THE
Cambridge Edition of
THE CORRESPONDENCE OF
SAMUEL RICHARDSON

CORRESPONDENCE WITH AARON HILL AND THE HILL FAMILY

EDITED BY
Christine Gerrard

CAMBRIDGE

THE CAMBRIDGE EDITION OF
THE CORRESPONDENCE OF
SAMUEL RICHARDSON

I

CORRESPONDENCE WITH AARON HILL AND THE HILL FAMILY

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 WITH AARON HILL AND THE HILL FAMILY

EDITED BY

Christine Gerrard

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

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/9780521872737

First published 2013

Printed in the United Kingdom by CPI Group Ltd, Croydon CR0 4YY

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

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Richardson, Samuel, 1689–1761.
Correspondence with Aaron Hill and the Hill Family / Samuel Richardson, Christine Gerrard.
pages cm
ISBN 978-0-521-87273-7 (hardback)
1. Richardson, Samuel, 1689–1761 – Correspondence. 2. Hill, Aaron, 1685–1750 – Correspondence. 3. Literature and society – Great Britain – History – 18th century. 4. Authors, English – 18th century – Correspondence. I. Gerrard, Christine. II. Title.
PR3666.A45 2013
823′.6 – dc23 [B] 2013027597

ISBN 978-0-521-87273-7 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 long-standing, such as the Oxford and Chicago editions of Alexander Pope and Edmund Burke respectively, now require extensive supplementation, perhaps even replacement. But there is no more anomalous case than Samuel Richardson, whose correspondence holds special interest, beyond its extraordinary scale and range, as that of a practising epistolary novelist who thought longer and harder than any contemporary about the letter as a form. Almost half of the surviving Richardson correspondence, which totals almost 1,700 letters, has never appeared in print, and barely a quarter of it is represented – with silent abridgements, 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 result is that Barbauld's six-volume edition is, for all its defects, the only surviving witness

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

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

for 324 letters;[3] similar uncertainties surround the text of other letters now known only from early printed sources.

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

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

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

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

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 33 different correspondents, many of them published for the first time, though often in excerpted form. For half a century, Carroll's selection, alongside Barbauld's, has been the edition cited by Richardson's critics, as well as by many other scholars of the period. More recently, Carroll and Barbauld provide the basis for Donatella Montini's *Lettere su Clarissa*, a more fully annotated selection of thirty-one letters by Richardson, published in 2009. Two and a half centuries after Erasmus Reich's original proposal for a selected edition in translation, it was in Italian, not German, that something resembling his plan came to fruition, though without adding new letters to the published corpus.

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

that proves, in light of his surviving correspondence as a whole, far more complex and 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 50 that he seems to have begun systematic efforts to preserve, copy and file his correspondence, though these files were apparently depleted by the time they reached Barbauld, and certainly depleted further before the 1828 auction, after which more items disappeared. Like Boswell's Johnson, Richardson is a figure we witness in sometimes crushing detail for the last twenty years of his life, but one whose youth and middle age are more distantly, patchily seen. Later letters give valuable insights into otherwise irretrievable aspects of his early career, notably the famous letter to Stinstra, an epistolary memoir comparable, as an exercise in short, informal autobiography, with Laurence Sterne's 'Memoir' and David Hume's 'My Own Life'. But it is above all in Richardson's creative maturity, and at his professional peak, when his range of correspondents grew alongside his fame, that he becomes truly present – vividly, copiously so – in epistolary sources.

Yet it is not only for information about Richardson himself that the correspondence is an important resource. Thanks to his celebrity as an author, his standing and influence as a book-trade professional, and above all his unrelenting fascination with epistolary dialogue and debate, Richardson was able to draw into the circle of his correspondence numerous leading figures in the literary culture

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

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 Margaret Anne Doody and Peter Sabor (eds.), *Samuel Richardson: Tercentenary Essays* (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

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

by Richardson's daughter Martha and his nephew and amanuensis William, as Barbauld reports,[9] but also by Aaron Hill's brother Gilbert, whom Richardson seems to have employed in some secretarial capacity, and perhaps also by other professional copyists. Thanks to his obsessive interest in the vagaries of reception and interpretation, and to the compelling, controversial nature of the texts themselves, three substantial archives survive of general correspondence arising from the three major novels, each with a descriptive index by Richardson himself. (Like the auction catalogue, these indexes list various intriguing items that are now missing.) At a time when literary reviewing was in its infancy and formal critical attention was rarely bestowed on novels, this body of material, which Richardson worked hard to expand by provoking his correspondents into debate, often in devil's-advocate mode, provides an unusually full and detailed archive of literary reception. In the case of the early novel, it is simply unique, not only as historical evidence of reading, but also for its traceable impact on authorial revision.

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

No less interesting is the overall character conferred by these habits of conversation and debate on much of the correspondence. As each individual exchange unfolds, meaning is mutually developed and incrementally extended through a kind of epistolary dialectic, and properly resides not in any individual letter, and certainly not on any one side of a correspondence, but rather within the transaction as a whole. Not infrequently, new layers or wider circles of meaning are created when, in a practice deliberately cultivated by Richardson as a way to 'mingle minds and concerns' (to Anne Dewes, 17 August 1750), letters or whole sequences are

[9] *Correspondence*, ed. Barbauld, I, iii.

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

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

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

additional letters found during the publication of the previous volumes; posthumous correspondence about Richardson, especially that between his daughters Anne Richardson and Martha Bridgen, and between Anne and her niece Sarah Crowther Moodie; and an annotated transcription of the 1828 Southgate auction catalogue.

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

The formidable practical difficulties posed by Richardson's letters in both their printed and manuscript forms have often been remarked on by scholars. Eaves and Kimpel describe the many letters to and from Lady Bradshaigh for 1751, of which only printed texts in Barbauld survive, as being 'in utter confusion', and painstaking efforts have been made by John August Wood to disentangle this particular problem.[12] William McCarthy, Barbauld's biographer, remarks that the texts available to her after their various revisions by Richardson and his correspondents

[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.

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 as first received. Printed versions are also used to supply words illegible in the manuscript.

[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 p. 354).

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, 'y^{e}' and 'y^{t}' (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 be conjectured from the context, it is printed thus: 'Lady <Bradshaigh>', 'Grandis<on>'. If a word is not certainly legible, but can be deciphered as a reasonable likelihood, the same symbol is used.

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

<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

I first started transcribing the manuscript correspondence between Samuel Richardson and members of the Hill family over a decade ago when I was preparing a biography of that culturally eclectic author and entrepreneur Aaron Hill. Unfortunately my transcriptions were far from the level of accuracy required of a scholarly edition, and so I had to start all over again for *The Complete Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*. I am therefore very grateful for the editorial assistance, at various stages, of Ben Brice, Tom Genrich and Olivia Murphy, who helped transcribe many of the manuscript letters. I also benefited from an AHRC research leave award in 2004 which gave me more time to check the transcriptions against the originals, most of which are held in the National Art Library in the Victoria & Albert Museum. When I found myself completely floored in tracking down elusive points of reference in specific letters, I leaned heavily upon my colleagues. I would like to thank in particular my fellow editors on the Richardson correspondence, especially Tom Keymer, Peter Sabor, Betty Schellenberg and David Shuttleton, whose knowledge of the *dramatis personae* involved in Richardson's life proved particularly helpful. I also owe a huge debt to Giles Bergel, whose magisterial knowledge of the eighteenth-century book trade, coupled with his physical proximity (we were co-teaching a graduate course), proved invaluable.

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	*Æsop'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 abridgement 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–October	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–December	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, *Correspondence*	*The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, ed. Anna Laetitia Barbauld, 6 vols. (London, 1804).
Eaves and Kimpel	T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).
FM	Forster Collection, Victoria & Albert Museum, London.
Gerrard, *Aaron Hill*	Christine Gerrard, *Aaron Hill: The Muses' Projector 1685–1750* (Oxford University Press, 2003).
Hill, *Works*	*The Works of the Late Aaron Hill, Esq. in Four Volumes. Consisting of Letters on Various Subjects, and of Original Poems, Moral and Facetious* (London, 1753).
Keymer and Sabor	*Pamela in the Marketplace: Literary Controversy and Print Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge University Press, 2005).
Pamela	Samuel Richardson, *Pamela; or, Virtue Rewarded*, ed. Albert J. Rivero (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
Pope, *Corr.*	*The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, ed. George Sherburn, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950).
Richardson's Published Commentary on 'Clarissa'	*Samuel Richardson's Published Commentary on 'Clarissa', Commentary on 'Clarissa' 1747–65*, ed. Florian Stuber *et al.*, 3 vols. (London: Pickering & Chatto, 1998).
Sale	William M. Sale, Jr, *Samuel Richardson: Master Printer* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1950).

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Aaron Hill occupies a special place among Samuel Richardson's correspondents. He was Richardson's earliest literary friend; and although Richardson later censored the unguarded expressions of emotion which coloured their correspondence ('All Mr Hill's Praises too warm, and should be lowered greatly'), he confessed that 'no Man Ever had a more expanded Heart, and *truer* Friendship, nor more Sincerity'.[1] Hill and Richardson met in the early 1720s when Richardson acted as the printer for Hill's periodical *The Plain Dealer* (23 March 1724 to 7 May 1725) and some of his other pieces.[2] Richardson was at this stage a businessman and successful printer. Hill, four years Richardson's senior, was a well-known literary patron, author and impresario, the former stage manager at Drury Lane who introduced Handel to the English stage with his operatic hit *Rinaldo* (1711). He was the leader of the 'Hillarian circle' whose members included the writers James Thomson, David Mallet, Richard Savage, Eliza Haywood, Martha Fowke and Edward Young, future author of *Night-Thoughts*.[3] It was through Hill that Richardson got to know Thomson, Mallet and especially Edward Young, with whom he established a lifelong friendship. Hill had been educated at Westminster school and in his early youth had travelled widely. At fifteen he had undertaken the voyage to Constantinople, where his distant relative, Lord Paget, was ambassador. Hill's *A Full and Just Account of the Ottoman Empire* (1709), which he later disparaged to Richardson as a 'light piece of work' and a 'puerile sally',[4] nonetheless testified to a life of exoticism and adventure very different from the life to which the pious and industrious Richardson had been raised as an apprentice printer in London. Richardson had never travelled abroad and Hill was one of his sources for the foreign detail in his novels.

Yet by 1736, the point at which their correspondence starts in earnest, Hill's fortunes had started to decline. In financial difficulty following an unresolved Chancery lawsuit concerning his dead wife Margaret Morris's estate, he moved in late 1738 with his two younger daughters Astrea and Minerva from Petty France

[1] A note which SR later added to Hill's letter to him of 29 July 1741.

[2] See William Sale, *Samuel Richardson: Master Printer* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1950), pp. 48–52.

[3] See Christine Gerrard, *Aaron Hill: The Muses' Projector 1685–1750* (Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 61–101, and Dorothy Brewster, *Aaron Hill: Poet, Dramatist, Projector* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1913), pp. 156–200.

[4] *Hill to SR*, 19 December 1739.

in Westminster to Hyde House in Plaistow.[5] Plaistow was at this time a rural village on the edge of the Essex marshes. Hill chose Hyde House because of family connections with the area and its ten-acre plot of land, in which he hoped to pursue his long-standing dream of creating a successful English vineyard. But the rural solitude and poor communications (Plaistow was a day's coach-ride into central London along bumpy muddy roads) made the place seem more isolated than its distance from central London might suggest. The Hill girls occupied themselves with reading and writing and 'improvements' to the grounds and garden.[6] However, the family received few visitors. The post was often erratic and Hill complained to Richardson on several occasions of lost or delayed letters. In late 1739, Hill, whose former family home in Westminster had been a hive of literary activity, complained that when he ventured into the West End of London, 'there is nobody but yourself, exclusive of 2 or 3 of my nearest Relations, who can tell where, in Town, to ask after me'.[7] The damp marsh climate at Plaistow made the family ill, with what they themselves diagnosed as 'agues' and 'fevers' but which was almost certainly malaria, carried by mosquitoes in the Essex marshlands until they were drained the following century. In his *Tour* of 1724, Daniel Defoe describes the high attrition rate amongst incomers to this region, who had not managed to build up immunity over the years.[8] On many occasions Richardson urged Hill to 'resolve speedily to quit this *terrible Marsh-Pit*' for the healthier air of central London, but he never managed to leave (in his own words) this 'unlucky and ill-chosen place'.[9] During the Plaistow years Hill suffered several domestic trials which drained him yet further. He never remarried after the death of his beloved wife Margaret Morris in 1731. The money which her mother left Hill's children proved destructive. His eldest daughter Urania, with whom he had been very close, defied his wishes in marrying the actor Warren ('Tall') Johnson, a handsome and charming spendthrift who died in 1746 leaving her penniless with two small sons. Hill's only surviving son Julius seemed bent on leading a life of dissipation.[10] His nephew and namesake the actor Aaron Hill (son of his brother Gilbert) stabbed himself to death in 1739, a suicide passed off in the newspapers as a footpad assault.[11] Hill, who found time hanging heavy on his hands in Plaistow, wrote to Richardson about these family misfortunes in a series of heartfelt letters.

Richardson became Hill's literary lifeline following his move to Plaistow. He sent him regular parcels of books to read, many of them the productions of his

[5] Gerrard, *Aaron Hill*, pp. 194–8.
[6] *Astrea Hill to SR and Elizabeth Leake*, 17 December 1740.
[7] *Hill to SR*, 27 September 1739.
[8] Daniel Defoe, *A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain*, ed. Pat Rogers (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), p. 55. SR would have been very familiar with Defoe's account of this area of Essex as he edited four separate editions of the *Tour*, two of them in Hill's lifetime (1740 and 1748).
[9] *SR to Hill*, 24 September 1742; *Hill to SR*, 24 October 1742.
[10] See *Hill to SR*, 29 July 1741.
[11] *Hill to SR*, May 1739.

own press. These included volumes of geography, history, theology, horticulture and medicine. Almost none of them were what we would describe as 'literary'. Richardson sent these packages by coach from his house at Salisbury Court (off Fleet Street), and occasionally from his country home at North End, near the Hammersmith turnpike. A leitmotif of Hill's letters to Richardson is the complimentary close prefaced with thanks for books received and comments passed on them. Access to new books in Plaistow was difficult and Hill was often too depressed or unwell to visit booksellers in central London. In 1749 he describes how his daughters have 'grown borrowing Customers to an Itinerary Bookseller's Shop, that rumbles, once a week, through Plaistow in a wheel-barrow'.[12] The Hill family came to depend mainly on Richardson for new reading matter: as Hill observed in 1741, 'excepting the pieces you have been so kind as to favour me with a sight of, I have read nothing, of what has been published, for eighteen months past'.[13] Richardson was also Hill's main point of contact for information about the London world of letters and the theatre. Although Hill continued to write for the stage during the 1730s and 1740s, with successful adaptations of Voltaire's tragedies, *Alzira*, *Zara* (both 1736) and finally *Merope* (1749), he rarely went to the theatre. In 1746 he complained to Garrick that he had not seen a play for over three years.[14] Richardson performed an even greater duty of care in overseeing and paying for the publication of all the works that Hill published between 1736 and his death in 1750. None of these works made Richardson any money. Hill frequently tried to compensate by handing over to Richardson the copyright of all his works but Richardson refused. More telling still was his insistence on lending Hill quite large sums of money without any expectation that it would be returned. Records survive of separate payments to Hill of £100 and £60. In late November 1748, Richardson apologized for not being able to offer even more financial support.[15] It is to his credit that Richardson, a successful novelist with a large circle of correspondents, and a printing business which required his time and energy, only occasionally became testy when Hill complained that either he or his works had been forgotten: 'Indeed, Sir, you cannot possibly enter into the hurrying Life of a Man of such a strange Variety of affairs . . . so pressed in Time, that I hardly know what I have written.'[16]

Although by 1738 the relationship had become an unequal one, with Richardson doing far more for Hill than Hill could do for Richardson, it was not one-sided. Richardson found in Hill a man of sympathetic character and sensibility, both personal and literary. Both men suffered from persistent poor health, Richardson from the nervous disorders which afflicted him from the mid-1730s onwards, Hill from fevers and bouts of acute debilitation probably caused by malaria, then subsequently

[12] *Hill to SR*, 20 July 1749.
[13] *Hill to SR*, 21 April 1741.
[14] Hill, *Works*, II, 264 (1753).
[15] *Hill to SR*, 10 November 1746 and 19 and 22 October 1748; *SR to Hill*, 12 January 1749.
[16] *SR to Hill*, 10 May 1749.

by kidney disease. Their correspondence is punctuated by detailed discussions of medical matters, with Hill venturing to suggest cures and questioning those prescribed by Richardson's Dr Cheyne, whose austere regimen of exercise, purging and fasting he considered too severe.[17] Their personal domestic lives had run a rather similar course. Both men had become widowers in their thirties. Both had lost a number of children in infancy – Hill five, Richardson seven. Both, by 1738, lived in all-female households – Richardson with his second wife Elizabeth Leake and their four young daughters, Mary ('Polly'), Martha ('Patty'), Anne ('Nancy') and Sarah ('Sally'); Hill (who never remarried) with his two younger daughters Astrea ('Jessy') and Minerva ('Minny'). Richardson frequently urged Hill and his daughters to stay with them either at North End or at Salisbury Court, worrying that the damp Plaistow air was slowly killing the family. Yet they seem to have met in person only twice during the course of their correspondence, once in the summer of 1741, and again in early 1749, a year before Hill's death: 'I long to pay my personal Respects to so dear and valued a Friend, whom I have not had the Pleasure of seeing for so many Years. – How many, Sir?'[18]

A shared sense of personal loss made both Hill and Richardson receptive to the tragic strain in life and art. The memorial tomb Hill planned for his wife Margaret in Westminster Abbey in 1731 anticipated, in its baroque symbolism, Clarissa's plans for her elaborately ornamented coffin.[19] Unlike other friends of Richardson, Hill never hoped for a happy ending for *Clarissa*.[20] 'With how much Justice, Dear Sir, do you tell me Your Clarissa is a work of *tragic* Species!'[21] Hill's tastes were not those of the Restoration rake that, in his sole surviving portrait, he resembles.[22] Despite some aristocratic family connections, his affinity as a commercial entrepreneur was with the Whiggish world of mercantilism, and it is no coincidence that his wife had been a wealthy grocer's daughter. His mercantile tragedy *The Fatal Extravagance* (1720) was modelled on the sentimental domestic drama of Rowe and Lillo. Hill was drawn to the literary culture of sincerity and sensibility, and valued the power of sympathy and the testament of tears which 'all Dramatic Strainers at pathetic Touchingness' could not invoke as convincingly as Richardson's novels.[23] Hill's sentimentalized description of the pool of tears which his adopted ward the 6-year-old Harry Campbell left on the carpet following the family reading of *Pamela* made its way into the prefatory material of the second edition (February 1741).[24] Despite their entirely different entrances into the world of literature – Richardson through the bourgeois conduct manual and the familiar

17 *Hill to SR*, 6 July 1738.
18 *Hill to SR*, 29 July 1741; *SR to Hill*, 12 January 1749.
19 Hill to Pope, c. 1 Oct. 1731, Pope, *Corr.*, III, 228–9.
20 *SR to Hill*, 7 November 1748.
21 *Hill to SR*, 12 November 1748.
22 See the 1709 portrait by Henry Hulsberg, Figure 1.
23 *Hill to SR*, 29 November 1748.
24 *Hill to SR*, 29 December 1740.

letter, Hill through the theatre, opera and the sublime poem – their literary tastes were very similar.

Nowhere was this more apparent than in their shared dislike of the age's most famous literary figure, Alexander Pope, who, following his death in May 1744, features largely in their correspondence.[25] Hill's long-standing antagonism with Pope dated back to 1720 and had been rekindled several times over subsequent years. Pope's provocative inclusion of Hill in *The Dunciad* and *Peri Bathous* of 1728 had led Hill to attack Pope in satirical squibs and to bombard him with letters which tried to expose Pope's false claims to 'morality'.[26] His *The Progress of Wit: A Caveat. For the Use of an Eminent Writer* (printed by Richardson in 1730) depicted Pope disappearing down the vortex of dullness with his tediously obscure subject matter. But the antagonism was more than personal. Hill and Pope embodied different literary values. Hill disliked personal satire and considered Pope's spleen and indecency degrading to a writer of such naturally great talent. Richardson's dissenting educational and social background made him unsympathetic to the mock-pedantic classical burlesque humour which characterized Scriblerian discourse. After the *New Dunciad* appeared he complained to Hill: 'I admire Mr Pope's Genius, and his Versification: But forgive me, Sir, to say, I am scandaliz'd for human Nature, and such Talents, sunk so low. Has he no Invention, Sir, to be better employ'd about? No Talents for worthier Subjects? – Must all be personal Satire, or Imitation of others Temples of Fame, Alexander's Feasts, Coopers Hills, Mac Flecknoe's?'[27] Richardson shared Hill's discomfort with the author-cult promoted by Pope. He disliked Pope's vanity and his tyranny over the age's literary taste. He complained that Pope 'by so many mean Arts, and by so much insolent Power, had made himself so much the Fashion, that one Half of the world would not, the other Half dared not, to receive any other Person's Performance, according to its Merit'.[28] But Richardson had too shrewd an understanding of contemporary literary taste to confidently assert, as did Hill, that Pope's poetry would soon be forgotten. As Hill himself proceeded through the 1740s to produce a series of increasingly obscure and cryptic poems such as *The Fanciad* (on the first Duke of Marlborough) and *The Impartial* (on Lord Carteret), or 'The Religion of Reason', a deistic piece loosely modelled on Pope's own *Essay on Man*, Richardson tactfully told Hill that 'I am of the opinion that it is necessary for a genius to accommodate itself to the mode and taste of the world it is cast into'.[29]

Just before the Christmas of 1740, Richardson sent the Hill family a small package to 'divert a dull Wintry Hour'. The package contained the novel *Pamela*.

[25] *SR to Hill*, 11 April 1743; *SR to Hill*, 19 January 1744; *Hill to SR*, 10 September 1744; *SR to Hill*, 7 July 1746; *Hill to SR*, 10 July 1746; *Hill to SR*, 21 July 1746; *Hill to SR*, 29 July 1746; *SR to Hill*, 5 August 1746; *Hill to SR*, 25 October 1746; *SR to Hill*, 7 November 1748; *Hill to SR*, 12 November 1748; *SR to Hill*, 18 November 1748.

[26] See Gerrard, *Aaron Hill*, pp. 135–7.

[27] *SR to Hill*, 19 January 1744.

[28] *SR to Hill*, 7 July 1746.

[29] *SR to Hill*, 27 October 1748.

Hill told Mallet that despite Richardson's 'grave Apology, as for a Trifle, of too light a Species', he guessed almost immediately that Richardson was the author.[30] *Pamela* contained two of Hill's own early lyrics, which Richardson may have used without his prior knowledge.[31] The Hill family responded to *Pamela* with an infectious warmth and enthusiasm. Hill was not a reader of prose fiction, even though he had known Eliza Haywood well during the 1720s and had even appeared in thinly veiled disguise in more than one of her novels.[32] He makes no references in his letters to any other novels. *Pamela* thus came as a revelation to Hill and his family of how absorbing a fully realized fictional world could be: a sense of immersion heightened by the family's communal reading of *Pamela* round the winter fire, as well as by their isolation from other daily diversions. As Hill wrote to Richardson on 15 January 1741:

> I am sometimes transformed into plain Goodman *Andrews*, and sometimes the Good Woman his Wife. – As for Old Mr *Longman* and *Jonathan*, the Butler, They are sure of me Both in their Turns. Now and then, I am *Colebrand* the Swiss; but as *broad* as I *stride*, in that Character, I can never escape Mrs *Jewke*s: who often keeps me awake, in the Night.

Between 17 December 1740 and 9 February 1741, Hill sent Richardson six long letters describing in detail his and his family's responses to *Pamela* and offering some critical observations on the work. When Richardson began to prepare the second edition of *Pamela*, he asked Hill if he could incorporate some of these letters in a new preface. Hill's enthusiastic agreement stemmed in part from pride, in part from his belief that his letters would clarify the 'moral' of the work. They would help readers liable to 'misread' *Pamela* to see the 'right point of View' and they would then 'with Pleasure, disclaim their mistakes'.[33] Hill failed to grasp the subtleties of the epistolary novel, and Richardson showed questionable judgment in using Hill's letters in this way. The second edition of *Pamela*, which appeared on 14 February 1741 with its effusive prefatory material, provoked a number of hostile responses. Richardson, complained one clergyman, must have been 'bewitched to print that bad stuff in his introduction'. He had 'done himself no good in accepting of such Greasy Compliments'.[34] Fielding's famous burlesque *Shamela*, which appeared less than seven weeks after the second edition of *Pamela*, ridiculed Hill's hyperbole almost as much as it did Pamela's morality. Fielding's plot turns the virtuous Pamela into the conniving Shamela, and Parson Tickletext's preface remorselessly draws out the latent sexual innuendo present in Hill's praises.

[30] *SR to Hill*, 8 December 1740; fair copy of Hill's letter to Mallet in Gilbert Hill's hand, enclosed with his letter to SR of 17 August 1750.

[31] The two pieces appear on pp. 266–7 and on pp. 454–5. For further details, see *Pamela*, ed. Thomas Keymer and Alice Wakely (Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 533 n. 289.

[32] For Hill's dealings with Haywood, see Gerrard, *Aaron Hill*, pp. 67–71.

[33] *Hill to SR*, 15 January 1741.

[34] For the responses see *The Pamela Controversy: Criticisms and Adaptations of Samuel Richardson's Pamela*, ed. Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001), I, xlvii.

Following these criticisms, Richardson toned down some of Hill's phrasing, and in the sixth edition (May 1742) he dropped the commendations of Hill, Webster and de Freval completely. It seems unlikely that Hill read *Shamela*. He responded angrily to other products of the 'Pamela Controversy', such as *Pamela Censur'd* and Kelly's spurious continuation, *Pamela's Conduct in High Life*, but not to *Shamela*.

As early as December 1740, Richardson appears to have begun the practice which was to characterize the compositional habit of his later novels, *Clarissa* and *Sir Charles Grandison*. He sent the Hill girls a copy of *Pamela* interleaved with blank pages on which he invited them to write critical comments and suggestions for improvement for later editions. They were too nervous to offer anything other than 'progressive memorandums of the Benefits her Conversation brings us'.[35] By the time Richardson was producing his own sequel to *Pamela*, partly in order to pre-empt any further 'spurious' continuations such as *Pamela's Conduct in High Life*, he was sending Hill the worked-off sheets of his new material. But when Hill suggested that Richardson should extend *Pamela* II to six volumes in order to distinguish it from its four-volume 'rivals', Richardson politely ignored him.[36] Richardson's habit of soliciting extensive advice from his friends on his work in progress yet refusing to embrace their suggestions characterizes the extended composition of *Clarissa*. Hill was involved with *Clarissa* at an early stage, and the lengthy sequence of letters which he and his daughters exchanged with Richardson during the process of its composition form an invaluable chapter in the history of that novel. Hill may possibly have seen a plan of *Clarissa* as early as July 1744.[37] He was still waiting for the text itself in November 1744, while Richardson was having a draft copy transcribed in another hand: 'To say Truth, I was not without Hope, that I shou'd see this Work, (which I am sure I shall find full of Charms) come to me from the *Press*.'[38] In the same letter Hill describes how Richardson had asked him to engage in '*pruning* Work' on the transcribed manuscripts, and he also expresses his great reluctance to do so. Over the course of the next year, Richardson sent Hill twelve manuscript volumes of *Clarissa*, interleaved with blank pages. By April 1745, when Hill realized that with the fifth volume he had reached 'Admission only to the Portico, or *Hall*, at most, of your delightful Building', he thought that *Clarissa* 'might be reduced' but that it was a task only Richardson, the author, could perform.[39] When in January 1746 Richardson started to send Hill the first instalments of a new draft of *Clarissa*, 'much altered from what you saw before', Hill, after reading them, argued that abbreviation was no longer called for.

> Give me Leave, to be afraid, lest, you are *too* solicitous for *short'ning*, where Length can never tire . . . I am, more and more, convinc'd, that

[35] *Astrea Hill to SR*, 30 December 1740.
[36] *Hill to SR*, 12 November 1741.
[37] *Hill to SR*, 24 July 1744 and the discussion in the headnote.
[38] *Hill to SR*, November 1744.
[39] *Hill to SR*, 4 April 1745.

> All, you take such pains to *shorten* in her, is mere Diamond-Cutter's Labour. You may give her Points more Brilliancy: but, at the same Time, Her Weight is but diminish'd, by new *fashioning*.[40]

Richardson did not consult Hill again for several months but in October 1746 returned to him to ask for help with shortening, and sent him a compendium of the novel's contents to aid him with the task. This time Hill agreed: he calculated that this version would stretch to thirty MS volumes. 'I am thus far compelled to yield to your Opinion, that – if it is possible in such a Manner to contract as not to hurt, the Beauties, every-where so thickly sown, it ought to be resolved upon.'[41] However, Hill's active involvement in the project led him to overstep his editorial role and argue for changes in plot and characterization – changes which Richardson fiercely resisted. Hill explained that, on the grounds of realism, Lovelace's character should be softened and his motivation altered. He argued strenuously that Clarissa's behaviour in 'eloping' with him would be more explicable were she in 'downright love' with Lovelace. Hill was not the only friend who wanted Lovelace's character to be made more sympathetic but Richardson's lengthy reply to Hill of 29 October 1746 carefully explains why 'I intend Lovelace to be unamiable'. When Hill stubbornly returned to this point in January 1747, arguing that no motive weaker than 'resistless *Love*' could 'justify Clarissa's rash Elopement with a *Man*', Richardson indignantly exclaimed that 'Clarissa . . . would rather die than be compelled to be the Man's Wife she hated; That this should be called . . . *a rash Elopement with a Man* . . . I am very unfortunate, good Sir, let me say, to be so ill-understood.'[42] Richardson must also have doubted Hill's capacity to truly understand *Clarissa* when he received the product of Hill's editorial labours, the 'Specimen of New Clarissa', his rewriting of the opening chapters, in late November 1746. Hill had tried to reduce the chapter length while saving 'All Parts intire'. His text is barely recognizable as Richardson's. The 'Specimen of New Clarissa', printed in the Appendix to this volume, fair copied in Gilbert Hill's hand, had gone much further than Richardson had intended. As Richardson pointed out in his testy reply of 5 January 1747, Hill had lopped off probably two-thirds of the original length. He had introduced substantive changes to the plot, making Lovelace's behaviour towards the Harlowe family far more 'delicate' than Richardson had intended. Hill had never before tried his hand at fiction, let alone epistolary fiction. He found it impossible to reproduce Richardson's subtle technique of advancing the narrative through the differing perspectives of multiple correspondents. In Hill's hands, Richardson's dialogue becomes stylized and over-theatrical. Yet Hill's 'Specimen', particularly in the scene between Clarissa and her sister Arabella, has a colloquial liveliness missing from the first edition of *Clarissa*: the 'Specimen' is of particular value because it may retain strong traces of Richardson's original speech idiom which were later 'corrected' before publication.

[40] *Hill to SR*, Early January 1746; March 1746.
[41] *Hill to SR*, 23 October 1746.
[42] *SR to Hill*, 26 January 1747.

Richardson's shocked objection to the 'Specimen' and Hill's hurt responses to his criticism – 'I told you, too, that I judged it an impossibility, to *shorten* . . . And, now, you have had an *Example* and *Proof*, that every-thing I said to you was true' – ended this phase of their relationship.[43] No letters survive (if indeed any were written) between Hill and Richardson between 9 February and 3 November 1747, when Hill asked pointedly, 'I hardly dare inquire, and yet can't possibly forbear it, What you mean to do, with your divine *Clarissa*?'[44] However flawed Hill may have been as an editor of *Clarissa*, his response to the published version, volumes of which Richardson started sending him in late November 1747, was profound. Once again, the Hills, immersed in the fictional world Richardson had created, testify to the sheer power of Richardson's imagination: 'We agree, and every Day afresh, remark to one another, that we can find no Difference at all, in the Impression of Things really done, and past, and recollected by us – and the Things we read of, in this *Intellectual World* which *you* have naturalized us into.'[45] Richardson was confident that Hill would understand why the novel had to end in Clarissa's death. He confided to him that Fielding, Colley Cibber, Dr Heylin and even George Lyttelton (despite writing so movingly in his famous *Monody* of his young wife's death) all wanted 'to make what is called a Happy Ending'.[46] Hill's letter of 29 November 1748, written just after he had finished reading the final scenes of *Clarissa*, testifies to a humble recognition of Richardson's brilliance. Richardson shows a 'conscious *Mastery*, of such a Genius, as was never equal'd! – I despise myself, and all Dramatic Strainers at pathetic Touchingness, when I am taught, in almost every Period, of this Comprehensive Model of Mankind, in all their paths of Passion, that he, who made us all, has given to you, alone, (by Heaven! I speak the last, of what I *feel*!) a Key, as powerfull as St. Peter's!' Hill becomes almost lost for words: 'Dear, Dear, transporting Friend! how little have I said! how little *can* I say! of what I glow with an inspiring *Sense* of!'

It was at this point that Astrea and Minerva, Hill's two younger daughters, summoned the courage to write to Richardson again. Their letter of 13 December 1748 admires *Clarissa* especially as a didactic text designed to educate young girls. Richardson's reply the next day ('what Pride you give me in your Approbation of my Clarissa') flattered them enormously. Richardson sent them the seven volumes of *Clarissa* with the hope that they might be able to correct her 'on any essential point of Delicacy' but, as with *Pamela*, they were too nervous to do so. The subsequent summer of 1749, just as their father was showing severe symptoms of the kidney disease that finally killed him six months later, Richardson requested from Astrea and Minerva their critical opinion of Fielding's *Tom Jones*, a novel which they had read but he had not. Richardson may have envied Fielding's success: he certainly disapproved of the sexual morality of his hero. The Hill girls, perhaps emboldened

[43] *Hill to SR*, 23 January 1747.
[44] *Hill to SR*, 3 November 1747.
[45] *Hill to SR*, 5 May 1748.
[46] *SR to Hill*, 7 November 1748.