a degree – from the seriousness of the assault on his creative energies and created products. In this late context, the extinguishing of the 'Scribbling Spirit' threatens to extend a deadening effect over of all aspects of Richardson the printer, writer, editor, and mentor.

Caught between the creative impulses, both entrepreneurial and novelistic, that have dominated his life and the shock of the assault by both the piracy and the increasing infirmities of age, Richardson is understandably ambivalent. After glancing into the abyss posed by the sense of loss of his will to write, he returns

[65] Sale (1936), p. 68. Sale (1936), pp. 65–70, offers a full account of the changes to SR's plans for publication of *Sir Charles Grandison*.
[66] SR to Stinstra, 2 June 1753.
[67] Maslen, p. 8.

in his letter to Lobb to something like a statement of resolution that attempts to defy belief in its final departure. He writes in a somewhat elegiac tone, searching for a consolation to be found in diminishing powers:

> Well but, my good Friend, let the Impulse return, and if God give me Ability, it shall be obeyed: Mean time, do you be so kind as to think for me; and if any Subject further offers, suggest it to me; as you have heretofore done for me. Yet, I fear, as I said before, the Spirit of Scribbling, is extinguished. Nevertheless, I am not in the least apprehensive of a narrow Spirit taking place of a more dilated one, tho' I were to make the Care of my Family my *whole Study*. In the Course of Nature, and from Bodily Infirmities, I cannot have a great while before me; and yet, I find not any Diminution of that Good Will to all my Fellow-Creatures to whom I can either do Service or give Pleasure; even, sometimes, (Family and Circumstances considered,) at the Expence of my Prudence. This Spirit I find to enlarge, as Power (however limited) enlarges; and were I to live Years to come, will, by God's Blessing, secure me from the Vice of Old Age; were my Power to be greater than it is likely ever to be.[68]

Although elsewhere he is consistent in arguing that he has finished permanently with novelistic writing, Richardson begins this passage with the unusual suggestion that he might continue writing on a topic suggested by Lobb. However, the opening statements in this passage depict a resignation, a giving over of control: 'let the Impulse return', unwilled, and 'if God give … Ability', he will resume the Pen and perhaps pursue 'any Subject further' offered. This momentary openness then gives way to a reiteration of his 'fear' that the 'Spirit' is extinguished, a fear balanced by his acceptance of 'a narrow Spirit taking place of a more dilated one', a projected contentment with this new 'narrow Spirit' framed within domestic interests. Interestingly, Richardson is not speaking of finding fit audience though few; rather, he is awaiting the return of a diminished 'Spirit' whose power is constrained by events and their impact on an aging self. The whole passage takes on the air of resignation and faith.

In responding to the French mathematician Alexis Claude Clairaut's enquiry concerning the possibility of a continuation of *Sir Charles Grandison*, Richardson, as he did in his letter to Lobb, again connects the undermining of his control over his physical properties – his home and print shop – and his intellectual property – *Sir Charles Grandison* – and the impact of this loss of control over his creative powers. He begins with a response which echoes that of the published *Copy of a Letter to a Lady*, citing the aesthetic goal of creating a fruitful uncertainty for his readers by not fully resolving all aspects of the Lady Clementina plot:

> I have not intended to pursue farther the History of Sir Ch. Grandison. I thought it best, to leave undecided the Fate of Clementina, and other

[68] SR to Samuel Lobb, 29 December 1755.

> Particulars which could not be taken in, in the Time of the Story. Readers were so divided, and so very earnest in relation to *her*, some putting an End to her Life, some marrying her to the Count of Belvedere; others destining her to the single Life, that I thought it was best to leave the Readers to make it out as they pleased.[69]

The story of Clementina, which seems to have engaged readers as fully as that of any other character in the novel, including Sir Charles and Harriet Byron, serves the narrative well in remaining unresolved. Multiple potential outcomes enrich the experience of the readership by remaining undetermined and by inspiring further speculation outside the novel itself. He goes on, however, to emphasize more immediate and personally affecting events which are taking their toll on his ability to write. The narrative which emerges is quite similar to that given in the letter to Lobb:

> and the rather, as I have new Engagements in the Building-way, added to those of Business, which engross my Attention; and then I have received so much Loss and Vexation from the Irish Pyrates, that I am quite sick of my Pen: And have I not been a profuse Scribbler? But do you, my dear Sir, give me your Opinion, should the Humor return, as to proceeding or closing, as at present.[70]

Richardson's reasons for not continuing *Grandison* range from the abstract to the pragmatic to the somewhat self-mocking. He seems content to leave elements of indeterminacy in the work, allowing the 'divided' and 'earnest' readership to remain in a state of suspended expectation about events outside the novel. In the case of *Grandison* and the unresolved 'Fate of Clementina', allowing 'Readers to make it out as they pleased' created the opportunity for a set of questions that would add to attachment to the novel and potentially act as an ongoing subject of conversation designed to keep interest in the novel alive. But it is also clear that the pragmatic demands of 'new Engagements' in his move to different living and working quarters and the challenges provided by his continuing battle with 'the Irish Pyrates' proved unavoidable diversions from any immediate work on *Grandison*. And yet further, his somewhat offhand comment 'I am quite sick of my Pen: And have I not been a profuse Scribbler?' offers a satirical self-comment that, if it does not acknowledge his own prolixity, certainly asks when enough is enough. The turn in the letter at 'rather' indicates the absorption in matters of property, both tangible and intangible, which begin to 'engross my Attention' and then diminish the creative impulse for scribbling. The profession that 'I am quite sick of my Pen' moves the metaphorical loss of creative energy from the imagery of absorption, engrossment, and supineness directly into the world of disease, a world of sickness in which the self and its instrument of expression

[69] SR to Alexis Claude Clairaut, 12 September 1755.
[70] SR to Alexis Claude Clairaut, 12 September 1755.

become toxic to one another. The remedy for this sickness is similar to the one cited in the Lobb letter over the loss of the 'Spirit of Writing' – it is the appeal to the opinions and stories of the outward circle of correspondents.

Interruption: Sickness and Death

The metaphors of immersion and consequent inertia, the conditions of supineness and sickness themselves become literalized in Richardson's description of the second great lacuna in his scribbling between 1755 and his death in 1761 – a period of protracted illness experienced by Richardson, his family and two of his close friends in late 1756. While staying with his family in his summer retreat at Parson's Green, he invites two close friends – Margaret Dutton and Thomas Edwards – to visit. It was generally hoped that these friends, who were currently suffering from different illnesses, would find the country retreat restorative, but unfortunately for all involved the experience did not lend itself to recovery for either individual. Margaret Dutton was the unmarried daughter of one of Richardson's neighbours and had been suffering from consumption. Thomas Edwards, a poet and writer of critical essays, including an attack on William Warburton's edition of Shakespeare, entered the Richardson circle around the appearance of *Clarissa* and was influential during the writing process of *Sir Charles Grandison*. Richardson writes to Sarah Fielding answering some of her enquiries and describing the state of health of himself, his family and these two friends:

> My poor friend, Mr. Edwards, on a returned visit to me, is taken very dangerously ill at Parson's-Green … A friend we value, Miss Dutton, has been with us some months for the air; but has reaped no benefit by it. Every week, for several past, has presented the good creature to our aggrieved hearts wasting visibly; and she seems now to be in the last stage of a consumption. Poor Sally has been confined with a rheumatic disorder. Three of our servants have taken their turns. But why trouble I you with these melancholy particulars?[71]

The moment of hesitation at the end of this passage is in itself revealing. Despite his hesitation – 'But why trouble I you with these melancholy particulars?' – the narrative of sickness and attempted recovery forces itself upon Richardson as a drama which must be written. His 'Nervous disorders' not only become worse but are also identified with the states of illness all around him. As his condition progresses, Richardson's plans to return to London and to his centre of business are further interrupted as the illnesses begin to form a plot beyond his ability to control. He writes to Thomas and Frances Sheridan that he had hoped to meet up with Miss Pennington upon his return to London, but any such plans

[71] SR to Sarah Fielding, 7 December 1756.

are suspended by the intensification of the sicknesses suffered by his family and friends:

> We were in great Hopes of inducing her, on her Return to Town, to favour us again with her Company; But, alas! My Wife & Family are still kept at Parson's Green, by the (I am afraid mortal) Sickness of two very valuable Friends; & our Sally, & Niece Sukey are also confin'd by Rheumatic Disorders: So that we are a Family of Nurses & Nurselings; my Wife at present not very well neither. But I hope Miss Pennington will be near us, & as much with us as she can. Mr Edwards & Miss Dutton are the two Friends, whose dangerous Illnesses we deplore.[72]

Richardson finally reports the deaths of Miss Dutton and Mr Edwards to Sarah Fielding in January while at the same time trying to offer an assessment of the impacts on his family and himself:

> Miss Dutton hastening to her dissolution in one room; Mr. Edwards, my dear, very worthy Mr. Edwards, in another; Sally and Sukey helpless in two several rooms; Polly and Patty in two others: it was with me nothing but going from room to room to beloved patients, in turn, when I went down, which I did much oftener than usual, you may be sure: three nurses in the house; continual visitors (but welcome ones to us) enquire after our two worthy friends state of health, &c. Think, my dear Miss Fielding, what a melancholy time we have had; nor will you wonder that my nerves have suffered. But no more in this sad strain. Our friends departed were worthy of all our cares; and being unexpectedly called upon to assist them in the last offices of friendship, we acted as persons in the way of our duty: we performed that duty. God has blessed my girls aforementioned with returned health. My wife, on her return to town with them, recovers her spirits. She, however, joins a silent tear, now and then, to those of her daughters, in remembrance of her departed friends; but chears up on recollecting, that she had so well, and in a manner so truly sisterly, helped to sustain and comfort the guests whom she looked upon as *deodands*, may I say?[73]

The correspondence after this period indicates that the impact of this period of sickness and death lasts well beyond January of 1757. Even later that year, Richardson begins several of his letters with apologies for his slowness in responding to his correspondents. In April, he writes to Philipp Erasmus Reich:

> Your Letter dated Febr. 1 I received not till Febr. 22 & by a very great Increase of my Nervous Disorders, have been unable to write before to acknowledge the head Contents; and Still I find, by my unsteady

[72] SR to Thomas and Frances Sheridan, 19 December 1756.
[73] SR to Sarah Fielding, 17 January 1757.

> Hand, shall but ill requite myself of the agreeable Task. In the last 3 or 4 Months of an unpropitious Winter I have had the Deaths of three most Excellent Friends (two of them at Parsons-Green, my little Rural Retirement, whither they came for the Benefit of the Air) to lament, my own Family down throughout the whole time, of Fevers & sore Throats. These were attacks on my weakest Side; other disagreeable Circumstances, (one of them, the Detection of a false & ungrateful Friend) concurring no Wonder that I was the more Susceptible of the heavy Strokes.[74]

In May he responds to Frances Sheridan, adding in a note about the death of Mary Watts, who died in February of 1757:

> Re perusing your last Favor, I am afflicted to find it dated Febr. 8. yet cannot allow you to be displeased with me for so long a Silence. I have been Struggling with a Severe nervous Paroxysm, & still, at times, am unable to hold a Pen. A heavy Winter have we had. – Mr Edwards, *good* Mr Edwards! Worthy Miss Dutton, both departed with us at Parson's Green; and since the excellent Mrs. Watts, at her House in Somersetshire – our poor Nancy was with her! What a Loss has the good Girl had! We were obliged to hurry her back to us.[75]

Here the nervous disorder has extended to a 'Paroxysm'. This worsening symptom returns Richardson to the world of immersion and supineness, making him 'unable to hold a Pen'. The 'Spirit of Scribbling', if not fully extinguished, is indeed significantly threatened.

While the impact of these moments of interruption and disruption is set out markedly in the correspondence, there is also evidence in the records of Richardson's printing activity as his work is recorded in Keith Maslen's *Samuel Richardson of London, Printer*. Maslen's book records an impressive array of works printed by Richardson and offers a compelling chart of 'Sheets Composed 1721–1760' by Richardson, demonstrating, for instance, that 'Increases in annual production continue to the very end of Richardson's life' but also noting that there were at times 'considerable fluctuations in annual output'.[76] One year that shows such a 'considerable' change in productivity is 1758. While in the previous year, Richardson's printing house produced a total of 822.5 sheets, 1758 saw the production of 393. The following year, 1759, moved up again to 1283+ sheets. Moreover, in 1758, Richardson produced no sheets for local bills and no Commons Journals. Indeed, this was the only year in which Commons Journals were not produced during the time Richardson had the contract to do so. While it is possible a number of factors may have caused fluctuation in

[74] SR to Philipp Erasmus Reich, 2 April 1757.
[75] SR to Frances Sheridan, 11 May 1757.
[76] Maslen, pp. 17, 15.

his printing activity, the fact that in all categories Richardson produced fewer sheets than in any other year after 1730 suggests that something substantial had happened to the productive impulse behind the press. The letters suggest there was a slowing of his ability to respond to correspondents at the end of 1756 and certainly through the first part of 1757, meaning that his forward planning for the press may have been significantly affected with the several threats to his 'Spirit of Scribbling'. His extensive involvement in all aspects of the press, from acquiring materials to editing and advising writers to managing many works through the processes of production shows the effectiveness and ambition of Richardson the printer. It is a testament to his resilience, though, that with sheet runs of 1283+ and 1235+ in 1759 and 1760 respectively, the productivity of Richardson's press in 1759 and 1760 increased well beyond that of any other year in his lifetime.

Conclusion

On Sunday, 28 June 1761, Richardson suffered a stroke while taking tea at home with Joseph Highmore. By 1 July he no longer recognized anyone, and on 4 July he died, leaving one final written document to draw to a conclusion the concerns of his long life. Richardson's will provides a glimpse of the author, businessman, and editor as he shapes the sometimes awkward legal prose to serve his wishes. Although it remains primarily a legal instrument designed to protect the financial interests of his family, the will nevertheless bears the same stamp of personality that shines through his correspondence, and reveals several concerns that dogged his thoughts in his final years.

The main elements of Richardson's will were drawn up in 1757, and the basic document outlines his wishes regarding the disposal of his physical remains, the small personal legacies he wished to give friends and relatives, and the distribution of his estate to his wife and daughters. On the first point Richardson is pragmatic: he asks that his body be buried beside his 'late Excellent wife Martha', but should this pose difficulties, 'let it be buried where most convenient'. Ever mindful of expenses, he advises 'that [his] funeral may be frugally performed not to Exceed to … [his] family 30£'. There follow a series of modest bequests – among others, three Guineas to each of the elder daughters of his brother Benjamin, and fifty pounds to their younger sister, Susanna, who has been living with Richardson's family – and 'a Ring of a Guinea value' to no fewer than thirty-one people. It is here that Richardson's characteristic combination of modesty and self-satisfaction shows through, as he comments, 'Had I bequeathed a Ring to each of the Ladies I was honoured by as Correspondents and truly Venerate for their Virtues and amiable Qualities, the List of their Names would even in this Solemn Act have subjected me to the charge of Ostentation'. If the author names singly and collectively in the document the women who delighted him by their attention to his works, the printer and businessman remembers 'each of

the Journeymen' in his employ at his decease with 'half a Guinea, for a pair of Gloves', as a 'Small Token of [his] friendly Esteem'.

Richardson's main concern, however, is provision for the financial well-being of his wife and daughters. He appointed a trio of executors with complementary skills and interests to manage the estate: Andrew Millar, one of the foremost booksellers in England, brought expertise in the trade; Francis Gosling, as both bookseller and banker, had long advised the author in financial dealings; his brother-in-law and life-long friend, Allington Wilde, rounded out the group. Richardson knew that 'the Chief of [his] Worth lies in Stock Copies and Printing Materials' and he hoped that the executors would continue the printing business in his wife's name. One further source of income would be the Law Patent partnership entered into in 1760 with Catherine Lintot, and in the fourth codicil to his will Richardson adds the name of James Bailey, who had been instrumental in the transaction, to his list of executors.

Perhaps the most vivid impression left by the will, however, is the picture it gives of Richardson's recurrent anxiety that in agreeing to the marriage settlement negotiated by Philip Ditcher on his marriage to Polly in 1757, he had seriously short-changed his other daughters. In the will itself he directs that 'each of my daughters Martha Anne and Sarah Shall receive a portion equal to what I gave my Daughter Mary on her Marriage with Mr. Ditcher … But if anything remain of the said two thirds of my Estate after all my Daughters portions shall be made equal then, I give such Surplus or remainder unto my said four Daughters equally Share and Share alike'. He returns to the issue however in the first codicils, commenting that the sale of his household goods mentioned in the main body of the document is 'Still the more unnecessary as Mr. Ditcher can have no further Expectations till my other children have been equally considered' and that 'his Wife's full Share of [Richardson's] calculated Worth at the time of his Marriage' was 'too probably by Mistake over calculated'.

Richardson's other persistent anxiety reflected in the will is his relationship with his nephew William. The son of his younger brother of the same name, William had been apprenticed to Richardson in 1748, and after the requisite seven years of service had been poised to take a greater role in the printing business. However, sometime between May and 15 July 1759, William struck out on his own, and by the end of the year had established his own business and was hiring his own apprentices.[77] Among the early minor bequests is three guineas to 'my Nephew William Richardson' who 'when he reflects he will allow that he Merits not from me and mine greater Distribution'. The first codicil asks that material 'relating to my kinsman who was my Overseer at the time of Signing the proceeding Testament' be scratched through, though he does add that he 'cordially wish[es him] success'. The second codicil also devotes space to making clear that while he recommends greater rewards for his brother William's other

[77] Eaves and Kimpel, p. 500.

children, the nephew William is to be shut out from further consideration: 'as I said above I mean that Son well and wish him Success But the Letters that have passed between him and me still manifest that he will have Success if it can be obtained … If any Difficulties attend him they must arise from his unprecedented Rashness … I mean this only for a Caution and Warning to my family with regard to this partial and selfish young Man that he may not at its Expense and to its Great Detriment get from it the means he will undoubtedly get if he can to repair the Exceeding rash Steps he has taken.'

Richardson's final years, as reflected in his correspondence in this volume, were years of both challenge and opportunity, marked by physical decline but also by a powerful will to preserve and assert the multi-faceted identity he had established in the course of his long career. The final sentence of the final letter included here speaks to his sense of physical and formal decline but his continued intellectual and affective strength: 'excuse all Defects in my Hand and Style. Neither Heart nor Head will allow me to own any, when I profess myself, Your Lordship's affectionate and faithful Humble Servant'.

Editorial Notes

The *Correspondence of Richardson's Final Years* brings together a collection of mostly minor correspondents engaged in relatively brief exchanges, whose letters are drawn from thirty-four different print and manuscript sources in Britain, Europe, America, and Australia; while major collections such as the British Library (17), Princeton (15), Harvard (12), and Yale (7) yielded multiple manuscript holdings, some thirteen libraries held only a single item connected to Richardson for inclusion in this volume. Of the total of 137 letters, just over a quarter (39) exist only in Barbauld's edition of the correspondence, including all nine between Smyth Loftus and Richardson. The transcriptions of those Barbauld letters for which we do have manuscripts (5) have proved to be for the most part accurate, though her errors in identifying William Lobb rather than Samuel Lobb as the author of one letter (Samuel Lobb to SR early 1755) and her identification of the manuscript sent by Frances Sheridan to Richardson as *Memoirs of Sidney Biddulph* rather than *Eugenia and Adelaide* (Sheridan to SR 5 February 1756) have been corrected. And in this digital age we are grateful for the aid of those who deal in manuscripts, many of whom have provided scans of documents destined for the private market.

The manuscripts themselves are largely intact, though a few bear witness to their age and history, with wear, rubbing, and sometimes holes and tears along folds and margins. The correspondence with Anna Meades, for example, has multiple words that must be conjectured because of marginal damage. In these last years of Richardson's life, his physical tremor rendered writing difficult, and the pages of his correspondence are filled with both apologies for his penmanship and the ample evidence of the blots and wavering lines of his shaky hand.

However, the worst of Richardson's pages are infinitely better than those in the hand of George Psalmanazar whose combination of cryptic style and egregious penmanship rendered each word a time-consuming exercise in deciphering (Psalmanazar to SR 10 April 1758).

Despite – or perhaps because of – its heterogenous nature, this final volume of Richardson's correspondence reflects all facets of the author-printer's life: family matters (Lobb, Pennington, Watts), business concerns (Smollett, Rivington, Psalmanazar), literary and political interests (de Luc, Loftus, Reich), and mentoring relationships (Meades, Frances Sheridan, Spence). In style they range from the mannered civility of his exchanges with young women seeking his aid like Anna Meades to the playful familiarity of the tone with his old friend Samuel Lobb to the crisp business-like prose of his report to the lawyer William Blackstone. Perhaps the most frustrating challenges for the reader, however, are posed by Richardson's habit of identifying real people with his fictional characters and of constructing surrogate families of his correspondents, as when his daughter Anne becomes the 'corresponding Nancy Selby' for his 'Sister' Mrs Watts.

TEXTUAL NOTE

The editorial principles for the following volume follow those established by the general editors. A pair of letters from William Dodd to SR are mentioned in the *Scriblerian* but have not been traced. James May notes, 'Quaritch lists William Dodd's appeal to Richardson for help obtaining a living in East Ham, with Richardson's autograph draft of a reply (along with other Dodd materials, mostly on his execution; $3,000)' (*Scriblerian*, 24 (1991) 96).