Samuel Richardson and Edward Young's Authorship Network

Hilary Havens, University of Tennessee

The surviving letters between the novelist Samuel Richardson and the poet Edward Young are deceptively short and business-like. Interpretations of their relationship have been distorted by the uneven nineteenth-century editing of their correspondence; until Henry Pettit's 1971 edition of Young's correspondence, scholars had to rely on Anna Laetitia Barbauld's "mangled treatment" of their letters in The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson (1804) or on their dispersal among twelve issues of the Monthly Magazine (1813–19) since few of them survive in manuscript form.[1] Pettit's edition and the forthcoming Cambridge edition of Richardson and Young's letters show that the two men were close friends: their unabridged letters detail Young's frequent stays with Richardson in town; reciprocal invitations to Richardson and his family, especially his daughter Nancy; and their frequent discussions of their maladies and treatments.[2] More importantly, both editions, especially the forthcoming Cambridge edition which highlights their textual interactions, show that the two men were literary collaborators, a detail that is often elided in earlier, partial versions of their correspondence.

The correspondence had probably begun as early as 1741; there is a record of an early, missing letter from Young to Richardson in praise of the latter's Pamela in Her Exalted Condition (1741).[3] At that point, Richardson was well known as the author of Pamela, which had inspired a publishing phenomenon upon its appearance on 6 November 1740. Imitations, parodies, paintings, and even fans flooded the marketplace as the novel achieved a tremendous notoriety. Yet, despite his flurry of literary activity from 1739–42, Richardson was, as his biographers T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel note, "still principally a business man," an

established printer who had been in business since 1721.[4] It was in his capacity as printer that Richardson developed his relationship with Young, though the men mutually admired each other's works.[5] Young had held the living of St. Mary's Church, Welwyn since 1730, but had experienced several personal tragedies in the ensuing years: his step-daughter Elizabeth died of consumption on 8 October 1737; his wife died on 29 January 1740; Young himself nearly died that summer of a dangerous fever; and his son-in-law Henry Temple died suddenly on 18 August 1740. These events inspired Young's greatest achievement and one of the most important long poems of the eighteenth century, The Complaint, or, Night-Thoughts on Life, Death, and Immortality, which was published over 1742–46 in nine "Nights" occupying nearly 10,000 lines of blank verse. Night-Thoughts allowed Young to grapple with his immense personal losses alongside prominent themes of Christian consolation and salvation.[6]

Their opening letters describe Richardson's editorial work on Night-Thoughts and Young's suggestions for Clarissa (1747–48), which are indicative of the former's particular compositional practices and of a larger collaborative trend in eighteenth-century authorship that critics like Betty Schellenberg and Hilary Havens have previously discussed.[7] Havens argues for a more inclusive definition of authorship as "a fluid body centered in a principal author figure that other authors, such as familial and literary circles, reviewers, and readers, are intermittently and continually accessing." This expanded notion highlights the often-unacknowledged textual contributions of other individuals, such as editors, printers, reviewers, and readers. Richardson, as the son of a joiner, may have been more conscious of his social class and hence more susceptible to influence by these figures and networks, though he progressively ignored them as his novelistic fame spread.[8] The unique case of Richardson is the focus of Louise Curran and Sören Hammerschmidt's special issue of Eighteenth-Century Fiction on "Mediation, Authorship,

and Samuel Richardson." In their introduction to the issue, Curran and Hammerschmidt argue that "Richardson offers a particularly appealing case study, since his novels arise out of and remain integrated within dense, multi-genre networks of composition and correspondence."[9] This is borne out in several of the essays as Peter Sabor discusses Richardson's engagement with Lady Echlin's and Lady Bradshaigh's alternate endings to Clarissa, and Teri Doerksen describes Richardson's "intertextual mediation" through his reading and editing of Anna Meades's Sir William Harrington.[10] Sabor and Doerksen demonstrate Richardson's robust involvement in the authorship networks of his own texts and those of others, all of which prefigure his extensive interactions with Young. Richardson and Young's early, mutually-beneficial advice heralds a relationship of highly productive literary activity that underwent a fundamental shift borne out in their later publications.

I argue that within their authorship network Richardson took an increasingly active role in Young's compositions, culminating in Conjectures on Original Composition (1759), while Young had a diminished effect on Richardson's writings after Clarissa. Their literary relationship has generally been couched in terms of equivalence, as in Ewing Jackson Webb, or only briefly addressed, as in Eaves and Kimpel.[11] At the beginning of their association, Young may have been the more famous author since Richardson's initial letters are deferent.[12] Yet, with the publication of Clarissa, Richardson began to class Young with the other members of his literary circle, encouraging but also subtly ignoring his literary contributions to Sir Charles Grandison (1753–54). Meanwhile, Richardson took on a more central role with his interventions into Young's work, which grew from his minor linguistic comments on The Centaur Not Fabulous (1755) to the substantial contributions he made to Conjectures on Original Composition. Though their correspondence throughout remained warm and collegial, their literary relationship, I argue,

was not one of equivalence. While discrete studies have discussed Young's and Richardson's collaboration (especially of Conjectures), I contend that it is necessary to view their work as part of a larger trajectory in which the balance of power shifted as Richardson progressively assumed a position of authority and expertise. It is, ultimately, by exploring their correspondence and literary network that we can trace Richardson's significant impact on Conjectures on Original Composition and rightly consider him as the text's co-author, though he is framed instead as the work's recipient. By resituating this text and its authorship, we can detect and emphasize its fictional elements and conversely recognize Richardson's contribution to the genre of literary criticism.

Samuel Richardson: Clarissa and Sir Charles Grandison

Clarissa

The first extant sentence of Richardson and Young's correspondence, written on 20 June 1744, is the earliest surviving reference to Clarissa—directly addressing Lovelace's "proud, bold, graceless heart, long indulged in vice"—and reveals that Young, with Aaron Hill, was among the first people to view the novel-in-progress.[13] Young had an active role in the composition of the novel, though most of his comments were largely supportive; he was one of the few who applauded the novel's length and "Clarissa's final determination!" to reject Lovelace's marriage proposals after he raped her, arguing that "Christians of taste will applaud your [Richardson's] plan."[14] Richardson acknowledges his assistance in a letter of 3 December 1745:

> I am greatly obliged to you for your admirable additions to the letter I sent you; but believe I shall insert them rather nearer the hour of her death, because in this letter I do not make her so fully able to die in charity with Lovelace, as she hopes she shall do. Such

> noble, such exalted sentiments and expressions will adorn her last hours, when above the world, and above the resentments she acknowledges in this piece. And only they are too exalted for the rest of the work, or they are entirely comformable to the frame I have designed she shall then be in.—Most heartily again, therefore, I thank you for them, as I should for any other emendations, elevations, or intimations.

This letter confirms the existence of a networked version of authorship between Richardson and Young in which each influenced the other's works, sometimes to a significant extent. The extent of these "admirable additions" is not made clear, and they contrast with the sentiments Clarissa expresses as late as her letter to John Belford of 4 August, a letter in which she is "not . . . so fully able to die in charity with Lovelace", writing "If, satisfied with the evils he has brought upon me, he will forbear all further persecutions of me, I will, to my last hour, wish him good: Altho' he hath overwhelmed the fatherless, and digged a pit for his friend."[15] Clarissa alludes to Job 6:27, but this biblical language is actually used to temper her seeming "charity." This contrasts with the "noble, . . . exalted sentiments and expressions" that "adorn her last hours" that Young apparently contributed. Given Richardson's acknowledgements, Young probably influenced Clarissa's final words to Belford regarding Lovelace, uttered shortly before her death: "Do you, Sir, tell your friend, that I forgive him! And I pray to God to forgive him!—Again pausing, and lifting up her eyes, as if praying that He would—Let him know how happily I die.—And that such as my own, I wish to be his last hour."[16] As a clergyman and the author of Night-Thoughts, Young was, after all, an expert on Christian consolation.

Richardson's long passage of 3 December also suggests that there was further collaboration on Young's part, given the former's request "for any other emendations, elevations, or intimations." In a letter of 17 May 1747, Young indicates that he has fulfilled one

such entreaty: "As for the request you are pleased to make me, about Clarissa, if I am better qualified for it than yourself, you may command my utmost in it." Eaves and Kimpel speculate that "Perhaps Richardson had asked him for a preface, for a justification of the tragic ending such as was later included in the postscript to the last volume, or for more pious reflections."[17] Indeed, Young's endorsement of Clarissa's tragic ending on Christian grounds could have been incorporated into Richardson's Postscript, in which Richardson argues that he "is therefore well justified by the Christian System, in deferring to extricate suffering Virtue to the time in which it will meet with the Completion of its Reward."[18] Yet, despite the assistance he rendered Richardson, Young's known comments on the novel were uniformly adulatory; he was one of the few members of Richardson's network to praise the novel's heft, even as Richardson himself complained: "And I have run into such a length!—And am such a sorry pruner, though greatly luxuriant, that I am apt to add three pages for one I take away!"[19] In fact, Richardson famously declared in a letter to Young of 19 November 1747 shortly before the publication of the first two volumes that "I wish I had never consulted any body but Dr. Young, who so kindly vouchsafed me his ear, and sometimes his opinion," a disingenuous remark since Richardson repeatedly expressed his gratitude towards other readers of the novel-in-progress, such as Aaron Hill and Sarah Wescomb. After Clarissa's publication, Young wanted to capitalize on the novel's fame and his own connection to Richardson by putting "published by the author of Clarissa" on the title page of Night-Thoughts, a comment that signals a shifting balance in Richardson and Young's relationship that was borne out in their later publications.[20]

Sir Charles Grandison

The correspondence between Young and Richardson regarding the latter's third and final novel The History of Sir Charles Grandison ostensibly indicates that Young was involved in its

composition in much the same way as he was with Clarissa's, but this was not the case. In late April 1751, Young had composed two short poems in praise of the novel in progress, the second of which alluded to Sir Charles's notorious refusal to fight a duel: "What hast thou done? I'm ravish'd at the scene, / A sword undrawn, makes mighty Caesar mean." The existence of these poems reveals that Young was again included in the first group of Sir Charles's readers.[21] As he did with Clarissa, Young, in a letter of 30 July 1751, offered his assistance, contributing a "long" prayer for Richardson's use. In Richardson's response, he enthusiastically suggests incorporating the prayer into the diction of Dr. Bartlett, the sainted clergyman figure within the novel:

> I have a character, Dr. Bartlett, whom my Sir Charles reveres for his piety, good sense, grey hairs, sweetness of manners; who might be desired by Sir Charles, on the very occasion, to compose such a prayer for him. And how would it illustrate the character of that sound divine; whom I am afraid to make write, for fear I should not keep up the character given him! And how would it adorn and exalt my work!
>
> But see what an impenetrable heart I discover, that such a next-to divine prayer cannot properly affect it! That such a prayer against self cannot banish selfishness from it!
>
> If you have an intention to publish it, as sometimes I think and hope you have, from the title you have affixed to it, it may do more good; and there will end my solicitude (even with a preference against my above request) for self.[22]

But the prayer, which would later become "Devout Thoughts of the Retired Penitent" within Young's The Centaur Not Fabulous, relates the speaker's remorse at his past conduct before turning to God and contains self-condemnatory language that would not suit Richardson's truly virtuous Sir Charles Grandison or Dr. Bartlett.[23] Richardson—shortly after issuing his tantalizing

invitation—observes that the prayer is intended to "banish selfishness" from an "impenetrable heart," implying instead that Young would "do more good" by publishing it separately. Young himself acknowledges that "This is not a Prayr for a Good man." Though Young offered to write a substitute, "the same Pen is ready to do Dr. Bartlet what service You please," it is not clear that Richardson ever took him up on his offer or accepted any of his assistance for Sir Charles Grandison.[24]

Young's surviving letters to Richardson regarding Sir Charles Grandison provide no further advice, a shift from his more active involvement in Clarissa. As he did with Clarissa, Young provided effusive praise after publication, especially of the novel's didactic elements: "When the Pulpit fails, other Expedients are necessary. . . . While they read, perhaps, from pure Vanity, they do not read in vain; and are betrayed into Benefit, while mere Amusement is their Pursuit."[25] Dressing instructive elements in the guise of fiction was a hallmark of Richardson's, and his subsequent publication, A Collection of the Moral and Instructive Sentiments, Maxims, Cautions, and Reflexions, Contained in the Histories of Pamela, Clarissa, and Sir Charles Grandison (1755), eschewed fictional elements entirely, distilling the didactic elements of his three novels. Richardson's Collection was published without any comments or contributions by Young, except perhaps for an unspecified allusion in a letter of 5 August 1754—"I have read your extract; pray proceed. It will do much good; and put your works in more and the best hands"—and two short sentences of praise on 6 March 1755: "I am glad your Sentiments, &c. are published. It will be a touchstone, and tell you, by its reception, or rejection, who read for amusement, and who to be wiser than they were before." Young's unmitigated praise confirms that he had become solely a reader instead of a contributor within Richardson's authorship network, and his effusiveness mirrors the language Richardson used in his earliest letters

regarding Night-Thoughts.

Edward Young: Night-Thoughts, The Centaur Not Fabulous, and An Argument Drawn from the Circumstances of Christ's Death

Night-Thoughts

Alongside Clarissa, Night-Thoughts is the primary subject of the earliest surviving letters between Young and Richardson. Richardson's assistance with Night-Thoughts was largely confined to typography and paratextual material, though some of Young's replies hint at his growing influence. After the diminishing sales of "Night the Fifth" and "Night the Sixth," the bookseller Robert Dodsley, who had purchased the copyright of the first five nights of Night-Thoughts for 160 guineas in November 1743, declined to publish "Night the Seventh." Instead, the publisher George Hawkins purchased the copyright, and Richardson was assigned as the printer.[26] The first extant letter to Richardson from Young is dated 20 June 1744, as Richardson was preparing "Night the Seventh" for publication on 16 July. The tone of many of Young's early letters is business-like: his second letter to Richardson of 9 July thanks him for "the friendship you show me in your kind attention to my little affair," the preparation and printing of "Night the Seventh," and informs him that he is "pretty much engaged in the Last Night," originally intended to be "Night the Eighth." In his following letter of 29 July, Young solicited Richardson's advice regarding a potential "pirated edition" of "Night the Seventh." Young's tone begins to shift as he solicits Richardson's opinion regarding the work's morality in a letter of <?17> December 1744 and offers to help him in turn: "I should be glad to show it ["Night the Eighth"] you; neither your modesty nor my vanity must deprive me of the benefit which I know I may receive from your real sentiments about it. . . . If I can return the favour in kind, I shall do it with pleasure and sincerity." Richardson started taking a demonstratively larger role in Young's

revisions to Night-Thoughts, especially in his preparations for the complete duodecimo volume that was printed on 30 January 1750: "I find, that the Preface to the 4th Night is temporary. I imagine you will make some little Alteration in the latter Part of it, as it leaves the Reader doubtful whether you will proceed with the excellent Work, when the Whole is before him complete."[27] In his response, Young gratefully acknowledged Richardson's suggestion, thanking him for his "kind care for the next edition of Night Thoughts," and omitted the preface, later moving it to the beginning of the volume at Richardson's later behest.[28]

The Centaur Not Fabulous

Richardson, however, began to take on a role that exceeded his responsibilities as a printer with Young's next major work, The Centaur Not Fabulous, which would be published on 4 March 1755, at nearly the same time as his Collection of the Moral and Instructive Sentiments. Although Young had been working on The Centaur Not Fabulous as early as 1751, he first mentioned his plans for a full-length text in a letter of 14 July 1754 to Richardson: "I have a thing I would send immediately to the press; it is about the length of five sermons." Early in the composition process, Young encouraged Richardson's involvement, writing in three separate letters over a period of two weeks, "Blot, add, alter, as you please; and, if then you approve it, print it; if not, lay it by"; "If you see any thing wrong in the letter, please to dele [delete] it, or let me know it"; "I know, sir, your discernment; and, if any thing occurs that will mend the letter, by your own pen, or a hint to me, deny not the favour to one that will much thank you for it."[29] Young's repeated solicitation of Richardson's help beyond the typical formatting and accidentals expected from printers indicates the latter had creative input on The Centaur Not Fabulous. Many of their initial letters from summer 1754 regarding the work do discuss Richardson's printing decisions for the text, including size and binding, which would be one volume octavo,

the print run, and the "Italics and Pointings, &c. . . . as in Sir Charles Grandison."[30] Richardson also sought "a proper Person for a Copper Plate" who would follow Young's "extremely picturesque, and well adapted" "Directions" for a "Grotesque Picture of a Centaur in [the] Dedication." Young's goal was "a Trick to cheat the Publick" into reading the didactic text, of which Richardson thoroughly approved: "The Trick is an innocent one; even a charitable one; to cheat People into their own Good."[31]

Richardson's advice on formatting extended to suggestions regarding the actual content of Centaur. In a detailed letter of 21 January 1755, Richardson provided Young with a list of eighteen corrections that were largely grammatical—mainly related to spellings, plural cases, and punctuation marks—roughly half of which Young adopted. Occasionally, Young adopted Richardson's changes to diction, such as replacing "papal Infallibility" with "the keenest discernment" and removing the words "Thou Joseph, thou Jacob of Heaven" for later editions.[32] Richardson's most extensive suggestion regarded the removal of two long sections of text:

> In another impression methinks it were to be wished that all from, If this is a man of pleasure, p. 161, to, from a higher hand, p. 163, were omitted, as it interrupts, by ludicrous images, emotions that were nobly excited.
>
> For the same reason, suppose, in p. 163, were omitted the words, Fain would I bury, &c. to the end of the paragraph, real men, p. 164?

Young subsequently and entirely removed pages 161–64 from all copies of the text, comprising an entire leaf. Richardson also edited Centaur's dedication; he acknowledges "the liberty I have presumed to take with his [Young's] dedication," suggesting that traces of more extensive changes have been lost: "a few pages cancelled will answer a good end, after some such manner as I have presumed to offer in a waste sheet of the print; which I enclose." The extent of his help

on the dedication is unknown, though Young gratefully responded in successive letters: "Infinitely am I indebted to my dear & most worthy friend, who has taken Such trouble for me; & most particularly for the Dedication-part" and "As you have been so very kind to the dedication, I beg leave to rely on your inspection for that, and the letters shall follow faster than the press can work."[33] Richardson and Young's subsequent letters hint at further changes to the text that cannot be confirmed. At the end of his long list of corrections of 21 January 1755, Richardson wrote to Young, "There are some other things that, in another edition, if I may be forgiven the above, I would take the liberty to suggest." Young returned to this offer in subsequent letters, using and later quoting Richardson's exact language.[34] After publication, Young repeatedly expressed his gratitude to Richardson for his assistance—"Till I looked over the copy you sent me I knew not how much I was obliged to you; accept my sincere thanks for your many excellent alterations"—foreshadowing the growing role Richardson would play in the composition and publication of Young's Conjectures on Original Composition and his sermon An Argument Drawn from the Circumstances of Christ's Death for the Truth of His Religion (1758).[35]

An Argument Drawn from the Circumstances of Christ's Death for the Truth of His Religion

Although we cannot trace the extent of Richardson's revisions to Centaur's dedication, we can discern their tone and focus through his surviving comments for the dedication to An Argument Drawn from the Circumstances of Christ's Death for the Truth of His Religion. Young's An Argument was written as part of his role as chaplain-in-ordinary to King George II, a post in which he had served since 30 April 1728.[36] As Young prepared An Argument for public presentation and the press, his biographer Harold Forster notes that "It is clear, however, that

Young's real motive for publishing the sermon was to remind the powers that be of his claims to preferment."[37] This desire of preferment was one of the implicit reasons why Young sought Richardson's advice for An Argument, especially for the dedication. In his first letter to Richardson regarding the sermon, of 30 April 1758, Young wrote:

> With the utmost freedom of a true friend to truth, and to me, favour me with your full opinion of the Dedication: for I am, my dear sir, somewhat uneasy till I can determine myself about it; and my own judgment is at a loss.
>
> Is there any thing mean in what I say of myself, and my long service at court?
>
> Is there impropriety, or too great length in what follows about the army?
>
> Pray let me know your real sentiments: or shall I take your silence as a tender way of your letting me know that you disapprove? . . .
>
> P.S. If you have been so good as to read the Sermon, please to let me also know your thoughts of that.

Young's main concern is the propriety of the dedication, and his rare use of emphasis signals his anxiety regarding its reception by the king and court. It is also unusual for Young to ask Richardson's advice concerning social protocols. The content of the sermon is relegated to the postscript, confirming that Young was primarily focused on the dedication.

Indeed, Richardson's principal comments on An Argument, given in a letter of 2 May 1758, are devoted to the dedication:

> As to the Dedication, I am far from thinking your mentioning length of service mean: will it not rather be thought, or misunderstood, to carry with it something of complaint, or even of reproach; and as if your neglecting your month for some years past were owing to resentment? I humbly think this part cannot be too delicately mentioned: especially, as

> you have touched upon it with great feeling in more places than one, in your 'Night Thoughts,' so long ago—My master knows me not, &c.: and nothing resulted from the just sensibility. Some of your great admirers in that divine work thought you descended too much for the superiority you appeared in to them. Suppose, sir, you stop at your well-known seniority in the present chaplainship, without carrying the hint to Leicester-house; leaving it upon them to recollect, that you could have gone further with justice, had preferment been your sole view. It is right, however, not to be quite silent on the subject.

Though he claims otherwise, Richardson's advice does imply that parts of the dedication are "mean," namely the implications for "Leicester-house," a metonym for the Prince of Wales and future King George III. Richardson indirectly signals his disapproval by alluding to a passage from Night-Thoughts in which Young laments his disappointments regarding royal patronage and preferment:

> My very Master knows me not. –
>
> Shall I dare say, Peculiar is the Fate?
>
> I've been so long remember'd, I'm forgot.
>
> An Object ever pressing dims the Sight,
>
> And hides behind its Ardour to be seen:
>
> When in his Courtiers' Ears I pour my Plaint,
>
> They drink it, as the Nectar of the Great;
>
> And squeeze my Hand, and beg me come to-morrow . . .[38]

Forster has argued that this passage contains a "satirical picture of his [Young's] twenty-year siege of the court" that was "seized on as literal truth by his critics, who point out that this striking denunciation of ambition was followed by five years of intensive campaigning for a

mitre or at least a stall," though Young's criticism of the system of patronage contains an acknowledgement of his continued participation within it.[39] The lines, indeed, are written in present tense. In An Argument, Young follows Richardson's advice to avoid mentioning his service at court, which is not mentioned in the published dedication.[40] Young also sent Richardson an additional revised version of the dedication, in a letter of 7 May 1758, to which he appended a note thanking Richardson: "Extremely Just, & Kind, Dear Sir! was your Advice. Continue your Goodness, & at your leisure (there is no Haste as to the Dedication) I beseech You most frankly say, your thoughts of the present Dedicat[ion]:–, for I am still doubtfull myself." Though Richardson's second set of comments are missing, Young again responded on 14 May 1758, acknowledging his further assistance: "A thousand thanks, my truest friend, for restoring me to common sense. I shall follow your advice in the Dedication; and now, on reflection, think it monstrous that I stood in need of it. I now see how weak myself, and what a friend is worth."[41] In the height of his gratitude for Richardson's help, Young wrote on Sunday 28 <May 1758>, "I cannot sufficiently thank you for your most judicious remarks and additions. You see what use I have made of them; but, whether well or ill, I earnestly desire you to judge; and, with utmost freedom, to add, erase, or alter, and finally fix the whole for the press: for indeed, and indeed, I rely more on your judgment than my own." That Young had bestowed the "utmost freedom" upon Richardson "to add, erase, or alter, and finally fix" his writing signals a new step in their authorship network in which Richardson transitioned from editor to full-fledged collaborator.

Edward Young and Samuel Richardson: Conjectures on Original Composition

Richardson truly exercised this "utmost freedom" on Young's Conjectures on Original Composition, which Young had been writing around the time of An Argument. Conjectures on Original Composition is an early work of literary criticism that draws distinctions between a

series of dichotomies, including "original" versus "imitation" and "the ancients" versus "the moderns." Much of the work surveys the attributions of "modern" authors beginning with Shakespeare, ending in a didactic turn with its description of Joseph Addison's virtuous death. It valorizes originality over imitation, though perhaps ironically, it was the text on which Richardson had the greatest amount of influence, as can be traced through their correspondence.[42] As Robert L. Chibka notes, the letters show "behind the public appeal for self-reliance a private plea for collaboration."[43] Although Young's composition may have been motivated by the publication of Joseph Warton's Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope (1756), its collaborative basis goes beyond Richardson's suggestion to write the work, advertised in the extended title "In a Letter to the Author of Sir Charles Grandison." Rather than "a trick to put it into more hands," as Young had earlier proposed for an edition of Night-Thoughts, Richardson's presence on the title page of Conjectures is a real acknowledgment of his sustained intervention in all aspects of its composition to the extent that he should be considered as the work's co-author.

Young solicited Richardson's early assistance on his initial draft on 21 December 1756, writing "I know not the merit or demerit of what I send; if it has merit I beg you give it more." Richardson returned his more than forty "humble suggestions" in a letter of 14 January 1757. Though many of these changes cannot be traced since they were implemented on an early draft version, we can discern Richardson's increased involvement in the composition process. For example, Richardson attempts to attenuate Young's praise of Alexander Pope (and largely succeeds):

> Pope's, sir, I venture to say, was not the genius to lift our souls to Heaven, had it soared ever so freely, since it soared not in the Christian beam; but there is an eagle, whose eyes

> pierce through the shades of midnight, that does indeed transport us, and the apotheosis is your's. Whether this may suggest any softening, or any improvement to the passage, must be submitted to you; but, surely, an heroic poem ought not to be mentioned in these terms, which so exactly belong to a divine one. The author of one wishes to have his name swim down the stream of time on the wreck of Bolingbroke; the other dedicates his early muse to Him who gave him voice, and consequently his work is remote from all imitation. Should there not be here some distinction of imitators of other authors, and imitation of nature, in which respect poetry is called one of the imitative arts? The tame imitator of other poets is a copier of portraits, the true genius a noble painter of originals, to whom nature delights to sit in every variety of attitude.
>
> Indeed, sir, I cannot imagine that Pope would have shone in blank verse; and do you really think he had invention enough to make him a great poet? Did he not want the assistance of rhyme, of jingle? What originality is there in the works for which he is most famed? Shall I say, that I wish you would be pleased to reconsider all you say of the creative power of Pope?

Richardson may be alluding to the final lines of Young's "Night the First," which both praise and critique Pope's An Essay on Man (1733–34): "Man, too, he sung: Immortal man I sing . . . / O had he, mounted on his wing of Fire, / Soar'd where I sink, and sung Immortal man!"[44] The issue, of course, is that Pope's verse lacked Young's religious grounding. Richardson goes on to demean Pope's notorious use of heroic couplets, "the assistance of rhyme, of jingle" and Pope's dedication of An Essay on Man to Henry St. John, 1st Viscount Bolingbroke; the "wreck of Bolingbroke" that Richardson is referring to is likely a reference to Bolingbroke's treasonous support of the Jacobite rebellion of 1715 and the "Pretender," James Francis Edward Stuart.

Richardson issued other numerous suggestions, ranging from lengthy additions to small emendations to diction. Young's effusive thanks hints at the growing imbalance in their professional relationship: "What pains have you taken? What masterly assistance have you given? What thanks are your due. I think I shall profit by your every remark; and I am sure I shall ever acknowledge a friendship which, in kind and proportion, I shall never be able to return."[45]

There was nearly a gap of two years following Richardson's first set of extensive corrections and his second series, sent in December 1758 and January 1759. This can be partially explained by Young's health—which was poor in late 1757, necessitating a stay in Bath through April 1758—and his work during the middle of 1758 on An Argument. By fall 1758, Young had returned to the Conjectures.[46] In a letter to Richardson, likely written on Wednesday 20 December 1758, Young asks for a further clarification of Richardson's remarks, "I see some marks of your's in the sheets I send, but I do not understand them: however, let me not lose the advantage of them; but correct as you please,—the more you do so, the kinder." This prompted Richardson's two lengthy letters of 26 December 1758 and 24 January 1759. In the letter written on 26 December, Richardson made sixteen suggestions, fifteen of which Young largely incorporated without substantive variation into the published text. Richardson prefaced his extensive commentary with a disclaimer, "Forgive, dear and reverend sir, the following humble suggestions, in obedience to your condescending call upon me," deceptively downplaying his considerable contributions, many of which were lengthy additions, such as the work's celebrated simile of the "monumental marbles":

> . . . rewarding myself, however, with digressing into subjects more important, and from which my thoughts ought not, at this season of life, to make too long excursions. A

> serious thought, standing single among many of a lighter kind, will sometimes strike the careless wanderer, who roamed only for amusement, with useful awe: as monumental marble, scattered in a wide pleasure-garden, (and such there are,) will call to recollection those who would never have gone to seek it in a church-yard walk of mournful yews.—To one such monument I may conduct you, within which the sepulchral lamp still burns; but, unlike those of old, will not be extinguished, but made illustrious, by being produced after so long a time, in open day.[47]

Young copied this passage directly into his Conjectures, writing, "Your monumental marbles, most beautiful, and the happiest thought in the world for my purpose."[48] This metaphor of an unexpected monument in a pleasure garden is a striking and important frame for the larger work; it is still praised by contemporary critics and attributed to Young.[49] There are other significant contributions in this letter that Young appropriates with only minor substantive variation, such as Richardson's claim that "After all, the first ancients had no merit in being originals; they could not be imitators. Modern writers have a choice to make: they may soar in the regions of Liberty, or move in the soft and shining letters of fair Imitation; and she has as many plausible reasons to urge, as Pleasure had to offer to Hercules. Hercules made the choice of an hero; and, as such, is ennobled."[50] This thesis—that the ancients were originals by virtue of being first, and that imitation is a conscious choice made by contemporary authors—is central to Conjectures, though it is, again, not attributed to Richardson. The scale of his suggested changes also descended to the minute, such as the removal of the word "licentiously" and replacing "thirdly" with "third" since the former was "too sermon-like!"[51] From additions of key passages and formulations of central arguments to small revisions to diction, Richardson indelibly left his mark on Conjectures with his contributions of December 1758.

Richardson's second long letter of 11 January 1759 contained twenty-three suggestions, many of which Young adopted, though not as uncritically as he did with Richardson's previous letter. Many of these related to the concluding remarks on Addison's deathbed, of which Young noted, "that part more particularly entreats your kind correction."[52] Richardson's January 1759 comments are mostly smaller changes to diction and phrasing, such as his comment that "Do not the words, For as, begin a new paragraph oddly?", which Young largely adopted, revising the specific paragraph opening as: "For I remember, as I and others were taking with him an evening's walk" (Conjectures, 64). But there are certain suggestions Young rejected, as he explains in his letter of late January–February 1759: "I am greatly obliged by your just remarks; and have profited much by them: but, as I have added much of my own, some of your's I have omitted." One of these was Richardson's diatribe against the current state of British drama:

> Page 5.—Not swept so clean. Not swept so clean, did I say? To our stage in its present state (and yet its present state is much better than it hath been in some former times,) the stables of Augæus were a place of safety and neatness. In those stables men were devoured by horses: in our licentious comedies, how often does the brute devour the nobler man; devour him body and soul too? What a mass of corruption? Were there an Hercules to extirpate the wild beast, who is often too rampant, even in our tragedies, the theatre might easily become again a temple sacred to virtue and improvement: but, till then, what do we more in bringing on now and then a play, be it ever so correct and blameless, than endeavour to sweeten a pestilential vault by pouring in, once a twelvemonth, a pint of rose-water?

Richardson's violent metaphor conflates Hercules's fifth labor (in which he cleaned up King Augeas's stables by flushing them with the water of two rivers) and his eighth labor (in which he

had to fetch the man-eating horses of Diomedes, King of Thrace), concluding that the British stage is "a mass of corruption," a polemical statement of literary criticism. Young neatly and concisely replaced Richardson's extensive purification rites in the published text: "There is at least as much Genius on the British as on the Grecian stage, tho' the former is not swept so clean; so clean from violations not only of the dramatic, but moral rule; for an honest heathen, on reading some of our celebrated scenes, might be seriously concerned to see, that our obligations to the religion of nature were cancel'd by Christianity" (Conjectures, 79–80). Although this specific contribution was not incorporated, most of Richardson's additions were included in Conjectures, confirming not only Young's increased reliance upon Richardson, but also Richardson's authorial role and intervention into the field of literary criticism.

Richardson's most significant contribution to Conjectures was the praise of Addison's works and the description of his deathbed. Indeed, Conjectures contains warm tributes to Addison's literary works, particularly of his play Cato (1712).[53] The acclaim probably derives from Richardson, who commented in a letter of 14 January 1757 to Young that "though Shakespeare as an author was so far greater than Addison, as more an original, yet was he inferior to him as a man; because, in his best writings, less useful—for man to man is only great with respect to his fulfilling the important purposes for which man was made." Richardson follows this comparison with a further one in Addison's favor: "Pray, sir, may it not be hinted, as a piece of justice, that Addison was sometimes original; and, in his Sir Roger, as much so as Shakespeare." Sir Roger de Coverley, one of the characters Addison created in The Spectator (1711), was a good-natured English squire who wrote about early eighteenth-century life and whom Addison mildly satirized for his outdated Tory politics. His "contributions" were so popular that they would go on to be published in a separate volume in the nineteenth century,

though Richardson's preference of him to Shakespeare is exaggerated. Young moderated Richardson's praise, celebrating Addison's works throughout Conjectures, though refusing to rank him alongside "great Originals" such as "Bacon, Newton, Shakespeare, [and] Milton" (Conjectures, 76).

Young also incorporated praise of Addison's death at Richardson's behest, though most scholars do not attribute the latter's authorship. While Tom Keymer acknowledges this sequence as "one of his [Richardson's] last literary acts," Jacob Sider Jost argues that this "centerpiece" to the Conjectures "builds on the narrative techniques of Richardson" "In self-consciously documenting and preserving Addison's pious deathbed performance for future generations."[54] In his letter to Richardson of 8 October 1758, Young wrote, "I have added, as you desired, Mr. Addison's death; and particularly request your kind assistance with regard to that." The phrase "as you desired" confirms Richardson's central role in the inclusion and composition of this section. Indeed, their correspondence confirms that Richardson contributed some of the section's key language; it begins: "You know, indeed, the value of his writings, and close with the world in thinking them immortal; but, I believe, you know not, that his name would have deserved immortality, tho' he had never written; and that, by a better title than the pen can give: You know too, that his life was amiable; but, perhaps, you are still to learn, that his death was triumphant" (Conjectures, 99–100). This language was virtually copied from Richardson's comments:

> You know the value of his writings; you know, too, that his life was amiable, was exemplary: but you know not, I believe, that his death was triumphant. This is a glory granted to very few; nor is it of much consequence to the individual. That parental hand, which sometimes snatches home its children in a moment, is equally gracious in its various dispensations. Yet, where strength and moment, is equally gracious in its various

> dispensations. Yet, where strength and opportunity are given for virtues to shine brightest at the point of death, the example is certainly meant for general good. Such was that of Addison: for after, &c.[55]

In this section, Addison, knowing that death was inevitable, sent away his physicians and summoned his notoriously dissipated stepson Edward Henry Rich, seventh Earl of Warwick, virtuously demonstrating with his dying words, "See in what peace a Christian can die" (Conjectures, 102). The language Richardson suggests contains didactic, sentimental, and descriptive elements that could be borrowed from his novels. Richardson's reply, three days later, rejected any further editorial intervention: "I am charmed with what you have added of Addison: what memory, what judgment, what force of writing, what unabated vigor of mind. Surely, sir, this spirited piece is the most spirited of all your spirited works."[56] Coupled with the section on Addison's writings, Young's treatment of Addison occupies 21 of the 112 pages of Conjectures, a considerable portion of the work that evinces—perhaps better than any part of it—Richardson's substantial influence and contributing authorship, especially considering its use of sentimental and didactic language.[57] Richardson's co-authorship, then, should not only broaden our understanding of his literary corpus, but it should also encourage us to emphasize the work's figurative elements and "narrative techniques," as scholars like Jost have already begun to do.

After the publication of Conjectures, Richardson made his last documented visit to Young at Welwyn on 25–26 July 1759 which was followed by a "shattered" state of health that heralded his deterioration.[58] Very few letters from Richardson to Young survive from those final years, just as Richardson's other correspondences declined in 1759 and especially 1760. Young, too, was having difficulties of his own. Though he would outlive Richardson by nearly four

years, Young complained of renewed difficulties with his eyesight in his two final surviving letters, fearing the approach of blindness. Nevertheless, from the letters that remain, the two men were still actively engaged with each other's work. Forster observes, regarding Young's "last known letter" from 8 September 1760, "It appears that Richardson was trying to get Young to write a new work, for he wrote to Lady Bradshaigh on 10 August about 'a very desirable subject, on which I was free enough to engage his pen.'"[59] And Young's poem, Resignation (1761), which he was composing as Richardson died, serves as a confirmation of their authorship network. Midway through the poem, Young acknowledges:

> This Instant I myself am stung:
> How exquisite the Smart?
> How critically tim'd the News,
> Which strikes me to the Heart?

The stanza is accompanied by the note, "Whilst the Author was writing This, he received the News of Mr. Richardson's Death."[60] Young pays liberal tribute to his friend within the lines of Resignation, praising in particular Richardson's ability "To touch our Passion's secret Springs" and to "[open] deep / The Bosom of the Fair."[61] Most tellingly, the single mention of Richardson's name is connected to his literary and personal influence:

> If Richardson, as he was wont,
> Now overlooks my Page;
> He'll see, I strive in vain from Him
> Sick Thought to disengage . . .[62]

Especially towards the end of their literary careers, Richardson was "wont" to "overlook" Young's writings. His ghostly influence—from which Young "vain[ly]" strives "to disengage"—

is a final and important indication of their friendship and, more crucially, their collaborative literary partnership, barely visible except in the epistolary traces of their authorship network.

---

[1] Pettit has compared Barbauld's letters with their counterparts in Monthly Magazine to show the extent of her editorial intrusiveness, which is compounded in part by the absence of original manuscripts ("The Text of Edward Young's Letters to Samuel Richardson," Modern Language Notes 57, no. 8 [1942]: 668–70 [669]). Helen Sard Hughes was one of the first to notice serious discrepancies between Barbauld's transcriptions and the surviving manuscript texts ("A Letter to Richardson from Edward Young," Modern Language Notes 37 [1922]: 314–16). William McCarthy is more sympathetic towards Barbauld's editing work, though he acknowledges that many of Young's letters appear to be conflations ("What Did Anna Barbauld Do to Samuel Richardson's Correspondence? A Study of her Editing," Studies in Bibliography 54 [2001]: 191–223 [207]).

[2] Harold Forster, Edward Young: The Poet of the Night Thoughts, 1683–1765 (Alburgh: Erskine Press, 1986), 200. All citations from Richardson and Young's correspondence are cited by date and taken from Correspondence with Edward Young, Johannes Stinstra, Eusebius Silvester and Lady Barbara Montagu, ed. Hilary Havens, James May, Peter de Voogd, Tom Keymer, and Linda Bree, The Cambridge Edition of the Correspondence of Samuel Richardson, vol. 8 (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, forthcoming).

[3] T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel, Samuel Richardson: A Biography (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 183n51.

[4] Eaves and Kimpel, Samuel Richardson, 157.

[5] Forster, Edward Young, 200, 203.

[6] See also James E. May, "Young, Edward (bap. 1683, d. 1765), writer," Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, last modified 23 September 2004, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/30260.

[7] Betty A. Schellenberg, Literary Coteries and the Making of Modern Print Culture, 1740–1790 (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2016), 45; and Hilary Havens, Revising the Eighteenth-Century Novel: Authorship from Manuscript to Print (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2019), 12.

[8] See Havens, Revising the Eighteenth-Century Novel, 12, 15, 21.

[9] Louise Curran and Sören Hammerschmidt, "Mediation, Authorship, and Samuel Richardson: An Introduction," Eighteenth-Century Fiction 29, no. 2 (2016–17): 121–29 [123–24].

[10] Peter Sabor, "Rewriting Clarissa: Alternative Endings by Lady Echlin, Lady Bradshaigh, and Samuel Richardson," Eighteenth-Century Fiction 29, no. 2 (2016–17): 131–50 [148]; Teri Doerksen, "Richardson, Celebrity, and Editorial Mediation in Anna Meades's Sir William Harrington," Eighteenth-Century Fiction 29, no. 2 (2016–17): 221–40 [226].

[11] Ewing Jackson Webb observes that "Young had most recently sent him the manuscript of The Centaur Not Fabulous (1755) under similar circumstances while Richardson in turn had sought the advice of Young (among others) during the writing of Clarissa and Sir Charles Grandison" ("Edward Young's Conjectures on Original Composition (1759): A Critical Edition" [PhD diss., Northwestern Univ., Evanston, IL, 1969], xi. Eaves and Kimpel underplay this relationship. They say that "Richardson did far more for Young's works than one would expect a printer to do" and that "Young . . . happily avoided giving adverse criticisms or suggestions," but they do

not describe the significance of these interactions (Samuel Richardson, 186, 212). For discussions of their work on Conjectures, see Alan D. McKillop, "Richardson, Young, and the Conjectures," Modern Philology 22, no. 4 (1925): 391–404; and Patricia Phillips, "Richardson, Young and the Conjectures: Another Interpretation," Studia Neophilologica 53, no. 1 (1981): 107–12.

[12] Eaves and Kimpel note that "By the 1740s Young already had something of a name as a verse satirist, and he was making an even bigger name with his blank verse series, The Complaint: or, Night-Thoughts" (Samuel Richardson, 183).

[13] Young to Richardson, 20 June 1744. See T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel, "The Composition of Clarissa and its Revisions before Publication," PMLA 83 (1968): 416–28 [416].

[14] Young to Richardson, 17 July 1746, 26 November 1745, and 20 June 1744.

[15] Samuel Richardson, Clarissa; or, The History of a Young Lady, 7 vols. (London, 1747–48), 6:332.

[16] Richardson, Clarissa, 7:218.

[17] Eaves and Kimpel, "Composition," 425. Joshua Swidzinski notes that both authors are "concerned with the formal problem of transforming ostensibly private discourse (prayer or meditation) into public instruction consonant with Anglican orthodoxy" within Clarissa and Night-Thoughts ("'Great Labour Both of Mind and Tongue': Articulacy and Interiority in Young's Night Thoughts and Richardson's Clarissa," Eighteenth-Century Poetry and the Rise of the Novel Reconsidered, ed. Kate Parker and Courtney Weiss Smith [Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell Univ. Press, 2013], 161–86 [165]).

[18] Samuel Richardson, Clarissa, 3rd ed., 8 vols. (London, 1751), 8:280.

[19] Richardson to Young, <c.10–14 December 1744>.

[20] Young to Richardson, 5 November 1749.

[21] See Eaves and Kimpel, Samuel Richardson, 370–71.

[22] Richardson to Young, 1 August 1751. Although Young's original prayer was published instead in The Centaur Not Fabulous, Jocelyn Harris suggests that Young "may subsequently however have composed for Richardson (he offered to do so) the prayer which Harriet finds written in Sir Charles's hand (VII.51–52), of which the theme is gratitude in an age of licence, dissipation, and foolishness." ("Sir Charles Grandison and the Little Senate: The Relation between Samuel Richardson's Correspondence and his Last Novel," [PhD diss., Univ. of London, 1968], 91).

[23] See Edward Young, The Centaur Not Fabulous (London, 1755), 187–217.

[24] Young to Richardson, 7 August 1751.

[25] Young to Richardson, 14 March 1754.

[26] See Forster, Edward Young, 199–200.

[27] Richardson to Young, 9 September 1749.

[28] Young to Richardson, 10 September 1749. See Richardson to Mary Hallows, 5 September 1750.

[29] Young to Richardson, 21 July 1754; 1 August 1754; and 5 August 1754.

[30] Richardson to Young, 24 July 1754; Young to Richardson, 28 July 1754; and 1 August 1754.

[31] Richardson to Young, 14 August 1754; and Young to Richardson, <11 August 1754>.

[32] Young, Centaur, p. 173, 291; cf. Edward Young, The Centaur Not Fabulous, 3rd ed. (London, 1755), 125.

[33] Young to Richardson, <?26 January or 2 February 1755> and <?6 or 13 February 1755>. James E. May documents the "bibliographical complexities" that resulted from these "Last

minute revisions", namely the cancellations of the B sheet with the dedication and N1 and N2 mentioned in Young and Richardson's letters above, as well as R1, R2, and U1 that were also cancelled, but they were not mentioned in the correspondence. ("Interrelating the Cancellantia and Partial Gatherings in the First Edition of Edward Young's The Centaur Not Fabulous," Studies in Bibliography 53 [2000]: 241–63 [242, 244]).

[34] Young to Richardson, <?22 or 29 January 1755> and <?6 or 13 February 1755>.

[35] Young to Richardson, 23 March 1755.

[36] As one of the king's chaplains, he was in waiting for one month every year and would be required to preach in the Royal chapel on Sundays and other festivals, read divine service before the king and before the household in the morning, and say grace to the king at dinner. "The Chapel Royal: Chaplains, 1660–1837," Office-Holders in Modern Britain: Volume 11 (Revised), Court Officers, 1660–1837, ed. R. O. Bucholz (London: Univ. of London, 2006), 251–78. British History Online, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/office-holders/vol11/pp251-278.

[37] Forster, Edward Young, 312.

[38] Young, Night Thoughts, 92 [Night IV, lines 55–62].

[39] Forster, Edward Young, 235.

[40] Young also seemingly adhered to Richardson's other advice from his letter of 2 May 1758: "Might not, sir, the manner of introducing what relates to the army be less violent, if I may so express myself, and the connexion be made more easy? Might not a word be said first, as to the influence of faith upon the present welfare of society, as well as upon the future happiness of individuals . . . ?" Indeed, Young's few paragraphs on the military highlight the importance of faith: "Faith, then, is a military Virtue; and should take the Field, or Fortitude may desert: Faith not only fortifies, but finishes the Soldier" (An Argument Drawn from the Circumstances of Christ's Death for the Truth of His Religion: A Sermon Preached before His Majesty, at Kensington, June, 1758 [London, 1758], v).

[41] Despite Young's care, his moderated hints regarding his "well-known seniority" had little effect. Shortly after the sermon was delivered, Young received a dismissive letter from Thomas Secker, Archbishop of Canterbury, written on 8 July 1758, explaining that although "more suitable notice of your great merit hath not been taken by persons in power":

> No encouragement hath ever been given to me to mention things of this nature to his Majesty. And therefore, in all likelihood, the only consequence of doing it would be weakening the little influence which else I may possibly have on some other occasions. Your fortune and your reputation set you above the need of advancement; and your sentiments, above that concern for it, on your own account. (The Correspondence of Edward Young, 1683–1765, ed. Henry Pettit [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971], 474).

[42] See Eaves and Kimpel, Samuel Richardson, 432–36; McKillop, "Richardson"; and Phillips, "Richardson."

[43] Robert L. Chibka, "The Stranger Within Young's Conjectures," ELH 53, no. 3 (1986): 541–65 [545].

[44] Young, Night Thoughts, 48 [Night I, lines 452, 457–58].

[45] Young to Richardson, 20 January 1757.

[46] See Forster, Edward Young, 310–15.

[47] McKillop also comments on the extensive nature of Richardson's comments and Young's revisions related to "the important letter of December 26, 1758," leading in particular to an "opening . . . entirely re-written" ("Richardson," 398).

[48] Young to Richardson, 7 January 1759; cf. Edward Young, Conjectures on Original

Composition. In a Letter to the Author of Sir Charles Grandison [London, 1749], 2–3, henceforth cited parenthetically in the text as Conjectures.

[49] See, for instance, Jacob Sider Jost, Prose Immortality, 1711–1819 (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 2015), 50.

[50] Cf. Conjectures, 18–19.

[51] Since "licentiously" is not in the published text, Young must have followed Richardson's suggestion. And "Thirdly" is replaced with "Third" in the published text; cf. Conjectures, 43.

[52] Young to Richardson, 11 January 1759.

[53] See Conjectures, 88–99.

[54] Tom Keymer, Richardson's Clarissa and the Eighteenth-Century Reader (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992), 204; Jost, Prose Immortality, 37, 38.

[55] Richardson to Young, 11 January 1759.

[56] Richardson to Young, 11 October 1758.

[57] Although Richardson wielded considerable influence on Conjectures, one thing that he was unable to influence was Young's composition of a second companion letter on moral composition. Richardson enquired about the state of the second letter on no fewer than four occasions, in letters to Young of 14 January 1757, 10 May 1757, 19 July 1757, and 26 July 1757, though Young never shared a draft. See also Phillips, "Richardson," 109.

[58] Correspondence with Lady Bradshaigh and Lady Echlin, Volumes 5–7 of the Cambridge Edition of the Correspondence of Samuel Richardson, ed. Peter Sabor (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2016), 3:761.
Richardson to Lady Bradshaigh, 2 August 1759. See also, Young to Richardson, 11 August 1759; and Eaves and Kimpel, Samuel Richardson, 516.

[59] Forster, Edward Young, 330, 331.

[60] Edward Young, Resignation, &c. in Five Parts. To Mrs. B******* Including a Funeral Epithalamium, Occasioned by a New Marriage-Act (London, 1761), 10.

[61] Young, Resignation, 11.

[62] Young, Resignation, 17.