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There is no Frigate like a Book

To take us Lands away

Nor any Coursers like a Page

Of prancing Poetry –

Without oppress of Toll –

How frugal is the Chariot

That bears the Human Soul –

-Emily Dickinson iv

*Pamela:* The Book as a Visual and Physical Experience

This thesis re-examines the dynamic and multifaceted reception of *Pamela,* with particular focus on how the physical qualities and appearance of specific copies and editions shaped readers’ responses. By combining narrative analysis with a discussion of the book as a physical object and an examination of the many visual representations of Pamela, this thesis proposes a new, interdisciplinary model for understanding how eighteenth-century novels were treated and received by their readers, and how the works, in turn, influenced reading and printing practices. Beginning with an exploration of how the narrative confusion and identity crises in *Pamela* directly affected the polarised reception and physical appearance of *Pamela*, this thesis then moves outside the pages of the book to examine the influence of sham and spurious publications on the physical appearance of later editions of *Pamela*. The opening chapters concerned with themes of guise and disguise are followed by a discussion of the printing business in eighteenth-century England and Ireland and an examination of the reading practices of Richardson’s circle of friends and fans. These two chapters serve to situate the novel in a broader political, social, and cultural context, which in turn shaped its creation and reception. The fifth and final chapter employs illustrations from *Pamela* and Fielding’s *Joseph Andrews* to shed light on the importance of the visual responses to the novel in the eighteenth-century. Ultimately, this new, interdisciplinary approach to *Pamela* fully explains for the first time how a work conceived of as a humble conduct-book-cum-novel for servant girls in 1740, was, by the end of the nineteenth-century, memorialised and anthologised as an elegant, moral masterpiece. v
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Introduction

The book history of Richardson’s *Pamela* is dramatic and varied, marked by moments of cheaply produced tracts and crowned by gorgeously engraved sets. Exuberant villagers have celebrated their love for the heroine by tolling church bells and elegant members of the bon ton have proudly strolled through Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens displaying the novel. Audiences have crowded into theatres to watch the heroine represented on stage and visited the home of Highmore to see his famous *Adventures of Pamela* in oil paint. This thesis re-examines the dynamic and multifaceted reception of *Pamela,* with a particular focus on how the physical qualities and appearances of specific copies and editions shaped readers’ responses. These issues, in turn, informed the novel’s appearance throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. I build on James Grantham Turner’s definition of *Pamela* as a ‘media event’ and Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor’s extensive research, which itself responds to Turner’s claims. Keymer and Sabor have scrupulously researched and organised the many different participants in the *Pamela* media event, creating an almost complete picture in *The Pamela Controversy* and *Pamela in the Marketplace*, but they have overlooked the physical and visual qualities of the works of literature and art that shaped *Pamela*’s public life. The bindings, format, paratextual material, advertising and printing practices of *Pamela* and sham works that responded to *Pamela* are as valuable as their narrative contents for revealing the texts’ ultimate goals - whether to support, to revise, to capitalize on, or to undermine the eponymous heroine. The only other scholars to emphasise the physical qualities of *Pamela* were William Merrit Sale, Jr. and Keith Maslen - who painstakingly compiled bibliographic details for all the editions printed by Richardson. Neither Sale nor Maslen analyse the role that the different formats and revisions of *Pamela* played in the novel’s reception. In this thesis, I pay special attention to the physical qualities of the different editions and copies of *Pamela* and argue that their many different appearances reveal Richardson’s attempts at negotiating a wider and more diverse readership than originally expected. I also treat the sham works with the same precision and show how these lesser-known writers and printers also manipulated the physical appearance of their texts to respond to different points of *Pamela.* To this treatment of the book as a physical object, I add a detailed narrative analysis of identity and confusion in *Pamela* and an exploration of the variety of representations of *Pamela* in fine art and illustration. Until this thesis, these diverse components – bibliography, narrative analysis, and art history – have been confined to their respective scholars and studied in relative isolation. However, as I will demonstrate, the verbal and visual were strongly linked in eighteenth-century literature and an interdisciplinary model is needed to accurately reflect an interdisciplinary culture. By the conclusion of this thesis, I will have presented a new model for understanding how eighteenth-century novels were treated and received by their readers, and demonstrate how this can be applied to analysing other participants in the *Pamela* media event and the novel’s continued reception in the nineteenth-century.

In this introduction, I will supply evidence, anecdotes, and background information that serve as a foundation for the arguments presented in the following five chapters. To appreciate *Pamela*’s complicated and dynamic reception, we must first understand how readers reacted to *Pamela*, how eighteenth-century novels were printed, published, and advertised, how *Pamela* and sham *Pamela* works were illustrated, how people read and displayed novels, how spaces were created for and around reading, and of course, get to know the man behind the novel and his exceptional position as both printer and author. These topics form the body of this introduction and then lead into summaries of the arguments and issues of the five main chapters that address a variety of interdisciplinary approaches to *Pamela.*

How Readers Reacted to *Pamela*

In Aaron Hill’s letter to Samuel Richardson dated 9th February 1741, he enthuses about *Pamela* (1740) and its surprising origins:

Let me, therefore, observe upon how narrow and weak a foundation (as to a matter of fact) you have erected such a temple of fancy and wonder, that all the powers of wit and love, and of goodness, will forever delight to dwell in it, as a feat that will call in new worshippers.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Hill marvels that such a powerful, moralising text could be based largely on fiction, not ‘matter of fact’ and he believes that this unexpected origin gives *Pamela* a miraculous air. In Hill’s letter, the ‘narrow and weak’ foundations can also be interpreted as a reference to the heroine’s own lowly and fragile origins and an expression of awe at the power of the book. To build upon Hill’s analogy, *Pamela* is a temple founded on weak and narrow boards, and laid paper and calf, to house Pamela, the goddess who achieved ladyhood from humble origins. This statement encapsulates themes of contradiction and transformation that are important elements in all five chapters of this thesis: first, that something divine and worth worshipping could come from a fictional source; second, that a low-bred woman could become a highly revered and emulated heroine; and third that a modestly printed duodecimo could become an exalted object. In many ways, Hill’s employment of the temple metaphor imbues the physical book with both architectural and spiritual properties. This then draws our attention to the fact that *Pamela* can be interpreted as a text that the reader inhabits both imaginatively and physically. The heroine *within* this temple must also be deserving of worship and Hill finds Pamela’s transition from lady’s maid to lady faultless and seamless. This transformation inspired his daughters to become apostles and preach *Pamela*.[[2]](#footnote-2) Hill explains his daughters’ passionate connection to the text in a later letter to Richardson: ‘My daughters are in Surrey, preaching *Pamela* and *Pamela*’s inimitable author, with true apostolic attachment’.[[3]](#footnote-3) Readers’ evangelical fervour for *Pamela* echoed Richardson’s characters’ admiration of Pamela in the text. For example, Mr Martin pours out praise when he sees Pamela at church:

‘You are,’ continued he, ‘and ‘tis not my way to praise too much, an ornament to your sex, an honour to your husband, and a credit to your religion. Every body is saying so,’ added he; ‘for you have, by your piety, edified the whole church.’[[4]](#footnote-4)

When an apostle of Richardson’s text felt compelled to worship, she could make a pilgrimage to her library or closet and open the book. For readers like Hill and his daughters, *Pamela* is more than a novel - it is a vehicle and site of worship. *Pamela* was treated as a portable, pocket-sized temple that could be visited and inhabited both psychologically and physically.

Hill’s belief that such a simple, modest object can be transcendent stems from the disconnection between the physical object and its message, and this tension between high and low qualities of both the heroine and the text will explored thoroughly in Chapter One. While passionate Pamelists such as Hill found the novel miraculous, other readers were more sceptical about the inconsistency between the novel’s humble, conduct book origins and its elevated reception – to these readers, the anti-Pamelists, the novel *Pamela* smacked of hypocrisy. In their opinions, *Pamela* the novel could not move beyond its simple, functional duodecimo binding and its heroine could not be anything other than a lowly servant girl. Perhaps the most famous anti-Pamelist response was Henry Fielding’s bawdy and raucous *Shamela*, in which he ‘signals his refusal to believe Pamela’s report of herself by inserting “I pretended” in his shamming heroine’s protestations of innocence.’[[5]](#footnote-5) Fielding mocks Richardson’s lengthy and laudatory preface and distorts a naïve, virtuous young girl into a calculating, teasing wench, all in the spirit of exposing and refuting ‘the many notorious falshoods [sic] and misrepresentations of a Book called Pamela.’[[6]](#footnote-6) The reluctance to acknowledge the duodecimo novel’s moralizing message, and a ridicule of a servant girl’s climb from the lower to upper-classes was expressed by several other writers, including Eliza Haywood’s *Anti-Pamela; or Feign’d Innocence Detected* (1741) and James Parry’s *The True Anti-Pamela: or, Memoirs of Mr James Parry* (1742). This thesis also includes the rarely discussed *Virgin in Eden* by Charles Povey (1742) as a valuable, if overlooked, example of how some writers interpreted *Pamela’s* virtues as vices.

In the midst of this polarized Pamela/Anti Pamela debate, many other writers were simply content to borrow the heroine’s name and theme, exploit the novel’s popularity, and write a sham or revised version. Within the first two years of *Pamela*’s release, there were at least sixteen *Pamela*-related publications: *Shamela*, *Pamela Censured, Pamela’s Conduct in High Life, Anti-Pamela, The Life of Pamela, Pamela-A Comedy, Pamela; or Virtue Triumphant, The Virgin in Eden, The Memoirs of the Life of Lady H-, Joseph Andrews, Pamela in her Exalted Condition, Pamela; or the Fair Impostor, The Pleasures of Conjugal Love Explain’d, Pamela Versified, Pamela-the Second* and *Mock Pamela.* Along with the obscure *Virgin in Eden¸* this thesis discusses the marginalised sham work by John Kelly – *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* (1741), and the small but significant children’s abridgment by Francis Newbery, *The History of Pamela* (1779). Although much has been made of Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor’s ‘Pamela Controversy’[[7]](#footnote-7) and ‘Pamela media event’[[8]](#footnote-8), I am the first scholar to examine and analyse the physical and visual qualities of the copies and editions, such as binding, typeface, pagination, preliminary material, layout and illustrations in relationship to *Pamela*’s reception. I argue that this is an essential component in capturing how the novel was read and treated in eighteenth-century England. Throughout this thesis, I use physical copies of *Pamela*, *Pamela*-related publications and visual representations to support my assertion that *Pamela*’s multi-faceted reception cannot be fully understood without a thorough understanding of these artefacts and documents. To this end, the introduction discusses specific copies and editions of Richardson’s work to highlight arguments that will be expanded on in the five chapters of this thesis. The introduction begins with a rare, first edition of *Pamela* as an informative benchmark for all later editions of the book and shows the work’s value in contemporary markets. The five chapters and conclusion explore the treatment and visual representations from this first edition to much later eighteenth-century abridgments and nineteenth-century anthologies, proposing a new model to analyse reader reception and prioritize the book as a physical object.

How *Pamela* was Printed, Published, and Advertised

A first edition, married four volume set of Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela* went up for auction on June 8th, 2011 at Christie’s, King Street, London (Figures 1, 2, and 3). [[9]](#footnote-9) The £12,000-15,000 estimate was calculated by taking into account the rarity of the first edition, its condition and its provenance. According to the English Short Title Catalogue, there are only twenty-two first edition *Pamela*s listed in institutional libraries, and not all of these are complete sets. This limited number of first editions confirms that the *Pamela* at Christie’s was exceptionally rare. As an intern, I drafted a catalogue entry for *Pamela*; these entries have a strict formula, requiring effective and efficient language. I had but two paragraphs to explain the impressive physical condition of the set and to extol the novel’s importance in literary history:

[RICHARDSON, Samuel (1689-1761)]. *Pamela: or, Virtue Rewarded.* London: C. Rivington and J. Osborn [vols. III-IV for S. Richardson and sold by C. Rivington and J. Osborn], 1741-1742. 4 volumes. 12mo (166 x 97mm). (Some minor age spotting.) Contemporary calf, double gilt fillet borders, skilfully rebacked preserving contemporary red paper labels with title in black ink (covers a little rubbed, further neat restoration to corners). Provenance: Thomas Percival Esquire (1719-1763, bookplate in all volumes; ownership signature of his daughter Kitty Percival on title-page of vol. I).

FIRST EDITION OF BOTH VOLUMES I-II AND III-IV IN UNIFORM BINDING with the bookplate of Thomas Percival, antiquary. Percival was himself the author of two controversial pamphlets opposing high-church clergy. His only daughter and heir, Katherine ‘Kitty’ Percival, married Sir Joseph Radcliffe of Milnesbridge, who preserved his father-in-law’s manuscript and papers. Although originally conceived of as a letter-writing manual for servant girls, Richardson’s anonymous two-volume novel became an instant bestseller, appealing to all classes of readership and engaging them in an energetic dialogue. Within the first year of the novel’s release over sixteen sham and spin-off Pamela publications flooded the marketplace, exploiting the author’s anonymity and claiming Pamela as their own creation. Inspired by the novel’s surprising success with the upper-class, Richardson penned volumes III and IV to confirm the heroine’s acceptance into the aristocracy and re-assert his right of control over the narrative. The sprinkling of footnotes and authorial asides in the last two volumes demonstrate his determination to guide reader’s interpretations. By close of the century, fourteen editions of Pamela had been released, containing some eight thousand textual corrections. This first edition reflects his original intentions as both printer and author, serving as a comparative baseline for the plethora of editions that followed, and the catalyst of a literary and cultural phenomenon that altered the course of English fiction. FINE SET. Rothschild 1745.

For *Pamela*, it was imperative to stress the novel’s evolution from conduct book to bestseller, the wider-than-expected audience, the spin-off publications, the importance of the first edition, and Richardson’s constant engagement with the text as printer and writer. These ‘selling points’ not only highlight why a first edition *Pamela* is a prized collectable, but also identify the physical qualities and printing situations that make Richardson’s first novel an exceptional subject for this thesis that focuses on this book as a physical object and its influence on reception. With this combination of both marketable and academic attributes, the Christie’s *Pamela* rested at the intersection of the art market and the academic world, its fate to be determined by the fall of an auctioneer’s hammer. To a Richardson scholar and book historian, there is no conceivable price estimate for a first edition with provenance because it provides valuable insight into *Pamela*’s reception and her readers. In the world of book collecting, however, a modest calf binding pales in comparison to the crisp crackle of vellum, the exoticism of deerskin, the glimmer of gilt tooling, and the imposing stature of double elephant folios. The Christie’s *Pamela* failed to meet the reserve price at auction and was returned to its owner. It is not known if it will be auctioned again, demonstrating the unpredictably and difficultly researchers face when attempting to piece together a complete picture of *Pamela*’s readership, reception, and treatment in the eighteenth-century.

Thus, as this anecdote suggests, a good, clean, finely-bound copy of *Pamela* is exceptionally rare; the novel was initially published in 1740 as a cheap, ephemeral object by Samuel Richardson. Richardson, a successful printer, had been approached by the booksellers Charles Rivington and James Osborn to write an affordable, instructive and moralising work. By this time, Richardson had already written a stern guidebook for aspiring printers, *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* (1734), as well as several other short tracts, indices and prefaces, and printed a plethora of material from newspapers to handbills to folios for the House of Commons.[[10]](#footnote-10) Richardson had to set aside work on a collection of sample letters, *Familiar Letters on Important Occasions* (1741) – which was an important source for *Pamela -* to begin this project for Rivington and Osborn and *Familiar Letters* was not completed until after *Pamela*’s publication. For *Pamela,* Richardson expanded on the epistolary style that he had used in *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* and *Familiar Letters* and blurred the line between fact and fiction, conduct book and novel. Like most conduct books, *Familiar Letters* and *Pamela* were published in portable, affordable duodecimo format. A brief synopsis of the narrative demonstrates the drama and appeal that Richardson created from this mixture of conduct book and novel: Pamela, a young and beautiful servant girl, is placed in a vulnerable position when her mistress dies and leaves the estate to her son, Mr B. Lusty and spoilt, he immediately begins to pursue and harass Pamela. Pamela informs her parents of the flirtations in her letters and they sternly advise her to guard her virginity. Pamela dutifully heeds their warning and rebuffs Mr B’s increasingly aggressive advances. But after several threatening encounters, Pamela is no longer able to endure the assault on her her chastity and requests to leave Mr B’s employment. Surprisingly, Mr B grants her wish and Pamela packs a small bundle of possessions in preparation to head home. In a shocking plot twist, Mr B has played a cruel trick on Pamela – instead of escorting her home in a carriage, he has arranged an elaborate kidnapping and takes Pamela to one of his estates. There Pamela is placed under the watch of the bawdy and vile Mrs Jewkes. Pamela tries to escape, contemplates suicide, fights off an attempted rape, and rejects a sham marriage before finally convincing Mr B to treat her as an equal with a legitimate wedding. Mr B marries Pamela, reunites his wife with her family, and together they convince his aristocratic friends of Pamela’s right to the title of Lady B. In the sequel, *Pamela II*, written in 1742, Richardson focuses on Mr B and Pamela’s long, loving relationship, only once briefly tarnished by Mr B’s fleeting affair at a masquerade. Pamela teaches her brood of children the importance of virtue and uses personal anecdotes as proof of its rewards. At the conclusion of *Pamela II*, the reader is assured that Pamela’s legacy will survive through the virtuous actions of her children. Thus, what had been conceived by Rivington and Osborn as a straight-forward volume of model letters was transformed into an emotionally compelling and intricate novel.[[11]](#footnote-11)

*Pamela* was Richardson’s first foray into fiction (although he would insist on keeping up the façade that he was only the editor of factual letters). The first edition was plainly printed in an affordable duodecimo format so that servant girls could easily read the work in their quarters. However, *Pamela* soon found itself in the hands of many unintended readers, from young labourers to gentlemen, like the Christie’s copy, and quickly became a bestseller. To court this larger audience, Richardson had to make revisions to the narrative, polish his characters’ diction, and improve the physical appearance of the novel. While the format of the *Pamela* was a duodecimo for all but one edition, the text of *Pamela* was extensively revised and corrected. Richardson made more than eight thousand changes - from spelling, grammar, and word choice to correcting titles and forms of address - and printed fourteen editions over a period of twenty years. Peter Sabor provides a brief chronology of *Pamela*s in his introduction:

It was first published anonymously in two volumes in November 1740; a revised edition with lengthy introduction was published in February 1741, and three further revised editions were published in that year. In December 1741 a two-volume sequel was published, written in response to numerous criticisms, parodies and spurious continuations of the original work. In 1742, a deluxe, illustrated octavo edition of all four volumes was published…Two further revised editions of the first part of *Pamela* were published in 1746 and 1754, and shortly after Richardson’s death in 1761, another four-volume edition was published…During the 1750s, however, Richardson had undertaken an extensive revision of *Pamela*, making numerous stylistic alterations…These changes were made in an interleaved copy of the octavo edition. Richardson did not print the resulting text during his lifetime, but it was preserved by his daughters after his death, and finally used as the copy text for an edition of *Pamela* published in 1801.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Each edition, from the two-volume second edition full of prolix preliminary material to the posthumous edition organized by his daughters, reveals Richardson’s responses to criticism and commentary from readers and friends. These editions also are examples of what printing and publishing techniques Richardson found useful. The lessons Richardson learned from *Pamela* influenced the marketing and appearance of his other two novels, *Clarissa* (1748) and *Sir Charles Grandison* (1753)*.* A general overview of how books were printed and sold during *Pamela*’s period will show us not only how important and influential these changes were in the history and reception of Richardson’s *Pamela* but also the strong correlation between the physical appearance of the book and its reception and treatment in eighteenth-century culture.

Book Production in Eighteenth-century England

Most books were sent from the printer to the bookseller, unbound and in sheets. The bookseller then selected a number of copies to be sold bound and the remaining books were kept in sheets or in blue paper so that the buyer could bind his purchase according to his personal preferences.[[13]](#footnote-13) Blue paper wrappers were fragile and usually discarded, so it is rare to find an example of a book in this state; however, a British Library copy of Jonathan Swift’s pert *Directions to Servants*, a humorous and coy foil to *Pamela*, has much of its original wrapper intact. This slim, duodecimo copy has been wrapped in recycled blue paper with old advertisements on the inside cover, and provides us with an idea of how some copies of *Pamela* would have first appeared to her readers. Once the blue paper was removed and the book was presented for binding, the possibilities were limited only by price: some copies of *Pamela* were simply bound in plain calf and sold for an affordable 6s., some, like Francis Newbery’s *The History of Pamela* discussed in Chapter Two were bound in cheap, coloured Dutch floral print paper, and others such as the Christie’s *Pamela* and Attingham Park *Pamela* were attractively bound by their owners for display. The outside of the book spoke to the status and quality of its contents and its owners; printers and authors were eager to exploit this language of size and binding as Barbara Benedict explains: ‘certain classes of books became associated with certain kinds of collections. Novels, for example, [more traditionally duodecimos] quickly adopt the form of the three-volume octavo, yet their cultural status remained relatively low for most of the period.’[[14]](#footnote-14) All three of Richardson’s novels, *Pamela, Clarissa,* and *Grandison* appeared in both duodecimo and octavo formats, with duodecimo being more common and popular. The decision to fold and cut the printed sheets into twelve or eight sections was not accidental and Richardson’s printing strategy for *Grandison* reveals the extent of his experience. Richardson wrote to Lady Bradshaigh to explain his choice of size for his final novel: ‘I think that when I publish, to give two vols. only in 8vo. and 12ver. at once, that people may buy which they will, whereas it has been too much the custom to cram down purchasers’ throats an 8vo. edition first, and after sometime to depreciate that by a cheaper.’[[15]](#footnote-15) This is a different printing approach than for *Pamela*, where five editions duodecimo were printed before an octavo sixth edition (1742). The octavo sixth edition *Pamela* did not sell well, so Richardson returned to duodecimos until his final, fourteenth edition which was an interleaved octavo. This final *Pamela* was interleaved because the revisions, mainly to further simplify Pamela’s character, were too extensive to be written in the margins.[[16]](#footnote-16) This octavo ‘manuscript’ was in the possession of Richardson’s daughters and the revisions contained in this text were not printed until 1801 and reprinted in 1810. Richardson’s change in printing techniques shows a growing commercial awareness and deepening understanding of the body language of the book.

Because books in an eighteenth-century bookshop could not be judged by their covers, booksellers had to find different ways to catch a potential reader’s eye – for example, the title page. This explains why many title pages were elaborate and verbose.[[17]](#footnote-17) The changes made to *Pamela*’s title pages throughout the fourteen editions reflect Richardson’s increasing awareness of a genteel audience and his desire to court their custom. For example, the title-page of the second edition, 1741, emphasizes instruction and virtue and informs the reader how they should respond:

Pamela; or Virtue Rewarded. In a Series of Familiar Letters Written from a Beautiful Young Damsel to her Parents. Now first Published in order to cultivate the *Principles of Virtue and Religion*[[18]](#footnote-18) in the Minds of the Youth of Both Sexes. A Narrative which has its Foundation in Truth and Nature; and at the same time that it agreeably entertains, by a Variety of curious and affecting Incidents, is intitely[sic.] divested of all those Images, which in too many Pieces calculated for Amusement only, tend to inflame the Minds they should *instruct*. The second edition. To which are prefixed, extracts from several curious letters written to the editor on the subject.[[19]](#footnote-19)

The title-page of the fourteenth edition, printed in 1801 by Richardson’s only surviving daughter, Anne, is much shorter, but stresses the heroine’s virtue, entertainment and aristocratic life:

Pamela; or Virtue Rewarded. In a Series of Letters from a Beautiful Young Damsel to her Parents: and afterwards in Her *Exalted*[[20]](#footnote-20)Condition between Her, and *Persons of Figure and Quality*, upon the Important and *Entertaining* Subjects, in Genteel Life. In Four Volumes. Published in order to cultivate the principles of virtue and religion in the minds of the youth of both sexes.[[21]](#footnote-21)

Small alterations in diction, such as the omission of ‘Familiar’ from ‘Series of Letters’ and ‘written’, present *Pamela* less like a didactic conduct book and more like a virtuous, genteel novel. Richardson did more than alter and gentrify language; he also played with the appearance and length of sentences and paragraphs to make each page of his novels as appealing as possible. The thought-process of the printer/author can be seen in the abundance of hyphens and dashes employed in *Pamela*, which Albert Riveiro explains helps the visual appearance of the text: ‘A close examination of the copy text reveals that the length of interruptive hyphens or dashes, while sometime appearing to be expressive, often seems dictated by nothing more than the number or length of words that can be accommodated within Richardson’s original line.’[[22]](#footnote-22) Richardson also experimented with footnotes and double columns in *Pamela*, which will be discussed in Chapters Two and Three, and in *Clarissa* he was even more adventurous - placing text on diagonals, inserting an engraved musical score, and playing with font and text size. In his final work, *Grandison*, a novel that Janine Barchas calls ‘a fiction sandwiched between reference texts’, Richardson returns to lengthy paratextual and preliminary material showcased in *Pamela.* Richardson buttressed *Grandison* with preliminary and concluding material largely as a response to the Irish ‘piracies’, which are the focus of Chapter Three. Richardson was intent on keeping the numerous editions of the eight-volume *Grandison* uniform and just as in *Pamela*, he controlled the spacing and arrangement of the text on the page:

Richardson sometimes used paragraphs for the purpose of making unbroken or long passages more appealing to the eye, but there is sufficient evidence in the third edition to show that an increase in the number of paragraphs was often the result of deleted passages. The third edition is to a large extent a page for page reprint of the first, and in order to keep the texts of the two editions together, Richardson (or the compositors) took passages of the first edition text and broke them into more paragraphs in order to fill the space that had resulted from deleted material [from revisions].[[23]](#footnote-23)

In this passage, Pierson suggests that if Richardson did not personally alter the paragraphs then he would have instructed his compositors to do so, demonstrating his commitment to controlling the text. It is important to stress the collaborative aspect of printing and publishing during this period. Contemporary scholarship has worked to untangle a complex chain of interactions. The theories of Robert Darnton and James Raven influence Chapter Three’s discussion of printing and publishing culture of *Pamela* and *Grandison* and provide us with a better understanding of the business culture in which novels were produced.

Darnton has identified and described the different components of book production; forming them into a readable model he calls the ‘communications circuit’. Darnton identifies eight essential institutions required to produce a book during this period – the author, publisher, printers, suppliers, shippers, booksellers, binders and readers – and he also includes the intellectual, social, economic, and political factors that inform and guide the participants in the production of books. Darnton simultaneously considers both the parts and the whole of the circuit, arguing that each element is essential to understanding a text’s history. The communications circle, therefore, is representative of a book’s life cycle and the reader-author relationship that is necessary for a text to thrive. For my thesis, the reader-author relationship is of particular importance. Darnton’s model implies that the reader-author relationship is symbiotic; the author is a node in a larger artistic web and he can never create a work entirely independent from the anticipation of the audience’s reaction.[[24]](#footnote-24) Darnton further explains how even the abstract concept of a reader plays an essential role in the communications circuit: ‘A writer may respond in his writing to criticism of his previous works, or anticipate reactions that this text will elicit. He addresses implicit readers and hears from explicit reviewers. So the circuit runs full cycle.’[[25]](#footnote-25) James Raven elaborates on Darnton’s multi-faceted model for book production and provides us with an even better understanding of all the factors that were involved in *Pamela*’s production:

The ‘book trade’ is a comprehensive and familiar term, but we might more usefully write of the *book trades*, of distinctive crafts and employments which support each other, and are also linked to other occupations. As an industry, the book trade is composed of a series of commercial transactions over different products involving different merchants, manufacturers, processors, furnishers, wholesale and retail distributors, circulation agents, and contractual and open market consumers.[[26]](#footnote-26)

Raven’s extensive list alerts us to how complex and interconnected the book trade was, and most importantly how deeply intertwined it was in eighteenth-century culture and daily life. These two theories dispel the myth of the author as sole creator of the text – a belief Richardson did not fully understand in his obsession with controlling the text and fighting mis-readings. Yet in researching Richardson and his novels, it is rare to find one study that acknowledge authorship, printers, workplace culture, physical objects, visual imagery and reader reception – this thesis seeks to correct this oversight in Chapter Three’s discussion of Richardson and Faulkner’s print battle about *Grandison.*

Illustrations of *Pamela*

The collaborative aspect of book production is further demonstrated in Richardson’s plan for illustrating *Pamela.* Richardson approached artist-engravers Hubert Gravelot and Francis Hayman and selected twenty-six scenes for them to illustrate for his ambitious, deluxe edition of *Pamela* (1742). The artists and *Pamela* illustrations will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five, but it is important to note here Richardson’s commitment to controlling the novel’s reception and to compare this elegant edition with cheaper, sham publications, such as *The Life of Pamela* (1741). Although Richardson had included twenty-five illustrations in his edition of *Aesop’s Fables*, he had not considered illustrating *Pamela* until sham and spurious publications began threatening the novel’s reputation.[[27]](#footnote-27) As T.C. Duncan Eaves explains, ‘Richardson proposed to enhance the dignity and importance of Part I… by the introduction of engraved plates. No previous English novel had displayed such elegance as he planned for *Pamela*.’[[28]](#footnote-28) Gravelot and Hayman were two of the most refined illustrators of the day and their twenty-six designs imbue Pamela with a fashionable rococo grace. Interestingly, Richardson did not always choose the most dramatic scenes to have illustrated – such as Mr B’s attempted rape and Mrs Jewkes and Mr B in Pamela’s bedroom and instead preferred quieter moments composed like conversation pieces – a term he uses quite frequently in *Pamela*’s narrative. These more climatic moments were frequently illustrated in the sham-Pamela suggesting that these scenes appealed to the general readership. Along with the illustrations, Richardson inserted a prolix table of contents that explained each letter and entry, and included elegantly cut headpieces to introduce the letters.[[29]](#footnote-29) Richardson proudly puffed his new and improved *Pamela* in *The* *Champion* on 8 May 1742: ‘With His Majesty’s Royal License, Beautifully printed on a writing paper, and large letter in four volume octavo, and embellished with twenty-nine copper plates design’d and engrav’d by Mr Hayman and Mr Gravelot (with a complete table of contents, being an epitome of the work).’[[30]](#footnote-30) In this short but emphatic advertisement, Richardson highlighted all of the features that separate his *Pamela* from the sham and spurious imitations: the special paper, skilled print, larger font and illustrations. Richardson’s deluxe octavo edition cost 1£ 4s., pricing poorer *Pamela* fans out of the market. His target audiences were older, more affluent first time readers and *Pamela* fans who might need some of their readings and impressions corrected with images.[[31]](#footnote-31) Ultimately, although this edition of *Pamela* was an aesthetic success, it was a financial flop, as Eaves explains: ‘The fact is that the copies did not sell, and as late as 1772 enough sheets of this edition remained for its reissuance minus the plates with a different title-page. Richardson had undoubtedly lost money on the venture and never again did he publish any of his novels “embellish’d with copper plates.”’[[32]](#footnote-32) I argue in detail in Chapter Five that Gravelot and Hayman’s illustrations did not create a satisfying image of the heroine, but as I note in the conclusion, this deluxe, sixth edition was the predecessor of the elegant, nineteenth century anthologies.

Richardson’s beautiful *Pamela* stands in direct contrast to spurious illustrated works such as *The Life of Pamela*, and shows us the significance of the visual component of *Pamela.* *The Life of Pamela,* a serial published in 1741, provided the reader with five hundred pages of text, nine narrative illustrations and one frontispiece for the affordable price of 4s.[[33]](#footnote-33) John Carwitham, a little known but fairly talented illustrator, provided the plates for this novel. Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor point out that the selection of an obscure artist was reflective of the book’s intended audience: ‘The expense of a more prestigious artist would have been too great for the downmarket *Life* but Carwitham’s illustrations are surprisingly effective. Although most of them depict scenes from Richardson’s *Pamela*, two represent incidents created by the author of the *Life.*’[[34]](#footnote-34) The author of the spurious text, now known to be Mary Kingman, also manipulated *Pamela* and took advantage of Richardson’s silence on the subject of authorship: ‘Whoever put together the other Account that has been published of Pamela was entirely misinformed of the Cause of Mr Andrews’ misfortunes.’[[35]](#footnote-35) To strengthen her argument, this author provides a more thorough explanation of Pamela’s entry into service, including details about how her parents lost money when the South Sea Bubble burst and supplying the last name ‘Belmour’ to Richardson’s abbreviated Mr B. *The Life of Pamela* exploits *Pamela* as the framework for its narrative and then continues the story beyond the early, happy days of Pamela’s marriage. The author clearly believed that authenticity could be achieved through detail and realism and *The Life of Pamela* is even more bloated with excessive description than *Pamela*. In the midst of this mediocre and murky prose, there are glimmers of insight and class sensitivity and less of Richardson’s ambiguity. The ‘sham’ Pamela is more pragmatic and socially aware – the world she lives in is harsh and limited, expressed accurately in Mrs Belmour’s condescending comment: ‘Poor child, thou canst expect no Fortune, but a good Education will do you no Hurt.’[[36]](#footnote-36) There are also touching details of the frustrations of servant life, such as when Pamela huddles on the balcony with other servants, wistfully watching Lord Davers and Miss Belmour at a ball. While *The Life of Pamela*’s Pamela is more open in her admiration for the upper-classes than Richardson’s, lustily observing a world beyond her reach, she is simultaneously more insistent on the limits of her station. She continually refers to herself as inferior, even to the vile Mrs Jewkes, and is honest with herself about the impossibility of wedding a wealthy, well-bred man. Kingman articulates this awareness by describing Pamela’s thought process (with a bit of hyperbole to compensate for her weak writing): ‘His birth and fortune, she knew would not let him to stoop to such a slave as Pamela, and therefore all she had to desire was to be permitted to return to her native meanness unviolated.’[[37]](#footnote-37)

*The Life of Pamela* is poorly written and cannot compete with the original in terms of narrative quality, but its twelve illustrations would have made it a desirable purchase, particularly for children and lower-class readers. The engraver, John Carwitham (fl. 1723-1741), is not well known, but does receive mention in Hans Hammelmann and T.S.R. Boase’s authoritative survey of British illustrators. They report that Carwitham was ‘employed by booksellers to engrave the works of other artists, including Bernard Picart, whose style of first etching the plate and finishing it with a burin he copied.’[[38]](#footnote-38) This means that Carwitham cannot necessarily be credited with the original design of the illustration but can be held responsible for the design’s translation onto copper-plate and therefore onto the page. However, there is no other artist credited in the text or under each illustration, as was popular with engravings, leaving us with the possibility that he did do the illustrations himself. The twelve illustrations capture a Pamela in transition from an awkward, poorly-clad servant girl to a fine lady, expressing a good knowledge of servant attire, posture, and emotion (Figures 4 and 5). The illustrations also indulge a fascination with the trappings of luxury and there is a heavy emphasis on carriages, a status symbol. With short strokes of a burin, Carwitham ensures that the illustrations appeal to the humbler origins of the narrative, an approach that Richardson dramatically departed from in his fashion-plate, rococo images. The differences in these illustrations confirm that both the narrative of *Pamela* and the images of the eponymous heroine were treated as a sort of Pygmalion, with each class forming their own ideal woman.

Reading *Pamela*

These copies, editions, shams, and illustrated versions of *Pamela* point to a diverse readership, which in turn raises issues about the nature of reading in the eighteenth-century. In the Richardson household, reading was a communal and vocal activity:

In the evening reading sessions, sociable reading aloud was combined with work. The evenings were spent around the table in Mrs Richardson’s parlour, where the practice was for one of the young ladies to read, while the rest sat with mute attention around the large table, and employed themselves in some kind of needle-work.’[[39]](#footnote-39)

Tadmor focuses on the sociability of reading during this period and this more interactive approach to reading would have influenced how authors constructed their works and pictured their audience. It is important to explore Richardson’s treatment of reading and writing as a social activity. Tadmor identifies three factors that contribute to the social nature of reading: ‘Firstly, purchasing, lending, and borrowing of books were closely connected with other social networks…Secondly, reading was often done in company. Thirdly, much reading was done aloud and intermittently.’[[40]](#footnote-40) Tadmor’s points explain why Richardson treated reading as a social transaction and circulated drafts of his novels to select groups of friends, soliciting their opinions and advice. Richardson’s drafts were social currency and he invited an elite circle to form his selectively public forum.

Because Richardson was an avid letter writer, scholars have been left with a fair amount of correspondence to piece together his reading and writing community. Although some letters were edited and altered by one of Richardson’s first biographers, Anna Laetitia Barbauld, the spirit of the correspondence has been preserved.[[41]](#footnote-41) The vast majority of Richardson’s surviving correspondence discusses his novels, and this topic was likely to have been the central focus of his exchanges with friends and critics.[[42]](#footnote-42) Susan Greenstein argues that Richardson’s correspondence with select readers is revolutionary and indicative of a much greater social movement: ‘They were charter members of a great community of readers, a community whose most celebrated citizens are surely those who begged Dickens to spare Little Nell.’[[43]](#footnote-43) As we have seen, Richardson’s correspondence with his friend Hill demonstrates the intensity of a community of readers’ involvement with text. Richardson invited Hill’s daughters to annotate, criticize and make recommendations for future editions of *Pamela* and the family believed themselves to be in ‘every where and every way, both his and his dear family’s most faithful servant.’[[44]](#footnote-44) Richardson’s community of readers did more than celebrate and preach the virtues of his heroes and heroines, they also wept and suffered. After beginning *Clarissa* in 1753, Lord Orrery wrote to Richardson: ‘Yet, I own, we thank you for sleepless nights and sore eyes, and perhaps, there are aching hearts and salt tears still in reserve for us.’[[45]](#footnote-45) The reader was required to suspend belief and accept the characters’ ‘provisional reality’ to become a full-fledged member of Richardson’s community.[[46]](#footnote-46) These emotional attachments to the text and the role they played in the reception of *Pamela* will be explored in greater detail in Chapters One and Four.

Domestic Libraries and *Pamela*

Because this thesis also pays considerable attention to the spaces in which Richardson’s novels were read by these devoted, impassioned friends and fans, Chapter Four focuses on the summer-house and the closet as two of the most important rooms for the characters’ literary activities. In fact, the library as a space for reading is mentioned infrequently in *Pamela*. However, the library, as a room, influenced the appearance and treatment of books. For example, a twelfth edition of *Pamela* (1785) housed at Attingham Park shows how the novel was successfully packaged as a decorative object, confirming the owner’s wealth and taste, and blending in with the opulent surroundings of the library (figure 6). This thesis is the first to include *Pamela*s in National Trust libraries, helping to create a more comprehensive picture of *Pamela’*s history. The four volumes of the Attingham Park *Pamela* are bound in good quality brown calf, with plain boards, but they have elegantly decorated and banded spines. The spines are adorned with coloured leather bands and a gilt floral motif. The volumes are duodecimo and only very lightly worn. Attingham Park was designed by George Steuart for the politician Noel Hill, in 1785 and was built on the site of his earlier house. While it is not known whether these volumes were part of the original Attingham Park library collection, the high quality binding indicates that they belonged to a prosperous person, such as Hill. The contrast of the plain boards with the ornate spine and crisp pages suggest that this *Pamela* was used more for display than for devoted reading. This hypothesis is further strengthened by the fact that the volumes of *Pamela* are accompanied by uniformly bound duodecimo copies of *Clarissa* and *Grandison* from the same year. Every detail, from the plain calf boards to the gilded spines, is identical and this creates a pleasingly uniform display on the bookshelf. In fact, many of the books on neighbouring shelves, whether octavo or duodecimo, are bound in similar harmonies of gold, crimson, and green. As other library catalogues demonstrate, fine binding was standard practice; for example, a bright red morocco, elegantly gilt edition of *Terence* at Ragley Hall was described as ‘English country-house library binding.’[[47]](#footnote-47) This uniform binding can even be glimpsed in Zoffany’s painting of Charles Towneley’s library, discussed shortly, and the books are mere washes of golden hues on a large book press. In this sense, books were treated purely as physical objects and were positioned so their gilding, not their actual size, impressed the library visitor. Furthermore, books in libraries were often catalogued and organized by their size and status, not by content.[[48]](#footnote-48) Benedict confirms this objectification of the book in stately homes: ‘The eye-catching beauty of books ranged in order and so positioned as not to be read, is only one aspect of the way book collections can transform books into objects.’[[49]](#footnote-49) The elevation of *Pamela*, commonly considered a ‘low’ novel, into an ornate decorative object for a stately library, implies that books were often treated as library furniture – simultaneously decorative, functional, and entertaining. The true value of such elegantly bound books, like the Attingham Park *Pamela* was not as an individual piece of literature, but as a larger community of books.

The eighteenth-century library was not only home to a community of books but also a gathering place for a group of readers. It was originally structured as a ‘refuge from the social melee, and to be used privately – as a room to discuss matters with servants, or for personal contemplation. [[50]](#footnote-50) Mr B spent much of his time after his marriage in his library, and Pamela would visit for intellectual and instructive discussions.[[51]](#footnote-51)In the seventeenth century, the library had been a solitary, scholarly space and over the next two hundred years, it developed into an additional drawing room.[[52]](#footnote-52) By the mid-eighteenth century, the library had become the domestic nexus of socializing and entertaining in affluent homes.[[53]](#footnote-53) Raven chronicles the rapid popularization of the room, noting its social nature by the mid-eighteenth century:

At the end of the seventeenth century, modest libraries had been incorporated into some English country houses, but the event was ‘still enough to call for notice.’ By the mid-eighteenth century the library had become a focal living and entertaining room for much of the English nobility and wealthier gentry.[[54]](#footnote-54)

The library was more than a designated room for reading; it was a multi-functional space – a room to stroll through, a place to browse for books and a centre for discussion.[[55]](#footnote-55) The transformation of the library into a domestic space inspired a new field of furniture specifically designed for this room: ‘library chairs, library steps, library desks, library footstools, library mirrors, library globes, and library hearth ornaments.’[[56]](#footnote-56) Unlike the stiff, plain summer-house chairs depicted in Susanna Highmore’s illustration in Chapter Four, library furniture was crafted to be comfortable and to encourage socializing and reading.[[57]](#footnote-57) The finest quality library furniture was also ‘clever’ and full of gimmicks, mimicking its intellectual environment, like a reading chair that turned into steps.[[58]](#footnote-58) Library furniture facilitated reading and also showcased books and other collectables. In fact, collectors of books also collected other objects, like busts or antique marbles – items that were considered ‘vessels of knowledge’ and statements of taste.[[59]](#footnote-59) Eighteenth and early nineteenth-century paintings of domestic libraries capture the room’s multiple functions and also show how works of art can provide a window into the treatment and display of books – a theme that will be expanded on in Chapter Four. Johann Zoffany’s (1733-1810) painting, *Charles Towneley’s Library* (c. 1783), captures the artful, intellectual medley of movement, collectibles, books and furniture[[60]](#footnote-60) (figure 7). Zoffany’s painting depicts Towneley and his friends in a neo-classical room in Park Street, London, crowded with antique marbles, library desks, reading chairs, and books. Towneley and his friends, tucked among the marbles, are conversing, confirming that this library functions as a space for discourse and debate – a select community of learned gentleman and antiquarians. The sheer quantity and disorganized display of the marbles is impressive and the eye darts from sculpture to bust to gentleman, creating an intellectual link among the three. On the far wall, a large case packed with uniformly bound books, adds further evidence that Towneley was a well-read, well-versed man. A book is casually splayed open, on the floor in front of the fireplace, and the overall scene is one of active conversation and lively research. This is not to suggest that the painting portrays the library as a place of chaos and disorder, in fact, it is a contrived scene and space, intended to reveal Towneley’s wealth, taste and education. Zoffany had many of the marbles brought from other rooms of the house to showcase as many of Towneley’s treasures as possible.[[61]](#footnote-61) It is a pleasing work of art, but also a document of how gentlemen chose to express and display their wealth. Every object in the library is significant, as Raven explains: ‘The reading chairs, stands, desks, print-racks, ladders, rotating shelve, globes, busts and miscellania…all contributed to the realization of certain social ideals in reading practice and purpose.’[[62]](#footnote-62) For example, Towneley’s sizeable collection of busts of literary and philosophical figures was an expression of his personal ideals. Even in Richardson’s small portrait by Mason Chamberlain (1754), the artist includes a bust of Milton in the background, who Richardson greatly admired (Figure 15). The placement of objects like these within the space of the library was coded, and there were important divisions within the rooms. The shelves, which stretch from floor almost to ceiling, were full of books, sculptures, and collectables, representing the worldly curiosity of man. The ceilings of libraries were often brightly lit – Zoffany captures the sun pouring in from Towneley’s sky-light and the rays metaphorically represented the light of God and intellectual enlightenment. Busts were frequently put on top of these shelves, not only as a system of cataloguing but also to mediate between man and God by evoking the genius of intellectuals.[[63]](#footnote-63) Libraries, therefore, had an architectural structure intended not only for the pursuit of knowledge, but also to display wealth, intellect and taste. Raven asserts that the ‘development of the domestic library also reflected changes in the functions of the books’ and the edition of *Pamela* in Attingham Park’s library, is a testament to the novel’s versatility to function as both pocket-book and collector’s item.

It is certainly a rarity in literary history for an author to have so much control over the physical appearance of his work, and as Alexander Pettit observes, ‘Because Richardson was his own printer, the distinctions on authority between substantives and accidental advanced in classical textual theory do not entirely apply.’[[64]](#footnote-64) This affords a scholar of Richardson’s texts a great deal of freedom and possibility and does not confine the interpretations of his novels to one theory or discipline. I apply Stephanie Fysh’s argument that ‘by extending the boundaries of the “text” of *Pamela*, by re-examining it as a work, as a cultural artefact that includes many material texts and even non-textual artefacts, we can come to a better understanding of the novels ‘way of being in the world – that is, of its meaning,’ and blur the boundaries of what constitutes a text or discipline. [[65]](#footnote-65) I also expand on Keymer and Sabor’s authoritative research on *Pamela* and the *Pamela* controversy by exploring not just the contents, but also the bindings, paratextual material and typeface. The inside and the outside of the book are engaged in an important, if often unheard, dialogue with each other and the reader*.* Indeed, to understand *Pamela* and its ‘little world’, one must examine the physical qualities of the books, explore the qualities of its illustrations and paintings, analyse commentary and criticism from specific readers, and seek to uncover more about eighteenth-century reading practices.[[66]](#footnote-66) When these different veins of research are combined, they provide the most thorough biography of *Pamela*’s conception and reception in eighteenth-century England and propose a model for situating other novels in their visual and verbal cultures.

A variety of issues have been raised in this introduction: when the methodology of treating books as physical objects is implemented, a wealth of insight about readership, reception and reading habits become available. The topics, in turn, raise concerns about the rarity of such sources, issue of authorship, debates about printing practices, tensions about gentlemanly conduct, class-driven visual reactions to *Pamela* and discussions about the social approaches to reading and writing. It is particularly notable that the simple story of a beautiful young servant girl, who attracts the attention of her lusty master but rebuffs his advances and finally wins his hand in marriage has continually engaged readers in debate and criticism. The drama of Pamela’s kidnapping, imprisonment and near rape has encouraged readers and scholars to continue turning the pages of this conduct book. The heroine’s happy ending, achieved by her devotion to virtue, has shaken readers’ notions of class and natural inheritance. There are questions to be answered: Why was *Pamela* published in such a variety of formats, qualities and versions of *Pamela*? How does the physical appearance of the text shape its readership and how does the readership affect the physical appearance of the text? What is the relationship between the proliferation of illustrations and the classes of readership? My explorations, outlined in the chapter summaries below, demonstrate that new approaches to *Pamela* will provide us with a better understanding of the text, its heroine, and its author.

Chapter Summaries

‘Vile Hands, Vile Arts’ explores the complex relationship between Pamela, the heroine, and *Pamela*, the novel. This chapter argues that the variety of different bindings and appearances of *Pamela* are a result of the confusion and contradiction about the characterisation and description of the heroine. Therefore, to better understand how the novel ‘saw’ itself, it is important to analyse how Pamela defined herself and how Richardson treated his heroine. By building on Christopher Flint’s observation that Pamela’s narrative is a ‘complex and enormous verbal effort of self definition’, ‘Vile Hands, Vile Arts’ shows Pamela’s difficulty in squaring her lowly origins with her elevated marital status and argues that this duality is selected in the physical properties of *Pamela* as a book. Throughout the narrative, Pamela fights the upset and vulnerability that her liminal position engenders. Contemporary readers were quick to notice the heroine’s exceptionality and uncertainty. While some readers whole-heartedly embraced Pamela’s rapid ascent from lady’s maid to lady, others found the plot preposterous, distasteful, and subversive. To assuage these readers and further shed light on his heroine’s character, Richardson tried to demonstrate through a series of costume changes and masquerades, what Pamela was *not* to clarify her virtue. Although it was Richardson’s hope to have converted even his most sceptical of anti-Pamelists by the end of the four volumes, his failure to do so only enriched the novel’s reception and treatment. With attention to both the narrative contents and physical qualities of *Pamela*, this chapter serves as the foundation for this thesis’s exploration of how *Pamela* was read, illustrated, received, and treated in eighteenth-century England.

In ‘The Beautiful and the Shammed’, I discuss Richardson’s reaction to the numerous sham and spurious Pamela-inspired publications and the motivations for these writers’ publications. This second chapter builds on Richardson’s tendency to humanise and protect his novel and explores his use of the terms ‘rape’, ‘debasement’, and ‘giving birth’, to better understand how he viewed his work as a physical object. After exploring Richardson’s perspective , ‘The Beautiful and the Shammed’ turns to three over-looked and under-valued *Pamela*-related publications - *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life, The Virgin in Eden*, and *The History of Pamela*. These texts not only respond to *Pamela* but to Richardson himself. Their authors, James Kelly, Charles Povey, and Francis Newbery, helped to unmask Richardson and his motivations for writing *Pamela* and also demonstrate how physical characteristics of the book could be manipulated to court a targeted audience.

Chapter Three, ‘The Battle of the Books,’ explores perceived threats to Richardson’s authority as author and his documented responses to this invasion of property, *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*. Although Richardson wrote these two tracts to express his outrage about the Irish ‘piracy’ of *Sir Charles Grandison*, the roots of his frustration with the Irish printing tactics are found in the publication of *Pamela* in Dublin. This chapter traces Richardson’s various attempts as an author to maintain control over the printing and distribution of his novels and analyses the contents and motivations for *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* in great detail. Scholars have tended to accept Richardson’s impassioned and strong claims in his two tracts without much question, but ‘The Battle of the Books’ questions why many of the author’s false and misguided claims have gone unchallenged. By drawing parallels among these two supposedly ‘non-fiction’ tracts and his early works of fiction and analysing the physical qualities of both English and Irish publications of *Pamela* and *Grandison*, I argue that Richardson’s case claiming Irish reprints were corrupting, illegal, and immoral is weak. Chapter Three takes Richardson’s novels out of the homes and hands of his readers and into the world of printing and production and demonstrates the power of existing physical copies to provide evidence to help overturn well-established and commonly accepted claims about Anglo-Irish printing in the eighteenth century.

‘Reading Faces and Reading Spaces’ analyses paintings of the author and his readers, select correspondence and specific reading spaces to explore how an engaged and dynamic reading community responded to and influenced Richardson’s novels. This chapter focuses specifically on two small communities and their spaces. First, Richardson’s friendship with Susanna Highmore, a prominent member of the North End circle, and the summer-house where this reading circle frequently met to discuss *Sir Charles Grandison* and other works. Secondly, the author’s intriguing long-distance correspondence with his most devoted fan, the aristocrat Lady Bradshaigh and the space of the closet where most of their letters were composed and portraits were hung. These examples help counter widely-accepted attitudes of eighteenth-century reading practices as solitary and isolated and propose a new model of understanding reading habits through painting, architecture, written responses and postures. ‘Reading Faces and Reading Spaces’ enables us to understand how Richardson’s novels were treated and received by contemporary readers and how this reception in turn affected their packaging and appearance.

In ‘Rococo Confections and Bawdy Burlesques’, I focus on the rich and dynamic relationship between the verbal and the visual in eighteenth century culture and in particular, its interaction in Richardson’s *Pamela*. I draw out Richardson’s frequent referencing of art and visual qualities throughout the narrative of *Pamela* and discuss the oft cited ‘Pamela media event’ that constituted the novel’s reception. In fact, visual and verbal representations of *Pamela* become a unifying link between prominent eighteenth century artists and writers such as Hogarth, Gravelot, Hayman, Highmore, Rowlandson, and Fielding. While the relationships between Hogarth and Fielding and Fielding and Richardson have been well-researched, the interaction among the three has been overlooked. Although Hogarth did not produce any successful illustrations for *Pamela*, his influence can be seen on the work of artists who did – Gravelot, Hayman, and Highmore. Hogarth also had a well-known effect on Fielding, whose mocking *Pamela*-inspired novel, *Joseph Andrews*, was a thoughtful and well-developed anti-Pamelist contribution. Rowlandson’s later illustrations for Fielding’s novel successfully captured Fielding’s humour and also, as I am the first to observe, have a dialogue with Highmore’s *Adventures of Pamela*. Chapter Five’s extensive discussion of the artists, writers, and illustrators involved with *Pamela* demonstrates the breadth and depth of the novel’s influence on visual and verbal culture and more broadly, shows the prominence of the novel as a literary artefact in eighteenth century England.

In the conclusion of this thesis, I take *Pamela* into the nineteenth century to see what aspects of the heroine’s character fascinated later audiences. I also discuss the importance of my interdisciplinary approach in creating a comprehensive picture of visual and verbal culture in the eighteenth-century and introduce several texts that still need to be incorporated into our body of Richardson research. My combination of methodologies, particularly the combining of art history, book history, and literary criticism is unusual in a British PhD, but is essential to understanding *Pamela*.

Introduction

The book history of Richardson’s *Pamela* is dramatic and varied, marked by moments of cheaply produced tracts and crowned by gorgeously engraved sets. Exuberant villagers have celebrated their love for the heroine by tolling church bells and elegant members of the bon ton have proudly strolled through Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens displaying the novel. Audiences have crowded into theatres to watch the heroine represented on stage and visited the home of Highmore to see his famous *Adventures of Pamela* in oil paint. This thesis re-examines the dynamic and multifaceted reception of *Pamela,* with a particular focus on how the physical qualities and appearances of specific copies and editions shaped readers’ responses. These issues, in turn, informed the novel’s appearance throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. I build on James Grantham Turner’s definition of *Pamela* as a ‘media event’ and Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor’s extensive research, which itself responds to Turner’s claims. Keymer and Sabor have scrupulously researched and organised the many different participants in the *Pamela* media event, creating an almost complete picture in *The Pamela Controversy* and *Pamela in the Marketplace*, but they have overlooked the physical and visual qualities of the works of literature and art that shaped *Pamela*’s public life. The bindings, format, paratextual material, advertising and printing practices of *Pamela* and sham works that responded to *Pamela* are as valuable as their narrative contents for revealing the texts’ ultimate goals - whether to support, to revise, to capitalize on, or to undermine the eponymous heroine. The only other scholars to emphasise the physical qualities of *Pamela* were William Merrit Sale, Jr. and Keith Maslen - who painstakingly compiled bibliographic details for all the editions printed by Richardson. Neither Sale nor Maslen analyse the role that the different formats and revisions of *Pamela* played in the novel’s reception. In this thesis, I pay special attention to the physical qualities of the different editions and copies of *Pamela* and argue that their many different appearances reveal Richardson’s attempts at negotiating a wider and more diverse readership than originally expected. I also treat the sham works with the same precision and show how these lesser-known writers and printers also manipulated the physical appearance of their texts to respond to different points of *Pamela.* To this treatment of the book as a physical object, I add a detailed narrative analysis of identity and confusion in *Pamela* and an exploration of the variety of representations of *Pamela* in fine art and illustration. Until this thesis, these diverse components – bibliography, narrative analysis, and art history – have been confined to their respective scholars and studied in relative isolation. However, as I will demonstrate, the verbal and visual were strongly linked in eighteenth-century literature and an interdisciplinary model is needed to accurately reflect an interdisciplinary culture. By the conclusion of this thesis, I will have presented a new model for understanding how eighteenth-century novels were treated and received by their readers, and demonstrate how this can be applied to analysing other participants in the *Pamela* media event and the novel’s continued reception in the nineteenth-century.

In this introduction, I will supply evidence, anecdotes, and background information that serve as a foundation for the arguments presented in the following five chapters. To appreciate *Pamela*’s complicated and dynamic reception, we must first understand how readers reacted to *Pamela*, how eighteenth-century novels were printed, published, and advertised, how *Pamela* and sham *Pamela* works were illustrated, how people read and displayed novels, how spaces were created for and around reading, and of course, get to know the man behind the novel and his exceptional position as both printer and author. These topics form the body of this introduction and then lead into summaries of the arguments and issues of the five main chapters that address a variety of interdisciplinary approaches to *Pamela.*

How Readers Reacted to *Pamela*

In Aaron Hill’s letter to Samuel Richardson dated 9th February 1741, he enthuses about *Pamela* (1740) and its surprising origins:

Let me, therefore, observe upon how narrow and weak a foundation (as to a matter of fact) you have erected such a temple of fancy and wonder, that all the powers of wit and love, and of goodness, will forever delight to dwell in it, as a feat that will call in new worshippers.[[67]](#footnote-67)

Hill marvels that such a powerful, moralising text could be based largely on fiction, not ‘matter of fact’ and he believes that this unexpected origin gives *Pamela* a miraculous air. In Hill’s letter, the ‘narrow and weak’ foundations can also be interpreted as a reference to the heroine’s own lowly and fragile origins and an expression of awe at the power of the book. To build upon Hill’s analogy, *Pamela* is a temple founded on weak and narrow boards, and laid paper and calf, to house Pamela, the goddess who achieved ladyhood from humble origins. This statement encapsulates themes of contradiction and transformation that are important elements in all five chapters of this thesis: first, that something divine and worth worshipping could come from a fictional source; second, that a low-bred woman could become a highly revered and emulated heroine; and third that a modestly printed duodecimo could become an exalted object. In many ways, Hill’s employment of the temple metaphor imbues the physical book with both architectural and spiritual properties. This then draws our attention to the fact that *Pamela* can be interpreted as a text that the reader inhabits both imaginatively and physically. The heroine *within* this temple must also be deserving of worship and Hill finds Pamela’s transition from lady’s maid to lady faultless and seamless. This transformation inspired his daughters to become apostles and preach *Pamela*.[[68]](#footnote-68) Hill explains his daughters’ passionate connection to the text in a later letter to Richardson: ‘My daughters are in Surrey, preaching *Pamela* and *Pamela*’s inimitable author, with true apostolic attachment’.[[69]](#footnote-69) Readers’ evangelical fervour for *Pamela* echoed Richardson’s characters’ admiration of Pamela in the text. For example, Mr Martin pours out praise when he sees Pamela at church:

‘You are,’ continued he, ‘and ‘tis not my way to praise too much, an ornament to your sex, an honour to your husband, and a credit to your religion. Every body is saying so,’ added he; ‘for you have, by your piety, edified the whole church.’[[70]](#footnote-70)

When an apostle of Richardson’s text felt compelled to worship, she could make a pilgrimage to her library or closet and open the book. For readers like Hill and his daughters, *Pamela* is more than a novel - it is a vehicle and site of worship. *Pamela* was treated as a portable, pocket-sized temple that could be visited and inhabited both psychologically and physically.

Hill’s belief that such a simple, modest object can be transcendent stems from the disconnection between the physical object and its message, and this tension between high and low qualities of both the heroine and the text will explored thoroughly in Chapter One. While passionate Pamelists such as Hill found the novel miraculous, other readers were more sceptical about the inconsistency between the novel’s humble, conduct book origins and its elevated reception – to these readers, the anti-Pamelists, the novel *Pamela* smacked of hypocrisy. In their opinions, *Pamela* the novel could not move beyond its simple, functional duodecimo binding and its heroine could not be anything other than a lowly servant girl. Perhaps the most famous anti-Pamelist response was Henry Fielding’s bawdy and raucous *Shamela*, in which he ‘signals his refusal to believe Pamela’s report of herself by inserting “I pretended” in his shamming heroine’s protestations of innocence.’[[71]](#footnote-71) Fielding mocks Richardson’s lengthy and laudatory preface and distorts a naïve, virtuous young girl into a calculating, teasing wench, all in the spirit of exposing and refuting ‘the many notorious falshoods [sic] and misrepresentations of a Book called Pamela.’[[72]](#footnote-72) The reluctance to acknowledge the duodecimo novel’s moralizing message, and a ridicule of a servant girl’s climb from the lower to upper-classes was expressed by several other writers, including Eliza Haywood’s *Anti-Pamela; or Feign’d Innocence Detected* (1741) and James Parry’s *The True Anti-Pamela: or, Memoirs of Mr James Parry* (1742). This thesis also includes the rarely discussed *Virgin in Eden* by Charles Povey (1742) as a valuable, if overlooked, example of how some writers interpreted *Pamela’s* virtues as vices.

In the midst of this polarized Pamela/Anti Pamela debate, many other writers were simply content to borrow the heroine’s name and theme, exploit the novel’s popularity, and write a sham or revised version. Within the first two years of *Pamela*’s release, there were at least sixteen *Pamela*-related publications: *Shamela*, *Pamela Censured, Pamela’s Conduct in High Life, Anti-Pamela, The Life of Pamela, Pamela-A Comedy, Pamela; or Virtue Triumphant, The Virgin in Eden, The Memoirs of the Life of Lady H-, Joseph Andrews, Pamela in her Exalted Condition, Pamela; or the Fair Impostor, The Pleasures of Conjugal Love Explain’d, Pamela Versified, Pamela-the Second* and *Mock Pamela.* Along with the obscure *Virgin in Eden¸* this thesis discusses the marginalised sham work by John Kelly – *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* (1741), and the small but significant children’s abridgment by Francis Newbery, *The History of Pamela* (1779). Although much has been made of Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor’s ‘Pamela Controversy’[[73]](#footnote-73) and ‘Pamela media event’[[74]](#footnote-74), I am the first scholar to examine and analyse the physical and visual qualities of the copies and editions, such as binding, typeface, pagination, preliminary material, layout and illustrations in relationship to *Pamela*’s reception. I argue that this is an essential component in capturing how the novel was read and treated in eighteenth-century England. Throughout this thesis, I use physical copies of *Pamela*, *Pamela*-related publications and visual representations to support my assertion that *Pamela*’s multi-faceted reception cannot be fully understood without a thorough understanding of these artefacts and documents. To this end, the introduction discusses specific copies and editions of Richardson’s work to highlight arguments that will be expanded on in the five chapters of this thesis. The introduction begins with a rare, first edition of *Pamela* as an informative benchmark for all later editions of the book and shows the work’s value in contemporary markets. The five chapters and conclusion explore the treatment and visual representations from this first edition to much later eighteenth-century abridgments and nineteenth-century anthologies, proposing a new model to analyse reader reception and prioritize the book as a physical object.

How *Pamela* was Printed, Published, and Advertised

A first edition, married four volume set of Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela* went up for auction on June 8th, 2011 at Christie’s, King Street, London (Figures 1, 2, and 3). [[75]](#footnote-75) The £12,000-15,000 estimate was calculated by taking into account the rarity of the first edition, its condition and its provenance. According to the English Short Title Catalogue, there are only twenty-two first edition *Pamela*s listed in institutional libraries, and not all of these are complete sets. This limited number of first editions confirms that the *Pamela* at Christie’s was exceptionally rare. As an intern, I drafted a catalogue entry for *Pamela*; these entries have a strict formula, requiring effective and efficient language. I had but two paragraphs to explain the impressive physical condition of the set and to extol the novel’s importance in literary history:

[RICHARDSON, Samuel (1689-1761)]. *Pamela: or, Virtue Rewarded.* London: C. Rivington and J. Osborn [vols. III-IV for S. Richardson and sold by C. Rivington and J. Osborn], 1741-1742. 4 volumes. 12mo (166 x 97mm). (Some minor age spotting.) Contemporary calf, double gilt fillet borders, skilfully rebacked preserving contemporary red paper labels with title in black ink (covers a little rubbed, further neat restoration to corners). Provenance: Thomas Percival Esquire (1719-1763, bookplate in all volumes; ownership signature of his daughter Kitty Percival on title-page of vol. I).

FIRST EDITION OF BOTH VOLUMES I-II AND III-IV IN UNIFORM BINDING with the bookplate of Thomas Percival, antiquary. Percival was himself the author of two controversial pamphlets opposing high-church clergy. His only daughter and heir, Katherine ‘Kitty’ Percival, married Sir Joseph Radcliffe of Milnesbridge, who preserved his father-in-law’s manuscript and papers. Although originally conceived of as a letter-writing manual for servant girls, Richardson’s anonymous two-volume novel became an instant bestseller, appealing to all classes of readership and engaging them in an energetic dialogue. Within the first year of the novel’s release over sixteen sham and spin-off Pamela publications flooded the marketplace, exploiting the author’s anonymity and claiming Pamela as their own creation. Inspired by the novel’s surprising success with the upper-class, Richardson penned volumes III and IV to confirm the heroine’s acceptance into the aristocracy and re-assert his right of control over the narrative. The sprinkling of footnotes and authorial asides in the last two volumes demonstrate his determination to guide reader’s interpretations. By close of the century, fourteen editions of Pamela had been released, containing some eight thousand textual corrections. This first edition reflects his original intentions as both printer and author, serving as a comparative baseline for the plethora of editions that followed, and the catalyst of a literary and cultural phenomenon that altered the course of English fiction. FINE SET. Rothschild 1745.

For *Pamela*, it was imperative to stress the novel’s evolution from conduct book to bestseller, the wider-than-expected audience, the spin-off publications, the importance of the first edition, and Richardson’s constant engagement with the text as printer and writer. These ‘selling points’ not only highlight why a first edition *Pamela* is a prized collectable, but also identify the physical qualities and printing situations that make Richardson’s first novel an exceptional subject for this thesis that focuses on this book as a physical object and its influence on reception. With this combination of both marketable and academic attributes, the Christie’s *Pamela* rested at the intersection of the art market and the academic world, its fate to be determined by the fall of an auctioneer’s hammer. To a Richardson scholar and book historian, there is no conceivable price estimate for a first edition with provenance because it provides valuable insight into *Pamela*’s reception and her readers. In the world of book collecting, however, a modest calf binding pales in comparison to the crisp crackle of vellum, the exoticism of deerskin, the glimmer of gilt tooling, and the imposing stature of double elephant folios. The Christie’s *Pamela* failed to meet the reserve price at auction and was returned to its owner. It is not known if it will be auctioned again, demonstrating the unpredictably and difficultly researchers face when attempting to piece together a complete picture of *Pamela*’s readership, reception, and treatment in the eighteenth-century.

Thus, as this anecdote suggests, a good, clean, finely-bound copy of *Pamela* is exceptionally rare; the novel was initially published in 1740 as a cheap, ephemeral object by Samuel Richardson. Richardson, a successful printer, had been approached by the booksellers Charles Rivington and James Osborn to write an affordable, instructive and moralising work. By this time, Richardson had already written a stern guidebook for aspiring printers, *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* (1734), as well as several other short tracts, indices and prefaces, and printed a plethora of material from newspapers to handbills to folios for the House of Commons.[[76]](#footnote-76) Richardson had to set aside work on a collection of sample letters, *Familiar Letters on Important Occasions* (1741) – which was an important source for *Pamela -* to begin this project for Rivington and Osborn and *Familiar Letters* was not completed until after *Pamela*’s publication. For *Pamela,* Richardson expanded on the epistolary style that he had used in *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* and *Familiar Letters* and blurred the line between fact and fiction, conduct book and novel. Like most conduct books, *Familiar Letters* and *Pamela* were published in portable, affordable duodecimo format. A brief synopsis of the narrative demonstrates the drama and appeal that Richardson created from this mixture of conduct book and novel: Pamela, a young and beautiful servant girl, is placed in a vulnerable position when her mistress dies and leaves the estate to her son, Mr B. Lusty and spoilt, he immediately begins to pursue and harass Pamela. Pamela informs her parents of the flirtations in her letters and they sternly advise her to guard her virginity. Pamela dutifully heeds their warning and rebuffs Mr B’s increasingly aggressive advances. But after several threatening encounters, Pamela is no longer able to endure the assault on her her chastity and requests to leave Mr B’s employment. Surprisingly, Mr B grants her wish and Pamela packs a small bundle of possessions in preparation to head home. In a shocking plot twist, Mr B has played a cruel trick on Pamela – instead of escorting her home in a carriage, he has arranged an elaborate kidnapping and takes Pamela to one of his estates. There Pamela is placed under the watch of the bawdy and vile Mrs Jewkes. Pamela tries to escape, contemplates suicide, fights off an attempted rape, and rejects a sham marriage before finally convincing Mr B to treat her as an equal with a legitimate wedding. Mr B marries Pamela, reunites his wife with her family, and together they convince his aristocratic friends of Pamela’s right to the title of Lady B. In the sequel, *Pamela II*, written in 1742, Richardson focuses on Mr B and Pamela’s long, loving relationship, only once briefly tarnished by Mr B’s fleeting affair at a masquerade. Pamela teaches her brood of children the importance of virtue and uses personal anecdotes as proof of its rewards. At the conclusion of *Pamela II*, the reader is assured that Pamela’s legacy will survive through the virtuous actions of her children. Thus, what had been conceived by Rivington and Osborn as a straight-forward volume of model letters was transformed into an emotionally compelling and intricate novel.[[77]](#footnote-77)

*Pamela* was Richardson’s first foray into fiction (although he would insist on keeping up the façade that he was only the editor of factual letters). The first edition was plainly printed in an affordable duodecimo format so that servant girls could easily read the work in their quarters. However, *Pamela* soon found itself in the hands of many unintended readers, from young labourers to gentlemen, like the Christie’s copy, and quickly became a bestseller. To court this larger audience, Richardson had to make revisions to the narrative, polish his characters’ diction, and improve the physical appearance of the novel. While the format of the *Pamela* was a duodecimo for all but one edition, the text of *Pamela* was extensively revised and corrected. Richardson made more than eight thousand changes - from spelling, grammar, and word choice to correcting titles and forms of address - and printed fourteen editions over a period of twenty years. Peter Sabor provides a brief chronology of *Pamela*s in his introduction:

It was first published anonymously in two volumes in November 1740; a revised edition with lengthy introduction was published in February 1741, and three further revised editions were published in that year. In December 1741 a two-volume sequel was published, written in response to numerous criticisms, parodies and spurious continuations of the original work. In 1742, a deluxe, illustrated octavo edition of all four volumes was published…Two further revised editions of the first part of *Pamela* were published in 1746 and 1754, and shortly after Richardson’s death in 1761, another four-volume edition was published…During the 1750s, however, Richardson had undertaken an extensive revision of *Pamela*, making numerous stylistic alterations…These changes were made in an interleaved copy of the octavo edition. Richardson did not print the resulting text during his lifetime, but it was preserved by his daughters after his death, and finally used as the copy text for an edition of *Pamela* published in 1801.[[78]](#footnote-78)

Each edition, from the two-volume second edition full of prolix preliminary material to the posthumous edition organized by his daughters, reveals Richardson’s responses to criticism and commentary from readers and friends. These editions also are examples of what printing and publishing techniques Richardson found useful. The lessons Richardson learned from *Pamela* influenced the marketing and appearance of his other two novels, *Clarissa* (1748) and *Sir Charles Grandison* (1753)*.* A general overview of how books were printed and sold during *Pamela*’s period will show us not only how important and influential these changes were in the history and reception of Richardson’s *Pamela* but also the strong correlation between the physical appearance of the book and its reception and treatment in eighteenth-century culture.

Book Production in Eighteenth-century England

Most books were sent from the printer to the bookseller, unbound and in sheets. The bookseller then selected a number of copies to be sold bound and the remaining books were kept in sheets or in blue paper so that the buyer could bind his purchase according to his personal preferences.[[79]](#footnote-79) Blue paper wrappers were fragile and usually discarded, so it is rare to find an example of a book in this state; however, a British Library copy of Jonathan Swift’s pert *Directions to Servants*, a humorous and coy foil to *Pamela*, has much of its original wrapper intact. This slim, duodecimo copy has been wrapped in recycled blue paper with old advertisements on the inside cover, and provides us with an idea of how some copies of *Pamela* would have first appeared to her readers. Once the blue paper was removed and the book was presented for binding, the possibilities were limited only by price: some copies of *Pamela* were simply bound in plain calf and sold for an affordable 6s., some, like Francis Newbery’s *The History of Pamela* discussed in Chapter Two were bound in cheap, coloured Dutch floral print paper, and others such as the Christie’s *Pamela* and Attingham Park *Pamela* were attractively bound by their owners for display. The outside of the book spoke to the status and quality of its contents and its owners; printers and authors were eager to exploit this language of size and binding as Barbara Benedict explains: ‘certain classes of books became associated with certain kinds of collections. Novels, for example, [more traditionally duodecimos] quickly adopt the form of the three-volume octavo, yet their cultural status remained relatively low for most of the period.’[[80]](#footnote-80) All three of Richardson’s novels, *Pamela, Clarissa,* and *Grandison* appeared in both duodecimo and octavo formats, with duodecimo being more common and popular. The decision to fold and cut the printed sheets into twelve or eight sections was not accidental and Richardson’s printing strategy for *Grandison* reveals the extent of his experience. Richardson wrote to Lady Bradshaigh to explain his choice of size for his final novel: ‘I think that when I publish, to give two vols. only in 8vo. and 12ver. at once, that people may buy which they will, whereas it has been too much the custom to cram down purchasers’ throats an 8vo. edition first, and after sometime to depreciate that by a cheaper.’[[81]](#footnote-81) This is a different printing approach than for *Pamela*, where five editions duodecimo were printed before an octavo sixth edition (1742). The octavo sixth edition *Pamela* did not sell well, so Richardson returned to duodecimos until his final, fourteenth edition which was an interleaved octavo. This final *Pamela* was interleaved because the revisions, mainly to further simplify Pamela’s character, were too extensive to be written in the margins.[[82]](#footnote-82) This octavo ‘manuscript’ was in the possession of Richardson’s daughters and the revisions contained in this text were not printed until 1801 and reprinted in 1810. Richardson’s change in printing techniques shows a growing commercial awareness and deepening understanding of the body language of the book.

Because books in an eighteenth-century bookshop could not be judged by their covers, booksellers had to find different ways to catch a potential reader’s eye – for example, the title page. This explains why many title pages were elaborate and verbose.[[83]](#footnote-83) The changes made to *Pamela*’s title pages throughout the fourteen editions reflect Richardson’s increasing awareness of a genteel audience and his desire to court their custom. For example, the title-page of the second edition, 1741, emphasizes instruction and virtue and informs the reader how they should respond:

Pamela; or Virtue Rewarded. In a Series of Familiar Letters Written from a Beautiful Young Damsel to her Parents. Now first Published in order to cultivate the *Principles of Virtue and Religion*[[84]](#footnote-84) in the Minds of the Youth of Both Sexes. A Narrative which has its Foundation in Truth and Nature; and at the same time that it agreeably entertains, by a Variety of curious and affecting Incidents, is intitely[sic.] divested of all those Images, which in too many Pieces calculated for Amusement only, tend to inflame the Minds they should *instruct*. The second edition. To which are prefixed, extracts from several curious letters written to the editor on the subject.[[85]](#footnote-85)

The title-page of the fourteenth edition, printed in 1801 by Richardson’s only surviving daughter, Anne, is much shorter, but stresses the heroine’s virtue, entertainment and aristocratic life:

Pamela; or Virtue Rewarded. In a Series of Letters from a Beautiful Young Damsel to her Parents: and afterwards in Her *Exalted*[[86]](#footnote-86)Condition between Her, and *Persons of Figure and Quality*, upon the Important and *Entertaining* Subjects, in Genteel Life. In Four Volumes. Published in order to cultivate the principles of virtue and religion in the minds of the youth of both sexes.[[87]](#footnote-87)

Small alterations in diction, such as the omission of ‘Familiar’ from ‘Series of Letters’ and ‘written’, present *Pamela* less like a didactic conduct book and more like a virtuous, genteel novel. Richardson did more than alter and gentrify language; he also played with the appearance and length of sentences and paragraphs to make each page of his novels as appealing as possible. The thought-process of the printer/author can be seen in the abundance of hyphens and dashes employed in *Pamela*, which Albert Riveiro explains helps the visual appearance of the text: ‘A close examination of the copy text reveals that the length of interruptive hyphens or dashes, while sometime appearing to be expressive, often seems dictated by nothing more than the number or length of words that can be accommodated within Richardson’s original line.’[[88]](#footnote-88) Richardson also experimented with footnotes and double columns in *Pamela*, which will be discussed in Chapters Two and Three, and in *Clarissa* he was even more adventurous - placing text on diagonals, inserting an engraved musical score, and playing with font and text size. In his final work, *Grandison*, a novel that Janine Barchas calls ‘a fiction sandwiched between reference texts’, Richardson returns to lengthy paratextual and preliminary material showcased in *Pamela.* Richardson buttressed *Grandison* with preliminary and concluding material largely as a response to the Irish ‘piracies’, which are the focus of Chapter Three. Richardson was intent on keeping the numerous editions of the eight-volume *Grandison* uniform and just as in *Pamela*, he controlled the spacing and arrangement of the text on the page:

Richardson sometimes used paragraphs for the purpose of making unbroken or long passages more appealing to the eye, but there is sufficient evidence in the third edition to show that an increase in the number of paragraphs was often the result of deleted passages. The third edition is to a large extent a page for page reprint of the first, and in order to keep the texts of the two editions together, Richardson (or the compositors) took passages of the first edition text and broke them into more paragraphs in order to fill the space that had resulted from deleted material [from revisions].[[89]](#footnote-89)

In this passage, Pierson suggests that if Richardson did not personally alter the paragraphs then he would have instructed his compositors to do so, demonstrating his commitment to controlling the text. It is important to stress the collaborative aspect of printing and publishing during this period. Contemporary scholarship has worked to untangle a complex chain of interactions. The theories of Robert Darnton and James Raven influence Chapter Three’s discussion of printing and publishing culture of *Pamela* and *Grandison* and provide us with a better understanding of the business culture in which novels were produced.

Darnton has identified and described the different components of book production; forming them into a readable model he calls the ‘communications circuit’. Darnton identifies eight essential institutions required to produce a book during this period – the author, publisher, printers, suppliers, shippers, booksellers, binders and readers – and he also includes the intellectual, social, economic, and political factors that inform and guide the participants in the production of books. Darnton simultaneously considers both the parts and the whole of the circuit, arguing that each element is essential to understanding a text’s history. The communications circle, therefore, is representative of a book’s life cycle and the reader-author relationship that is necessary for a text to thrive. For my thesis, the reader-author relationship is of particular importance. Darnton’s model implies that the reader-author relationship is symbiotic; the author is a node in a larger artistic web and he can never create a work entirely independent from the anticipation of the audience’s reaction.[[90]](#footnote-90) Darnton further explains how even the abstract concept of a reader plays an essential role in the communications circuit: ‘A writer may respond in his writing to criticism of his previous works, or anticipate reactions that this text will elicit. He addresses implicit readers and hears from explicit reviewers. So the circuit runs full cycle.’[[91]](#footnote-91) James Raven elaborates on Darnton’s multi-faceted model for book production and provides us with an even better understanding of all the factors that were involved in *Pamela*’s production:

The ‘book trade’ is a comprehensive and familiar term, but we might more usefully write of the *book trades*, of distinctive crafts and employments which support each other, and are also linked to other occupations. As an industry, the book trade is composed of a series of commercial transactions over different products involving different merchants, manufacturers, processors, furnishers, wholesale and retail distributors, circulation agents, and contractual and open market consumers.[[92]](#footnote-92)

Raven’s extensive list alerts us to how complex and interconnected the book trade was, and most importantly how deeply intertwined it was in eighteenth-century culture and daily life. These two theories dispel the myth of the author as sole creator of the text – a belief Richardson did not fully understand in his obsession with controlling the text and fighting mis-readings. Yet in researching Richardson and his novels, it is rare to find one study that acknowledge authorship, printers, workplace culture, physical objects, visual imagery and reader reception – this thesis seeks to correct this oversight in Chapter Three’s discussion of Richardson and Faulkner’s print battle about *Grandison.*

Illustrations of *Pamela*

The collaborative aspect of book production is further demonstrated in Richardson’s plan for illustrating *Pamela.* Richardson approached artist-engravers Hubert Gravelot and Francis Hayman and selected twenty-six scenes for them to illustrate for his ambitious, deluxe edition of *Pamela* (1742). The artists and *Pamela* illustrations will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five, but it is important to note here Richardson’s commitment to controlling the novel’s reception and to compare this elegant edition with cheaper, sham publications, such as *The Life of Pamela* (1741). Although Richardson had included twenty-five illustrations in his edition of *Aesop’s Fables*, he had not considered illustrating *Pamela* until sham and spurious publications began threatening the novel’s reputation.[[93]](#footnote-93) As T.C. Duncan Eaves explains, ‘Richardson proposed to enhance the dignity and importance of Part I… by the introduction of engraved plates. No previous English novel had displayed such elegance as he planned for *Pamela*.’[[94]](#footnote-94) Gravelot and Hayman were two of the most refined illustrators of the day and their twenty-six designs imbue Pamela with a fashionable rococo grace. Interestingly, Richardson did not always choose the most dramatic scenes to have illustrated – such as Mr B’s attempted rape and Mrs Jewkes and Mr B in Pamela’s bedroom and instead preferred quieter moments composed like conversation pieces – a term he uses quite frequently in *Pamela*’s narrative. These more climatic moments were frequently illustrated in the sham-Pamela suggesting that these scenes appealed to the general readership. Along with the illustrations, Richardson inserted a prolix table of contents that explained each letter and entry, and included elegantly cut headpieces to introduce the letters.[[95]](#footnote-95) Richardson proudly puffed his new and improved *Pamela* in *The* *Champion* on 8 May 1742: ‘With His Majesty’s Royal License, Beautifully printed on a writing paper, and large letter in four volume octavo, and embellished with twenty-nine copper plates design’d and engrav’d by Mr Hayman and Mr Gravelot (with a complete table of contents, being an epitome of the work).’[[96]](#footnote-96) In this short but emphatic advertisement, Richardson highlighted all of the features that separate his *Pamela* from the sham and spurious imitations: the special paper, skilled print, larger font and illustrations. Richardson’s deluxe octavo edition cost 1£ 4s., pricing poorer *Pamela* fans out of the market. His target audiences were older, more affluent first time readers and *Pamela* fans who might need some of their readings and impressions corrected with images.[[97]](#footnote-97) Ultimately, although this edition of *Pamela* was an aesthetic success, it was a financial flop, as Eaves explains: ‘The fact is that the copies did not sell, and as late as 1772 enough sheets of this edition remained for its reissuance minus the plates with a different title-page. Richardson had undoubtedly lost money on the venture and never again did he publish any of his novels “embellish’d with copper plates.”’[[98]](#footnote-98) I argue in detail in Chapter Five that Gravelot and Hayman’s illustrations did not create a satisfying image of the heroine, but as I note in the conclusion, this deluxe, sixth edition was the predecessor of the elegant, nineteenth century anthologies.

Richardson’s beautiful *Pamela* stands in direct contrast to spurious illustrated works such as *The Life of Pamela*, and shows us the significance of the visual component of *Pamela.* *The Life of Pamela,* a serial published in 1741, provided the reader with five hundred pages of text, nine narrative illustrations and one frontispiece for the affordable price of 4s.[[99]](#footnote-99) John Carwitham, a little known but fairly talented illustrator, provided the plates for this novel. Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor point out that the selection of an obscure artist was reflective of the book’s intended audience: ‘The expense of a more prestigious artist would have been too great for the downmarket *Life* but Carwitham’s illustrations are surprisingly effective. Although most of them depict scenes from Richardson’s *Pamela*, two represent incidents created by the author of the *Life.*’[[100]](#footnote-100) The author of the spurious text, now known to be Mary Kingman, also manipulated *Pamela* and took advantage of Richardson’s silence on the subject of authorship: ‘Whoever put together the other Account that has been published of Pamela was entirely misinformed of the Cause of Mr Andrews’ misfortunes.’[[101]](#footnote-101) To strengthen her argument, this author provides a more thorough explanation of Pamela’s entry into service, including details about how her parents lost money when the South Sea Bubble burst and supplying the last name ‘Belmour’ to Richardson’s abbreviated Mr B. *The Life of Pamela* exploits *Pamela* as the framework for its narrative and then continues the story beyond the early, happy days of Pamela’s marriage. The author clearly believed that authenticity could be achieved through detail and realism and *The Life of Pamela* is even more bloated with excessive description than *Pamela*. In the midst of this mediocre and murky prose, there are glimmers of insight and class sensitivity and less of Richardson’s ambiguity. The ‘sham’ Pamela is more pragmatic and socially aware – the world she lives in is harsh and limited, expressed accurately in Mrs Belmour’s condescending comment: ‘Poor child, thou canst expect no Fortune, but a good Education will do you no Hurt.’[[102]](#footnote-102) There are also touching details of the frustrations of servant life, such as when Pamela huddles on the balcony with other servants, wistfully watching Lord Davers and Miss Belmour at a ball. While *The Life of Pamela*’s Pamela is more open in her admiration for the upper-classes than Richardson’s, lustily observing a world beyond her reach, she is simultaneously more insistent on the limits of her station. She continually refers to herself as inferior, even to the vile Mrs Jewkes, and is honest with herself about the impossibility of wedding a wealthy, well-bred man. Kingman articulates this awareness by describing Pamela’s thought process (with a bit of hyperbole to compensate for her weak writing): ‘His birth and fortune, she knew would not let him to stoop to such a slave as Pamela, and therefore all she had to desire was to be permitted to return to her native meanness unviolated.’[[103]](#footnote-103)

*The Life of Pamela* is poorly written and cannot compete with the original in terms of narrative quality, but its twelve illustrations would have made it a desirable purchase, particularly for children and lower-class readers. The engraver, John Carwitham (fl. 1723-1741), is not well known, but does receive mention in Hans Hammelmann and T.S.R. Boase’s authoritative survey of British illustrators. They report that Carwitham was ‘employed by booksellers to engrave the works of other artists, including Bernard Picart, whose style of first etching the plate and finishing it with a burin he copied.’[[104]](#footnote-104) This means that Carwitham cannot necessarily be credited with the original design of the illustration but can be held responsible for the design’s translation onto copper-plate and therefore onto the page. However, there is no other artist credited in the text or under each illustration, as was popular with engravings, leaving us with the possibility that he did do the illustrations himself. The twelve illustrations capture a Pamela in transition from an awkward, poorly-clad servant girl to a fine lady, expressing a good knowledge of servant attire, posture, and emotion (Figures 4 and 5). The illustrations also indulge a fascination with the trappings of luxury and there is a heavy emphasis on carriages, a status symbol. With short strokes of a burin, Carwitham ensures that the illustrations appeal to the humbler origins of the narrative, an approach that Richardson dramatically departed from in his fashion-plate, rococo images. The differences in these illustrations confirm that both the narrative of *Pamela* and the images of the eponymous heroine were treated as a sort of Pygmalion, with each class forming their own ideal woman.

Reading *Pamela*

These copies, editions, shams, and illustrated versions of *Pamela* point to a diverse readership, which in turn raises issues about the nature of reading in the eighteenth-century. In the Richardson household, reading was a communal and vocal activity:

In the evening reading sessions, sociable reading aloud was combined with work. The evenings were spent around the table in Mrs Richardson’s parlour, where the practice was for one of the young ladies to read, while the rest sat with mute attention around the large table, and employed themselves in some kind of needle-work.’[[105]](#footnote-105)

Tadmor focuses on the sociability of reading during this period and this more interactive approach to reading would have influenced how authors constructed their works and pictured their audience. It is important to explore Richardson’s treatment of reading and writing as a social activity. Tadmor identifies three factors that contribute to the social nature of reading: ‘Firstly, purchasing, lending, and borrowing of books were closely connected with other social networks…Secondly, reading was often done in company. Thirdly, much reading was done aloud and intermittently.’[[106]](#footnote-106) Tadmor’s points explain why Richardson treated reading as a social transaction and circulated drafts of his novels to select groups of friends, soliciting their opinions and advice. Richardson’s drafts were social currency and he invited an elite circle to form his selectively public forum.

Because Richardson was an avid letter writer, scholars have been left with a fair amount of correspondence to piece together his reading and writing community. Although some letters were edited and altered by one of Richardson’s first biographers, Anna Laetitia Barbauld, the spirit of the correspondence has been preserved.[[107]](#footnote-107) The vast majority of Richardson’s surviving correspondence discusses his novels, and this topic was likely to have been the central focus of his exchanges with friends and critics.[[108]](#footnote-108) Susan Greenstein argues that Richardson’s correspondence with select readers is revolutionary and indicative of a much greater social movement: ‘They were charter members of a great community of readers, a community whose most celebrated citizens are surely those who begged Dickens to spare Little Nell.’[[109]](#footnote-109) As we have seen, Richardson’s correspondence with his friend Hill demonstrates the intensity of a community of readers’ involvement with text. Richardson invited Hill’s daughters to annotate, criticize and make recommendations for future editions of *Pamela* and the family believed themselves to be in ‘every where and every way, both his and his dear family’s most faithful servant.’[[110]](#footnote-110) Richardson’s community of readers did more than celebrate and preach the virtues of his heroes and heroines, they also wept and suffered. After beginning *Clarissa* in 1753, Lord Orrery wrote to Richardson: ‘Yet, I own, we thank you for sleepless nights and sore eyes, and perhaps, there are aching hearts and salt tears still in reserve for us.’[[111]](#footnote-111) The reader was required to suspend belief and accept the characters’ ‘provisional reality’ to become a full-fledged member of Richardson’s community.[[112]](#footnote-112) These emotional attachments to the text and the role they played in the reception of *Pamela* will be explored in greater detail in Chapters One and Four.

Domestic Libraries and *Pamela*

Because this thesis also pays considerable attention to the spaces in which Richardson’s novels were read by these devoted, impassioned friends and fans, Chapter Four focuses on the summer-house and the closet as two of the most important rooms for the characters’ literary activities. In fact, the library as a space for reading is mentioned infrequently in *Pamela*. However, the library, as a room, influenced the appearance and treatment of books. For example, a twelfth edition of *Pamela* (1785) housed at Attingham Park shows how the novel was successfully packaged as a decorative object, confirming the owner’s wealth and taste, and blending in with the opulent surroundings of the library (figure 6). This thesis is the first to include *Pamela*s in National Trust libraries, helping to create a more comprehensive picture of *Pamela’*s history. The four volumes of the Attingham Park *Pamela* are bound in good quality brown calf, with plain boards, but they have elegantly decorated and banded spines. The spines are adorned with coloured leather bands and a gilt floral motif. The volumes are duodecimo and only very lightly worn. Attingham Park was designed by George Steuart for the politician Noel Hill, in 1785 and was built on the site of his earlier house. While it is not known whether these volumes were part of the original Attingham Park library collection, the high quality binding indicates that they belonged to a prosperous person, such as Hill. The contrast of the plain boards with the ornate spine and crisp pages suggest that this *Pamela* was used more for display than for devoted reading. This hypothesis is further strengthened by the fact that the volumes of *Pamela* are accompanied by uniformly bound duodecimo copies of *Clarissa* and *Grandison* from the same year. Every detail, from the plain calf boards to the gilded spines, is identical and this creates a pleasingly uniform display on the bookshelf. In fact, many of the books on neighbouring shelves, whether octavo or duodecimo, are bound in similar harmonies of gold, crimson, and green. As other library catalogues demonstrate, fine binding was standard practice; for example, a bright red morocco, elegantly gilt edition of *Terence* at Ragley Hall was described as ‘English country-house library binding.’[[113]](#footnote-113) This uniform binding can even be glimpsed in Zoffany’s painting of Charles Towneley’s library, discussed shortly, and the books are mere washes of golden hues on a large book press. In this sense, books were treated purely as physical objects and were positioned so their gilding, not their actual size, impressed the library visitor. Furthermore, books in libraries were often catalogued and organized by their size and status, not by content.[[114]](#footnote-114) Benedict confirms this objectification of the book in stately homes: ‘The eye-catching beauty of books ranged in order and so positioned as not to be read, is only one aspect of the way book collections can transform books into objects.’[[115]](#footnote-115) The elevation of *Pamela*, commonly considered a ‘low’ novel, into an ornate decorative object for a stately library, implies that books were often treated as library furniture – simultaneously decorative, functional, and entertaining. The true value of such elegantly bound books, like the Attingham Park *Pamela* was not as an individual piece of literature, but as a larger community of books.

The eighteenth-century library was not only home to a community of books but also a gathering place for a group of readers. It was originally structured as a ‘refuge from the social melee, and to be used privately – as a room to discuss matters with servants, or for personal contemplation. [[116]](#footnote-116) Mr B spent much of his time after his marriage in his library, and Pamela would visit for intellectual and instructive discussions.[[117]](#footnote-117)In the seventeenth century, the library had been a solitary, scholarly space and over the next two hundred years, it developed into an additional drawing room.[[118]](#footnote-118) By the mid-eighteenth century, the library had become the domestic nexus of socializing and entertaining in affluent homes.[[119]](#footnote-119) Raven chronicles the rapid popularization of the room, noting its social nature by the mid-eighteenth century:

At the end of the seventeenth century, modest libraries had been incorporated into some English country houses, but the event was ‘still enough to call for notice.’ By the mid-eighteenth century the library had become a focal living and entertaining room for much of the English nobility and wealthier gentry.[[120]](#footnote-120)

The library was more than a designated room for reading; it was a multi-functional space – a room to stroll through, a place to browse for books and a centre for discussion.[[121]](#footnote-121) The transformation of the library into a domestic space inspired a new field of furniture specifically designed for this room: ‘library chairs, library steps, library desks, library footstools, library mirrors, library globes, and library hearth ornaments.’[[122]](#footnote-122) Unlike the stiff, plain summer-house chairs depicted in Susanna Highmore’s illustration in Chapter Four, library furniture was crafted to be comfortable and to encourage socializing and reading.[[123]](#footnote-123) The finest quality library furniture was also ‘clever’ and full of gimmicks, mimicking its intellectual environment, like a reading chair that turned into steps.[[124]](#footnote-124) Library furniture facilitated reading and also showcased books and other collectables. In fact, collectors of books also collected other objects, like busts or antique marbles – items that were considered ‘vessels of knowledge’ and statements of taste.[[125]](#footnote-125) Eighteenth and early nineteenth-century paintings of domestic libraries capture the room’s multiple functions and also show how works of art can provide a window into the treatment and display of books – a theme that will be expanded on in Chapter Four. Johann Zoffany’s (1733-1810) painting, *Charles Towneley’s Library* (c. 1783), captures the artful, intellectual medley of movement, collectibles, books and furniture[[126]](#footnote-126) (figure 7). Zoffany’s painting depicts Towneley and his friends in a neo-classical room in Park Street, London, crowded with antique marbles, library desks, reading chairs, and books. Towneley and his friends, tucked among the marbles, are conversing, confirming that this library functions as a space for discourse and debate – a select community of learned gentleman and antiquarians. The sheer quantity and disorganized display of the marbles is impressive and the eye darts from sculpture to bust to gentleman, creating an intellectual link among the three. On the far wall, a large case packed with uniformly bound books, adds further evidence that Towneley was a well-read, well-versed man. A book is casually splayed open, on the floor in front of the fireplace, and the overall scene is one of active conversation and lively research. This is not to suggest that the painting portrays the library as a place of chaos and disorder, in fact, it is a contrived scene and space, intended to reveal Towneley’s wealth, taste and education. Zoffany had many of the marbles brought from other rooms of the house to showcase as many of Towneley’s treasures as possible.[[127]](#footnote-127) It is a pleasing work of art, but also a document of how gentlemen chose to express and display their wealth. Every object in the library is significant, as Raven explains: ‘The reading chairs, stands, desks, print-racks, ladders, rotating shelve, globes, busts and miscellania…all contributed to the realization of certain social ideals in reading practice and purpose.’[[128]](#footnote-128) For example, Towneley’s sizeable collection of busts of literary and philosophical figures was an expression of his personal ideals. Even in Richardson’s small portrait by Mason Chamberlain (1754), the artist includes a bust of Milton in the background, who Richardson greatly admired (Figure 15). The placement of objects like these within the space of the library was coded, and there were important divisions within the rooms. The shelves, which stretch from floor almost to ceiling, were full of books, sculptures, and collectables, representing the worldly curiosity of man. The ceilings of libraries were often brightly lit – Zoffany captures the sun pouring in from Towneley’s sky-light and the rays metaphorically represented the light of God and intellectual enlightenment. Busts were frequently put on top of these shelves, not only as a system of cataloguing but also to mediate between man and God by evoking the genius of intellectuals.[[129]](#footnote-129) Libraries, therefore, had an architectural structure intended not only for the pursuit of knowledge, but also to display wealth, intellect and taste. Raven asserts that the ‘development of the domestic library also reflected changes in the functions of the books’ and the edition of *Pamela* in Attingham Park’s library, is a testament to the novel’s versatility to function as both pocket-book and collector’s item.

It is certainly a rarity in literary history for an author to have so much control over the physical appearance of his work, and as Alexander Pettit observes, ‘Because Richardson was his own printer, the distinctions on authority between substantives and accidental advanced in classical textual theory do not entirely apply.’[[130]](#footnote-130) This affords a scholar of Richardson’s texts a great deal of freedom and possibility and does not confine the interpretations of his novels to one theory or discipline. I apply Stephanie Fysh’s argument that ‘by extending the boundaries of the “text” of *Pamela*, by re-examining it as a work, as a cultural artefact that includes many material texts and even non-textual artefacts, we can come to a better understanding of the novels ‘way of being in the world – that is, of its meaning,’ and blur the boundaries of what constitutes a text or discipline. [[131]](#footnote-131) I also expand on Keymer and Sabor’s authoritative research on *Pamela* and the *Pamela* controversy by exploring not just the contents, but also the bindings, paratextual material and typeface. The inside and the outside of the book are engaged in an important, if often unheard, dialogue with each other and the reader*.* Indeed, to understand *Pamela* and its ‘little world’, one must examine the physical qualities of the books, explore the qualities of its illustrations and paintings, analyse commentary and criticism from specific readers, and seek to uncover more about eighteenth-century reading practices.[[132]](#footnote-132) When these different veins of research are combined, they provide the most thorough biography of *Pamela*’s conception and reception in eighteenth-century England and propose a model for situating other novels in their visual and verbal cultures.

A variety of issues have been raised in this introduction: when the methodology of treating books as physical objects is implemented, a wealth of insight about readership, reception and reading habits become available. The topics, in turn, raise concerns about the rarity of such sources, issue of authorship, debates about printing practices, tensions about gentlemanly conduct, class-driven visual reactions to *Pamela* and discussions about the social approaches to reading and writing. It is particularly notable that the simple story of a beautiful young servant girl, who attracts the attention of her lusty master but rebuffs his advances and finally wins his hand in marriage has continually engaged readers in debate and criticism. The drama of Pamela’s kidnapping, imprisonment and near rape has encouraged readers and scholars to continue turning the pages of this conduct book. The heroine’s happy ending, achieved by her devotion to virtue, has shaken readers’ notions of class and natural inheritance. There are questions to be answered: Why was *Pamela* published in such a variety of formats, qualities and versions of *Pamela*? How does the physical appearance of the text shape its readership and how does the readership affect the physical appearance of the text? What is the relationship between the proliferation of illustrations and the classes of readership? My explorations, outlined in the chapter summaries below, demonstrate that new approaches to *Pamela* will provide us with a better understanding of the text, its heroine, and its author.

Chapter Summaries

‘Vile Hands, Vile Arts’ explores the complex relationship between Pamela, the heroine, and *Pamela*, the novel. This chapter argues that the variety of different bindings and appearances of *Pamela* are a result of the confusion and contradiction about the characterisation and description of the heroine. Therefore, to better understand how the novel ‘saw’ itself, it is important to analyse how Pamela defined herself and how Richardson treated his heroine. By building on Christopher Flint’s observation that Pamela’s narrative is a ‘complex and enormous verbal effort of self definition’, ‘Vile Hands, Vile Arts’ shows Pamela’s difficulty in squaring her lowly origins with her elevated marital status and argues that this duality is selected in the physical properties of *Pamela* as a book. Throughout the narrative, Pamela fights the upset and vulnerability that her liminal position engenders. Contemporary readers were quick to notice the heroine’s exceptionality and uncertainty. While some readers whole-heartedly embraced Pamela’s rapid ascent from lady’s maid to lady, others found the plot preposterous, distasteful, and subversive. To assuage these readers and further shed light on his heroine’s character, Richardson tried to demonstrate through a series of costume changes and masquerades, what Pamela was *not* to clarify her virtue. Although it was Richardson’s hope to have converted even his most sceptical of anti-Pamelists by the end of the four volumes, his failure to do so only enriched the novel’s reception and treatment. With attention to both the narrative contents and physical qualities of *Pamela*, this chapter serves as the foundation for this thesis’s exploration of how *Pamela* was read, illustrated, received, and treated in eighteenth-century England.

In ‘The Beautiful and the Shammed’, I discuss Richardson’s reaction to the numerous sham and spurious Pamela-inspired publications and the motivations for these writers’ publications. This second chapter builds on Richardson’s tendency to humanise and protect his novel and explores his use of the terms ‘rape’, ‘debasement’, and ‘giving birth’, to better understand how he viewed his work as a physical object. After exploring Richardson’s perspective , ‘The Beautiful and the Shammed’ turns to three over-looked and under-valued *Pamela*-related publications - *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life, The Virgin in Eden*, and *The History of Pamela*. These texts not only respond to *Pamela* but to Richardson himself. Their authors, James Kelly, Charles Povey, and Francis Newbery, helped to unmask Richardson and his motivations for writing *Pamela* and also demonstrate how physical characteristics of the book could be manipulated to court a targeted audience.

Chapter Three, ‘The Battle of the Books,’ explores perceived threats to Richardson’s authority as author and his documented responses to this invasion of property, *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*. Although Richardson wrote these two tracts to express his outrage about the Irish ‘piracy’ of *Sir Charles Grandison*, the roots of his frustration with the Irish printing tactics are found in the publication of *Pamela* in Dublin. This chapter traces Richardson’s various attempts as an author to maintain control over the printing and distribution of his novels and analyses the contents and motivations for *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* in great detail. Scholars have tended to accept Richardson’s impassioned and strong claims in his two tracts without much question, but ‘The Battle of the Books’ questions why many of the author’s false and misguided claims have gone unchallenged. By drawing parallels among these two supposedly ‘non-fiction’ tracts and his early works of fiction and analysing the physical qualities of both English and Irish publications of *Pamela* and *Grandison*, I argue that Richardson’s case claiming Irish reprints were corrupting, illegal, and immoral is weak. Chapter Three takes Richardson’s novels out of the homes and hands of his readers and into the world of printing and production and demonstrates the power of existing physical copies to provide evidence to help overturn well-established and commonly accepted claims about Anglo-Irish printing in the eighteenth century.

‘Reading Faces and Reading Spaces’ analyses paintings of the author and his readers, select correspondence and specific reading spaces to explore how an engaged and dynamic reading community responded to and influenced Richardson’s novels. This chapter focuses specifically on two small communities and their spaces. First, Richardson’s friendship with Susanna Highmore, a prominent member of the North End circle, and the summer-house where this reading circle frequently met to discuss *Sir Charles Grandison* and other works. Secondly, the author’s intriguing long-distance correspondence with his most devoted fan, the aristocrat Lady Bradshaigh and the space of the closet where most of their letters were composed and portraits were hung. These examples help counter widely-accepted attitudes of eighteenth-century reading practices as solitary and isolated and propose a new model of understanding reading habits through painting, architecture, written responses and postures. ‘Reading Faces and Reading Spaces’ enables us to understand how Richardson’s novels were treated and received by contemporary readers and how this reception in turn affected their packaging and appearance.

In ‘Rococo Confections and Bawdy Burlesques’, I focus on the rich and dynamic relationship between the verbal and the visual in eighteenth century culture and in particular, its interaction in Richardson’s *Pamela*. I draw out Richardson’s frequent referencing of art and visual qualities throughout the narrative of *Pamela* and discuss the oft cited ‘Pamela media event’ that constituted the novel’s reception. In fact, visual and verbal representations of *Pamela* become a unifying link between prominent eighteenth century artists and writers such as Hogarth, Gravelot, Hayman, Highmore, Rowlandson, and Fielding. While the relationships between Hogarth and Fielding and Fielding and Richardson have been well-researched, the interaction among the three has been overlooked. Although Hogarth did not produce any successful illustrations for *Pamela*, his influence can be seen on the work of artists who did – Gravelot, Hayman, and Highmore. Hogarth also had a well-known effect on Fielding, whose mocking *Pamela*-inspired novel, *Joseph Andrews*, was a thoughtful and well-developed anti-Pamelist contribution. Rowlandson’s later illustrations for Fielding’s novel successfully captured Fielding’s humour and also, as I am the first to observe, have a dialogue with Highmore’s *Adventures of Pamela*. Chapter Five’s extensive discussion of the artists, writers, and illustrators involved with *Pamela* demonstrates the breadth and depth of the novel’s influence on visual and verbal culture and more broadly, shows the prominence of the novel as a literary artefact in eighteenth century England.

In the conclusion of this thesis, I take *Pamela* into the nineteenth century to see what aspects of the heroine’s character fascinated later audiences. I also discuss the importance of my interdisciplinary approach in creating a comprehensive picture of visual and verbal culture in the eighteenth-century and introduce several texts that still need to be incorporated into our body of Richardson research. My combination of methodologies, particularly the combining of art history, book history, and literary criticism is unusual in a British PhD, but is essential to understanding *Pamela*.

CHAPTER TWO

THE BEAUTIFUL AND THE SHAMMED: SHAM, SPURIOUS AND ABRIDGED RESPONSES TO RICHARDSON’S *PAMELA*

An effusive letter written by a cryptic J.B.D.F., tucked in the preface to the third edition of Richardson’s *Pamela,* speaks again to the power of the book as a physical object: ‘Little Book, charming Pamela, face the world, and never doubt of finding Friends and Admirers, not only in thine own country, but far from home.’[[133]](#footnote-133) J.B.D.F’s praise artfully personifies Richardson’s novel and provides another example of how readers blurred the distinction between the book and its eponymous heroine. The writer is encouraging the book - a physical, inanimate object - to bravely confront the public and never to doubt its inherent virtue. J.B.D.F. valiantly offers to protect the novel from the mis-readings and misuse by libertines and reassures *Pamela* that her chastity will always be preserved. For readers such as J.B.D.F., who ‘had inexpressible pleasure in the perusal of *Pamela’*,[[134]](#footnote-134) the physical book – its binding and pages – was not merely a conduit for the narrative, but also a virtuous entity in its own right. J.B.D.F’s letter speaks to the value and vulnerability of the book as a physical object - its ability to educate, charm, disguise, and seduce.

As we have seen in Chapter 1, J.B.D.F’s conflation of *Pamela* with Pamela was not unusual; in fact, Richardson himself humanised and protected the physical qualities of his work when he felt it under threat from sham and spurious writers. Richardson treated unauthorised continuations, such as John Kelly’s *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life*, as vicious attacks on *Pamela*’s virtue, and framed his disgust in terms of rape and debasement. This sentiment is epitomised in an excerpt from an oft-quoted letter from Richardson to his brother-in-law, the bookseller James Leake, explaining why the author had to write his own authoritative sequel: ‘I was resolved to do it, rather than my Plan should be basely Ravished out of my Hands, and my Characters depreciated and debased by those who knew nothing of the Story nor the Delicacy required in the Continuation of the Piece.’[[135]](#footnote-135) The purity of *Pamela* that Pamelists such as J.B.D.F. strove to defend had been violated by other opportunistic writers and Richardson’s only choice was to restore his heroine and redeem his text by penning *Pamela II.* This is noted in Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor’s comments about diction and tone in Richardson’s letter to Leake: ‘There is a furious eloquence to his images of ravishment, debasement and engraftment, which swarm with lurid connotations of sexual despoliation, corruption’.[[136]](#footnote-136) Although theterm *‘*rape’ and the idea of ravishing a text may be too loaded for scholars to continually apply to the reception of Pamela and the production of the sixteen sham sequels and spurious Pamela re-writes that entered the marketplace in 1741,Richardson’s impassioned reaction highlights two important questions about the *Pamela* controversy that are often overlooked: what was *Pamela*? And what role was the author playing in the creation of the text? This chapter moves the discussion from confusion *in* the novel to confusion *about* and *outside* of the novel, raising several important topics: the relationship between the confused heroine and confused genre; the origins of *Pamela*; how writers such as John Kelly reacted both to Richardson and to *Pamela*; how his work masqueraded as *Pamela* and directly affected *Pamela*’s appearance; how Povey’s tract attempted to unmask *Pamela*, condemn art and artifice, and redress Pamela in her original homespun; and how Newbery translated and abridged a controversial novel into a suitable didactic chapbook for children. This wide range of topics shows us how Pamela’s many costume changes in the novel influenced the variety of interpretations of the novel. These arguments and analyses create a more complete picture of *Pamela*’s reception and enable us to understand how both the high and low elements of the novel were realised in contemporary culture.

Fittingly, Richardson’s work about a confused and vulnerable heroine had an uncertain and precarious position in the classification of eighteenth-century fiction. In the contemporary analyses and criticisms of Richardson’s work, the words ‘romance’, ‘novel’, ‘conduct book’, and ‘prose fiction’ were loosely employed, reflecting the genre’s flexibility and possibilities in eighteenth-century British literature. The term ‘novel’, in particular, was frequently included in discussions of Richardson’s work and *Pamela* was published at an important moment that George Barnett describes: ‘the greatest contributions to the theory and practice of the novel came between 1740 and 1760. Commentary became more voluminous and was expressed in more ways.’[[137]](#footnote-137) Anna Laetitia Barbauld, one of Richardson’s earliest biographers, puts Richardson at the forefront of this movement and dubbed him creator of the modern novel: ‘He may, in a great measure, be said to be father of the modern novel of the serious or pathetic kind, and he was also original in the mode of epistolary writing by which he carried on the story.’[[138]](#footnote-138) From Barbauld’s comment, it is clear that the idea of the novel was only just beginning to take hold in contemporary literary criticism and many of the debates on Pamela reacted to this new terminology. As we will see, the three *Pamela*-related works discussed in this chapter react to *Pamela* in three different formats – the novel, the tract, and the children’s ‘chapbook’.

There were many competing and sometimes conflicting theories of the novel; most used the more traditional ‘romance’ as an illuminating point of comparison. As early as 1692, the playwright and poet William Congreve, contrasted the romance with the novel, explaining that the novel is ‘of a more familiar Nature; comes near us, represents our Intrigues in practice, delights us with Accidents and Odd Events, but not such as are wholly unusual or unprecedented, such which not being so distant from our Belief, brings also the pleasure near us.’[[139]](#footnote-139) Nearly one hundred years later, in 1785, Clara Reeve continued to explore the ideas of the novel and the romance, concluding that the ‘Romance, in lofty and elevated language, describes what never happened nor is likely to happen.’[[140]](#footnote-140) The majority of contemporary definitions in this period bookmarked by Congreve and Reeve concord to these polarities of the romance and the novel - the novel concerned the real and possible; the romance specialised in the ideal and impossible. Interestingly, Geoffrey Day argues that while the ‘novel’ was a popular theory, it was a rarely a literary reality:

Works commonly referred to as “eighteenth century novels” were not perceived as such by readers or indeed by the major writers of the period; and that so far from being ready to accept the various works as “novels”, they do not appear to have arrived at a consensus that works such as Robinson Crusoe [1719], Pamela [1740], Tom Jones [1749], etc[…]were even all of the same species.[[141]](#footnote-141)

Thus, we must take the flurry of terms about fiction in this period with this in mind. Day’s argument is supported by statistics and estimates that ‘the proportion of all fiction (new titles to reprints) to total book and pamphlet production for the years of 1720-9 was only 1.1 percent, rising to 4 percent by 1790.’[[142]](#footnote-142) Flint deduces that the numbers indicate that fiction, in particular the novel, was not the predominant factor in the literary market and had stiff competition from a variety of print media.[[143]](#footnote-143) Indeed, the only major eighteenth-century writers known to declare themselves as novelists were Fanny Burney and Tobias Smollett. Smollett defined the novel as ‘a large, diffused picture, comprehending the characters of life, disposed in different groupes, and exhibited in various attitudes, for the purposes of a uniform plan, and general occurrence, to which every individual figure is subservient.’[[144]](#footnote-144) *Pamela* was entangled in this web of abstract theories and shifting labels, and contemporary criticism of Richardson’s work reveals just how difficult it was to pinpoint the novel.

The essayist Vicesimus Knox divorced the novel from any negative connotations and praised *Pamela*: ‘Richardson’s novels are written with the purest intentions of promoting virtue’[[145]](#footnote-145) whereas the writer and physician John Moore was more comfortable with *Pamela* as an interesting variation on the romance, stating: ‘Richardson introduced a new species of romance.’[[146]](#footnote-146) It is difficult to gather a satisfactory and definitive answer from Richardson himself; in his preface to *Pamela* he insists that his work is instructional, intended to ‘give practical examples, worthy to be followed in most critical and affecting cases, by the virgin, the bride, and the wife’.[[147]](#footnote-147) He included this preface in the majority of editions he printed after the term ‘novel’ had been coupled with Pamela in criticism - at first suggesting that he was determined to remain faithful to the work’s origins as a conduct book. Yet Richardson’s insistence on locating his work within the well-established tradition of conduct book writing is undermined by his famous declaration that he set out to ‘create a new species of writing.’ Richardson did successfully master the task of creating a new species of writing; there are elements of the novel in *Pamela* - familiar settings, accidents, odd events, human emotions and vulnerability, but there are also elements of the romance - the heroine’s overwhelming perfection, the near impossibility of a servant girl becoming a lady. Many Anti-Pamelists criticised not only the heroine, but Richardson’s method of recording her story, complaining that it was wildly fictional and sensational. Fielding, with a sneer, mocked the work as ‘revolutionary’, a term not complimentary in the eighteenth-century. For months under these attacks, Richardson continued to insist that the story of Pamela was factual until enterprising authors exploited this claim to write their own ‘true’ versions of Pamela’s ‘biography’.

The intention of this short digression is not to agonise over *Pamela*’s genre, but to establish a contemporary framework and cultural parameters for the work’s classification. With this conflicting flurry of criticism and categorisation, I take the mediating approach of Eaves and Kimpel, who argue that *Pamela* was a novice novel: ‘*Pamela* was, at any rate, one of the first works in Western prose fiction to convey a story as it happened rather than merely relate it - in doing so, it helped the nascent novel to acquire the closely related virtues of psychological depth and of intensity which had in earlier periods been the advantage of narrative poetry and especially of the drama.’[[148]](#footnote-148) This hybrid of novel and romance, a sort of proto-novel, explains the wide-range of verbal and visual interpretations, criticisms, and responses to *Pamela*, and for the sake of simplicity, I refer to *Pamela* loosely as a novel throughout the thesis. It quickly becomes clear from our three selected works that not all Pamelists and anti-Pamelists felt that the work was a novel and their reactions in a variety of media in format emphasise the interpretive possibilities of Richardson’s work.

The Importance of *Familiar Letters* to Richardson and *Pamela*

A discussion of *Pamela’s* influence and reception would not be complete without an understanding of the work’s origins, which in turn reveals Richardson’s interest in experimenting with genre, narrative, and format. Richardson complained to Leake that ‘the publication of the history of Pamela gave birth to no less than 16 pieces.’[[149]](#footnote-149) Richardson’s choice of words, given the seductive qualities of the text and the sequel that anti-Pamelists in particular responded to, imbues Pamela with a maternal quality. This feminine quality can also be applied to the author, because he is the creator. Moreover, the fact that Pamela supposedly ‘gave birth’ to these works, including John Kelly’s *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* and Povey’s *The Virgin in Eden*, suggests that as the author of the original, Richardson can view the spin-off works from an authoritative vantage point. *Pamela* also has roots and predecessors; many other scholars have explored eighteenth-century literary models and precursors of the ‘novel’ such as the epistolary works by Aphra Behn’s *Oroonoko*, and Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe*. These writers are outside the scope of the thesis, and I instead focus on examining the relationship between *Pamela* and *Familiar Letters* in greater detail. *Familiar Letters* is a lengthy volume of sample letters composed for a variety of situations. It was written primarily as a guide book for lower-class readers and was started before Richardson began *Pamela.*[[150]](#footnote-150) Throughout this varied, epistolary text, Richardson imagines himself as gentleman, lady, servant, aunt, father, uncle, widow, brother, apprentice, master, young trader, landlord, tenant, sailor, and mother. In ‘Letter LXII: a Young Woman in Town to her Sister in the Country, recounting her Narrow Escape from a Snare Laid on her First Arrival, by a Wicked Procuress’, we see a prototype for Pamela. This young woman, who narrowly escapes becoming the next Moll Hackabout, details her misfortune to her sister, writing that ‘an elderly gentlewoman of a sober and credible appearance directed a young girl to Mrs C…She then ply’d me very close with liquor, which she again said was innocent and weak; but I believe it was far otherwise, for my head began to turn round’.[[151]](#footnote-151) Mrs C, is of course, a prototype for the masculine, villainous Mrs Jewkes. In this young girl’s version of events, she is saved by a beautiful young woman in white, who shows her how to escape – a physical embodiment of virtue and kindness. In a few short lines, the disaster is averted and the young girl writes exuberantly to the recipient: ‘I am sure, sister, you rejoice with me for my deliverance.’[[152]](#footnote-152) Richardson adds an editorial interjection in the form of a *nota bene*, pointing out that the story is entirely true and thus increasing the impression of reality: ‘This shocking story is taken from the mouth of the young woman herself, who so narrowly escaped the snare of the vile procuress, and is fact in every circumstance.’[[153]](#footnote-153) We can see the beginnings of *Pamela* in this scenario and in two other sample letters. The verbose title of letter LXX: ‘A lady to a gentleman of superior fortune, who after long address in an honourable way, proposes to live with her as a Gallant,’ demonstrates Richardson’s awareness of the difficulties of social climbing. The exemplary heroine of this short letter vehemently rejects her suitor’s indecent proposal: ‘Ungenerous man! To take advantage of your superior fortune to insult me thus, when you had gain’d my Affections! What, tho’ I am not blessed with a worldly circumstance equal to what you might expect in a wife, can you think my mind so base as to submit to be yours on unworthy terms.’[[154]](#footnote-154) So much of Pamela’s rebuffing of Mr B’s advances is framed around this lady’s indignant cry. Lastly, Letter CXXXVIII: A Father to a Daughter in Service, on hearing of her master’s attempting her virtue’ with the thematic statement of ‘Consider thy dear child, your reputation is all you have to trust to’ is a very short prelude to Richardson’s prolix novel.[[155]](#footnote-155) Although Richardson would like to believe otherwise, *Pamela* did not appear via an immaculate conception and *Familiar Letters* is first consummation of a marriage between the author’s narrative talents and exemplary fictional characters.

It is important to note the variety of characters that Richardson speaks for in *Familiar Letters*; he is able to write equally convincingly as a confused apprentice, a vulnerable young woman in service, a worried father, and a tender mother. Indeed, *Familiar Letters* provides an invaluable exposition of Richardson’s talents for characterisation, but it leaves the reader with little sense of a stable authoritative voice. Richardson is, in essence, masquerading as a variety of fictional characters and experimenting with scenarios; he would choose three to adopt and perfect in his novels: Pamela - the beautiful, vulnerable, and righteous servant girl; Clarissa – the idealistic and passionate martyr; Sir Charles Grandison – the ideal gentleman in a less-than-ideal love triangle. Of these three novels, *Clarissa* and *Grandison* use multiple narratives, making *Pamela* a unique departure in Richardson’s writing. As this chapter will argue, this lack of other perspectives *inside* the narrative of *Pamela* played a large part in inspiring responses from readers *outside* the novel.

Madeleine Kahn has cleverly termed Richardson’s chameleon-like narrative technique ‘narrative transvestism’, and we can see *Familiar Letters* as Richardson’s dressing room experimentation with re-gendering and moreover, evidence of a passionate identification with female characters. Kahn explains Richardson’s particular use of narrative transvestism, arguing that ‘makes the thematisation of the status of the body and its ambiguous desires practically inevitable. One cannot adopt the voice of another whose difference is primarily defined by the body without reflecting that bodily difference in the metaphorical body of the text.’[[156]](#footnote-156) The physical body of the text plays an important role in Richardson’s metamorphosis into a female character; *Pamela* is a text written by a male about a young servant girl’s sexual awakening and this tension informs the novel’s confused and controversial reception. While it was not unusual for a male author to create a female character, the extent of Richardson’s connection and attachment to his heroine is particularly unique**.** Thus, anti-Pamelist readers, well aware of Richardson’s authorship, were not only protesting the social improbability of a servant marrying a master, they were also reacting to the fact that this young girl’s journal and letters were actually written by a middle-age, middle-class man. Kahn is sensitive to such incongruities which were intensified by the epistolary format of the novels and proposes that Richardson’s true literary strength is revealed in these ‘gaps’:

The letters display in astonishing variety and fluency Richardson’s talent for projecting himself into the assumptions, desires, and concrete details of an imaginary other’s life. Over and over again Richardson finds his narrative copies in the most unlikely fictional bodies – in the gaps, as it were, between the formal constraints of genre; in the differences, that is, between his experience of life and the lives he imagines for his letter writers.[[157]](#footnote-157)

In the liminal spaces between being a man and inventing a woman, creating as a text and posing as an editor, writing fiction and marketing nonfiction, and arguing for virtue and titillating the readers, it is easy to see how readers could become confused during these numerous costume changes. As Tassie Gwilliam points out with so much disguise the heroine, not her author, gets the blame: ‘This masquerade, because it is seen as primarily an attribute of femininity, seems for many readers to revert to the female character who is the object rather than originating in its male author.’[[158]](#footnote-158) In fact, as the term masquerade would suggest, there is a superficial and incomplete transformation from the authentic self to the chosen character, and that underneath the costume or trappings of language the self remains a fixed point. However, while this could imply that the disguise was unsatisfactory for some, Richardson found great freedom in his experimentation; he was ‘somehow more than himself in writing.’[[159]](#footnote-159) Gwilliam argues that his masquerades make Richardson’s novels seem duplicitous but I believe the evidence suggests otherwise. In these small experiments in *Familiar Letters* and more sophisticated flights of fancy in his novels, Richardson is breaking through every conceivable limitation: class, gender, reality, and audience.[[160]](#footnote-160) In two of his three novels, he is a woman, but in all three, he places his characters in upper-class surroundings. Thus, for Richardson, these literary experiences were not only a chance to gender-bend but also an opportunity to imaginatively class-climb - a sort of social transvestism. Nina Schechet fleshes out the important question that Kahn’s study of cross-gendered verse is attempting to ask: ‘the most incisive questions we can pose about a male author’s use of female narrative voice is not, did he create a believable woman? But what did he gain from the attempt? What is the point of creating a rather elaborate narrative structure to gain access to a voice on the other side of the structural divide between genders?’[[161]](#footnote-161) Through *Pamela*, Richardson was able to climb from rags to riches, and free to learn and indulge in upper-class life in *Clarissa* and *Grandison*. By changing genders and promoting morals, Richardson was able to advance his social ambitions, and as Homai J. Shroff drily observes, inhabit an imaginary world:

Though Richardson thus occasionally thought it necessary to register a mild protest against the supercilious attitudes towards trade, he himself did not deign to make a tradesman the hero of any of his novels. Instead of portraying the life he knew intimately, he chose to moralize about Lord A. and Lady B. and the Countess of C., providing an opportunity to aristocrats like Horace Walpole to ridicule his tradesman’s concept of upper-class life as ‘pictures of high life as conceived by a bookseller.’[[162]](#footnote-162)

In Chapter Four, I will explore the visual representations of Richardson as a successful tradesman and his interest in fashioning himself as a gentleman, but for the moment, we can establish that Richardson’s fantasies of high life were escapist and artistically inspiring. Richardson, in essence, is creating a world populated with characters that he liked and in which he could belong to the upper class. Even though these fictional worlds were a product of Richardson’s imagination, he could not control their reception in reality and *Pamela*’s ‘incorrect’ readings became as much a part of her reality as the author’s intended message.

Literary reactions to Richardson and *Pamela:* John Kelly masquerading as Richardson

It is important to recognise that the sham and spurious publications inspired by *Pamela*’s success were not simply responses to Richardson’s novel, but also reactions to the author himself. *Familiar Letters* was a literary laboratory forRichardson to experiment with characterisation and plot; by the time he turned to *Pamela*, Richardson was an author posing as an editor, a middle-aged tradesman writing as an adolescent servant girl, and an aspirational middle-class man masquerading as an upper-class insider. By as early as December 1740, most readers were aware of Richardson’s role as author, not editor, although he would maintain this posturing for many more years. There was as much to admire as to mock in these flights of imagination and as opportunistic writers re-wrote Pamela’s life, they also helped unmask Richardson and his many disguises. One of the most poignant commentaries on *Pamela* and Richardson was John Kelly’s *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* (1741), a boisterous, if clumsy, continuation of Pamela’s role in high society. In this two-volume text masquerading as an authentic sequel, Kelly’s narrative builds on Pamela’s frequently absurd and overly subservient behaviour and also demonstrates his superior knowledge of ‘high life’. Kelly may be masquerading as Richardson when he purposefully misleads readers into thinking *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* has the same author as *Pamela*, but he simultaneously reveals Richardson’s ambitious affectations.

Throughout his lengthy narrative, Kelly guides the reader’s attention to his extensive education and superior knowledge of the nuances of high-life. We can read this as Kelly’s attempt to demonstrate his acceptance into the upper-class and reclaim the esteem of his youth. Kelly was born to a wealthy family in Port Royal, Jamaica, in 1684.[[163]](#footnote-163) For much of his childhood, Kelly was privileged and well-educated. Allegedly, Kelly was defrauded of his inheritance and his Jamaican estate, and spent the rest of his life bordering on destitution. In an attempt to restore dignity and escape from the fringes of poverty, he turned to writing minor comedies and pamphlets such as ‘The Islanders, or Mad Orphan’, ‘Timon in Love’, and ‘The Oracle of Gin’. The audience and appreciation for Kelly’s experiments were limited and he found himself imprisoned for slandering Queen Caroline.[[164]](#footnote-164) Shortly after his release, Kelly was sent to debtor’s prison. In desperation, Kelly turned to prose fiction and had moderate success with *The Third Volume of Peruvian Tales* and *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life*. Kelly’s life had gone from grandeur to Grub Street, and as Keymer and Sabor observe, ‘by the time of *Pamela’s Conduct*, he occupied a fascinatingly ambiguous and conflicted position, that of insider and outsider at once.’[[165]](#footnote-165) Indeed, the plot of Kelly’s life reads much like a reversal of Pamela’s – once privileged and highly educated, Kelly had fallen perilously down the social ladder, while Richardson’s Pamela was diligently and virtuously climbing up every rung. Perhaps, as Keymer and Sabor suggest, Kelly’s liminal position as an impoverished upper-class gentleman and desperate hack writer made him the perfect candidate for Chandler and Ward’s project. More importantly, I posit that Kelly’s disillusionment with social mobility influenced his sarcastic, determined, and hyperbolised characterisation of Pamela, and motivated him to demonstrate his previously impressive connections – this is why *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* is a lumpy mixture of high-brow Hebrew, classical references, lowly drunkenness, and embarrassing subservience.

From the first pages of Kelly’s narrative, it is obvious that *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* is a subversive text, written primarily to undercut Richardson and his presentation of *Pamela* as a saintly heroine.[[166]](#footnote-166) While lacking the lengthy description of *Pamela*’s title page, the title-page of *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* highlights the inclusion of several ‘curious’ letters to the editor that mock Richardson’s prefaces (Figure 8) Instead of simply waxing lyrical and puffing the novel up with the highest praises, Kelly’s letters to the editor chronicle why this sequel was written. A fictitious and mysterious B.W. contacts a Mrs Mary Brenville, supposed niece of Mrs Jervis, who is in possession of unseen papers written by Pamela. B.W. is interested in perusing these papers in the hopes that this new material will provide an opportunity to correct any misgivings about the heroine and be fruitful enough for a continuation. Mrs Mary Brenville is happy to turn over the packet for potential profit and have B.W. bring it to a bookseller for a consultation. B.W. writes to Mrs Mary Brenville with promising news about the marketability of these unpublished papers:

I have consulted a Bookseller, who I dare say, very justly bears the character of a man of Great Probity. He looked over the Papers you have entrusted in my Hand, said they may make about thirteen or fourteen sheets of Print, on the same letter and the same size of Paper with the two volumes already published, and if they were writ with as much Spirit and the same elegant ease as those which have appeared and have been so justly admired he would be a purchaser.[[167]](#footnote-167)

The three hundred and twelve pages of narrative that follow are confirmation that the bookseller found Mrs Mary Brenville’s document to be written with ‘spirit’, ‘elegant ease’, and concordant with the first two volumes of *Pamela*. B.W.’s letter also mentions that the continuation will be printed in the same typeface and on the same size sheet as the ‘first two volumes’ in an attempt to convince readers that the bookseller had access to the original *Pamela* and the existing volumes are proof of this plan. B.W.’s letter is encouraging the readers to equate the similarity with authenticity, and his argument is cleverly crafted.

Although the introduction to *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* lacks the heavy-handed didacticism and bloated praise of Richardson’s preface, Kelly still takes a moral stance and attempts to distinguish his work from other sham productions. Kelly employs B.W. as the vehicle for these distinctions and in the introduction he refers to *Shamela* and *Pamela Censured* as two responses which were ‘visibly calculated with the view of being paid for the dirt they fling.’[[168]](#footnote-168) B.W. dismisses *Shamela* with a few insults, and then dwells longer on *Pamela Censured*, taking objection to the author’s lengthy comments on the ‘warm scenes’[[169]](#footnote-169) such as: ‘a Modest Young Lady can never read the Description of Naked Breasts being run over with the Hand, and Kisses given with such Eagerness that they cling to the Lips; but her own soft Breasts must heave at the Idea and secretly sigh for the same Pressure.’[[170]](#footnote-170) After his long-winded tirade, B.W. summarises his attitude towards the sham works:

I have written enough to shew you of what stamp are all the caluminators of the virtuous Pamela. How sensual and coarse their Ideas, how inhumane their Sentiments, how immoral their Principles, how vile their endeavours, how unfair their quotations, how lewd and weak their remarks.[[171]](#footnote-171)

Kelly, writing as B.W., is anticipating possible complaints about his own entry into the outpouring of *Pamela* publications; he uses indignation and self-righteousness as a means to separate his work from the crowd. Of course, Richardson did not find any redeeming distinction in Kelly’s work - to Richardson, Kelly was simply another one of *Pamela*’s ‘ravishers’ and *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* belonged in the dirt. But how much damage did Kelly’s pen do to Richardson’s heroine and the integrity of *Pamela* as a physical object?

It is undeniable that Kelly’s Pamela functions as a foil to Richardson’s heroine; Keymer and Sabor point out that Kelly’s heroine exposes ‘in negative…the priorities of the original text.’ Kelly’s Pamela was occasionally ill mannered, frequently ridiculous, and overly subservient, and this was reinforced by other characters. For example, Pamela’s mother boldly assures Mr B of her daughter’s absolute inferiority: ‘I am sure my Daughter will agree chearfully [sic] to whatever is agreeable to you.’[[172]](#footnote-172) The presentation of this submissive, insipid, and spineless Pamela, interpreted by many such as Richard Gooding as the ‘most faithful of the Pamelist imitations’ can be also read as an exaggeration of Richardson’s spirited, determined, but humble heroine.[[173]](#footnote-173) In fact, Kelly’s protagonist seems to mock Richardson’s Pamela’s humility and gratitude by distorting her piety to the point of simpering absurdity; she is verbose, uncensored and rambling: ‘Oh! How shall I express my Gratitude to my ineffably, bountiful Creator but by the most humble protestations and Tears of Joy…Words are too poor to express, my Compassionate creator, the Shield of my Innocence, will read in a Heart swelling with Joy’.[[174]](#footnote-174) Mr B is not immune from some revisions and Kelly adds drunkenness to his vices, which he acknowledges when he encourages Pamela and her mother to maintain routine while he ‘recovers’ from an outing: ‘My dear Pamela you and your mother will dine at your usual Hour, you ought not to suffer for the Debaucheries of your Husbands.’[[175]](#footnote-175) This is a notable contrast to the man that Richardson’s Pamela praises for sobriety: ‘for he [Mr Arthur, a friend] drinks hard, it seems; so indeed, all the gentlemen around us do, except my master who has not that vice to answer for.’[[176]](#footnote-176) There is something vaguely Hogarthian about Kelly’s characters; Pamela seems more of an artful Moll Hackabout than a fictional version of Susanna Highmore (see Chapters Four and Five), and Mr B has some habits in common with Tom Rakewell.

It is clear from these passages that Kelly’s work is mocking and provocative and that his renditions of the characters lack depth. Richard Gooding identifies specific flaws in Kelly’s work when comparing it to Richardson’s:

Kelly’s approach to style has regrettable consequences for the inner life of the characters, because their high-life banter presents itself in a bland, stylistic homogeneity that robs them of their distinctiveness. What is lost is Richardson’s particularizing realism with all that it suggests about the importance of the individual’s response to experience, what is gained is more of dubious value; a model of stylistic decorum based almost wholly on the ranks of the speakers.[[177]](#footnote-177)

Gooding’s criticism is astute, but it does not take into account that Kelly was building on an already developed set of characters and critiquing a prescribed narrative. Although he lowers the diction and sentiment of his characters, Kelly also adds flourishes of intellectual asides, and has Pamela, unconvincingly, ponder the etymology of words:

In the Afternoon Sermon, which cannot be too much commended, I took particular notice of a pretty Remark, very properly introduced; namely, that the Name of *Bacchus* the Heathen’s God of Wine came from a Hebrew word which is pretty near of the same sound; and signifies *weeping*, or *Tears.[[178]](#footnote-178)*

While Gooding would likely find this passage an example of ‘dubious value’-prose, it also demonstrates that Kelly was willing to embarrass Pamela and Richardson to prove his upper-class origins. Immediately following Pamela’s brief intellectual exploration, Kelly interrupts Pamela’s narrative with a lengthy footnote, translating the Hebrew, explaining its similarities with the Greek word, and trumping her thought process. The footnote takes up nearly one-third of the page, and distracts from the contents of Pamela’s letter. Kelly juxtaposes Pamela’s simplistic and clumsy understanding of etymology with his extensive knowledge, illustrating her short-comings to an upper-class audience. Kelly’s footnote is condescending not only to Pamela, but to Richardson, who must have felt particularly sensitive to the author’s use of foreign languages, as he only knew English.

Kelly’s footnotes do not only function as an assertion of his supposed superiority to Pamela and Richardson, they enable the author/editor to interject without disturbing the flow of the narrative. Kelly is able to be present in a text that is narrated by a young woman and the margins allow him to guide reader interpretations. The footnotes, along with one diagram, numerous wood-blocked headpieces, and elegant ornamented capitals, suggest to the reader that this is a serious and authentic *Pamela* continuation. Indeed, I argue that the quality of *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* is more impressive than earlier runs of Richardson’s *Pamela*. Richardson may have felt that Chandler and Ward’s project was a cheap blow to *Pamela*’s virtue, but the physical object was not obviously cheaper – it was priced at 6s., same as *Pamela.*  Richardson must have felt simultaneously threatened and impressed by Kelly’s book because he used footnotes for the first time in fiction in *Pamela II* and improved the quality and appearance of his text in the sixth edition of *Pamela*, 1742. As reactions such as this demonstrate, *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* was a sham work, but not a work in shambles.

How *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* affected *Pamela*

*Pamela II* was written in direct response to *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life*. Richardson quietly found inspiration in Kelly’s few printing experiments and his novel may have directly influenced Richardson’s growing interest in ornamentation, paratextual material, typeface, and format in later editions of *Pamela* and *Clarissa.* What Richardson did not adopt, he revised, and he invested considerable energy in preventing his heroine from resembling Kelly’s awkward and vulgar rendition. The third edition of Richardson’s *Pamela*, which appeared before Kelly’s work, had fifty-nine corrections, most of them slight improvements to language in an effort further to gentrify his heroine.[[179]](#footnote-179) However, the fifth edition, published on 22 September 1741, after *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life*, had nine hundred and fifty corrections, some of which were improvements to the heroine’s diction, and others that softened the profuse praise in the introductory material.[[180]](#footnote-180) This dramatic increase in corrections and alterations suggest that Richardson was threatened by Kelly’s Pamela’s presence in the marketplace and that he was worried about control over his heroine’s image. In his newspaper puffs and published complaints, Richardson fails to report several important opportunities that would have let him have more control of *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life*, and prevented this unhappy outcome: Chandler, in desperate financial circumstances (he would later commit suicide rather than face debtors’ prison), saw a glimmer of hope in a continuation of *Pamela*. Chandler approached Richardson, who declared that he had absolutely no intention of drafting a sequel ‘having neither the leisure nor inclination to pursue the story.’[[181]](#footnote-181) Chandler then tried another tactic and suggested that Kelly could do the labour and Richardson receive the credit – unsurprisingly, this offer was declined.[[182]](#footnote-182) Chandler’s final attempt, in what was proving to be an intensely frustrating and fruitless exchange was an offer to scrap Kelly’s project and place Richardson in control.[[183]](#footnote-183) Richardson also refused this suggestion, and Chandler, convinced that there was no unethical component to his project, forged ahead and printed *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life*.

Richardson defended his *Pamela* by launching a print attack against Chandler and Ward. In this advertising campaign Richardson emphatically casts himself as victim in his embellished version of events, as he would later do with the Dublin printers over *Grandison* discussed in Chapter Three, but the reality was less dramatic. On 30 May 1741, in *Common Sense*, Chandler and Ward puffed Kelly’s work, claiming it used the same materials as *Pamela* - a detail repeated in *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life’s* introduction; *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* was also priced the same, ‘printed on the same letter as *Pamela; or Virtue Rewarded,* price 3s. Bound. *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life*.’[[184]](#footnote-184) Frequently, these advertisements were quickly followed by a printed protest from Richardson, like the puff in *The Daily Gazetteer* on 12 June 1741 – Rivington and Osborn objected to the contents of Chandler and Ward’s advert and presented a challenge: ‘That when any person who is above scandal and scandalous practices, shall say anything worthy of notice, and set his name to what he publishes, he shall receive a proper reply.’[[185]](#footnote-185) Rivington and Osborn were blatantly calling Kelly’s reputation into question, which would have been interpreted by contemporaries as a challenge to a print or perhaps even physical duel. Richardson’s tendency to air his grievances in print will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Three, but it is worth citing Homai J. Shroff’s explanation of gentlemanly conduct: ‘For “honour”, the code by which the gentleman was supposed to guide his life, had its own laws…According to the code of honour, there can be no degradation greater than to endure injury without retaliating.’[[186]](#footnote-186) In a manner evoking the style of a duel, Rivington and Osborn challenged Kelly to declare his authorship by stating his name in public. Richard Cronin explains the symbolism of the name:

It was common to object to the public use of a name almost as if one’s name was an aspect of the private self that is so defiled by being printed and published to the world…understanding that a name was what marked and secured a professional identity.[[187]](#footnote-187)

Kelly, Chandler and Ward responded to this invitation by continuing to puff their *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life*, highlighting its similarities to the original *Pamela -* in their formula, similarity should be synonymous with authenticity. Each puff gave them the opportunity to repeat this argument to the public. In fact, although Richardson may have cast Kelly as an inconsequential hack, his persistence in resisting *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* only gave the work more publicity.[[188]](#footnote-188) Published, advertised, and occasionally bound as *Pamela* as we will see shortly*, Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* was fairly successful in masquerading as the authentic.

*Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* Masquerading as *Pamela*

A selection of surviving copies of *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* demonstrates that while Kelly may have been labelled as ‘hack writer’ and his work a ‘sham publication’, the physical bindings and paratextual material were able to costume the work as a legitimate text. In fact, as we shall see, *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* was occasionally accepted as the authentic continuation to *Pamela*, it was popular enough to be ‘pirated’, and a standard copy printed by Chandler and Ward was treated as a respectable, readable novel. This is the first discussion of the *Pamela* media event to focus on the phenomenon’s influence on the physical appearance of the text, which, as a printer, Richardson highly valued. To prove that Richardson’s worst fear came true - that readers would not be able to successfully divorce Kelly’s Pamela from his original heroine - we turn to a mismatched, four volume set of *Pamela/Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* in the British Library. This edition is impressively ornate and contains the armourial book plates of Penry Williams (1798-1885), a Welsh water-colourist. Whether Williams bound this set, rebound it, or bought it second-hand, cannot be determined, but the original owner of this *Pamela* certainly delighted in beautiful binding. The brown calf is decorated with a double gilt fillet border, a gilt seashell order, and a six-banded spine covered with a gilt diamond and floral motif,[[189]](#footnote-189) rivalling the beauty of the Attingham Park *Pamela.* In this four-volume set, the third and fourth volumes are titled *Pamela* but are actually *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life.* The fourth edition of *Pamela* (2 vols) was published on May 5, 1741, and Kelly’s first edition of *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* followed shortly on May 28, 1741. The second edition of *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* was released on September 12, 1741, ten days before Richardson’s two volume fifth edition, and over two months before the publication of Richardson’s *Pamela* sequel.[[190]](#footnote-190) With these close and confusing publication deadlines in mind, it is likely that the owner of this particular *Pamela* thought *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* was the official sequel. This confusion was exacerbated by the title page of Kelly’s work, which advertised *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* as being ‘publish’d from original papers’ and mimicked Richardson’s posturing as anonymous editor.[[191]](#footnote-191) The booksellers Chandler and Ward further perpetuated the mistaken identity by deceptively re-labelling the two volumes of Kelly’s work as volumes III and IV to give the reader the impression that *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* was Richardson’s sequel. With such close publication dates, similar title-pages, and a deceptive printing strategy, it is not surprising that the Penry Williams’ *Pamela* is a mis-matched set. The Penry Williams’ *Pamela* is concrete proof that Chandler and Ward successfully had Kelly’s spurious work masquerade as the authentic *Pamela*. William Sale, in his extensive Richardson bibliography, documents Chandler and Ward’s manipulative publishing procedures: ‘Volume II of the first edition of Kelly’s *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* was published four months after [the first edition] Volume I, and was combined with Volume I of the *second edition* when the set was as a work in two volumes.’[[192]](#footnote-192) Thus, it was unusual to get a matched pair of *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life.* This binding and marketing strategy is confirmed in Keymer and Sabor’s extensive study of *Pamela* spin-offs and sequels; they argue that Chandler and Ward tempted readers to bind *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* ‘with the original and so materially confirm the union of the two in a single cohesive unit.’[[193]](#footnote-193) Kelly’s sequel was able to operate in tandem with Richardson’s original edition and proves that the physical appearance of a text was a vehicle for legitimising an illegitimate work.

*Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* could confuse readers even when not uniformly bound with Richardson’s sequel. A single volume duodecimo of the first part of *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life*, printed in 1741 for Chandler and Ward was advertised in the *London Evening Post* in a similar style to Richardson’s puff for the fourth edition of *Pamela*, stating: ‘Price 3s. bound. In a neat pocket volume. Printed from Original Papers, regularly’.[[194]](#footnote-194) This 3s. copy was bound by the bookseller in simple, lightly marbled calfskin with no tooling and the narrative was printed on standard laid paper with rounded corners and plain edges. The paratextual material and introductory pages are decorated with small flora and fauna wood-blocked headpieces. The spine is banded and raised with *Pamela*, not *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* as the title. This copy, nearly identical to many volumes of Richardson’s *Pamela*, such as the first two volumes of the Penry Williams *Pamela,* confirms that Chandler and Ward were eager to seduce their readers with impressions of authenticity – a sham in *Pamela*’s clothing. Keymer and Sabor explain: ‘Richardson’s fear was that clever marketing and production would give *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* an air of definitiveness as the natural companion of his novel, and it is clear that Chandler and Ward had just this ambition.’[[195]](#footnote-195) Chandler and Ward’s achievement is evident in mis-married *Pamela*s such as Penry Williams’, and also in ‘pirated’ copies of *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* printed in Dublin.

The British Library also has a copy of a two-volume *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life*, printed for George Faulkner, in Dublin, in 1741.[[196]](#footnote-196) While George Faulkner, the issue of Irish reprints, and Richardson’s reactions to ‘pirated’ publications are the focus of Chapter Three, it is notable that Dublin printers went to the effort to ‘pirate’ and reprint a sham English novel. *Pamela*’s popularity was not confined to England, as Keymer and Sabor explain: ‘When Pamela arrived there herself she did so in triumph, and among friends. Public enthusiasm was fostered.’[[197]](#footnote-197) *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* was one of *Pamela*’s opportunistic friends and Faulkner made this work available to Dubliners for a lower price. Despite the fact that Faulkner’s work was a ‘pirate’ of a ‘sham’ edition, the quality is strikingly similar to Chandler and Ward’s ‘authentic’ London edition. The Dublin *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* is bound in the manner of most affordable novels marketed to a modest audience - plain, un-tooled calf. The paratextual and introductory material is as ornate as the first example of *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* discussed in this chapter, and in my opinion, the headpieces, decorated with strap-work and acanthus leaf designs, are more ornate, the ink is slightly darker, the edges of the laid paper are slightly deckled. These embellishments are indicative of the reasonably high quality typical of Faulkner’s productions, and although the work was pirated, it was not compromised. Faulkner’s work confirms that *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* was successful enough to be reprinted in Ireland and that it could function as a convincing doppelganger for *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* and *Pamela.*

Literary Reactions to Richardson and *Pamela*: Povey’s Unmasking ofRichardson and *Pamela*

While *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* masqueraded as *Pamela*, Charles Povey stripped Richardson’s novel of all its rhetorical flourish and grace in his bombastic *The Virgin in Eden*. Christine Roulston’s observations about common traits in anti-Pamelist tracts are partly applicable to Povey’s piece: ‘[anti-Pamelist] critics seek to make explicit what they see as implicit in the narrative, namely Pamela’s deviousness. What emerges in their writings, however, is a paradox, for their own language becomes eroticised in its drive to strip Pamela bare of her disguises.’[[198]](#footnote-198) Povey removes all of Pamela’s clothes and Richardson’s rhetorical flourish, exposing them to his readership. However, Povey accomplishes this stripping without erotic language – in fact, his diction is unpalatably self-righteous and, even at the time of publication, dated. *The Virgin in Eden* is a hodge-podge polemical tract that takes an anti-Pamelist stance to the perceived moral hypocrisy of Richardson’s text and warm scenes in *Pamela*, for example, Povey questions the purpose of such titillating moments: ‘Are they pictures to extinguish vice, and restrain the wickedness of the Times?’[[199]](#footnote-199) Povey’s reference to *Pamela* as pictures to view illuminates the visual quality of Richardson’s text and the reader’s conflicted position as both reader and voyeur. If anti-Pamelist readers were expecting yet another eye-brow raising, licentious narrative response to *Pamela* in *The Virgin in Eden*, they would have been sorely disappointed. Roulston’s other astute observation about anti-Pamelist works, that they ‘indulge the voyeurism against which they claim to guard their readers’, is not applicable to Povey’s *The Virgin in Eden*.[[200]](#footnote-200) Unlike Fielding’s rowdy *Shamela* or *Pamela Censured* which delight in fleshing out the fleshliness of *Pamela*, Povey recoils with horror at each titillating scene and does not dwell on the details.

One can imagine Philip Mercier’s elegant and bold portrait of *Pamela* *rising from her bed* (c. 1745) as the visual expression of a typical anti-Pamelist heroine (like the protagonist found in Fielding’s *Shamela* and *Pamela Censured* or Haywood’s *Anti-Pamela*). In one version of Mercier’s painting a dark-haired, buxom young woman rises from a rumpled bed; one hand brazenly holds back the tumbling curtains, the other rests nonchalantly on her pillow – neither hand protects her modesty by covering her exposed breast or pulling up her slipping shift. Pamela’s gaze is level and steady, from her expression and posture, it is clear that she is welcoming the gaze of the viewer (and Mr B), and perhaps even inviting him into her bed. The second recorded version of this painting has slight variations in Pamela’s cap, curtain, quill pen, and paper. [[201]](#footnote-201) With its fleshy lines and earthy colours, this could be a portrait of a mistress, but Mercier has anchored his imagination in a literary context by prominently displaying Pamela’s quill pen, ink stand and letters. In fact, a bit of mystery surrounds Mercier’s *Pamela* paintings and demonstrates how incomplete our understanding of *Pamela*’s visual and verbal culture is: the two versions of *Pamela* are recorded as ‘location unknown’ in 1978 and in Turner’s article, but it has recently come to my attention that one version of *Pamela* is in a private collection in England. Furthermore, Ingamells tentatively suggests that several other paintings by Mercier that use the same model are possibly misattributed *Pamela* illustrations.[[202]](#footnote-202) The paintings that employ the same model are *The Lacemaker* (c.1745-50), *Girl with a Tea Tray* (c. 1743-44), *The Biblemaker* (1743), and *A Young Woman Removing her Stockings* (c. 1745). There are at least four known versions of *A Young Woman Removing her Stockings*, one of which came up for sale at Christie’s in 2004.[[203]](#footnote-203) There is nothing about the pose, setting, or sitter to suggest that this is definitely *not* Pamela, and given the importance of stockings in *Pamela* and Mercier’s other coy *Pamela*, this could be another contribution to the body of images of a ‘warm’ Pamela. While Fielding could quite happily adopt Mercier’s quiet vixen as the heroine of *Shamela*, this ‘anti-Pamela’ Pamela would outrage Povey. Povey’s impulse would be to pull up Pamela’s shift, push the girl back into bed, draw the bed curtains closed, and then draw a curtain over the painting. Povey may have disliked Pamela, but he did not overtly delight in her sexuality. Indeed, he has impressively strict standards for virtuous behaviour and avoids titillating the reader: ‘Virgins pure in mind and thought, when they retire to rest at night and have the least apprehension of a design against them, never undress till every Avenue in the room is searched and the doors safely secured.’[[204]](#footnote-204) Instead of checking for monsters under the bed, a true virgin must search the room for rakes before turning out the light.

How Povey Reacted to Richardson’s ‘Moralising’

Povey (165? – 1753) was a relatively obscure, prolific, eccentric and opinionated writer of tracts and some of the most concrete information about his life can be gleaned from late-eighteenth and mid-nineteenth century literary periodicals. For example, in the *Gentleman’s Magazine and Historical Chronicle*, 1788, Sylvanus Urban publishes a response to a question about Povey, author of ‘the Eternity of Hell Torments’; a ‘Castorius’[[205]](#footnote-205) informs Mr Urban and the readers of the magazine that he is in possession of several of Povey’s pamphlets and Povey was ‘a man of very singular turn of mind, somewhat of the cast of the late respectable, but enthusiastic, Mr Alex Cruden,[[206]](#footnote-206) but more rational.’[[207]](#footnote-207) This description is echoed nearly a century later in the 1865 January to June *Notes and Queries*, in which Povey is described as ‘an outstanding egoist, his works being filled with the most amusingly self-complacent examples of what he had done’.[[208]](#footnote-208) Over a century after this extensive note, Keymer and Sabor cleverly dubbed Povey ‘an exotic, zealous blast from the Puritan past.’[[209]](#footnote-209) Povey’s tracts were indeed overbearing, outdated, and prim; titles in his oeuvre include: ‘Judgement of whole Kingdoms and Nations’, ‘Advice to the Freeholders of England’, ‘A Memorial of the Proceedings of the late Ministry’, and the ‘English Inquisition’. In these documents, Povey vehemently addressed a variety of historical, contemporary, and personal topics inflaming readers and colleagues alike. John Dunton, a bookseller and author of *The Athenian Oracle* complained that Povey was a pirate: ‘Povey not only steals my projects but reprints those very questions and answers I formerly published in *The Athenian Chronicle*.’[[210]](#footnote-210) Povey was constantly controversial - according to the author in *Notes and Queries*, Povey’s *Virgin in Eden* did not increase his popularity and only enhanced his feeling of persecution: ‘[he] managed to render himself so unpopular that another of his complaints is that the false wits were down upon every move he made.’[[211]](#footnote-211) This little-known anecdote about why Povey’s idea to create a postal system was stolen by the government creates a fuller picture of the victimised polemicist: ‘Povey was original institutor of the present Penny-post…the ministry suspecting it to be too lucrative for a private subject, laid their injunctions on the inventor (and without making him any satisfaction) their hands upon the job.’[[212]](#footnote-212) In *The Virgin in Eden,* Povey uses the introduction as an opportunity to restate these earlier misfortunes: ‘Read my sheets, intitled *The English Memorial,* that I presented to the King and Parliament in the year one thousand seven hundred and thirty seven, there you will find and see my wrongs and sufferings.’[[213]](#footnote-213) It is interesting that Povey, who felt victimised and persecuted, chose to tackle the narrative of a victimised and persecuted girl, *Pamela*, written by an author, Richardson, who was particular sensitive to these feelings. What Povey and Richardson had in common though was their affinity to print as the perfect medium to air their grievances, and willingness to puff their wares at every opportunity.

Povey’s choice to address *Pamela* indicates how pertinent Richardson’s novel was in contemporary society and Povey did not spare any of his characteristic zeal and prudishness in his critique*.* Povey, whose only experience was in ephemeral, topical tracts, addresses Richardson’s prolix narrative in a comparatively thin one hundred and eighteen pages. Indeed, *The Virgin in Eden* is a sort of medieval morality tale/ contemporary journal, with a heavy accent of the Biblical. The titles and contents of the works in *The Virgin in Eden* are extensive, varied, and trying, and most importantly, create a picture of the literary company Povey’s exposé of *Pamela* was to keep:

‘The Virgin’s Vision – the first night she lay in Abraham’s house’, ‘The Parable of the Shepherd, Joshua, and Mary – who lived in thatched tenements’, ‘The Parable of Zachariah the Shepherd’, ‘The Parable of Mary’, ‘A Copy of the Manuscript taken out of Mary’s closet after her decease’, ‘Pamela’s Letters’, ‘The Copy of a letter sent by a Divine of the Church of England to the Author’, ‘The Copy of a Letter sent to the author from a dissenting minister’, ‘A copy of the letter directed to the author from a speaker amongst the people call’d Quakers’, ‘A copy of a letter deliver’d to the Author by a young Nobleman’, ‘A Copy of the Letter directed to the Author by a young Lady’, ‘Manuscripts directed to Sodom’, ‘The Virgin’s Epistle’, ‘A Copy of a Letter writ in Sodom by the Virgin’s sister’, ‘Manuscripts directed from Canaan to the City of Sodom’, ‘The Virgin’s Brother’s Memorial’, ‘A Memorial’, ‘Authentick Speeches and Divine Sayings of Queen Mary and Carolina’, ‘A Panegyrick in Memory of Mary and Carolina’, ‘The Speeches and Sayings of Queen Mary’, ‘A Copy of the Manuscript found in Queen Mary’s closet’, ‘A Memorial to the Defendants of Queen Caroline’, ‘The Virgin in Eden’s Memorial to Prince George, Prince Edward, and Princess Augusta’, ‘Universal Charity imitates the saviour of the world’, ‘A Catalogue of what Points the Author hath wrote upon and publish’d, not yet recited in his treatises’.

A small portion of this material directly addresses Richardson’s *Pamela,* although the quasi-Virgin’s progress that surrounds *Pamela’s Letters* is a heavily-veiled re-write of Richardson’s narrative. A few attacks on Richardson’s *Pamela* are hidden in these other works; for example in ‘A Copy of the Manuscript taken out of Mary’s Closet after her decease’, which precedes ‘Pamela’s Letters’, Mary primly reports: ‘In the flower of youth I never convers’d with men of lewd conversation. That restraint extinguish’d vain thoughts otherwise I might have given up my Honour to strangers, and sacrific’d my Innoceny.’[[214]](#footnote-214) To this, Povey interjects and adds: ‘What words can be more excellent than these of Mary for Virgins in our Age to copy after.’[[215]](#footnote-215) Povey may sound like he is posing a question, but is making a definite assertion, as his attack of *Pamela* on the following pages of this hodgepodge polemical tract demonstrates.

*The Virgin in Eden* as *Pamela* in Homespun

The surviving, tattered copies of *The Virgin in Eden* are in keeping with Povey’s fast-paced, cheap printing tactics, as described by our informant in the 1783 *Gentleman’s Magazine*. His description of the author’s production of ‘Judgement of whole Kingdoms and Nations’ could be applied to *The Virgin in Eden*, albeit the fictitious crest was not omitted: ‘It is an octavo pamphlet of 71 pages, and, like all his other pieces, printed in miserable type and bad paper, at the same time wanting on the title-page, what all his other publications have, a sort of crest, very much resembling what we often meet in the bills of quacks and mountebanks.’[[216]](#footnote-216) Povey printed his works privately, published most of them irregularly and anonymously,[[217]](#footnote-217) and was sensitive to the importance of the book as a physical object. Although his works were more functional than ornamental, Povey viewed the author as an artist and begins his criticism of *Pamela* with this assertion: ‘Books are schools that beautify or stain the soul. Authors may be compar’d to Painters, who draw representations according to their Fancy, or what they think tend most to their gain.’[[218]](#footnote-218) Povey’s argument here is convoluted: first, books have the power to either enlighten or taint a person, and their authors either write what they imagine or what will be commercially successful. It can be assumed that Povey intended his work to purify and beautify the soul and that *The Virgin in Eden* represents his virtuous ‘fancy’. His flimsy, paper-bound text is a striking contrast to Richardson’s elegant calf-skin duodecimos, and reinforces his argument that *Pamela* is a corrupting, immoral narrative masquerading as a virtuous conduct book. A virtuous work should be simple, like Povey’s, and the relatively refined qualities of Richardson’s texts serve only to spoil the soul. In this sense, it is Povey who first puts *Pamela* in a ‘quaker’-like costume. Povey refers to *Pamela* as the ‘apple of sodom’, a pun of Aaron Hill’s compliment that Pamela was the angel of Sodom – which implies that *Pamela* is ‘beautiful for the eye to behold, but stains and rottenness within.’[[219]](#footnote-219) Povey argues that his tract is devoted to beautifying the soul, and although his moral lessons are not distractingly graceful or eloquent, their earnestness means they are solid, virtuous, and lasting. In Povey’s mind, Richardson’s *Pamela* has a heart of darkness and immorality.

Povey devotes a considerable amount of attention to the paratextual material; his bold, assertive title page makes an immediate impact on the reader.[[220]](#footnote-220) The title-page is a typical, eighteenth-century ‘hurly-burly’ construction,[[221]](#footnote-221) and Povey’s announcement begins with a stately crest, surrounded by a declaration: ‘Examples to convert, or at least amend in Every Family, either the Father, the mother, the son or the daughter’ (Figure 9). While *Pamela* is intended to appeal to the ‘youth of both sexes’, Povey broadens his target audience to include the parents. The remainder of the syntactically confusing puffs on the title-page foreshadow the strange assortment of material included in Povey’s work, and also reveal a strong fixation on the tension between art and artifice:

The Virgin in Eden; or, the State of Innocency. Deliver’d by way of Image and Description. Presenting a Nobleman, a Student, and Heiress, on the Progress from Sodom to Canaan…Pamela’s letters proved to be Immodest Romances painted in the Images of Virtue: Masquerades in Disguise, that receiv’d Birth, now Vice reigns in Triumph and swells in Streams even to a deluge.[[222]](#footnote-222)

Like many other anti-Pamelists, Povey is addressing the perceived hypocrisy, confusion, and contradiction in *Pamela*, and his buzzwords, ‘art’, ‘artifice’, ‘masquerade’, ‘painted’, and ‘disguise’, are the key words that run through each chapter of this thesis, confirming their relevance to the many readings of *Pamela*. Although most scholars dismiss the contents of Povey’s work as inconsequential, the points raised in his text about artifice have a direct effect on his tract’s appearance and also reflect back on the physical appearance of Richardson’s *Pamela*. Neither the book nor its heroine should be ‘dress’d in airs.’[[223]](#footnote-223)

Povey begins his tirade with an anecdote about a virtuous lady presenting the author with Richardson’s *Pamela*: Povey tells the reader that from the book’s appearance and paratextual material, he believed the novel to be chaste and didactic. When Povey actually began to read the narrative, his impression was contradicted: ‘I have not gone through two sheets before I perceiv’d myself, as it were, convey’d within the circles of lewdness; nay even in Bed-chambers frequented by women as charming as nuns, in company with wild Rakes.’[[224]](#footnote-224) Povey has found himself in the presence of a Pamela à la Mercier and story-line that he expected to be sobering and puritanical is instead titillating, provocative, and engaging. The quality of Richardson’s writing activated Povey’s imagination and enabled him to feel too close to the action. Povey is beside himself with guilt and indignation because the text has elicited such an illicit response from him. As a ninety-two year old man at the time of writing *The Virgin in Eden*, Povey can only imagine that what raised his pulse and dilated his pupils would have consumed malleable and impressionable youths, whose ‘blood is Hot, and runs quick in every vein’ in passion.[[225]](#footnote-225) Povey refrains from directly quoting Richardson’s text because he wants to shelter virtuous readers from depravity and instead uses *Pamela* as an abstracted springboard for his own moral views. He focuses his criticism on Pamela, the character, and on Richardson, the Editor. Povey seems to believe that *Pamela* was not fictional, and criticises Richardson, who as an editor, chose to print and disseminate such a distasteful, immoral tale. As Gwilliam points out in her commentary on anti-Pamelist literature, anti-Pamelist authors often conflated Richardson with his heroine, and saw ‘the relation of Richardson to his heroine…as an obvious but perverse self-reflection.’[[226]](#footnote-226) This links back to the earlier discussion of Richardson’s narrative transvestism and his strong identification with female characters, demonstrating that contemporary readers found the author’s connection unusual. Povey’s conflation of Richardson and his heroine shows clearly how some anti-Pamelist sentiment was motivated by a disdain for such strong narrative transvestism. With Richardson’s many masks and voices, how was Povey to know who and what were accurate reflections of the author/editor’s soul?

Povey locates an essential flaw in Richardson’s characterization and narrative and argues that if Pamela was truly virtuous, she never would have spoken to Mr B, or remained in the house long enough for him to make an advance:

My answer to the Editor is this, I here lay it down as a maxim to the present and after generation that sedate reflections, secluded from every temptation, directs the running of springs of unruly youths, and brings home their wandering thoughts to God. Pure Virgins keep their innocency, undefil’d, they never converse with lewd Rakes.[[227]](#footnote-227)

Povey argues that if Richardson had sincerely intended his heroine to be virtuous, he would have had her escape from Mr B’s house, even if it had meant leaving his waistcoat unfinished. In fact, Povey’s recommended course of action for Pamela is brutal and he recommends a Lucretia-like stance: ‘Virgins pure in Thought retreat upon the First Temptation; at the second, flee as an arrow from the snare; never return more to that man, tho’ they starve and die.’[[228]](#footnote-228) Because Richardson’s Pamela chose to stay and not risk rape, starvation, or robbery on what would have been a road to ruin, she cannot be considered virtuous. Povey includes letters from like-minded readers, completely contradicting Richardson’s praise of his heroine. In a slightly ironic twist, considering Richardson’s Pamela would appear as a Quaker in *Pamela II*, a Quaker father complains to Povey that : ‘I am the father of ten sons and daughters. Thy manuscript wherein thou settest forth Pamela’s Letters Immodest romances, thou sayest well: they are profane lessons, and shall not dwell in my house.’[[229]](#footnote-229) *Pamela* would also find herself an unwelcome house guest in the home of a ‘young nobleman’ who also complains to Povey:

The Editor teaches more lewdness than chastity…Pamela’s epistles are licentious scenes…Images of virtue and lewdness painted in one picture, can never sacrifice vice, nor convert the prodigal.[[230]](#footnote-230)

This young nobleman seems to be anticipating Mercier’s *Pamela* painting in his comment about virtue and lewdness being uneasy bedfellows. He signs his letter ‘I am your convert’, indicating that Richardson was not alone in having converts, apostles, and preachers.

Art and Artifice

Povey treats Richardson as a ‘fanciful’ painter who has distorted virtue to appeal to the basest passions in his reading public and ensure financial gains. *Pamela*’s elegant bindings, sycophantic prefatory material, sumptuous epistolary narrative, and festishising of material goods are considered by Povey artful disguises. In *Pamela*, fine clothes may hide a servant’s body, but they cannot make it disappear, and Povey is sensitive to this tension. In essence, Povey is crashing Richardson’s masquerade, stopping the orchestra, and unmasking the characters. To Povey, Richardson’s *Pamela* is a low-brow, bawdy chapbook masquerading as a sophisticated and moral history, or in the words of a ‘young lady’ and fan of *The Virgin in Eden*, *Pamela* is ‘the moon in eclipse, and *The Virgin in Eden* [is] the sun at is meridian height.’[[231]](#footnote-231)

Although Povey tried his hand at thoughtful, poetic prose, waxing lyrical about the depravity of contemporary society in statements such as ‘Now as I behold Vice reigns in Triumph, and swells even to a Deluge, I cannot, tho’ I am arrived at the Period of four score, retire from my study till I have delivered my ideas of Holy Living and Dying and presented them to all ranks and degrees in this degenerate age’, he was first and foremost a polemical tract writer. His works were hurriedly and cheaply printed so that they could be quickly and easily disseminated to the public. He places his criticism of *Pamela* in this chapbook like format and attempts to challenge Richardson’s more substantial duodecimos and octavos. Povey considers his work an interweaving of ‘images and descriptions’, and although there are no illustrations, Povey’s vivid, impactful, and emotive language inspired by his experience as a tract writer, is highly persuasive. Furthermore, although Povey’s work was printed rapidly, this should not detract from the gravity of his intentions or seriousness as an author. Like Richardson, Povey sees writing as a way to expunge the modern generation of their immorality: ‘my writings will do me Honour in the sight of Men and Angels, when I am gone to silence and returned to my original dust.’[[232]](#footnote-232) *The Virgin in Eden* is part of this legacy. Povey considers Richardson’s work to be a literary ‘dead sea fruit’ that dissolves into ashes when read, but ironically, it is *The Virgin in Eden*, paper-bound and cheaply printed, that has faded over time. It is an ephemeral book with an overzealous message – the fragility of the physical object to survive has ensured that Povey’s message has diminished with the foxed and dog-eared pages, crumbling binding, and loosened leaves. Moreover, Povey’s work must not have been the success he predicted it would be; in his will, he left two hundred copies of *The Virgin in Eden* for distribution to a select group of widows.[[233]](#footnote-233) Widows occupied a liminal social position and were often viewed as sexual wantons; interestingly, along with single women, they were the largest buyers of fiction in the eighteenth-century.[[234]](#footnote-234) Povey’s sombre words have resonance: ‘The Time allotted in these visible shades are momentary, years flee away, ages leave no other traces behind them but as it were shadows or stories transmitted to us in History, which oftentimes adds deformity, rather than Beauty to the memory.’[[235]](#footnote-235) His vehement work has added to the memory and understanding of the reception of Richardson’s *Pamela; The Virgin in Edens* shows us the variety of narrative and authorial qualities that Anti-Pamelists objected to and that such a slim tract could challenge the authority and hierarchy of a duodecimo novel.

Francis Newbery’s Children’s Book

Francis Newbery’s pocket-sized *Pamela* (1769) for children functions as a curious foil to Povey’s cheap, chapbook-like response to Richardson’s novel. The narrative that Povey found unfit to repeat and quote in *The Virgin in Eden* was transformed into suitable material for one of the first children’s book abridgements made by Francis Newbery, after taking over his father’s printing business in 1767. Although Keymer and Sabor dismiss this *Pamela* abridgement as one of the ‘least distinguished’ and criticise the illustrations for ‘lack [of] any vitality’, I argue that Newbery’s edition is a valuable contribution to the study of *Pamela*’s visual culture, its reception, and its ability to assume varied, and often, contradicting forms. *Pamela*, which could be interpreted as toxic and corrupting by anti-Pamelists, could also be packaged as a successful and charming children’s book.

Francis Newbery’s publications were a continuation of a tradition of printing cheerful children’s books established by his father, John Newbery. John Newbery was considered the first genuine and prosperous publisher of children’s books.[[236]](#footnote-236) Brian Alderson and Felix de Marez Oyens describe John Newbery as an ‘experimenter’[[237]](#footnote-237) and indeed, during his lifetime, his firm published approximately twenty to thirty children’s books.[[238]](#footnote-238) More importantly, John Newbery was, according to Charles Walsh, the first to create quality products: ‘[he] gave children books in a more permanent form than the popular chapbooks of the period.’[[239]](#footnote-239) Until Newbery’s publications, books written for children were cheap chapbooks ‘simply folded and not stitched’; Newbery found the low standards of quality for children’s books intolerable: ‘[he] was irritated that booksellers to whom he sold the fifth edition of [Mathurin] Cordier’s *Colloquia* in sheets were selling copies in inferior binding which distracted from the reputation of the book, and so he determined to sell school books only in the strong linen binding he devised.’[[240]](#footnote-240) Newbery’s books were ‘strongly bound and gilt,’[[241]](#footnote-241) and alongside the strong linen binding, he also used parti-coloured, Dutch floral print paper. Although very few examples of these well-worn volumes survive, we can rely on anecdotes for how the works were perceived and received. In Leigh Hunt’s *The Town*, the author reflects fondly on John Newbery’s little pocket books: ‘The most illustrious of all booksellers in our boyish days, not for his great names, not for his dinners, not for his riches that we know of, not for any other full-grown celebrity but for certain little penny books, radiant with gold and rich with bad pictures, was Mr Newbery, the famous children’s bookseller.’[[242]](#footnote-242) Reflections such as this suggest that the works were beloved for their cheerful colours and charming simplicity, and evoked nostalgia from readers who had long outgrown the moral and didactic tales.

John Newbery’s interest in the importance of the physical qualities of the texts extended further than the binding and paratextual materials; for example, Newbery was a clever and prolific puffer and launched several advertising campaigns that offered children’s toys – ‘free games, pull-outs, and models’, with the purchase of a book.[[243]](#footnote-243) Like many other booksellers, Newbery sold patent medicines, trinkets, and other assorted goods.[[244]](#footnote-244) Newbery ‘advertised’ his other wares in his narrative quite frequently, ‘having experimented in advertising gimmicks or their patent medicines, [they] indulged in ingenious book trade advertising in London newspapers, in handbills in the sheets, and in well-placed asides within the actual narrative of the tales.’[[245]](#footnote-245) Newbery was not the first to imbed puffery in his narrative - Richardson occasionally dropped a subtle reference in his writing; for example, Pamela alludes to *Aesop’s Fables*, published by Richardson in 1740: ‘I am as much frighted as were the city mouse and the country mouse, in the same book of Fables, at every thing that stirs,’[[246]](#footnote-246) but he was the first to target children and offer them paraphernalia of their favourite characters.

With accessible prices, brightly coloured binding, good quality, and cheerful illustrations, John Newbery’s books capitalised on the burgeoning market for children’s publications in the mid-eighteenth century. Frederick Darnton attributes Newbery’s ability to corner this market to the social, political, and economic conditions of eighteenth-century England, ‘internal peace, increasing trade at home, and a broad, wider literacy in all but the lowest of classes.’[[247]](#footnote-247) While the ‘development’ of childhood in the eighteenth-century is outside the scope of this thesis, it is worth briefly discussing children’s literature during this period to better situate Newbery’s work and point out that producing a children’s book was more than puffery. Anja Müller argues that ‘rather than merely reflecting existing notions of childhood…children’s literature functions as a mediating instance, presenting, negotiating, and proliferating concepts of childhood by claiming to represent the character and needs of a particular age group.’[[248]](#footnote-248) Producers of children’s literature drew on the wealth of novels and romances in the market-place and then tempered works so that they did not ‘over stimulate their senses nor unduly incite their emotions,’ thus ‘integrating them into an age specific system.’[[249]](#footnote-249) Before Newbery revolutionised children’s literature, play-books and hornbooks were printed for children on small sheets, costing a mere fourpence, and most of the works were what we would consider chapbooks.[[250]](#footnote-250) These chapbooks, previously the ‘staple literary food of the young people’, were folded, not stitched, and fragile.[[251]](#footnote-251) Newbery’s brightly coloured, durably-bounds were a marked departure and were clearly meant for childish pleasure.[[252]](#footnote-252) Thus Newbery, rightfully, was touted as ‘probably one of the most ingenuous advertisers of his day’ was also one of the best children’s printers of his time, and Francis Newbery inherited these sensitivities.[[253]](#footnote-253) Although Francis Newbery did not creatively package toys to compliment his abridged narratives, he did heavily puff his other works for children, which gives us a better picture of *The History of Pamela*’s companions – a mixture of moral fables and abridged popular novels: *The Brother’s Gift, or the Naughty Girl Reformed, The Cries of London, as they are daily exhibited in the streets, A New and Beautiful Edition of Aesop’s Fables, The History of Sir Charles Grandison, Clarissa; or the History of a Young Lady,* and *The History of Joseph Andrews* – all are ‘embellish’d with copperplates’ or ‘adorned with cuts.’ It is clear from Francis Newbery’s catalogue of works that he focused on making adult novels readable, moral and didactic; so how did he manage to eliminate the *Pamela* controversy from what many considered a ‘warm’ and ‘lewd’ text?

*Pamela* in the Hands of Children

The first and most striking difference between Francis Newbery’s book and Richardson’s novel is the format; Francis Newbery’s *The History of Pamela* was a slim, one hundred and sixty-eight page sextodecimo abridgement, bound by Newbery in cheap, parti-colour Dutch floral print paper, containing six illustrations and a frontispiece.[[254]](#footnote-254) As Newbery’s title-page states, the price of the abridgement was 1 shilling, making it affordable for its target audience –parents of young children.[[255]](#footnote-255) In this child-friendly, portable pocket work, Newbery placed illustrations designed and engraved by a minor and unexceptional John Lodge (fl. 1782). Unsurprisingly, these illustrations pale in comparison to the earlier images produced by Gravelot, Hayman, and Highmore discussed in Chapter Five, but Lodge’s cheap cuts also serve as an important foil for the high-brow, elegant, and often out-of-touch engravings; Lodge’s work is visual confirmation of how easily *Pamela*/Pamela could be manipulated to appeal to the tastes of children and lower-class readers. The primary purpose of Lodge’s illustrations was in functionality, not aesthetics, although his images are not without charm. In a copy of *The History of Pamela* at the British Library, Lodge’s engravings are partially coloured in simple washes of colour – Pamela is sometimes given a purple and yellow spotted dress, and sometimes has very pink cheeks.[[256]](#footnote-256) These decorative embellishments must be the hand of one of *Pamela*’s young readers, and the little splotches of colour provide a palpable example of how eighteenth-century children used and treated their books. Lodge illustrated five events in Pamela’s narrative, namely: ‘Pamela seeks advice from Mrs Jervis’, ‘Mr Andrews meets Mr B’, ‘Pamela contemplates suicide’, ‘Pamela reunited with her father’, and ‘Pamela fleeing Lady Davers’. As Keymer and Sabor observe, Lodge’s choice of scenes to illustrate were similar to those selected by Gravelot and Hayman (albeit Lodge does not include Pamela’s marriage to Mr B). Unlike Gravelot, Hayman, and Highmore, Lodge did not have the luxury to dwell on Pamela’s beauty and harmony in elegant rococo settings, nor were the flimsy pages of the sextodecimo the appropriate setting for this aesthetic flight. A comparison of the same scene ‘Pamela Reunited with her Father’ illustrated by Lodge and by Gravelot and Hayman demonstrates how the form of Pamela followed the function of *Pamela* (Figures 10 and 11).

In Lodge’s depiction of the heroine’s reunion with her father, Pamela is imagined as an excitable and graceless girl, thoughtlessly flinging herself to the floor and upsetting furniture. Lodge emphasises the raw humanity of Pamela whereas Gravelot and Hayman show her as a paragon of virtue. The accompanying narrative to this scene in Richardson’s text is Pamela’s description of her unrestrained joy at her father’s visit: ‘Lifting my eyes, and seeing my father, gave a spring, overturned the table, without regard to the company, and threw myself at his feet.’[[257]](#footnote-257) Newbery expands on this unbridled joy in his rendition of the scene:

Pamela knew his voice; she saw him, she gave a spring, overturned the card- table, and threw herself at his feet, crying, ‘O my father! My father! Can it be? Is it you? – Yes, it is, it is! – Bless, o, bless your happy, happy - - she here sunk down, and all the ladies ran to her, made her drink a glass of water; when soon recovered, she found herself in the arms of her father.[[258]](#footnote-258)

There is an earthy quality to his Pamela, reminiscent of John Kelly’s imperfect heroine and Lodge captures this in his illustration. He places Pamela in a clumsily designed drawing room with an impossible perspective – the floor appears to slant. Mr B’s upper-class guests are all seated stiffly in over-powering chairs with splats that are a poor invocation of Thomas Chippendale’s designs from the 1760s. This is a slightly modernised *Pamela*, not set in 1720, but in the mid-eighteenth-century. Mr Andrews leans awkwardly down to catch his hysterical daughter. For all her aesthetic faults and unpolished manners, Lodge’s Pamela is natural, unguarded, and approachable – in such an emotional reunion, tears would be shed, knees buckled, and tables and chairs overturned. As Pamela knocks over the card-table, she flings aside the layers of social convention and returns to her true servant-girl-self, revealing an internal goodness that exists regardless of garments or graces. Lodge may have been a fairly talentless draughtsman, but he was attuned to the importance of the visual image in guiding a young reader’s interpretation – in this scene, he knows the pulse of Pamela and his readers.

In direct contrast to this childish composition, Gravelot and Hayman’s illustration for Richardson’s sixth edition octavo denies Pamela’s softness, spontaneity, and authenticity. Although Gravelot and Hayman include an overturned table for good measure, it does not look like Pamela is overwhelmed or excited. Gravelot’s lithe, lissom Pamela leans towards her father, and he extends his arms to embrace her. Gravelot’s Pamela’s face maintains its characteristic expressionless appearance; the focus is more on her clothing than on her emotions. Mr B’s other well-turned out guests form a pleasing backdrop to the scene, and Gravelot has ensured that the room, with paintings and rococo ornamentation, is as refined as its inhabitants. Lodge’s engraving treats the setting as subordinate to the action, but Gravelot delights in all the details. Indeed, Gravelot’s illustration was not created to show the reader Pamela’s true emotions in the reunion, but rather, to reassure the reader that in all situations, regardless of her feelings, Pamela always maintained an elegant and lady-like persona. While Lodge’s image honours the humility and sensitivity of Pamela’s former servant-girl status with simple lines, heavy cross-hatching, and attention to action, Gravelot denies the existence of this inferior being and confirms Pamela’s inherent refinement in arabesque lines, fine frocks, fitting architectural settings, and rococo figures.

Although Lodge’s five illustrations in the body of the text correspond to the scenes previously represented by Hayman and Gravelot, Lodge was asked to include a frontispiece to Newbery’s edition, something not in the 1742 sixth edition. As we will see in Chapter Five, Richardson had planned for a frontispiece to appear in the second edition of *Pamela*, but this never came into fruition. It is unclear why Gravelot and Hayman were instructed to overlook a frontispiece, but perhaps this comes from Richardson’s indecision about what scene would actually make an appropriate centrepiece, discussed in the final chapter of this thesis. The frontispiece in Newbery’s *The History of Pamela* would have instantly grabbed a young reader’s attention and given them an immediate impression of the heroine. Newbery was one of the first to include a frontispiece (the other attempt was Carwitham’s in *The Life of Pamela* and sent Lodge into uncharted territory; the scene selected to illustrate was ‘Pamela going into service’ (Figure 12). While Richardson’s *Pamela* did not include details of the heroine leaving her family to go into service with the B’s at the age of 12, Newbery’s abridged (and in this case, expanded) *The History of Pamela* includes an explanation of how his heroine became a lady’s maid:

The lovely Pamela, was the daughter of Mr Andrews, who, from being in pretty easy circumstances, was reduced to be a day-labourer, and to earn his bread by hedging and ditching. When she was twelve years of age, Lady B, taking a fancy to her, received her into her family; and as she daily grew more genteel, pretty, and engaging, her ladyship became so fond of her, that she took great pleasure in improving her mind.[[259]](#footnote-259)

Lodge translates this scene into images by showing Pamela leaving her modest home in a simple dress and cap – an outfit Pamela would try to recreate in her thwarted attempt to escape Mr B’s – heading towards her future. This young Pamela, honest, poor, and humble, would have appeased anti-Pamelists, like Povey. Although it is unlikely that Pamela would have made the journey to the B’s on her own, Pamela is shown alone, allowing the viewer to get an impression of the heroine before she becomes entangled in adventures. This addition may also represent Pamela’s singularity and correspond with a common figure in children’s literature: the child on its own. Pamela’s head is slightly bowed, making her facial expression unreadable, and one hand rests on her chest, as if indicating nervousness and uncertainty. The sky, trees, and cottage are heavily hatched, creating an impression of heaviness and foreboding. A patch of light (created by a lack of hatching) rests at Pamela’s feet, suggesting that while her journey may be unpredictable, there is hope for the preservation of her integrity and virtue. This is the most static and comprehensive glimpse the reader gets of Newbery’s rendition of the heroine; in the next five illustrations, Pamela will be much deeper into the picture plane, darting across the scene. For all its simplicity and childish charm, Lodge’s frontispiece is an important contribution to the *Pamela* media event – it presents us with a clear-cut interpretation of Newbery’s revised heroine, and provides a visual representation of how Newbery clarified the text and simplified the images to make it more suitable for children.

In this sense, Lodge’s illustrations can be seen as a visual parallel to Newbery’s reworked narrative; although Lodge largely based his images on scenes already selected by Hayman and Gravelot, he manipulated the image to represent Newbery’s plot, which in turn, was structured around central scenes gleaned from Richardson’s novel. Both Lodge and Newbery distilled the complexities, embellishments, and controversy from *Pamela*, and thus, we can view *The History of Pamela* as a simplified *Pamela.* Naturally, Newbery had to shorten Richardson’s prolix narrative, simplify the story line, and the third-person narrative firmly guides the impressionable young reader through the text to one very clear didactic conclusion. Newbery makes it clear from the title-page that this is a work for children, but also one that he expected to be read aloud, shared, and discussed by ‘Parents, Guardians, and Governesses of Great Britain and Ireland.’[[260]](#footnote-260) As we have seen, Newbery then provides the reader with a brief but vital description of Pamela’s family’s circumstances, which eliminates the anti-Pamelist complaint that the heroine’s marriage to Mr B was ‘preposterous.’[[261]](#footnote-261) Eve Taylor Bannet, who has compared Richardson’s and Newbery’s narratives in great detail explains the message that Newbery was trying to convey to children in the first part of *The History of Pamela*: ‘Newbery turned the first part of the novel into a condemnatory study of sexual harassment, domestic violence and rape, which demonstrates the role of passions in disrupting household peace. The emotions that Newbery initially puts in play between Pamela and Mr B are not attraction, love or lust, but anger, jealously, and fear.’[[262]](#footnote-262)

These modifications are completely in keeping with the tradition of eighteenth-century children’s literature – adult romances were purged of all questionable ingredients, a clear didactic message was formed from various moral impulses within the narrative, and the editor was a prominent figure in leading his young readers to a worthy and instructive goal. Müller further explains the self-reflective qualities of children’s literature which are clearly applicable to *The History of Pamela*: ‘By explicitly instructing the child reader in how to handle and understand the book, children’s literature mediates in its own structure a ‘monitored’ reading controlling its reception. In the absence of the parent or other adults, the children’s book itself comes to embody or reflect the tutor/monitor. The child readers are not left to their devices, but they are controlled’.[[263]](#footnote-263) Newbery is controlling the child reader by constructing an appealing physical text, inserting clear and readable illustrations, and removing complex and mature emotions such as romantic love or lust from the narrative. Newbery’s Pamela tries much harder to run away from Mr B, and does not use petty excuses, such as an unfinished waistcoat to stay. Furthermore, Newbery points out to his young readers that the people are obligated to help the weak and vulnerable, as Bannet explains:

Newbery’s point was that everyone in the household ‘family’…was responsible for what transpired in it, and had a duty to protect the innocent against the lascivious, the weak against the strong, and an inferior against a superior, which superseded the duty to obey their master, even if doing so went against their own self-interest.[[264]](#footnote-264)

Newbery highlights Mrs Jervis’s exemplary behaviour when she protects Pamela from Mr B’s advances: ‘Sir, quoth Mrs Jervis, throwing herself across Pamela and clasping her round the waist, you shall not hurt this innocent, I will lose my life in her defense.’[[265]](#footnote-265) The idea that we are required to put aside self-interest in order to protect the moral and virtuous is clearly a didactic current coursing through *Pamela*, and it is one of the most child-friendly lessons Richardson’s novel has to offer to young readers. In fact, as Bannet astutely observes, Newbery is more interested in the contrasting behaviour of Mrs Jervis, who tries to protect Pamela, and Mrs Jewkes, who gleefully indulges in punishment, ‘when confronted with their master’s abuses of domestic power’ than on the tortuous relationship between Pamela and Mr B.[[266]](#footnote-266) The marriage of Pamela and Mr B, which is the apex of Richardson’s novel, receives fleeting recognition in Newbery’s work: ‘The marriage was performed the following Thursday, as private as possible, none of the family having the least notice of it, except Mrs Jewkes and maid-servant. Mr Williams performed the ceremony and Mr Peters gave her away.’[[267]](#footnote-267) Newbery’s refocusing of Richardson’s narrative fits with Bannet’s theory that ‘Newbery answers the objections made in *Critical Remarks* so exactly that he might have been their author.’[[268]](#footnote-268) Bannet is referring to *Critical Remarks on Sir Charles Grandison, Clarissa, and Pamela*: *Enquiring whether they have a tendency to corrupt or improve the Public taste and morals in a Letter to the Author*’ (1754), written by an anonymous ‘Lover of Virtue’. This slim tract was sold by J. Dowse, an ‘obscure pamphlet shop proprietor’[[269]](#footnote-269) and was dismissive of *Pamela* as a moral and instructive work. The ‘Lover of Virtue’s’ main complaint about *Pamela* was that the novel was a thinly veiled promotion of exchanging sex for social status:

The plot and fable of your *Pamela* may indeed be easily enough discovered. They consist in Mr B’s attempts to debauch his beautiful young waiting-maid, her resistance, and their happy nuptials. If we look for a moral, we shall find only one that can be extracted out if it to be very ridiculous, useless, and impertinent it appears to be this, that when a young gentleman of fortune cannot obtain his ends of a handsome servant girl, he ought to marry her, and the said girl out to resist him in expectation of that event.[[270]](#footnote-270)

Newbery’s relative lack of interest in Pamela’s marriage to Mr B short-circuits the above criticism and fleshes out the other less-titillating and commercial morals inherent in Richardson’s novel - morals which fittingly, are more appealing and digestible for children. Newbery addresses criticism from works such as *Critical Remarks* not only by readjusting Richardson’s narrative, but as we have seen, by presenting a cohesive and readable image of the heroine, and by packaging the work in a simple, durable, and enticing binding. Bannet’s narrative analysis of Newbery’s abridged work is strengthened by my discussion of the physical appearance of the text, demonstrating the importance of the physical object in understanding reception. The differences in attitudes towards *Pamela* expressed by Newbery and the ‘lover of virtue’ show once again the incredible flexibility of Richardson’s narrative and the Pygmalion-like possibilities of its heroine. It was in a book for babes then, that criticisms of Richardson’s *Pamela* were answered - the warm scenes were cooled and the heroine returned to her natural and humble state.

How Newbery’s Abridgement Affected *Pamela*

In Richardson’s lifetime, there was one prominent abridgment of his three fictional works entitled *The Paths of Virtue Delineated* (1756), and Newbery’s *The History of Pamela* did not appear until nearly a decade after his death. As we have seen, the authors of these mid-to-late eighteenth-century abridgements of Richardson’s prolix epistolary novels had no qualms in altering the structure, narrative, and style of the originals. These later editors/ authors replaced the epistolary style with a third person narrative, as Leah Price explains in her study of anthologies: ‘Eighteenth-century abridgements altered epistolarity along with length. For a collection of first-person present tense letters “written to the moment” they substituted a single retrospective, impersonal narrator, temporally…removed from the events described.’[[271]](#footnote-271) For most editors, re-casting the narrator was the only way to reduce the bulk of epistolary material and still maintain a story line. Transforming an epistolary novel into a third person narration also required some additional details to efficiently convey important information. Like Newbery’s tactical decision to introduce the reader to Pamela before she went into service and to give more logical details about her humble origins, all other abridgement writers ‘prefixed genealogical material and biographical information to the courtship plot which Richardson himself had begun *in media res* before returning belatedly to the heroine’s childhood origins.’[[272]](#footnote-272) For example, *The Paths of Virtue Delineated* was fairly successful and went through several editions both in one volume containing all three stories, and as three separate volumes. Interestingly, Newbery’s abridgement only had one print run in England but was met with great success in America, as Bannet chronicles: ‘American printers in Philadelphia, Boston, and New York followed at the turn of the century by a host of country printers, appropriated Newbery’s *Pamela*; there were at least ten American editions of it before 1800, and three more before 1819. Newbery’s *Pamela* was far more frequently reprinted in America than the abridged *Clarissa*. While the American reception of *Pamela* is outside the scope of this thesis, it is worth positing that Newbery’s simpler, class-climbing heroine was more palatable to the Colonists, who devoured stories of servants marrying masters such as Elizabeth Canning’s supposedly factual report of her kidnapping. The statistics support these cross-class marriages in a newly forming country that was essentially a social melting pot: ‘In America, though less than a third of indentured servants were female, reality and the marriage plot had initially converged in young colonies were white women were scarce, they rapidly married even when they had arrived as convicts.’[[273]](#footnote-273) Thus, when Christopher Smart, Francis Newbery’s brother-in-law, decided to promote his books in local papers and abroad, he found a receptive audience: ‘In this way thousands were sold to the country districts and book-dealers in the American commonwealths, reading the English papers and alert to improve their trade, imported them in considerable quantities.’[[274]](#footnote-274)

Surviving editions of Newbery’s work and its American counterpart are extremely rare, because although Newbery’s binding was considerably more durable than other children’s chapbooks, not even the strongest calf and thickest laid pages could withstand the eager hands of a child as they excitedly turned the page. But in the copies that have withstood the test of time, there are small, seemingly insignificant reminders of the little hands that grasped the text – some shakily practiced the alphabet, others more artistically-inclined coloured the six engravings, some declared the time and place of their *Pamela* encounters, such as the childish inscription ‘1788 Reading’ – all impressing the twenty-first century scholar that this was very much their *Pamela*.

*Pamela’s* Many Costumes and Disguises

As discussed in Chapter One, the heroine identifies the disconnection between her soul and her physical appearance: ‘But, O Sir! My soul is equal importance with the soul of a princess, though I am but upon a foot with the meanest slave.’[[275]](#footnote-275) The first edition of *Pamela* was a modest affair, a calfskin bound duodecimo, un-ornamented text with no visual representation of the heroine. The physical object was a substitute for illustration; after all, it was a novel intended to ‘*instruct* and *improve* the minds of the YOUTH *of both sexes*’ not a romance to stimulate the sense or excite the eye. However, the very vulnerability of a virtuous superior soul packaged in a lowly body was noticed by *Pamela*’s reading public. While Pamelists admired and adored the ‘little book’, others sought to exploit the contradiction between ‘soul of a princess’ and body of the ‘meanest slave’. Kelly loosened and sullied the heroine’s diction and personality to make the character more concordant with the most modest duodecimo; Povey blasted the heroine’s hypocrisy and artifice; he removed this ‘immodest romance’ from its didactic, moral pedestal and placed it in the format of a disposable tract. Povey used *Pamela*’s narrative as a point of departure and embedded his work more deeply in literary culture.Newbery’s children’s book continues with the presentation of Pamela as first and foremost a servant girl – a servant’s soul in simple binding. For Newbery, *Pamela* served a simple, didactic message. This chapter has, in essence, been a parade of *Pamela*’s many costumes, and meeting of book history and the masquerade.

Although Richardson felt otherwise, these shams, sequels, criticisms, and visual responses deeply enriched *Pamela*’s history and appealed to reader’s imaginations and provide us with a better understanding of how novels were received and treated in eighteenth-century Britain.Chapter Three will broaden this vein of book history by addressing issues of book production, printing practices, and piracy in relation to *Pamela* and Richardson’s third novel, *Sir Charles Grandison*. Finally, the conclusion of this thesis will unite visual history and book history in a discussion of *Pamela*’s appearance and reception in the nineteenth century, and the trajectory from the simple, two-volume duodecimos introduced here, to the deluxe, illustrated *Complete Volume of Richardson* will be travelled.

CHAPTER THREE

THE BATTLE OF THE BOOKS: RICHARDSON, FAULKNER, AND THE ANGLO-IRISH PRINTING SITUATION

*Pamela*’s purity and integrity was not only threatened by opportunistic and spurious writers, but also, Richardson believed, by his tradesmen and business partners. In 1741, *Pamela* had been printed in Dublin without Richardson’s permission, but in a completely acceptable manner under the provisions of the *Statute of Anne* (or rather, a loophole within it). Dublin printers, George Faulkner (1703-1775) and George Ewing (1718-1764) printed *Pamela* only two and a half months after its release in London. Richardson continued to battle with Faulkner and other Irish printers over the release of *Clarissa* and *Grandison*. Richardson’s on-going dispute climaxed with his decision to write and publish two tracts, *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* (both 1753) that severely criticised Irish printing practices and in particular, the behaviour of Faulkner, who he identified as the scapegoat. Richardson handed these tracts out for free, inserted them into his editions of *Sir Charles Grandison* and had excerpts printed in the October 1753 issue of *The Gentleman’s Magazine.* In this chapter, I shift my focus from writers of sham and spurious works to the publishers and printers of such ‘illegitimate’ works and broaden my discussion to include *Sir Charles Grandison*. As his first novel, *Pamela* was an opportunity for Richardson to explore and experiment with the physical appearance of his text and as his final novel, *Grandison* represents the findings and results of his many different tests. I will explore the motivations and claims in *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* by looking at their connections with Richardson’s earlier *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum, Familiar Letters*, *Pamela,* and‘Six Original Letters Against Duelling’ – a short tract published seriously and posthumously.This chapter uses these resources as a springboard to explore Irish ‘piracy’ in greater detail. By examining the physical qualities of the London and Dublin editions of *Pamela* and *Grandison*, and then drawing parallels between Richardson’s treatment of these two novels, the validity of Richardson’s claims and Faulkner’s actions can be re-assessed. These grievances are examined in a discussion of the professional, legal, and cultural factors informing Richardson and Faulkner, and the scope is then expanded to include Jonathan Swift, another author who dealt with Faulkner and Irish reprints in an entirely different manner. Swift’s response to the Irish ‘piracy’ provides an alternative and more successful model for dealing with Anglo-Irish printing relationships. This chapter is the first study of Richardson and Faulkner’s print duels that brings together earlier sources, analyses the contents of the author’s two vitriolic tracts, and considers the broader context for Irish piracy, effectively restoring Faulkner’s honour and overturning scholarly misconceptions.

Printing *Pamela* in Ireland

The Dublin *Pamela* was sold to the public for six pennies less than Richardson’s London version, and was profitable enough to require a second printing in March.[[276]](#footnote-276) A mixed and married set of a four-volume-Dublin-printed *Pamela*, currently held in the British Library, provides insight into how Faulkner and Ewing treated the text.[[277]](#footnote-277) Were they violating *Pamela*, like the sham and spin-off authors discussed in the previous chapter? Richardson believed the Dublin printers to be guilty of such a crime, but *Pamela*’s diverse book history proves that this straight forward Dublin reprint was not a considerable threat. The first of these four-volume duodecimos is a sixth edition, printed for Ewing and Faulkner in 1741, uniformly bound in plain calf with a raised and banded spine. The paper is crisp and laid, the font is small, and there is no ornamentation. The second volume is a second edition, printed by S. Powell, for George Ewing, W. Smith, and George Faulkner in 1742. This means Faulkner and Ewing expanded and collaborated with Smith for many of *Pamela*’s printings, and sometimes included even more printers - the third and fourth volumes, printed in 1742, also name a ‘W. Smith’ in the colophon. Interestingly, the second volume of the second edition has more ornamentation, including wood-block headers and capitals, revealing the versatility of Faulkner, Ewing, and Smith’s printing operation. Most importantly, this mismatched, married set of different editions, all identically bound in contemporary calf, suggests that some readers, while insisting on a uniform, outward appearance were indifferent to the harmony and uniformity of the interior text. Their *Pamela*s only had to *appear* to be perfect. This preference for content over decorative consistency suggests that Richardson’s complaints that Faulkner and other Irish printers had mishandled publications were exaggerated and that their printing techniques did not have any damaging influence on the reception of *Pamela*.

Richardson’s reactions to the Dublin printing of *Pamela, Clarissa,* and *Grandison*

Instead of confronting Faulkner about the Dublin printing of *Pamela*, which Stephanie Fysh terms a ‘perceived invasion of his rights’, Richardson secured a royal license for *Pamela* and sent more copies to Ireland to sell. [[278]](#footnote-278) A copy of this royal licence was included in Volumes III and IV of some editions of *Pamela* and was headed by the Crest of George II:

George, the second, by the Grace of God, King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, & c. To all whom these presents shall come, Greetings. Whereas our truly and well-beloved Charles Rivington, Samuel Richardson, and John Osborn, of our City of London, Stationers, have by their petition, humbly represented unto us, that they have a great Experience and Labour prepared for the Press a work, intitled Pamela: Or Virtue Rewarded…By his Majesty’s Command.[[279]](#footnote-279)

To compound the King’s message, Richardson concludes his fourth volume with a short, pointed statement, writing that his work was printed ‘solely, at the assignment of Samuel Richardson, of Salisbury-Court, Fleet-Street, the Editor of their four volumes of Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded.’[[280]](#footnote-280) When it came time for Richardson’s second novel, *Clarissa*, to be printed, Richardson returned to Faulkner and worked out a financial arrangement for the reproduction rights. Interestingly, *Clarissa* did not sell well in Ireland[[281]](#footnote-281) and according to T.C. Duncan Eaves and Benjamin Kimpel, may not have circulated as well as Richardson claimed in England.[[282]](#footnote-282) For Richardson’s third novel, *Grandison*, he constructed a contract and charged Faulkner seventy guineas. This time he attached three conditions to the contract and we can begin to understand how difficult Richardson was to work with and satisfy; the conditions were: ‘First, that the edition be limited to Ireland, second that Faulkner not advertise publication until Richardson gave him word to do so, and third, that Faulkner publish only two volumes at a time.’[[283]](#footnote-283) Richardson wanted as much command over his text as possible. Richardson also tightened his control over work in his print-shop to prevent piracy; he posted printed notices, changed his employee’s routines, and spread production of his manuscript across his three printing houses.[[284]](#footnote-284) Richardson sent Faulkner four sheets, 96 pages, of the first volume of *Sir Charles Grandison*, which the Dubliner received on the 3rd of August, 1753.[[285]](#footnote-285) This was, of course, only a small portion of the novel, but it was understood in the community of Dublin printers that once part of the work was received, the printer could advertise the title (which Richardson had not yet authorized Faulkner to do), announce that the work had gone to press, and declare his right to be sole printer of this title in Dublin.[[286]](#footnote-286) From Richardson’s contract with Faulkner, and most importantly, his previous experience with Irish printers, it is certain that the author understood the Dublin printing practices. According to Richardson’s account of the *Grandison* printing situation documented in hisemotionally loaded tract, *An Address to the Public,* the day after Faulkner received the sheets, Faulkner learned that other Dublin printers, including Ewing, had much more substantial copies of Richardson’s novel. Richardson quotes Faulkner’s lament published in the *Dublin Journal*: ‘But to my great surprise, I find four more of the same work, in octavo and duodecimo, which they have shewn me and left with me to compare.’[[287]](#footnote-287) Faulkner and Richardson correctly concluded that journeymen had colluded with Richardson’s workers to give them copies of *Grandison* before it reached Faulkner’s hands, violating the ethical code set out by Richardson himself in *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* (1735). Robert Ward and Mary Pollard both explain Faulkner’s now precarious position within Dublin’s printing culture: Faulkner could no longer claim to be the legitimate printer of the work because the other printers had declared their rights. Faulkner told Richardson it would be futile to send him any more sheets of *Grandison* because he had to join the group of Dublin printers if he wanted to be involved in the release of *Grandison.* Faulkner explained this further, writing that ‘they produced so much of the copy, they agreed, according to an established, invariable, and constant custom among the booksellers of Dublin, that whoever gets any Books or Pamphlets…by the same Post, shall or may join together.’[[288]](#footnote-288) Richardson uses his *An Address to the Public* to publicly refute Faulkner’s explanation, and re-shapes the printer’s statements with italics: ‘Will Mr Faulkner say that it is an *established*, *invariable*, constant custom among the Booksellers of Dublin, to renounce their agreements with men they had contracted with, or their being notoriously robbed.’[[289]](#footnote-289) It is clear that Richardson dismissed Faulkner’s explanation with disdain, and launched a campaign against Anglo-Irish printing customs. In a gesture of peace and goodwill, Faulkner offered to refund Richardson the seventy guineas he had charged for copyright, but Richardson refused and ultimately lost control over the appearance of the Irish editions. Richardson was eager for a print duel.

Richardson’sRetaliation: *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*

Richardson had two reactions to this Dublin printing debacle: the first was to attempt to find another bookseller in Dublin to out-sell the other ‘pirates’; the second was to write two polemical and inflammatory tracts, *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson,* publicly to express his grievances. Richardson’s first reaction was a failure – he sent 750 copies of his London *Grandison* to Robert Main, a Dublin bookseller, to sell. Richardson does not mention this in either of his anti-Irish tracts because the attempt was enormously unsuccessful; Richardson’s involvement with Main caused the bookseller to go bankrupt in 1755.[[290]](#footnote-290) The simple fact was that the Irish public and many English readers preferred the Dublin reprint for two-shillings less.[[291]](#footnote-291) Also, Richardson’s attempt to flood the Irish market with his work was morally dubious and it threatened to damage the local book trade - a common act of sabotage by eighteenth-century London printers. Although Richardson criticized all Dublin booksellers for this printing debacle, he singled out Faulkner as his scapegoat in both of his tracts, ignoring the critical fact that the ‘robbery’ had taken place in London and had been committed by one of his own employees.[[292]](#footnote-292) After all, the proofs for *Grandison* were stolen *en-route* to Faulkner, something not entirely unexpected, as Ward explains: ‘Both men [Faulkner and Richardson] knew that there were journeymen in London who would steal galley proofs and send them to Dublin, Paris, or Edinburgh, but Richardson chose to ignore that fact.’[[293]](#footnote-293) Faulkner openly acknowledged his disapproval of the theft as unethical, writing to Richardson that ‘I know that you have been much, and most injuriously, villainously, and unprecedentedly treated by your more than hellish, wicked, and corrupted servants.’[[294]](#footnote-294) Faulkner correctly identifies the true culprit of the crime in his supplicating response – Richardson’s employees. In this particular case, the corrupt servant was Thomas Killingbeck, an employee of Richardson’s during the printing of *Grandison*, who had previously worked for Faulkner. Killingbeck claimed that Faulkner printed copies ‘clandestinely obtained from England’, however, the motivation for Killingbeck’s testimony was questionable and Richardson fired him shortly after the publication of *The Case of Samuel Richardson*. Killingbeck’s verbal confession and Richardson’s knowledge of Dublin printing practices provide further support for Ward’s assertion that Richardson could not plead ignorance of Dublin printing practices.

Richardson’s second attempt at retaliation was far more successful; both *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* have had lasting effects on Faulkner’s reputation and the book history of *Sir Charles Grandison*. Until recently, scholars have accepted Richardson’s claims in these two tracts and not interrogated the motivations for his vitriolic, nationalistic accusations. Mary Pollard argues that the cries of London booksellers, authors, and printers such as Richardson have passed ‘unchallenged into folk memory.’[[295]](#footnote-295) Indeed, Richardson’s tracts have had traction, and the assertiveness and availability of *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* have distracted scholars from re-examining the situation. However, I interpret Richardson’s tracts as two distorted rewritings of the Irish printing situation, with the author fancifully casting Faulkner as the villain and himself as the virtuous hero. I argue also that origins for these two vitriolic, exaggerated works can be found as early as 1734, in his *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* – a document that displays his strict and intolerant business practices.

*The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum*

Richardson’s *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum*, is an exhaustive treatise on his attitude and expectation for printers’ apprentices. It also anticipates Hogarth’s later *Industry and Idleness* (1747) which was written for working children and ‘calculated for the Us & Instruction of Youth’. The strong moralising approach and content of Richardson’s tract and Hogarth’s narrative series implies a relationship between author and artist, which will be further explored in Chapter Five. *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* was constructed around a letter of instruction and advice to his nephew, Thomas Verren Richardson, who was apprenticed to his uncle’s print-shop.[[296]](#footnote-296) Richardson felt compelled to write this tract because ‘the present depravity of servants is a general complaint in the mouths of all masters of families, and it must be allow’d there is but too much reason for it.’[[297]](#footnote-297) Richardson addresses several of these tempting depravities, including alcohol, young women, moral laxity, and the theatre. The author writes from the perspective of a master and forbids apprentices from participating in games, gambling, and other diversions ‘whereby his master may have any loss.’[[298]](#footnote-298) This interest in protecting the financial integrity of the master’s business is further emphasized when Richardson states that his employees will not be allowed to explore outside business, because ‘this might otherwise be an inlet into many great inconveniences to the master, who might, according as he repos’d a confidence in his servant, be robbed of the profit’s of his business and a clandestine trade by carry’d on in his name, and at his expence, as it might happen.’[[299]](#footnote-299) A major emphasis of *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* is the apprentice’s respect for the master’s profits and this preoccupation caused Richardson to be warily out of touch with his employees’ culture and needs.

Richardson condemns the institution of the tavern to apprentices, stating that it is only appropriate for a master occasionally to visit, justifying this exception ‘it is well known of what bad consequence the haunting of a tavern is to a master himself, who has, at least, the pretence of meeting his customers, and treating of business there, and who really very often promotes his Business by discreet use of it.’[[300]](#footnote-300) However, the tavern was a central fixture for those involved in the printing industry, it was a place where workmen could build relationships with each other and the community. Richardson’s refusal to acknowledge the tavern as a legitimate institution reflects the distance between the master and his employees. The entirety of *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* is paternalistic, controlling, didactic, and reflective of an increasingly out-dated approach towards the master-apprentice relationship. Richardson’s attitude was most likely based on earlier patterns of the book trade, which Keith Maslen describes:

In Richardson’s day, the British book trade was centred in London, as it had been for centuries. Its members, whether printers or booksellers, belonged to a man to the Worshipful Company of Stationers. Family links persisted from one generation to the next, and family was linked to family.[[301]](#footnote-301)

This business arrangement was no longer viewed as a ‘father-son’ dynamic, but rather an ‘employer-employee relationship [which] developed under the pressures of the new, large-scale capitalistic workshops, which in 1734, Richardson’s own printing house was well on its way to becoming.’[[302]](#footnote-302) In fact, as Keith Maslen posits in his extensive study of Richardson’s printing practices, Richardson had at least twenty employees in 1734. He gathers this information from the number of signatures on Richardson’s *Rules and Orders to be Observed by the Members of this Chapel* (another example of Richardson’s paternalistic printing habits). To these twenty signatures, Maslen observes that Richardson had at least four apprentices, a corrector, and warehousemen, making it quite a large business.[[303]](#footnote-303) By 1753, at the time of the Dublin piracy issues, Richardson had at least 40 workmen, impressive growth in a twenty year period.[[304]](#footnote-304) With this changing structure in mind, Richardson’s insistence on controlling all aspects of his apprentices’ lives, even when outside the workshop, was antiquated. Richardson was one of the largest employers of apprentices, and as his writing career developed, he became not only an out-of-date master, but an out-of-touch employer.[[305]](#footnote-305)

A striking example of Richardson’s limitations as an employer is his refusal to issue orally any orders to his apprentices and foremen; he instead insisted on written directions.[[306]](#footnote-306) Although this silence was in the spirit of *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum,* Richardson’s distant attitude did not foster the intimacy and loyalty required in such a business. More importantly, his refusal to speak to employees was a strong factor in the breakdown of trust that led to Richardson’s apprentices deceptively handing over the manuscripts of *Grandison*, as Fysh explains: ‘Richardson’s gradual movement away from a direct relationship with his journeymen, through his use of foremen and correctors, posted notices, revised Chapel[[307]](#footnote-307) rules, was more likely to offend journeymen than inspire the kind of trust that he needed to prevent the piracy of *Sir Charles Grandison*.[[308]](#footnote-308) *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum*, which had been intended as a ‘little manual of good advice’, became instead an overly didactic document which demonstrated how not to run a business.[[309]](#footnote-309) Thus, the failure of Richardson’s treatise to prevent a breakdown of trust and communication within his own business directly links *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* with *An Address to the Public.*

Along with documenting Richardson’s out-of-touch business practices, *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* provides an insight into the author/printers’s advertising strategy and illustrates the interconnectedness of Richardson’s works of fiction and non-fiction. While the reception of *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* was modest, the tract was successful enough to be advertised by Richardson’s booksellers James Roberts, John Osborn, Charles Rivington, and James Leake throughout the next decade.[[310]](#footnote-310) Richardson composed *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* in 1733, and was about to release it in September when he learned of another similar work being published, *The Apprentice’s Faithful Monitor*. A prolix puff for *The Apprentice’s Faithful Monitor* in the October, 1733 edition of *The London Magazine* creates a full picture of the tract’s purpose:

*The Apprentice’s Faithful Monitor*, directing him in the several branches of his Duty to God, his Master, and himself, and shewing him the fatal consequences of his Neglect thereof, with Regard both to his temporal and eternal Happiness. Digested under proper Heads, with Prayers particularly adapted. Composed by a Divine of the Church of England, for the Instruction of his own Children, and now made Publick for the Good of others. Price 1s. 6d bound, or 15s. per dozen to those who give them away.[[311]](#footnote-311)

Richardson responded to this heavy-handed, religious approach to guiding apprentices by puffing an excerpt from his text in which the author ridicules a fop. Here he appeals to Hogarth’s satire to create a better picture of this ridiculous character. Richardson does not try to compete with *The Apprentice’s Faithful Monitor* author’s pious approach and suggestion that the work should be distributed en-masse; instead, our author emphasizes his work’s practicality and contemporary awareness. Richardson puffed his work intermittently throughout the autumn of 1734, and dramatically increased publicity that winter advertising zealously in numerous papers. As Alexander Pettit and McKillop both observe, Richardson’s experience in puffing *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* with a ‘revved up publicity machine’ and competing with *The Apprentice’s Faithful Monitor* shaped his approach to advertising his first novel, *Pamela.* While *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* may not have been a commercial success in its own right, the lesson learned during its promotion directly influenced Richardson’s puffery campaign against sham and spurious writers, like John Kelly, discussed in Chapter Two. These advertising experiences in turn influenced Richardson’s decision in 1753 to not only publish complaints about Faulkner’s behaviour in periodicals, but also to expand the formula of a puff into two verbose tracts, *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*. Richardson’s *Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* is evidence of his awareness of the audience and desire to control his readership. This provides further support to my arguments in Chapter Two and Five about Richardson’s motivations for writing *Pamela II* and heavily illustrating *Pamela.*

Although *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* is considered a relatively insignificant work in Richardson’s oeuvre, he found it highly inspirational. It was also one of the first expressions of Richardson’s struggle for power and textual control that would become a preoccupation in his three novels, as Fysh writes ‘simply put, in both its material form and its implications for the workplace, it demonstrates the desire of a master to establish control, both over the text and over the worker.’[[312]](#footnote-312) Furthermore, this small, pocket-sized polemic is an early example of Richardson’s interest in the physical qualities of the text – there is an abundance of preliminary material, several title pages, summaries of the main points, and a verbose table of contents.[[313]](#footnote-313) For better or worse, these paratextual items would be repeated in many variations in Richardson’s later tracts and novels. As well as being an important representative of Richardson’s fledgling printing aesthetic, *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* is also a product of borrowings from other writers and connections with other tracts. Pettit remarks on the interconnectedness of Richardson’s early polemical writings: ‘extensive sections of *The Infidel Convicted –* incorporating text from Addison’s *Evidences of Christian Religion* (1721), appeared in the third part of *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum*.[[314]](#footnote-314) He also offers further analysis of Richardson’s opinionated, controversial tracts, arguing that the author’s inability to distance himself from his works ultimately undercuts their message: ‘Richardson’s tendency to restate a small set of prejudices in a variety of contexts suggests a nearer congruency of author and utterance than obtained in the comparatively sophisticated polemics with which the period abounds.’[[315]](#footnote-315) Pettit’s criticism resonates in this discussion of *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* because Richardson’s personality dominates the text and weakens his message, as we have seen in his failure to understand printing house culture. Richardson is unable to separate himself and his own experiences and prejudices. He cannot act as an objective and informative master providing general guidance or later, as an impartial editor of his novels – as Pettit describes as ‘Richardson the polemicist seems to be writing “as” Richardson, transferring whole passages from text to text and context to context as he does so.’[[316]](#footnote-316) Although the language and narrative may change, Richardson cannot free his fiction and non-fiction works from the heavy-handed didacticism that flourishes in *The* *Apprentice’s Vade Mecum.* Richardson struggles to masquerade as a polemicist, editor, instructor, and fiction writer; his ego always appears, and ‘comes to the forefront…as a consequence of the diminution of the pool of authorities, so does the thinness of the claims that Richardson advances.’[[317]](#footnote-317) Furthermore, Pettit sees Richardson’s ego as a virus which infects each one of his polemical works and weakens his message. While Pettit limits his exploration of the connections among Richardson’s early works, like *The Infidel Connected* and *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum,* other scholars such as Alan McKillop place *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* within a larger context and argue that this work and Richardson’s *Familiar Letters* to ‘gave rise to *Pamela*.’[[318]](#footnote-318) I expand on Pettit and McKillop’s arguments, finding a common thread connecting *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* to ‘Six Letters onDuelling’ to *Familiar Letters* to *Pamela, Grandison*, and ultimately, *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*. *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* was not simply an egotistical, polemical tract instructing apprentices, it was a remarkable starting point for Richardson’s writing and directly influenced his later battle with Faulkner.

The Influence of *Familiar Letters*

Richardson’s *Familiar Letters* has already played an important role in Chapter Two’s discussion of masquerade and Richardson’s many voices as an author; in this chapter, *Familiar Letters* works to connect *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* with *Pamela* and *An Address to the Public* and demonstrates a further interconnection among themes. *Familiar Letters* uses an epistolary template that is later modified in *An Address to the Public* - Richardson presents a letter that introduces an ethical and social predicament, and then offers a morally sound response. As we have seen in *Familiar Letters*, the two characters in dialogue are fictional, but in *An Address to the Public*, the author casts Richardson and Faulkner as the characters and engages them in a heated dialogue. The character of Richardson in *An Address to the Public* challenges Faulkner and Dublin’s honour, introducing the argument with this paragraph:

Mr Richardson thinks he shall be excused for taking this opportunity to lay before the Publick an account of the whole transaction; and rather, as the Invaders of his properties have done their utmost to make a National Cause of the measure they compelled him to take; and as he presumes to think, that the Cause of literature in general is affected by their usage of him.[[319]](#footnote-319)

Richardson then divides the page into two columns and produces a ‘transcription’ of Faulkner’s defence, which are excerpts from a defence, now lost, that Faulkner had published in local Irish newspapers like *The Dublin Spy* and *Dublin Journal*. Richardson structures his entire argument around Faulkner’s claims, which were taken out of context. In his passionate indignation, Richardson also takes over Faulkner’s ‘character’ and responds to hand-picked excerpts: ‘[Faulkner] knew that he and his confederates should be able to secure in their interest the Dublin Presses. He had discouraged the sending over any of the genuine edition, and thought it right to conclude with repeating his advice, that Mr Richardson would meanly court the corruptors, as he had done’.[[320]](#footnote-320) Throughout the entirety of *An Address to the Public*, Richardson is applying the letter/response format of *Familiar Letters* to this very real discussion and taking control of the narrative, as if his judgement was supreme. *An Address to the Public* maintains *Familiar Letters’* characteristic tone of self-assured authority - Richardson’s ego is a dominating force.

A fitting sample letter in *Familiar Letters* about a young printing apprentice’s dilemma not only echoes Richardson’s meticulous guidelines in *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum*, but also anticipates Thomas Killingbeck’s behaviour. A young apprentice writes to his uncle that he has witnessed his fellow-apprentice defraud his master. The young apprentice does not know whether to remain silent, preserve his friendship with his colleague, but risk possible implication if the defrauding is discovered, or to report him and assure the master of his own innocence. The young apprentice’s uncle firmly replies:

I charge you, if you value your own happiness, and my Peace, to acquaint your Master instantly with the Injustice that has been done to him; which is the only Means of vindicating your Innocence and prevent your being looked upon as an Accomplice to a Fact.[[321]](#footnote-321)

In this situation, Richardson proposes that one must not let unethical behaviour go unpunished. The parallels between the apprentice/master situation and the Richardson/Faulkner ordeal explain why the author felt compelled to publicly denounce Faulkner as a pirate – Richardson did not want to be considered an accomplice. Here, Pettit’s argument that ‘Richardson the polemicist seems to be writing “as” Richardson’ comes to the forefront of this anecdote because in his tract he lets very personal experiences guide broader judgements and claims. Furthermore, the overwhelming and unrelenting presence of Richardson’s ego in these situations highlights that the author wanted to wage his battles on moral grounds rather than resolve the solution financially. Richardson conflated the world of his tracts and fiction works with the actual, physical world around him in *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* and created two documents that straddle the line dividing imagination from reality.

As examples from *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* and *Familiar Letters* have demonstrated, in Richardson’s world, the membrane between fiction and reality was fairly permeable. The structure of *An Address to the Public* shares stylistic similarities with his earlier work, *Familiar Letters,* and also with *Pamela.* The entirety of *An Address to the Public* resembles a memorable passage in *Pamela* in which Mr B proposes seven ‘articles’ to Pamela in the hopes that she will become his mistress. Pamela records Mr B’s suggestions in one column and then places her retorts in a second column. This format encouraged the readers to view Pamela and Mr B’s exchange as a debate, with a very clear right and wrong answer. But the appearance of a well-rounded, factual debate is shattered by the reality that all of this information is presented to the reader by Pamela (and Richardson), and the two dimensional debate flattens into a one-sided report. It is easy to see this experiment with typography, narration, and dialogue as a trial-run for later works, and Richardson must have found this format successful, because he structured *An Address to the Public* in the same vein. Faulkner’s arguments appear in the same column as Mr B’s proposal, and his own response appear in the right-hand column that Pamela’s explanations dominated. In *Pamela*, the eponymous heroine introduces her exchange with Mr B with a short passage that appeals not only to her parents, the fictional intended audience, but also the reader: ‘I fear there will be nothing omitted to ruin me, and though my poor strength may not be sufficient to defend me, yet I will be innocent of the crime in the sight of God; and leave him to the avenging of all my wrongs.’[[322]](#footnote-322) Here Pamela places the reader in the position of God and asks him to make the final judgment on her character. Richardson expands this trope in *An Address to the Public*, explaining that he must present his case to readers for their supportive ruling, and at the finale of his tract, calls on their sympathy:

[Mr Richardson] is bringing himself to look upon their [the Irish] unprovoked treatment of him, as a punishment for assuming the pen, at the expence of his health, and to the giving up every rational amusement, when he had business upon his hands which was enough to employ his whole attention.[[323]](#footnote-323)

When compared with Richardson’s fiction, it becomes evident that *An Address to the Public* conflates fictional and non-fictional tropes to ensure that the readers of the document understand the author is the victim and the Dublin printer the villain.

To enhance the effectiveness of his tract, Richardson exaggerates Faulkner’s role as a villain into that of a pirate. This hyperbole then heightens Richardson’s role as hero; the author writes that he alone had ‘the spirit, the will, the independence, to hang out light to his contemporaries, to enable them to avoid savages, who hold themselves in readiness to plunder a vessel even before it becomes a wreck.’[[324]](#footnote-324) Kathryn Temple highlights the importance of Richardson’s phrase ‘to hang out the light’, and argues that this metaphor evokes tales of piracy and sea-faring romances.[[325]](#footnote-325) Moreover, the phrase ‘to hang out the lights’ was a double-edged sword, referring both to citizens who hung out lights along rocky coasts to warn approaching ships of danger and to pirates who used lights to lure ships into their territory. Temple correctly points out that the very use of this phrase links Richardson to the pirating practices from which he is trying to distinguish himself:

For the claims Richardson made to original production, whether in prefaces to novels or in copyrights tracts, were patently untrue. Instead, his assertion of original and solitary production flew in the face of both a highly imitative transhistorical, transnational reliance on romance and intensely collaborative production process. Both were inconsistent with the claims of the originary right to ownership which he made for his work.[[326]](#footnote-326)

As this excerpt suggests, in *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*, Richardson’s statements distorted the truth. His arguments were couched in romantic language and functioned as an aesthetic gloss over these falsehoods. Richardson overused the term ‘pirate’ to evoke sympathy, and in both of his responses to the Dublin ‘piracy’, we see the author ‘re-enacting and relying on the currency of[…]novelistic themes.’[[327]](#footnote-327)

Richardson also borrows a legal tone and preoccupation with trial and judgment from *Pamela* – a novel that centres on proving and defending the eponymous heroine’s innocence and virtue. In *Pamela*, threats to the heroine’s virginity are taken with the utmost seriousness and spoken of in a language that blends law and religion. Pamela’s fate is the hands of Mr B and she explains this to her master by employing legal metaphors: ‘“Who! I, sir?” said I: “have I robbed you? Why then you are a Justice of Peace, and may send me to gaol, if you please, and bring me to a trial for my life!’[[328]](#footnote-328) A few days later, Pamela repeats her appeal to Mr B’s judgment, this time reminding him of the ultimate ruler: ‘Surely you ought to be more afraid of God Almighty, in whose presence we all stand, and to whom the greatest, as well as the least, must be accountable’.[[329]](#footnote-329) Here Richardson elevates Pamela’s virginity into a ‘spiritual cause.’ In his tract, he again plays with sweeping statements, transforming his grievances with Dublin printers into a ‘NATIONAL CAUSE’ – a term, especially when capitalized, that could not fail to capture the reader. Richardson instructs the reader that Faulkner is on trial and that the public’s ruling of the Dublin printer’s fate will have a profound effect on literature. Although Richardson presents the arguments as a dialogue, he further exerts his control over the text by selectively italicizing some of Faulkner’s claims, and then responding to them in the adjacent column in capitals. The use of italics enhances the appearance of a conversation, enhances the drama of the statement, and draws the reader’s eye to particular words. This is tactic perfected in *Pamela*; Richardson punctuates Pamela’s prose with a plethora of italics which guides the reader’s interpretation. When Mr B playfully ‘fails’ to recognize Pamela dressed as a country girl, Richardson conveys the heroine’s seriousness by italicizing part of her statement: ‘I am Pamela. Indeed, I am Pamela, *her own self*!’ [[330]](#footnote-330) As in *Pamela,* Richardson sprinkles italics throughout *An Address to the Public*, trying to emphasize the absurdity of some statements: ‘that when *these People* produced their sheets, and *obliged me* [Mean Man!] to shew mine, that I was *compelled* to give them up, in order to obtain a share with them.’[[331]](#footnote-331) Richardson’s interjection ‘Mean Man’ heightens the theatricality and drama of their printed debate and functions as yet another example of the author’s continued interest in textual play and control. As Christopher Flint explains, Richardson’s interest in manipulating text, typography, and format is primarily emotional, he ‘uses blank spaces and non-verbal matter principally to invite the reader’s emotional, as well as reflective, response to the printed word.’[[332]](#footnote-332) These clever tropes of placing passages side-by-side, conflating fictional characters with contemporary figures, and employing legal diction are all gleaned from his experiments with novels. More importantly, from the perspective of the Dublin printers, these textual manipulations are calculated attempts to distract from the validity of Faulkner’s printed explanations in the left-hand column of *An Address to the Public.* Richardson is again mixing fact with fiction to shift the debate from one about literary property in a ‘political and economic context’ into an aesthetic and moral discourse.[[333]](#footnote-333)

Richardson revels in this altered context and applies his skills in evoking sentiment and animating imagination to further cast Faulkner as a stock villain. Not content with the charges of ‘piracy’ so effectively presented in *An Address to the Public*, Richardson challenges Faulkner’s honour in what can only be seen as a written invitation for a print duel. Richardson’s statements in *An Address to the Public* call Faulkner’s integrity and bravery into question: ‘How wickedly does he slubber over this part of his conduct, to the justification, as may be said, of that of his new Confederates!’[[334]](#footnote-334) Richardson then appeals to the reader, asking him whether the author should ignore such dishonourable behaviour: ‘Does it become the character of a man valuing himself for the sincerity and plain-dealing, thought I, to let Mr Faulkner imagine me such a poor creature, either in spirit or understanding as to be so blinded by his self-deception?’[[335]](#footnote-335) Richardson does not want to appear to be aiding and abetting the Dubliners’ printing practices. This slim tract is peppered with insults and slurs to Faulkner’s character which is the formal first step in instigating a duel, as Stephen Banks explains: ‘There were certain offences against the dignity of a gentleman that, if they were committed, were regarded to be so heinous that it was difficult for the recipient to retain his place in society unless he took steps to requite them…A gentleman could be many things, but he could not be a coward.’[[336]](#footnote-336) Clearly, Richardson is implying that Faulkner was a coward for not distancing himself from the other Dublin printers and their unethically obtained manuscript. The connection between Richardson’s accusations in *An Address to the Public* and a duel to defend honour is not random, but rather is informed by the author’s preoccupation with duelling in *Sir Charles Grandison* and his early work *Six Original Letters upon Duelling* (written in 1741, published posthumously in 1765). The attitudes towards duelling presented in these works provide not only provide insight into how Richardson viewed Faulkner and the Dublin’s printers invasion of his work, but also how he viewed himself as a gentleman and man of honour. These perspectives in turn influence the (misguided) language in *An Address to the Public.*

The duel, an institution of violence in late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth century England, was a battle to ‘defend personal and family honour…a routine and public ritual.’[[337]](#footnote-337) Duelling was an institution centred on upper-class gentleman, but as the culture of politeness expanded throughout the eighteenth-century, the definition of what constituted a gentleman became increasingly vague.[[338]](#footnote-338) Banks describes politeness as ‘the recognition of interests. That is to say that the polite gentleman recognised the interest of others around him in society and acknowledged those interests by adopting pleasing demeanour and modes of conciliation in social interaction.’[[339]](#footnote-339) If this politeness was called into question, then it was considered compulsory among some circles in the eighteenth century to duel to refute the slander. Richardson, as an aspiring, moral middle-class tradesman, strongly objected to the practice of duelling and focused on this topic in one of his earliest tracts, *Six Original Letters upon Duelling*. Not much has been written about this rather undistinguished tract, but Pettit observes that *Six Original Letters* was probably composed of rejected material from *Familiar Letters*, demonstrating once again Richardson’s tendency to reuse and repeat themes.[[340]](#footnote-340) The statements that Richardson made in *Six Original Letters*, such as ‘[It is] so arrogant, in taking upon one’s self to be both our own judge and jury’, and ‘There is more true bravery in forgiving an injury than in resenting it’, ran the risk of sounding too radical to the very aristocratic audience that Richardson wanted to court, and the document remained unpublished until after his death. [[341]](#footnote-341) When *Six Original Letters* was printed in 1765, it was fully titled *Six Original Letters upon Duelling, written by the late Mr Samuel Richardson, Author of the History of Sir Charles Grandison*, demonstrating the tract’s undeniable, thematic link with Richardson’s final novel – a novel which analyses the nature of the gentleman.

Print Duels

While Richardson felt unable to publish his bold and controversial platform against duelling in the format of a non-fiction tract, he was liberated in fiction and allowed his *Grandison* characters to be mouthpieces for these views. Sir Charles Grandison was designed to be the epitome of upper-class politeness, an exemplar for all, but he finds himself in a difficult position when he is challenged to duel several times, most importantly by Sir Hargrave Pollexfen over Harriet’s position. Richardson repeatedly and knowingly presents Sir Charles and his readers with a conflict of class and morality: Sir Charles eschews duelling, but how can he disregard this institution and still maintain his status as gentleman? James Bagnell, acting on behalf of Sir Hargrave Pollexfen poses this question to Harriet in a letter urging her to marry the villain and save Sir Charles: ‘You might easily believe, that the affair betwixt Sir Hargrave Pollexfen and Sir Charles Grandison could not, after so violent an insult as the former received from the latter, end without consequence.’[[342]](#footnote-342) Richardson presents Sir Charles’s response as the solution: ‘I write a long letter because I propose *only* to write…let any man insult me upon my refusal, and put me upon defence, and he shall find that numbers to my single arm shall not intimidate me…My life is not my own; much less another man’s mine.’[[343]](#footnote-343) As Sylvia Kasey Marks astutely observes, this statement confirmed Sir Charles as a new type of ideal gentleman, and his ‘verbal response to a succession of challenges would have received high marks from the conduct book writers.’[[344]](#footnote-344) Not only was Richardson attempting to extinguish duelling, he was also forming a new model of politeness and Christian gentlemanliness. Sir Charles’s magnanimous and pious statements are repeated throughout the seven volumes of *Grandison*, but still Richardson did not feel satisfied in his crusade. Richardson employs the paratextual material to push further his anti-duelling agenda and address readers’ concerns about Sir Charles’s behaviour. He acknowledges possible objections and then tackles Sir Charles’s avoidance of the duel: ‘It has been objected by some persons, that a man less able by strength of skill to repel an affront, than Sir Charles appears to have been, could not with such honour, have extricated himself out of difficulties on refusing a challenge.’[[345]](#footnote-345)To overcome this weakness and convince the reader that Sir Charles acted correctly, Richardson goes into a lengthy and persuasive discussion of honour and summarizes, again, his views of duelling:

Refusing a Duel is a duty to ourselves, our fellow creatures, and our maker. And whoever acts on these principles, the more reproach he undergoes for it, rather than be driven, like a coward, by the scoffs of his fellow subjects, to rebel against the sovereign of the universe, will have more delightful unconsciousness of a strong inward principle of piety and virtue, and the more distinguished reward from the final judge of all, who alone disposes of that Honour which shall never fade.[[346]](#footnote-346)

While Richardson’s anti-duelling stance is abundantly clear, it is interesting that he allows for one caveat, expressed in Sir Charles’s letter to Sir Hargrave Pollexfen – angry words can be written, but blows cannot be exchanged. In essence, Richardson permitted a paper duel – a written defence – to protect one’s honour. This emphasis on the written word as a vehicle to ensure justice is a major motivating factor for Richardson’s attack on Faulkner in the press. Richardson took great and personal offence to the unauthorized printing of his manuscripts and saw this as an affront to his character. Richard Cronin explains how writers and artists could interpret a violation of their work as a violation of themselves: ‘The artist’s body becomes an allegorical representation of his paintings, and the same technique might serve to characterize a writer…It was a mark of the new prose that it searched the body for indicators of character.’[[347]](#footnote-347) Faulkner, who was primarily a printer, could not know what it was like to be violated as an author. Richardson and Faulkner were to fight with words, and in this battle of books, Richardson used his imagination, his early polemical works, and novelistic techniques as potent and, until recently, effective ammunition.

As we have seen, Richardson’s *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* were manipulative, fanciful tracts influenced by his earlier experiments in polemical tracts and fictions. The earliest copies of *An Address to the Public* were printed by Richardson, freely distributed, and then bound in the third edition of *Grandison.* This means that the first readers of *An Address to the Public* were not necessarily interested members of the public willing to spend a few shillings, but simply those passing by who had been handed a leaflet. The second audience for the *Address to the Public* were not actively seeking out the work, but rather happened across it in their edition of *Grandison.* Thus, it is hard to say how involved and captivated general members of the public were in this ‘scandal’, although as we will see later, these works had a detrimental effect on Faulkner’s career. Richardson challenged Faulkner to a print duel on false premises, because neither the integrity nor the quality of the author’s final novel was compromised by Dublin’s involvement. In fact, it is likely the cheaper prices and greater circulation only helped *Grandison*’s cultural reach and may have only reduced slightly Richardson’s commercial success. In this battle of books, the physical qualities of London and Dublin editions of *Grandison* are witnesses and will be crucial evidence in undermining Richardson’s bold claims in his tracts.

*Sir Charles Grandison* in London and Dublin

As both a printer and an author, Richardson was sensitive to the appearance of the paratextual material and its consequences on the ‘visual, nonlinguistic meaning that supplements the text’s words’.[[348]](#footnote-348) Because the binding was selected by the reader after the book was purchased, the title-page functioned both as an advertisement, or ‘bill of fare’, for the narrative and as an important first impression. [[349]](#footnote-349) The wording and formatting of the title-page was typically the responsibility of the publisher, and Richardson’s dual role as writer and publisher meant that his title-pages directly reflected his intentions.[[350]](#footnote-350) While it was possible for a novel to enter the marketplace without a frontispiece, illustrations, or other graphics – like most of Richardson’s editions – all had to have a title-page, regardless of the budget.[[351]](#footnote-351) There was no uniform formula for a title-page and, as Janine Barchas points out, a title-page acted as a strong indicator of a publishing house’s ‘practices and desires’. This first printed page was intended to influence the literary interpretation of text.[[352]](#footnote-352) With this in mind, the 1754 edition discussed in this chapter is a pristine example of how Richardson wanted his readers first to meet *Grandison*.

The 1754 *Grandison*’s long, detailed title-page in varying sizes of Caslon’s pica roman font, informs the reader that this is another true story, compiled by the editor of *Pamela* and *Clarissa*, and that the narrative is followed by ‘Historical and Characteristical Index’ and a ‘Brief History’ in which Richardson complains of the Dublin printing practices[[353]](#footnote-353) (Figure 13). These three statements about authorship, and the two different types of supplementary, paratextual material, are all treated in similar font sizes. Barchas describes many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century title-pages as ‘hurly-burly’ and ‘cacophonous’, but Richardson’s title-page, albeit cluttered, reads more as a graceful decrescendo, with strong accents on ‘History’, ‘Series of Letters’, ‘An Historical and Characteristical Index’, ‘A Brief History’, and ‘London’, winding down to a publishing imprint. It is clear that Richardson wanted his readers to be impressed with a stately, ornamental, legitimate, and virtuous text, and to bind, package, display, and read their *Grandison*s in a similar manner. These visual qualities are illuminating expressions of Richardson’s efforts to control the text as both printer and author.

Richardson believed that the choice of font could help shape the reader’s interpretations of the novels, add further depth to his characters, and control the narrative. [[354]](#footnote-354) Dr Cheyne’s letters complaining about the type-face and paper quality of *Pamela,* discussed in Chapter One,influenced Richardson’s decision to improve the physical appearance of his works, and he continued this practice in the formatting of *Clarissa* and *Grandison*. Richardson uses Caslon’s pica roman not only on *Grandison*’s title-page but also in the main body, creating consistency. According to Stephen Price, eighteenth-century readers considered Caslon’s pica roman an appropriate, respectable choice, fitting for a serious, didactic text. [[355]](#footnote-355) Developed in 1720, but not used with any regularity until 1734, Caslon pica roman was a popular and very English typeface in Richardson’s time.[[356]](#footnote-356) Richardson occasionally varied the font size for different editions in an effort to make his work more accessible to ‘elderly readers and some who have weak eyes’, or to give the impression of realism in the characters’ correspondence in *Clarissa,* but he rarely ever strayed from the conservative Caslon’s pica roman. [[357]](#footnote-357) The inclusion of the header and ornamented capital on the opening page of each *Grandison* volume work as filigreed foils to the narrative’s sober undertones, and remind the reader that this is a story of the highest quality about one of society’s finest (fictional) men. The physical qualities of *Grandison*, as the author’s final fictional work, can be interpreted as representative of what Richardson’s preferences for the most effective formatting and visual techniques.As we have seen in Chapters One and Two, there were a myriad of possibilities for how the writer(s) and readers could represent *Pamela.*

Experiments and Revisions

Of the three novels, *Clarissa* was arguably Richardson’s most successful foray into visual enhancements: four editions of the novel came directly from his printing press, all contained an engraved musical score[[358]](#footnote-358) in a rare use of a script face, which was an innovative and indulgent fusion of type-face and illustration. [[359]](#footnote-359) Barchas points out that this musical page ‘alludes to the materiality of book-making’ and I argue that this musical page, combined with all the other choices of type-faces, supplementary material, illustrations, and textual ornaments, points to the author/printer’s firm belief in the power of the book as a physical object. [[360]](#footnote-360) In a departure from *Clarissa,* *Grandison* balances elegance with the simplicity characteristic of all but one edition (the octavo sixth edition, 1742) of *Pamela*. Thus *Pamela* and *Grandison* function as important book-ends for Richardson’s adventures into more sophisticated verbal and visual expressions. The physical qualities of both of these novels will be interwoven into the following discussion of eighteenth-century print culture and publishing practices.

Interestingly, the first six volumes of the seven-volume *Grandison* published in Dublin by the ‘pirates’ do not list the Irish printers involved: Exshaw, Saunders, Ewing, and Wilson*,* and the seventh only mentions Saunders. This may be evidence of a hurried, disorganized, and predatory printing process.[[361]](#footnote-361) This rapid printing pace is also manifested in the quick release of *Grandison* instalments. As with his other two novels, Richardson released *Grandison* in duodecimo instalments in London. [[362]](#footnote-362) However, in Ireland, Faulkner learned that the Dublin printers had twelve sheets on larger paper (octavo) and in larger type, revealing that Richardson was planning to print both octavo and duodecimo editions at the same.[[363]](#footnote-363) David Blewett explains Richardson’s publication schedule for *Grandison*:

The first edition (seven volumes in duodecimo) of *Grandison* was published in instalments: vols 1-4 in November 1753, vols 5-6 in December 1753, and vol 7 in March 1754. The second edition in octavo was published at the same time, but in six volumes. It was extensively revised, as was the third edition (in duodecimo) of 1754.[[364]](#footnote-364)

Blewett notes that both the second and third editions were ‘extensively revised’ by Richardson. This was an attempt by the author not only to correct mistakes in earlier editions, but also to distinguish his work from the Dublin editions. Dublin printers often claimed that they ‘revised’ London editions by correcting typographical errors, and were therefore, in part creating a ‘new’ work. This, in their minds, made them beyond reproach for their reprints.[[365]](#footnote-365) A brief survey of the most important revisions Richardson made to *Grandison,* from Robert Pierson’s collations, will illustrate how much effort the author put into the smallest details to make his text more consistent and to distinguish it from the Dublin editions.

Of the eight editions of *Grandison*, four have significant revisions: the second (1754), the third (1754), the fourth (1756/1762), and a London edition (1810).[[366]](#footnote-366) Richardson, an impressively thorough editor, exercised great control over the text and made 928 corrections to the second edition. The corrections of greatest significance to this thesis are Richardson’s interest in italicizing words, the improvement to characters’ diction, and the addition of footnotes. Craig posits that Richardson italicized 369 words to give the reader the impression that the character was ‘speaking a dialogue aloud in a play’. I add that these corrections would also be a direct visual signal to a concerned and discerning reader that they were in possession of a legitimate, up-to-date edition of Richardson’s novel, particularly if they compared it with a Dublin edition also for sale at a shop or with their friends’ copies. For example, Richardson’s friend, the poet Edward Young, changed the title of his plays right before publication so that the Irish could not make the correction before printing.[[367]](#footnote-367) Richardson, a ‘middle-class’ tradesman, took great pains to polish his character’s language and make their statements appropriate to their stations.[[368]](#footnote-368) The author received many suggestions from friends and readers, particularly his North End circle and Lady Bradshaigh, discussed in Chapter Four and in each revised edition, Richardson continued to improve the forms of address and reduce affectation.[[369]](#footnote-369) These in-depth efforts to increase the veracity of the text could not be repeated by the Dublin printers, who only hurriedly scanned for errors. Richardson also lightly seasoned his text with footnotes, something he had also experimented with in *Pamela* and *Clarissa*. This aided readers’ memories as they waded through *Grandison,* and enhanced Richardson’s posturing as editor. It was also a very clear statement by Richardson that the text was his, and that only he possessed the power to make links and connections among the volumes. [[370]](#footnote-370) These small and effective changes to the text were an expression of Richardson’s desire tightly to control his text and shield it from the Dubliners.

The most important narrative revision to the Dublin edition was the inclusion of an Editor’s note written by Richardson. In the Editor’s note, Richardson reflects on the lessons the near-perfect Sir Charles teaches the reader, responding to and anticipating some of his readers’ protests about the hero’s unconvincingly saintly behaviour. Most importantly, Richardson preaches a doctrine of tolerance and understanding that will be undermined by his later attitude towards the Dublin printers:

The God of Nature intended not human nature for a vile and contemptible thing: and many are the instances, in every age, of those whom he enables, amidst all the frailties of morality, to do it honour. Still the *best* performances of human creatures will be imperfect; but, such as they are, it is surely both delightful and instructive to dwell sometimes on this bright side of things.[[371]](#footnote-371)

How different this concluding sentiment is to the stormy final statement of the London edition’s *An Address to the Public*: ‘What are these Booksellers of Dublin, that they think themselves intitled [sic] to prey upon the property of every man in every nation round them; yet join to hunt down any other subject of the same Prince, if he attempts to get bread among, or near, them?’[[372]](#footnote-372) Richardson cannot bring himself to consider the bright side of Irish reprints, namely that Dublin’s interest in the author’s works would enhance sales for them and not for him, and he instead uses *Grandison* as a vehicle to launch a nationalist attack.

The influences and obvious connections among Richardson’s early polemical works and successful novels with *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* led Richardson to believe that *Grandison* was not only his novel, but his property: ‘The editor [Richardson] who had also great reason to complain of the Treatment he with in his *Pamela* on both sides of the water, cannot but observe that never was the work [*Grandison*] more the property of any man than that is his.’[[373]](#footnote-373) Richardson believed he had total ownership of his book; after all, he had participated in every aspect of *Grandison*’s creation, from the first germ of the story to its final draft, from choice of font to number of volumes. Richardson’s use of the word ‘property’ to describe his work flags up this term for further examination. Fysh identifies three qualities that encourage Richardson to consider *Grandison* as his property: first, that Richardson owned the copy and all the materials that had gone into producing it; second, that the work was original, and third, that the work was moral.[[374]](#footnote-374) Richardson believed that a moral and original work, produced by a moral author, allowed the author greater right to that property.[[375]](#footnote-375) He expresses this sentiment in the concluding note of *The Case of Samuel Richardson*: ‘N.B. This is not a contention between Booksellers of England and Ireland, and on a doubtful property, but between a lawful proprietor for a *New* and *Moral*  work.’[[376]](#footnote-376) The onus was on the author to protect this property and in ‘claiming authority for[…]ownership of his works, Samuel Richardson participated in the creation of the role of the modern author and claimed it for himself.’[[377]](#footnote-377) But Fysh’s interpretation and Richardson’s stance are complicated by the fact that Richardson claimed to be the editor, not the author, of these works. In the mid-eighteenth century, anonymous authorship was more a tradition than an actual incognito, and the public often knew the true identity of the author through word of mouth.[[378]](#footnote-378) This antiquated trope stunted the growth of an author as a professional, as Barchas explains: ‘While pseudonymity and anonymity stimulate generic innovation and enable the genre-wide counterfeiting of authority with the fictional frontispieces, they simultaneously delay the establishment of individual reputation based on genuine authorship.’[[379]](#footnote-379) If Richardson was willing to publicly declare himself author, then his claims in *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* had traction, but if he insisted on keeping up the façade that he was only the editor, the rightful owners of the texts were the eponymous heroines and heroes themselves – Pamela, Clarissa, and Sir Charles. Consequently, Richardson’s works would not only be un-*original*, and the morality of the text would have to be attributed to the characters, not the author. If these were true stories, as Richardson loved to insist, then wasn’t Richardson pirating the work from them? This argument was never presented to Richardson and the author placed all the blame on Faulkner.

The Prince and the Pirate

Just who was this George Faulkner, so unfortunate as to be cast as Richardson’s arch villain in his two tracts? A look into Faulkner’s biography suggests that the author was overstretching his claims. Faulkner, considered the ‘best known and most important [Irish] bookseller of the century’,[[380]](#footnote-380) by modern scholars, was also dubbed both the ‘Prince of Dublin Printers’ by Jonathan Swift and the ‘Hibernian Atticus’[[381]](#footnote-381) by Lord Chesterfield. Lord Chesterfield even encouraged Faulkner to reprint London editions at a lower price, personally requesting a cheaper copy of Boner’s *History of the Popes*.[[382]](#footnote-382) Information about Faulkner’s background is hazy, but the little available information creates a portrait of a determined printer. Faulkner began his career as an apprentice to the Dublin printer Thomas Hume, and then travelled to London to work for the printer William Bowyer. When Faulkner returned to London in 1724, he bought two newspapers, *The Dublin Post Boy* and *The Dublin Journal*. In the latter, thirty years later, he would refute Richardson’s aggressive accusations of piracy. Faulkner, a Protestant, entered into a partnership with the Catholic printer, James Hoey (?-1775), however, their business relationship quickly deteriorated. A possible cause for this break-up may have been a disagreement over the *Dublin Journal*. Although Hoey printed a periodical he called the *Dublin Journal*, Faulkner began to print his own *Dublin Journal* in March 1725, which was an ‘entirely distinctive publication’.[[383]](#footnote-383) Faulkner’s *Dublin Journal* outshone Hoey’s publication. This rivalry reveals the increasingly competitive, political, and sharp practice of print in a rapidly developing Dublin. The other prominent printers in Dublin at this time, the Exshaws, Peter Wilson, and Samuel Fairbrother, had developed successful businesses and later crossed paths with Faulkner in the reprinting of *Grandison*.[[384]](#footnote-384) These printers were also key figures in advancing what is now considered by scholars such as Maurice Craig and Colm Lennon as Ireland’s golden age of book-binding and printing. As Craig has confirmed, it was one of Richardson’s accused ‘pirates’, Samuel Fairbrother, a member of the King’s Stationers, who held the share of responsibility for producing the journals of the Irish House of Lord and Commons from 1723 to 1749. Fairbrother’s works were of such fine quality and innovation that they record the evolution of bookbinding and mark the craft’s ‘period of its greatest achievement’ in Ireland. [[385]](#footnote-385) Lennon confirms Ireland’s ‘golden age’, stating that ‘both the numbers of those involved in printing and its allied activities and the volume of material that emanated from printing presses increased exponentially during the eighteenth-century.’[[386]](#footnote-386) Of all these successful printers, Faulkner was the only positively reviewed printer in a 1766 public evaluation of Dublin masters, held by the journeymen-printers, who would later call themselves the Amicable Society of Printers.[[387]](#footnote-387)

Faulkner was not only the most successful printer in an increasingly sophisticated and developing Dublin, he was also a prominent and visible member of the local community. While Faulkner’s work with the Irish will be discussed in a later section of this chapter, it is important to remark here that Faulkner was known as an active Protestant-Catholic intermediary, working to smooth tensions in Dublin. Richardson saw Faulkner as a ‘highly charged representative of Irish piracy’ because of his prominence in the community and his interest in Irish Nationalism,[[388]](#footnote-388) suggesting that Faulkner’s reputation was well-known. He was also admired for his hospitality and interest in mixing and breaking down social barriers. Eighteenth-century Dublin had a more relaxed social life, ‘the professions were more intermixed and ranks more blended’ than in London,’[[389]](#footnote-389) and Faulkner brought this attitude into his own home, where ‘people of the most varied kind gathered there upon occasion and all were welcome.’[[390]](#footnote-390) Faulkner’s print-shop was a landmark in Dublin and considered an icon of Irish life. [[391]](#footnote-391) Faulkner was popular and social, if not somewhat of an affected fop, and his warm and vibrant relationship with the printing community stands in direct contrast to Richardson’s sober and earnest treatment of employees.

While Richardson pointed to Faulkner as a thief, the disenfranchised Dubliners embraced the ethos of Robin Hood. Samuel Madden, in his powerful pamphlet, *Resolutions for Irish Gentlemen* from the late 1790s, captures the spirit of frustration many Irish felt from the arbitrary rules imposed by England that had been building throughout the eighteenth-century. Madden expresses the Irish people’s willingness to unite and break from the yoke of English oppression:

If we consider it [Ireland] as possessed and managed by a people allied to, and descended from a nation where trade and agriculture, arts and science, wealth and liberty flourish to the highest degree, we might hope a large share of all those blessings would have been our lot, and descended down to us as the inheritance of our ancestors, who were sent hither to enlarge the British empire and commerce[…]Reflect how little use Great Britain has yet made of those advantages she might have drawn from a full planting our country, and improving our manufactures, and how wretchedly we have managed our trade, so as only to impoverish us and our tillage, so as to starve us, how we have sent away our wealth or goods for everything we did not want, and made our mobility and gentility our factors abroad to help every nation but us.[[392]](#footnote-392)

Many Irish saw their right to reprint and have a functioning printing industry as a matter of principle and honour; many wanted Ireland to be treated as an autonomous kingdom and this is one of the main reasons London and Dublin printers chafed. [[393]](#footnote-393) In his *Dublin Journal*, Faulkner espoused the view that circumventing strict English law was virtuous and patriotic, and we can see how Faulkner embodied Madden’s later philosophy. Richardson brought these Anglo-Irish issues to the forefront of his dispute with the Dublin printer, and Temple explains the consequences of Richardson’s actions: ‘In response to Irish claims that English overreaching had prompted a perfectly legal reprinting of *Grandison*, Richardson branded the Irish “pirates’’ – transforming a commercial matter into a highly politicized dispute involving crimes against the nation.’[[394]](#footnote-394) Temple’s acknowledgment of the political connotations of the term ‘pirates’ and this chapter’s earlier discussion of Richardson’s romantic use of ‘pirates’ were blended into an unstable emulsion.

Despite this collision of two printing cultures and practices, most relationships between London and Irish printers were amicable. Irish printing relationships were considerably more casual and perhaps this perplexed Londoners such as Richardson who operated in formal terms as dictated in his *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum*. In Dublin, deals were ‘struck in person, over dinner, at the tavern, or in the coffeehouse, and sealed with a handshake.’[[395]](#footnote-395) In London, the different roles in book production were segregated and practices more formal.[[396]](#footnote-396) It is important to remember that London printers also had to deal with local and provincial ‘piracy’: during the publishing of John Gay’s *Beggar’s Opera*, there were over twenty-one London booksellers pirating copies.[[397]](#footnote-397) London printers also ‘pirated’ books by Irish writers, because the transportation costs would have made them more expensive in the capital. For example, William Bowyer reprinted at least 60 Irish books between 1729 and 1767.[[398]](#footnote-398) Even more interestingly, Maslen has discovered that Richardson himself participated in the re-print trade.[[399]](#footnote-399) Dublin printers produced between 750 and 2,000 copies of each edition, comparable to the quantity being produced in London, and were generally about half price.[[400]](#footnote-400) Because most authors sold their copyrights, it was the London/Dublin booksellers, not the writers, who lost money to Irish/London reprints. In fact, as Adrian Johns’ theory that London authors cried ‘piracy’ in an attempt to increase publicity suggests, reprints most likely enhanced the author’s exposure and boosted sales.[[401]](#footnote-401)

As Richardson’s two tracts have demonstrated, many embittered authors relied on the familiar medium of print to air their grievances. Nick Groom observes that this was a common approach to piracy, with the ‘victims taking the law into their own hands and seeking redress through a literary “sentence’’ such as public humiliation reported in sensational pamphlets.’[[402]](#footnote-402) Yet there was legislation that established parameters (albeit rather vague) for copyright and more authors and booksellers became emboldened enough to bring these issues into court, starting with the implementation of the Statute of Anne (1710). Before the pivotal 1710 Statute, issues of copyright and printing were controlled by the Stationers’ Company, who had the sole power to grant rights to print a book. Only booksellers and printers could be admitted as members to the Stationers’ and this centralized business structure was motivated by the censorial Licensing Act (abolished on 1695), which sought to suppress all controversial writing not in support of the Church or State.[[403]](#footnote-403) Under this system there was no method of regulating printing and one printer could print what his competitor had released only the day before. Booksellers were eager to remedy this situation and thus looked to a statute for change.

The Legal Environment

TheStatute of Anne, ‘an act for the encouragement of learning by vesting in the copies of printed books in the authors or purchasers of such copies, during the times therein mentioned,’[[404]](#footnote-404) was conceived of as an extension of the Stationers’ Company tradition and formalized a system that gave both authors and publishers ‘standardized, time-limited privileges as of right.’[[405]](#footnote-405) The Statute of Anne’s two main purposes were, in theory, to encourage the writing of books, and to legitimize printing and publishing practices.[[406]](#footnote-406) The act also required a public deposit of nine copies of each book to be distributed to various colleges and libraries, something that booksellers would desperately try and avoid by not registering their works.[[407]](#footnote-407) The Statute of Anne enabled authors to hold their own fourteen-year long copyrights independent of the guild,[[408]](#footnote-408) however, its primary intention was not to advance the vague and fledgling notion of authorship, as many historians believe.[[409]](#footnote-409) Rather, theStatute of Anneattempted to prevent booksellers from copying already published works, and primarily concerned itself with issues of printing and reprinting books.[[410]](#footnote-410) Groom identifies two significant consequences of the Statute of Anne’s implementation; first, that it gave all persons, not just authors, the right to acquire copyright, and second, that it was not concerned with authors’ interests, but was a right to ‘which a book was subject, and not the whole property interest in the book.’[[411]](#footnote-411) In short, the Statute of Anne was intended to be about books and booksellers, not authors; a ‘trade regulation statute enacted to bring order to the chaos created in the book trade’.[[412]](#footnote-412) It was an effort to strengthen the role of ‘legal sanctions’ in Darnton’s communications circuit discussed in the Introduction.

The Statute of Anne also strove to add structure and organization to the communications circuit, by clarifying the role of the booksellers and printers. It is commonly touted as the ‘first copyright act’, but as Bently astutely points out, the term ‘copyright’ is not a term present in the Act.[[413]](#footnote-413) Bently continues to explain the contemporary concept of copyright:

If ‘copyright’ is the right to control copying, then I think there is not much harm in the statement. But if one understands ‘copyright’ to mean the rights of the authors, or the regime of regulation of literary and artistic works, or a regime of regulation related to but distinct from laws of patents and designs, then we need to be much more wary.[[414]](#footnote-414)

Thus, the *Statute of Anne* was a copyright law in the simplest interpretation of the term, and it anticipated and facilitated a period when authorship would become more formally and legally associated with ownership. This transition in meaning and application occurred during the period between 1710 and 1774: ‘In 1710, copyright was the right of the publisher to the exclusive publication of a work[…]by 1774, copyright had come to be the right of an author.’[[415]](#footnote-415) In this sixty-four year transitional period, bookended by the Statute of Anne and *Millar v Taylor,* in which an author was declared the sole person responsible for deciding how and when to publish his work,authors and booksellers were perplexed by the vagaries of the Statute and its implications for piracy. [[416]](#footnote-416) At first, booksellers welcomed the *Statute of Anne* and registered their titles with the Stationers’ - in 1710, 678 titles were registered - but over the next fifty years, the average number of titles registered per year declined to a mere fifty.[[417]](#footnote-417) Many booksellers found the registration prices too high, the protection of the *Statute of Anne* inadequate, and chose completely to ignore it.[[418]](#footnote-418) As we have seen, Richardson and Faulkner, as late as 1753, struggled to find absolutes in the grey matter.

Dealing with Dublin – A Different Model

Another case involving Faulkner, a London printer, Benjamin Motte, and the writer Jonathan Swift, provides an illuminating parallel to how different writers and publishers waded through the murkiness of the *Statute of Anne* and found their own ways to enforce laws and assert authorship and ownership. Both Richardson and Swift’s reactions to Faulkner highlight another philosophical and cultural consequence of the *Statute of Anne* not mentioned by these historians – the further development and shaping of English and Irish identity – demonstrating that Richardson was motivated by nationalism. When the *Statute of Anne* was originally passed, Ireland was independent and therefore exempt from English law; this had profound implications on the disputes that developed across borders. Pollard points out that in 1710, Dublin had so few printers (probably fewer than ten) that Ireland was considered insignificant in the printing industry.[[419]](#footnote-419) By 1735, Ireland had a more powerful presence in printing and *Motte v Faulkner*, which ‘resulted in the granting of injunction to restrain publication of the Pope and Swift *Miscellanies*’, brings issues of Irish identity and culture to the forefront of the copyright discussion. *Motte v Faulkner* involved the successful London and Dublin printers in contentious dialogue over the publication of Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* (first published in London in 1726 by Motte, and then by Faulkner in Dublin in 1735). Faulkner’s publication of *Gulliver’s Travels* was considered authoritative and was his most successful product. The Dublin printer’s dealings with Swift were not always placid, but their dynamic, frequently rebellious relationship generated improved editions and shifted some focus onto the Irish printing situation as a whole. Swift’s initial prevention of Dublin and London piracies also provides a good guideline for how Richardson should have dealt with the distribution of his *Grandison* manuscript. Instead of posting flyers in his workshop and making his employees sign oaths, Richardson should have followed the lead of Swift or John Gay. As Bently explains, Swift hedged his bets and ‘under the guidance of Pope, Gay, and Erasmus Lewis he had spread the publication of *Gulliver’s Travels* [1726] between no less than five printers to guard against piracy.’ [[420]](#footnote-420) Gay, frustrated by the plethora of pirated *Beggar’s Opera*s, contacted printer-cum-politician, John Barber, who negotiated with Thomas Astley, a prominent London ‘pirate’, and set up an arrangement ‘whereby Astley paid some damages, promised to sell no more pirated copies, and, in return, became a legitimate printer in Gay’s publication.’[[421]](#footnote-421) Instead of working with the system, Richardson worked against it. His choice to attack Faulkner with anti-Irish, nationalistic sentiment only inflamed the issue, causing the London and Dublin communications circuits to become entangled and locked.

Faulkner and Swift’s relationship began in earnest in 1732, when Faulkner undertook the printing of Swift’s *Queries relating to the Sacramental Text* and *Considerations upon Two Bills[…]Related to the Clergy of Ireland.*[[422]](#footnote-422) In *Queries*, Swift protested against the repeal of the Test Act (1673, extended to Ireland in 1704), which required any person in a civil or military position to swear an oath of allegiance to the Church of England, and more importantly, to deny transubstantiation.[[423]](#footnote-423) This tract was especially inflammatory in a country divided by Protestant and Catholic beliefs, and Faulkner was imprisoned for his participation in a Pro-Catholic tract. Although Swift was decidedly anti-Catholic, he was infuriated by the way the English exploited the Irish.[[424]](#footnote-424) Faulkner was considerably more tolerant of Catholics, and actively worked to heal the bitter relations in Ireland, but it was not until he met Swift that he began to address both national and international issues. Charles O’Conor explains how Faulkner’s relationship with Swift encouraged Faulkner to address Anglo-Irish tensions:

Since the early days of his association with Dean Swift, he [Faulkner] had imbibed something of the Dean’s own rancour against the shameless ways that Ireland was exploited by English statesmen, though his outlook was more generous than even Swift’s had been and was uncoloured by any sense of personal grievances such as distorted Swift’s version.[[425]](#footnote-425)

As a prominent printer in the community, Faulkner’s workshop was a powerful mouthpiece for the promotion of tolerance. In the early-nineteenth century publication, *The History of Catholics*, Faulkner was retrospectively honoured as the first convert to the Catholic cause, and although he remained a devoted Protestant, his publication of pro-Catholic and Catholic- material and tracts was considered an enormous step in the advancement of Catholic acceptance. [[426]](#footnote-426) Faulkner acted as an ‘intermediary in the community’,[[427]](#footnote-427) garnering support for the Catholic sufferers from the famines of 1740 and 1757, and encouraging the Protestant business members to rise to success and prominence by ethical means. [[428]](#footnote-428) O’Conor describes the rarity of Faulkner’s position as both a tolerant spokesperson for the Catholic cause and a well-known Protestant businessman: ‘By his antecedents and profession, Faulkner was from the first free from the sense of guilty insecurity which harassed those whose rise to affluence and honour was stained by a record of spoliation and plunder.’[[429]](#footnote-429) Faulkner encouraged the Protestants not to pirate or plunder the Catholics in order to create a unified Ireland.

While Faulkner continued to engage with these domestic discordances, he also applied his philosophies to international concerns and joined Swift in being vehemently pro-Irish. In *The Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides,* James Boswell recounts a conversation between Faulkner and Samuel Johnson about the Irish situation. According to Boswell, Faulkner stated that ‘England has drained Ireland of fifty thousand pounds in specie in fifty years’. Dr Johnson asked how this had happened, thinking of Anglo-Irish trade tensions: ‘How so, Sir? You must have a very great trade?’ Faulkner pointed out that this financial drainage was not from trade, but rather, ‘out of the blood and bowels of the poor people of Ireland’.[[430]](#footnote-430) This serves as Faulkner’s unstated thesis in his rebuttal to Richardson’s claims in *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*. Faulkner’s statement alludes to the financial and emotional tensions between England and Ireland, and explains why, even when his fellow printers robbed him of *Grandison* proofs, he still chose to support the Irish. Loyalty to Ireland was an important factor on the Dublin communications circuit.

Faulkner and Swift were not the only literary men to see the English laws and customs as symptomatic of English oppression and the printing press as an ‘agent of change’, Dublin booksellers Patrick Byrne and Patrick Wogan believed their ‘pirated’ Irish works asserted national identity and broadened the market for readers. Cole explains the impact of the booksellers’ attitudes: ‘Byrne and Wogan affirmed that they were enlarging the audience for English writers by printing cheap editions. As Roman Catholics suffering from British penal laws in Ireland, Byrne and Wogan undoubtedly saw copyright as another example of British oppression.’[[431]](#footnote-431) Although, arguably, increasing the Irish audience for English books could be read as a cultural colonisation of Ireland, the Irish were more concerned with having rightful access to works at an acceptable price. Possession of the physical object was more important than the author or contents; it was a symbol of equality and progress. Works had been ‘pirated’ in Ireland, long before the Statute of Anne, but it was only with the growth of the printing industry, the spread of the novel, and intensifying Anglo-Irish relations that the issues were inflated with symbolism and nationalist sentiment.[[432]](#footnote-432) This contentious atmosphere was a catalyst for Swift, and he used his connections with the press to bring particular pet issues to the forefront of the public eye: ‘Among others he strove to manipulate public opinion through pamphlets and broadsides. In doing so, he took advantage of the city’s almost insatiable appetite for printed material and raised the profile of those who printed and published his works in Ireland – most famously George Faulkner.’[[433]](#footnote-433) Whether motivated by business interactions, religious oppression, or a general concern for Irish identity, Irish writers and printers flexed their muscles within the communications circuit, using it as a vehicle for freedom, as Faulkner’s publication of *Gulliver’s Travels* will show.

Although Swift was pleased with Faulkner’s initial work for him, he was resistant to the printer’s proposal to release an authoritative edition of *Gulliver’s Travels.* Swift had already appointed his London printer, Motte, to lead the project, and the author stressed to Faulkner that he would be disappointed if this edition was first published in Dublin. Faulkner defiantly reminded Swift that the legal situation rendered the writer’s permission unnecessary.[[434]](#footnote-434) Motte questioned Swift as to whether he would be the author’s only printer on this important project, and the slippery and unreliable Swift replied: ‘Upon my word, I never intended that any but yr self should be concerned as Printer or Bookseller in anything that shall be published with my consent while I am alive.’[[435]](#footnote-435) This assurance was retracted one week later when Swift signed a contract with another London printer and Faulkner’s former employer, William Bowyer, to print his work.[[436]](#footnote-436) Swift then sent Faulkner a copy of *Gulliver’s Travels*, edited by friend and ‘guardian of the true text’ Charles Ford (1682-1741), with further comments by the author.[[437]](#footnote-437) Swift’s commentary transformed Faulkner’s edition into a prized, authoritative *Gulliver’s Travels* and stood in stark contrast to Motte’s revised and censored edition, edited by Andrew Tooke and printed in 1726.[[438]](#footnote-438) Swift’s decision to support Faulkner’s publication stems not only from his frustration with Motte’s earlier edition, but also from Swift’s pro-Irish sentiment. A statement in the *Queries* captures Swift’s eagerness to support the honest man in his noble cause against bigger, more corrupt powers, ‘there are no qualities incident to the frailty and corruption of human kind, than an indifference, or insensibility for other men’s sufferings and sudden forgetfulness of their former humble state when they rise in the world.’[[439]](#footnote-439) Swift’s statement is an elegant articulation of Faulkner’s philosophy about an ethical rise to success. In the particular printing situation surrounding *Gulliver’s Travels*, Swift considered Motte representative of a country and ethos that was censorious and cruelly indifferent to the plight of the Irish.

Faulkner was quick to puff the exclusivity, quality, and authenticity of his editions of Swift, as an advertisement reveals: ‘N.B. A compleat Edition of that Author’s works can never be printed in England, because some of them were published without his Knowledge, and liking, and consequently belong to different Proprietors’[[440]](#footnote-440) Here Faulkner is disparaging printing piracy, the very method Richardson would later accuse him of supporting. Later, in response to an attempt by rival printer Samuel Fairbrother to capitalize on the Swift mania with an unauthorized release of Swift’s work, Faulkner re-emphasized his product’s authenticity: ‘This is the only genuine collection of this Gentleman’s work that was ever publish’d, excepting that which was done by subscription on four volumes octavo printed on very fine Genoa paper.’[[441]](#footnote-441) This four volume octavo was, of course, also printed by Faulkner. Faulkner’s advertisement addresses the physical quality of the text as a direct signal that the work was genuine. As we have seen in Chapter Two, sham, pirated, and inferior editions often were made of poor-quality materials. The association between quality and authenticity in part explains why Richardson embellished many of his texts with headers, ornaments, and illustrated capitals, as demonstrated in his early edition of *Grandison*. According to Maslen, Richardson had approximately five hundred and twenty-six ornaments to choose from in his printing house.[[442]](#footnote-442) The Irish re-prints of *Grandison*, while still of standard quality, look cheap in comparison to Richardson’s overly ambitious texts. Like Richardson, Swift had specific ideas about the quality of materials he wanted his work printed on; when Faulkner planned to print *A Proposal for Giving Badges to Beggars in All Parishes of Dublin* (1737), Swift requested that Faulkner ‘print the following Treatise in a fair letter, and a good paper’.[[443]](#footnote-443) Faulkner’s claims to quality were legitimate and his puffs were a vehicle for separating himself from other unscrupulous printing practices, as we have seen in Richardson’s *Grandison.*

Motte was threatened by Faulkner and Swift’s partnership because the success of Faulkner’s edition immediately cast the Dublin printer as the author’s premier printer, and deprived Motte of further profit and recognition.[[444]](#footnote-444) Motte launched a lawsuit against Faulkner, *Motte v Faulkner*, and it resulted in an injunction, legally preventing Faulkner from importing some of his Swift editions into England. Faulkner was discouraged from appealing this decision because it would be futile, and Collins explains that contemporary judicial bias meant that London courts were prejudiced against the Irish.[[445]](#footnote-445) Swift’s correspondence with Motte and Faulkner throughout their legal deadlock illuminates some of the complex consequences of the Statute of Anne, namely, inflaming Anglo-Irish relations. Motte wrote to Swift asking for support in the lawsuit and although Swift’s response does not survive, it is evident from the author’s later sentiments that he chose not to help the London printer, and ‘did not exercise the remarkable judicial power attributed to him by Motte.’[[446]](#footnote-446) Swift remarked that Ireland was exempt from the constraint of the Statute of Anne and transformed Motte’s challenge to Faulkner as a springboard for a nationalist crusade.[[447]](#footnote-447) This tension inspired Swift’s memorable rebellious retort, and perhaps emboldened Faulkner in his later dealing with Richardson: ‘If I were a booksellers in this Town [Dublin], I would use all safe means to reprint London Books and run them into any Town in England that I could.’[[448]](#footnote-448) Swift’s comments bolster the role of social conjectures and publicity on the communications circuit that would come into play between Richardson and Faulkner nearly two decades later. The implications of the Statute of Anne may have made for a murky printing situation, but Swift’s and Faulkner’s later view was clear – the Irish must be protected.

*Grandison* ends happily with Sir Charles’s honour reigning supreme and a penitent Sir Hargrave Pollexfen. For Richardson and Faulkner, the two characters in the author’s *An Address to the Public*, the conclusion was not as satisfying and Faulkner became the undisputed victim of Richardson’s print war. The scathing attacks on Faulkner’s honour in *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*, dampened the printer’s reputation. Richardson’s comments fuelled the playwright Samuel Foote’s later jeering characterization of Faulkner as the crippled, comic Peter Paragraph in his mocking play, *The Orators* (1788).[[449]](#footnote-449) Faulkner sued Foote for libel, but the public enjoyed Foote’s unforgiving caricature, and the Dublin printer’s reputation was tainted. Richardson also prevented Faulkner from joining the Society for Promoting Arts, Commerce, and Manufactures.[[450]](#footnote-450) Thus, between the calfskin covers *Grandison*, a whole, previously unwritten narrative exists – two prominent printers, two bitterly entangled countries, one romantic vision and one harsh reality, were all unprotected by one vague law. Just as the format and text of the London edition of *Grandison* is more ornate, prolix, and self-conscious, so are Richardson’s claims in *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*. But a simpler truths emerge from the white spaces of the text – Faulkner was not a corrupt pirate, he was a patriot, Dublin editions were not harmful, they were beneficial to the circulation and success of the novel, and the contents of the text had far more resonance than the cover to Richardson’s early readers. With the testimonies of book history, legal context, and culture, the verdict is in and the former verdict of ‘pirate’ is overturned. The covers of the *Grandison*s, of supple leather, stately gold tooling, containing crisp laid pages and primly inked text, speak for their equality and virtue. Perhaps it is time to consider *An Address to the Public* as Richardson’s last and shortest novel.

CHAPTER THREE

THE BATTLE OF THE BOOKS: RICHARDSON, FAULKNER, AND THE ANGLO-IRISH PRINTING SITUATION

*Pamela*’s purity and integrity was not only threatened by opportunistic and spurious writers, but also, Richardson believed, by his tradesmen and business partners. In 1741, *Pamela* had been printed in Dublin without Richardson’s permission, but in a completely acceptable manner under the provisions of the *Statute of Anne* (or rather, a loophole within it). Dublin printers, George Faulkner (1703-1775) and George Ewing (1718-1764) printed *Pamela* only two and a half months after its release in London. Richardson continued to battle with Faulkner and other Irish printers over the release of *Clarissa* and *Grandison*. Richardson’s on-going dispute climaxed with his decision to write and publish two tracts, *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* (both 1753) that severely criticised Irish printing practices and in particular, the behaviour of Faulkner, who he identified as the scapegoat. Richardson handed these tracts out for free, inserted them into his editions of *Sir Charles Grandison* and had excerpts printed in the October 1753 issue of *The Gentleman’s Magazine.* In this chapter, I shift my focus from writers of sham and spurious works to the publishers and printers of such ‘illegitimate’ works and broaden my discussion to include *Sir Charles Grandison*. As his first novel, *Pamela* was an opportunity for Richardson to explore and experiment with the physical appearance of his text and as his final novel, *Grandison* represents the findings and results of his many different tests. I will explore the motivations and claims in *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* by looking at their connections with Richardson’s earlier *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum, Familiar Letters*, *Pamela,* and‘Six Original Letters Against Duelling’ – a short tract published seriously and posthumously.This chapter uses these resources as a springboard to explore Irish ‘piracy’ in greater detail. By examining the physical qualities of the London and Dublin editions of *Pamela* and *Grandison*, and then drawing parallels between Richardson’s treatment of these two novels, the validity of Richardson’s claims and Faulkner’s actions can be re-assessed. These grievances are examined in a discussion of the professional, legal, and cultural factors informing Richardson and Faulkner, and the scope is then expanded to include Jonathan Swift, another author who dealt with Faulkner and Irish reprints in an entirely different manner. Swift’s response to the Irish ‘piracy’ provides an alternative and more successful model for dealing with Anglo-Irish printing relationships. This chapter is the first study of Richardson and Faulkner’s print duels that brings together earlier sources, analyses the contents of the author’s two vitriolic tracts, and considers the broader context for Irish piracy, effectively restoring Faulkner’s honour and overturning scholarly misconceptions.

Printing *Pamela* in Ireland

The Dublin *Pamela* was sold to the public for six pennies less than Richardson’s London version, and was profitable enough to require a second printing in March.[[451]](#footnote-451) A mixed and married set of a four-volume-Dublin-printed *Pamela*, currently held in the British Library, provides insight into how Faulkner and Ewing treated the text.[[452]](#footnote-452) Were they violating *Pamela*, like the sham and spin-off authors discussed in the previous chapter? Richardson believed the Dublin printers to be guilty of such a crime, but *Pamela*’s diverse book history proves that this straight forward Dublin reprint was not a considerable threat. The first of these four-volume duodecimos is a sixth edition, printed for Ewing and Faulkner in 1741, uniformly bound in plain calf with a raised and banded spine. The paper is crisp and laid, the font is small, and there is no ornamentation. The second volume is a second edition, printed by S. Powell, for George Ewing, W. Smith, and George Faulkner in 1742. This means Faulkner and Ewing expanded and collaborated with Smith for many of *Pamela*’s printings, and sometimes included even more printers - the third and fourth volumes, printed in 1742, also name a ‘W. Smith’ in the colophon. Interestingly, the second volume of the second edition has more ornamentation, including wood-block headers and capitals, revealing the versatility of Faulkner, Ewing, and Smith’s printing operation. Most importantly, this mismatched, married set of different editions, all identically bound in contemporary calf, suggests that some readers, while insisting on a uniform, outward appearance were indifferent to the harmony and uniformity of the interior text. Their *Pamela*s only had to *appear* to be perfect. This preference for content over decorative consistency suggests that Richardson’s complaints that Faulkner and other Irish printers had mishandled publications were exaggerated and that their printing techniques did not have any damaging influence on the reception of *Pamela*.

Richardson’s reactions to the Dublin printing of *Pamela, Clarissa,* and *Grandison*

Instead of confronting Faulkner about the Dublin printing of *Pamela*, which Stephanie Fysh terms a ‘perceived invasion of his rights’, Richardson secured a royal license for *Pamela* and sent more copies to Ireland to sell. [[453]](#footnote-453) A copy of this royal licence was included in Volumes III and IV of some editions of *Pamela* and was headed by the Crest of George II:

George, the second, by the Grace of God, King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, & c. To all whom these presents shall come, Greetings. Whereas our truly and well-beloved Charles Rivington, Samuel Richardson, and John Osborn, of our City of London, Stationers, have by their petition, humbly represented unto us, that they have a great Experience and Labour prepared for the Press a work, intitled Pamela: Or Virtue Rewarded…By his Majesty’s Command.[[454]](#footnote-454)

To compound the King’s message, Richardson concludes his fourth volume with a short, pointed statement, writing that his work was printed ‘solely, at the assignment of Samuel Richardson, of Salisbury-Court, Fleet-Street, the Editor of their four volumes of Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded.’[[455]](#footnote-455) When it came time for Richardson’s second novel, *Clarissa*, to be printed, Richardson returned to Faulkner and worked out a financial arrangement for the reproduction rights. Interestingly, *Clarissa* did not sell well in Ireland[[456]](#footnote-456) and according to T.C. Duncan Eaves and Benjamin Kimpel, may not have circulated as well as Richardson claimed in England.[[457]](#footnote-457) For Richardson’s third novel, *Grandison*, he constructed a contract and charged Faulkner seventy guineas. This time he attached three conditions to the contract and we can begin to understand how difficult Richardson was to work with and satisfy; the conditions were: ‘First, that the edition be limited to Ireland, second that Faulkner not advertise publication until Richardson gave him word to do so, and third, that Faulkner publish only two volumes at a time.’[[458]](#footnote-458) Richardson wanted as much command over his text as possible. Richardson also tightened his control over work in his print-shop to prevent piracy; he posted printed notices, changed his employee’s routines, and spread production of his manuscript across his three printing houses.[[459]](#footnote-459) Richardson sent Faulkner four sheets, 96 pages, of the first volume of *Sir Charles Grandison*, which the Dubliner received on the 3rd of August, 1753.[[460]](#footnote-460) This was, of course, only a small portion of the novel, but it was understood in the community of Dublin printers that once part of the work was received, the printer could advertise the title (which Richardson had not yet authorized Faulkner to do), announce that the work had gone to press, and declare his right to be sole printer of this title in Dublin.[[461]](#footnote-461) From Richardson’s contract with Faulkner, and most importantly, his previous experience with Irish printers, it is certain that the author understood the Dublin printing practices. According to Richardson’s account of the *Grandison* printing situation documented in hisemotionally loaded tract, *An Address to the Public,* the day after Faulkner received the sheets, Faulkner learned that other Dublin printers, including Ewing, had much more substantial copies of Richardson’s novel. Richardson quotes Faulkner’s lament published in the *Dublin Journal*: ‘But to my great surprise, I find four more of the same work, in octavo and duodecimo, which they have shewn me and left with me to compare.’[[462]](#footnote-462) Faulkner and Richardson correctly concluded that journeymen had colluded with Richardson’s workers to give them copies of *Grandison* before it reached Faulkner’s hands, violating the ethical code set out by Richardson himself in *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* (1735). Robert Ward and Mary Pollard both explain Faulkner’s now precarious position within Dublin’s printing culture: Faulkner could no longer claim to be the legitimate printer of the work because the other printers had declared their rights. Faulkner told Richardson it would be futile to send him any more sheets of *Grandison* because he had to join the group of Dublin printers if he wanted to be involved in the release of *Grandison.* Faulkner explained this further, writing that ‘they produced so much of the copy, they agreed, according to an established, invariable, and constant custom among the booksellers of Dublin, that whoever gets any Books or Pamphlets…by the same Post, shall or may join together.’[[463]](#footnote-463) Richardson uses his *An Address to the Public* to publicly refute Faulkner’s explanation, and re-shapes the printer’s statements with italics: ‘Will Mr Faulkner say that it is an *established*, *invariable*, constant custom among the Booksellers of Dublin, to renounce their agreements with men they had contracted with, or their being notoriously robbed.’[[464]](#footnote-464) It is clear that Richardson dismissed Faulkner’s explanation with disdain, and launched a campaign against Anglo-Irish printing customs. In a gesture of peace and goodwill, Faulkner offered to refund Richardson the seventy guineas he had charged for copyright, but Richardson refused and ultimately lost control over the appearance of the Irish editions. Richardson was eager for a print duel.

Richardson’sRetaliation: *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*

Richardson had two reactions to this Dublin printing debacle: the first was to attempt to find another bookseller in Dublin to out-sell the other ‘pirates’; the second was to write two polemical and inflammatory tracts, *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson,* publicly to express his grievances. Richardson’s first reaction was a failure – he sent 750 copies of his London *Grandison* to Robert Main, a Dublin bookseller, to sell. Richardson does not mention this in either of his anti-Irish tracts because the attempt was enormously unsuccessful; Richardson’s involvement with Main caused the bookseller to go bankrupt in 1755.[[465]](#footnote-465) The simple fact was that the Irish public and many English readers preferred the Dublin reprint for two-shillings less.[[466]](#footnote-466) Also, Richardson’s attempt to flood the Irish market with his work was morally dubious and it threatened to damage the local book trade - a common act of sabotage by eighteenth-century London printers. Although Richardson criticized all Dublin booksellers for this printing debacle, he singled out Faulkner as his scapegoat in both of his tracts, ignoring the critical fact that the ‘robbery’ had taken place in London and had been committed by one of his own employees.[[467]](#footnote-467) After all, the proofs for *Grandison* were stolen *en-route* to Faulkner, something not entirely unexpected, as Ward explains: ‘Both men [Faulkner and Richardson] knew that there were journeymen in London who would steal galley proofs and send them to Dublin, Paris, or Edinburgh, but Richardson chose to ignore that fact.’[[468]](#footnote-468) Faulkner openly acknowledged his disapproval of the theft as unethical, writing to Richardson that ‘I know that you have been much, and most injuriously, villainously, and unprecedentedly treated by your more than hellish, wicked, and corrupted servants.’[[469]](#footnote-469) Faulkner correctly identifies the true culprit of the crime in his supplicating response – Richardson’s employees. In this particular case, the corrupt servant was Thomas Killingbeck, an employee of Richardson’s during the printing of *Grandison*, who had previously worked for Faulkner. Killingbeck claimed that Faulkner printed copies ‘clandestinely obtained from England’, however, the motivation for Killingbeck’s testimony was questionable and Richardson fired him shortly after the publication of *The Case of Samuel Richardson*. Killingbeck’s verbal confession and Richardson’s knowledge of Dublin printing practices provide further support for Ward’s assertion that Richardson could not plead ignorance of Dublin printing practices.

Richardson’s second attempt at retaliation was far more successful; both *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* have had lasting effects on Faulkner’s reputation and the book history of *Sir Charles Grandison*. Until recently, scholars have accepted Richardson’s claims in these two tracts and not interrogated the motivations for his vitriolic, nationalistic accusations. Mary Pollard argues that the cries of London booksellers, authors, and printers such as Richardson have passed ‘unchallenged into folk memory.’[[470]](#footnote-470) Indeed, Richardson’s tracts have had traction, and the assertiveness and availability of *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* have distracted scholars from re-examining the situation. However, I interpret Richardson’s tracts as two distorted rewritings of the Irish printing situation, with the author fancifully casting Faulkner as the villain and himself as the virtuous hero. I argue also that origins for these two vitriolic, exaggerated works can be found as early as 1734, in his *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* – a document that displays his strict and intolerant business practices.

*The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum*

Richardson’s *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum*, is an exhaustive treatise on his attitude and expectation for printers’ apprentices. It also anticipates Hogarth’s later *Industry and Idleness* (1747) which was written for working children and ‘calculated for the Us & Instruction of Youth’. The strong moralising approach and content of Richardson’s tract and Hogarth’s narrative series implies a relationship between author and artist, which will be further explored in Chapter Five. *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* was constructed around a letter of instruction and advice to his nephew, Thomas Verren Richardson, who was apprenticed to his uncle’s print-shop.[[471]](#footnote-471) Richardson felt compelled to write this tract because ‘the present depravity of servants is a general complaint in the mouths of all masters of families, and it must be allow’d there is but too much reason for it.’[[472]](#footnote-472) Richardson addresses several of these tempting depravities, including alcohol, young women, moral laxity, and the theatre. The author writes from the perspective of a master and forbids apprentices from participating in games, gambling, and other diversions ‘whereby his master may have any loss.’[[473]](#footnote-473) This interest in protecting the financial integrity of the master’s business is further emphasized when Richardson states that his employees will not be allowed to explore outside business, because ‘this might otherwise be an inlet into many great inconveniences to the master, who might, according as he repos’d a confidence in his servant, be robbed of the profit’s of his business and a clandestine trade by carry’d on in his name, and at his expence, as it might happen.’[[474]](#footnote-474) A major emphasis of *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* is the apprentice’s respect for the master’s profits and this preoccupation caused Richardson to be warily out of touch with his employees’ culture and needs.

Richardson condemns the institution of the tavern to apprentices, stating that it is only appropriate for a master occasionally to visit, justifying this exception ‘it is well known of what bad consequence the haunting of a tavern is to a master himself, who has, at least, the pretence of meeting his customers, and treating of business there, and who really very often promotes his Business by discreet use of it.’[[475]](#footnote-475) However, the tavern was a central fixture for those involved in the printing industry, it was a place where workmen could build relationships with each other and the community. Richardson’s refusal to acknowledge the tavern as a legitimate institution reflects the distance between the master and his employees. The entirety of *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* is paternalistic, controlling, didactic, and reflective of an increasingly out-dated approach towards the master-apprentice relationship. Richardson’s attitude was most likely based on earlier patterns of the book trade, which Keith Maslen describes:

In Richardson’s day, the British book trade was centred in London, as it had been for centuries. Its members, whether printers or booksellers, belonged to a man to the Worshipful Company of Stationers. Family links persisted from one generation to the next, and family was linked to family.[[476]](#footnote-476)

This business arrangement was no longer viewed as a ‘father-son’ dynamic, but rather an ‘employer-employee relationship [which] developed under the pressures of the new, large-scale capitalistic workshops, which in 1734, Richardson’s own printing house was well on its way to becoming.’[[477]](#footnote-477) In fact, as Keith Maslen posits in his extensive study of Richardson’s printing practices, Richardson had at least twenty employees in 1734. He gathers this information from the number of signatures on Richardson’s *Rules and Orders to be Observed by the Members of this Chapel* (another example of Richardson’s paternalistic printing habits). To these twenty signatures, Maslen observes that Richardson had at least four apprentices, a corrector, and warehousemen, making it quite a large business.[[478]](#footnote-478) By 1753, at the time of the Dublin piracy issues, Richardson had at least 40 workmen, impressive growth in a twenty year period.[[479]](#footnote-479) With this changing structure in mind, Richardson’s insistence on controlling all aspects of his apprentices’ lives, even when outside the workshop, was antiquated. Richardson was one of the largest employers of apprentices, and as his writing career developed, he became not only an out-of-date master, but an out-of-touch employer.[[480]](#footnote-480)

A striking example of Richardson’s limitations as an employer is his refusal to issue orally any orders to his apprentices and foremen; he instead insisted on written directions.[[481]](#footnote-481) Although this silence was in the spirit of *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum,* Richardson’s distant attitude did not foster the intimacy and loyalty required in such a business. More importantly, his refusal to speak to employees was a strong factor in the breakdown of trust that led to Richardson’s apprentices deceptively handing over the manuscripts of *Grandison*, as Fysh explains: ‘Richardson’s gradual movement away from a direct relationship with his journeymen, through his use of foremen and correctors, posted notices, revised Chapel[[482]](#footnote-482) rules, was more likely to offend journeymen than inspire the kind of trust that he needed to prevent the piracy of *Sir Charles Grandison*.[[483]](#footnote-483) *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum*, which had been intended as a ‘little manual of good advice’, became instead an overly didactic document which demonstrated how not to run a business.[[484]](#footnote-484) Thus, the failure of Richardson’s treatise to prevent a breakdown of trust and communication within his own business directly links *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* with *An Address to the Public.*

Along with documenting Richardson’s out-of-touch business practices, *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* provides an insight into the author/printers’s advertising strategy and illustrates the interconnectedness of Richardson’s works of fiction and non-fiction. While the reception of *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* was modest, the tract was successful enough to be advertised by Richardson’s booksellers James Roberts, John Osborn, Charles Rivington, and James Leake throughout the next decade.[[485]](#footnote-485) Richardson composed *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* in 1733, and was about to release it in September when he learned of another similar work being published, *The Apprentice’s Faithful Monitor*. A prolix puff for *The Apprentice’s Faithful Monitor* in the October, 1733 edition of *The London Magazine* creates a full picture of the tract’s purpose:

*The Apprentice’s Faithful Monitor*, directing him in the several branches of his Duty to God, his Master, and himself, and shewing him the fatal consequences of his Neglect thereof, with Regard both to his temporal and eternal Happiness. Digested under proper Heads, with Prayers particularly adapted. Composed by a Divine of the Church of England, for the Instruction of his own Children, and now made Publick for the Good of others. Price 1s. 6d bound, or 15s. per dozen to those who give them away.[[486]](#footnote-486)

Richardson responded to this heavy-handed, religious approach to guiding apprentices by puffing an excerpt from his text in which the author ridicules a fop. Here he appeals to Hogarth’s satire to create a better picture of this ridiculous character. Richardson does not try to compete with *The Apprentice’s Faithful Monitor* author’s pious approach and suggestion that the work should be distributed en-masse; instead, our author emphasizes his work’s practicality and contemporary awareness. Richardson puffed his work intermittently throughout the autumn of 1734, and dramatically increased publicity that winter advertising zealously in numerous papers. As Alexander Pettit and McKillop both observe, Richardson’s experience in puffing *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* with a ‘revved up publicity machine’ and competing with *The Apprentice’s Faithful Monitor* shaped his approach to advertising his first novel, *Pamela.* While *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* may not have been a commercial success in its own right, the lesson learned during its promotion directly influenced Richardson’s puffery campaign against sham and spurious writers, like John Kelly, discussed in Chapter Two. These advertising experiences in turn influenced Richardson’s decision in 1753 to not only publish complaints about Faulkner’s behaviour in periodicals, but also to expand the formula of a puff into two verbose tracts, *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*. Richardson’s *Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* is evidence of his awareness of the audience and desire to control his readership. This provides further support to my arguments in Chapter Two and Five about Richardson’s motivations for writing *Pamela II* and heavily illustrating *Pamela.*

Although *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* is considered a relatively insignificant work in Richardson’s oeuvre, he found it highly inspirational. It was also one of the first expressions of Richardson’s struggle for power and textual control that would become a preoccupation in his three novels, as Fysh writes ‘simply put, in both its material form and its implications for the workplace, it demonstrates the desire of a master to establish control, both over the text and over the worker.’[[487]](#footnote-487) Furthermore, this small, pocket-sized polemic is an early example of Richardson’s interest in the physical qualities of the text – there is an abundance of preliminary material, several title pages, summaries of the main points, and a verbose table of contents.[[488]](#footnote-488) For better or worse, these paratextual items would be repeated in many variations in Richardson’s later tracts and novels. As well as being an important representative of Richardson’s fledgling printing aesthetic, *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* is also a product of borrowings from other writers and connections with other tracts. Pettit remarks on the interconnectedness of Richardson’s early polemical writings: ‘extensive sections of *The Infidel Convicted –* incorporating text from Addison’s *Evidences of Christian Religion* (1721), appeared in the third part of *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum*.[[489]](#footnote-489) He also offers further analysis of Richardson’s opinionated, controversial tracts, arguing that the author’s inability to distance himself from his works ultimately undercuts their message: ‘Richardson’s tendency to restate a small set of prejudices in a variety of contexts suggests a nearer congruency of author and utterance than obtained in the comparatively sophisticated polemics with which the period abounds.’[[490]](#footnote-490) Pettit’s criticism resonates in this discussion of *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* because Richardson’s personality dominates the text and weakens his message, as we have seen in his failure to understand printing house culture. Richardson is unable to separate himself and his own experiences and prejudices. He cannot act as an objective and informative master providing general guidance or later, as an impartial editor of his novels – as Pettit describes as ‘Richardson the polemicist seems to be writing “as” Richardson, transferring whole passages from text to text and context to context as he does so.’[[491]](#footnote-491) Although the language and narrative may change, Richardson cannot free his fiction and non-fiction works from the heavy-handed didacticism that flourishes in *The* *Apprentice’s Vade Mecum.* Richardson struggles to masquerade as a polemicist, editor, instructor, and fiction writer; his ego always appears, and ‘comes to the forefront…as a consequence of the diminution of the pool of authorities, so does the thinness of the claims that Richardson advances.’[[492]](#footnote-492) Furthermore, Pettit sees Richardson’s ego as a virus which infects each one of his polemical works and weakens his message. While Pettit limits his exploration of the connections among Richardson’s early works, like *The Infidel Connected* and *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum,* other scholars such as Alan McKillop place *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* within a larger context and argue that this work and Richardson’s *Familiar Letters* to ‘gave rise to *Pamela*.’[[493]](#footnote-493) I expand on Pettit and McKillop’s arguments, finding a common thread connecting *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* to ‘Six Letters onDuelling’ to *Familiar Letters* to *Pamela, Grandison*, and ultimately, *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*. *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* was not simply an egotistical, polemical tract instructing apprentices, it was a remarkable starting point for Richardson’s writing and directly influenced his later battle with Faulkner.

The Influence of *Familiar Letters*

Richardson’s *Familiar Letters* has already played an important role in Chapter Two’s discussion of masquerade and Richardson’s many voices as an author; in this chapter, *Familiar Letters* works to connect *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* with *Pamela* and *An Address to the Public* and demonstrates a further interconnection among themes. *Familiar Letters* uses an epistolary template that is later modified in *An Address to the Public* - Richardson presents a letter that introduces an ethical and social predicament, and then offers a morally sound response. As we have seen in *Familiar Letters*, the two characters in dialogue are fictional, but in *An Address to the Public*, the author casts Richardson and Faulkner as the characters and engages them in a heated dialogue. The character of Richardson in *An Address to the Public* challenges Faulkner and Dublin’s honour, introducing the argument with this paragraph:

Mr Richardson thinks he shall be excused for taking this opportunity to lay before the Publick an account of the whole transaction; and rather, as the Invaders of his properties have done their utmost to make a National Cause of the measure they compelled him to take; and as he presumes to think, that the Cause of literature in general is affected by their usage of him.[[494]](#footnote-494)

Richardson then divides the page into two columns and produces a ‘transcription’ of Faulkner’s defence, which are excerpts from a defence, now lost, that Faulkner had published in local Irish newspapers like *The Dublin Spy* and *Dublin Journal*. Richardson structures his entire argument around Faulkner’s claims, which were taken out of context. In his passionate indignation, Richardson also takes over Faulkner’s ‘character’ and responds to hand-picked excerpts: ‘[Faulkner] knew that he and his confederates should be able to secure in their interest the Dublin Presses. He had discouraged the sending over any of the genuine edition, and thought it right to conclude with repeating his advice, that Mr Richardson would meanly court the corruptors, as he had done’.[[495]](#footnote-495) Throughout the entirety of *An Address to the Public*, Richardson is applying the letter/response format of *Familiar Letters* to this very real discussion and taking control of the narrative, as if his judgement was supreme. *An Address to the Public* maintains *Familiar Letters’* characteristic tone of self-assured authority - Richardson’s ego is a dominating force.

A fitting sample letter in *Familiar Letters* about a young printing apprentice’s dilemma not only echoes Richardson’s meticulous guidelines in *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum*, but also anticipates Thomas Killingbeck’s behaviour. A young apprentice writes to his uncle that he has witnessed his fellow-apprentice defraud his master. The young apprentice does not know whether to remain silent, preserve his friendship with his colleague, but risk possible implication if the defrauding is discovered, or to report him and assure the master of his own innocence. The young apprentice’s uncle firmly replies:

I charge you, if you value your own happiness, and my Peace, to acquaint your Master instantly with the Injustice that has been done to him; which is the only Means of vindicating your Innocence and prevent your being looked upon as an Accomplice to a Fact.[[496]](#footnote-496)

In this situation, Richardson proposes that one must not let unethical behaviour go unpunished. The parallels between the apprentice/master situation and the Richardson/Faulkner ordeal explain why the author felt compelled to publicly denounce Faulkner as a pirate – Richardson did not want to be considered an accomplice. Here, Pettit’s argument that ‘Richardson the polemicist seems to be writing “as” Richardson’ comes to the forefront of this anecdote because in his tract he lets very personal experiences guide broader judgements and claims. Furthermore, the overwhelming and unrelenting presence of Richardson’s ego in these situations highlights that the author wanted to wage his battles on moral grounds rather than resolve the solution financially. Richardson conflated the world of his tracts and fiction works with the actual, physical world around him in *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* and created two documents that straddle the line dividing imagination from reality.

As examples from *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* and *Familiar Letters* have demonstrated, in Richardson’s world, the membrane between fiction and reality was fairly permeable. The structure of *An Address to the Public* shares stylistic similarities with his earlier work, *Familiar Letters,* and also with *Pamela.* The entirety of *An Address to the Public* resembles a memorable passage in *Pamela* in which Mr B proposes seven ‘articles’ to Pamela in the hopes that she will become his mistress. Pamela records Mr B’s suggestions in one column and then places her retorts in a second column. This format encouraged the readers to view Pamela and Mr B’s exchange as a debate, with a very clear right and wrong answer. But the appearance of a well-rounded, factual debate is shattered by the reality that all of this information is presented to the reader by Pamela (and Richardson), and the two dimensional debate flattens into a one-sided report. It is easy to see this experiment with typography, narration, and dialogue as a trial-run for later works, and Richardson must have found this format successful, because he structured *An Address to the Public* in the same vein. Faulkner’s arguments appear in the same column as Mr B’s proposal, and his own response appear in the right-hand column that Pamela’s explanations dominated. In *Pamela*, the eponymous heroine introduces her exchange with Mr B with a short passage that appeals not only to her parents, the fictional intended audience, but also the reader: ‘I fear there will be nothing omitted to ruin me, and though my poor strength may not be sufficient to defend me, yet I will be innocent of the crime in the sight of God; and leave him to the avenging of all my wrongs.’[[497]](#footnote-497) Here Pamela places the reader in the position of God and asks him to make the final judgment on her character. Richardson expands this trope in *An Address to the Public*, explaining that he must present his case to readers for their supportive ruling, and at the finale of his tract, calls on their sympathy:

[Mr Richardson] is bringing himself to look upon their [the Irish] unprovoked treatment of him, as a punishment for assuming the pen, at the expence of his health, and to the giving up every rational amusement, when he had business upon his hands which was enough to employ his whole attention.[[498]](#footnote-498)

When compared with Richardson’s fiction, it becomes evident that *An Address to the Public* conflates fictional and non-fictional tropes to ensure that the readers of the document understand the author is the victim and the Dublin printer the villain.

To enhance the effectiveness of his tract, Richardson exaggerates Faulkner’s role as a villain into that of a pirate. This hyperbole then heightens Richardson’s role as hero; the author writes that he alone had ‘the spirit, the will, the independence, to hang out light to his contemporaries, to enable them to avoid savages, who hold themselves in readiness to plunder a vessel even before it becomes a wreck.’[[499]](#footnote-499) Kathryn Temple highlights the importance of Richardson’s phrase ‘to hang out the light’, and argues that this metaphor evokes tales of piracy and sea-faring romances.[[500]](#footnote-500) Moreover, the phrase ‘to hang out the lights’ was a double-edged sword, referring both to citizens who hung out lights along rocky coasts to warn approaching ships of danger and to pirates who used lights to lure ships into their territory. Temple correctly points out that the very use of this phrase links Richardson to the pirating practices from which he is trying to distinguish himself:

For the claims Richardson made to original production, whether in prefaces to novels or in copyrights tracts, were patently untrue. Instead, his assertion of original and solitary production flew in the face of both a highly imitative transhistorical, transnational reliance on romance and intensely collaborative production process. Both were inconsistent with the claims of the originary right to ownership which he made for his work.[[501]](#footnote-501)

As this excerpt suggests, in *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*, Richardson’s statements distorted the truth. His arguments were couched in romantic language and functioned as an aesthetic gloss over these falsehoods. Richardson overused the term ‘pirate’ to evoke sympathy, and in both of his responses to the Dublin ‘piracy’, we see the author ‘re-enacting and relying on the currency of[…]novelistic themes.’[[502]](#footnote-502)

Richardson also borrows a legal tone and preoccupation with trial and judgment from *Pamela* – a novel that centres on proving and defending the eponymous heroine’s innocence and virtue. In *Pamela*, threats to the heroine’s virginity are taken with the utmost seriousness and spoken of in a language that blends law and religion. Pamela’s fate is the hands of Mr B and she explains this to her master by employing legal metaphors: ‘“Who! I, sir?” said I: “have I robbed you? Why then you are a Justice of Peace, and may send me to gaol, if you please, and bring me to a trial for my life!’[[503]](#footnote-503) A few days later, Pamela repeats her appeal to Mr B’s judgment, this time reminding him of the ultimate ruler: ‘Surely you ought to be more afraid of God Almighty, in whose presence we all stand, and to whom the greatest, as well as the least, must be accountable’.[[504]](#footnote-504) Here Richardson elevates Pamela’s virginity into a ‘spiritual cause.’ In his tract, he again plays with sweeping statements, transforming his grievances with Dublin printers into a ‘NATIONAL CAUSE’ – a term, especially when capitalized, that could not fail to capture the reader. Richardson instructs the reader that Faulkner is on trial and that the public’s ruling of the Dublin printer’s fate will have a profound effect on literature. Although Richardson presents the arguments as a dialogue, he further exerts his control over the text by selectively italicizing some of Faulkner’s claims, and then responding to them in the adjacent column in capitals. The use of italics enhances the appearance of a conversation, enhances the drama of the statement, and draws the reader’s eye to particular words. This is tactic perfected in *Pamela*; Richardson punctuates Pamela’s prose with a plethora of italics which guides the reader’s interpretation. When Mr B playfully ‘fails’ to recognize Pamela dressed as a country girl, Richardson conveys the heroine’s seriousness by italicizing part of her statement: ‘I am Pamela. Indeed, I am Pamela, *her own self*!’ [[505]](#footnote-505) As in *Pamela,* Richardson sprinkles italics throughout *An Address to the Public*, trying to emphasize the absurdity of some statements: ‘that when *these People* produced their sheets, and *obliged me* [Mean Man!] to shew mine, that I was *compelled* to give them up, in order to obtain a share with them.’[[506]](#footnote-506) Richardson’s interjection ‘Mean Man’ heightens the theatricality and drama of their printed debate and functions as yet another example of the author’s continued interest in textual play and control. As Christopher Flint explains, Richardson’s interest in manipulating text, typography, and format is primarily emotional, he ‘uses blank spaces and non-verbal matter principally to invite the reader’s emotional, as well as reflective, response to the printed word.’[[507]](#footnote-507) These clever tropes of placing passages side-by-side, conflating fictional characters with contemporary figures, and employing legal diction are all gleaned from his experiments with novels. More importantly, from the perspective of the Dublin printers, these textual manipulations are calculated attempts to distract from the validity of Faulkner’s printed explanations in the left-hand column of *An Address to the Public.* Richardson is again mixing fact with fiction to shift the debate from one about literary property in a ‘political and economic context’ into an aesthetic and moral discourse.[[508]](#footnote-508)

Richardson revels in this altered context and applies his skills in evoking sentiment and animating imagination to further cast Faulkner as a stock villain. Not content with the charges of ‘piracy’ so effectively presented in *An Address to the Public*, Richardson challenges Faulkner’s honour in what can only be seen as a written invitation for a print duel. Richardson’s statements in *An Address to the Public* call Faulkner’s integrity and bravery into question: ‘How wickedly does he slubber over this part of his conduct, to the justification, as may be said, of that of his new Confederates!’[[509]](#footnote-509) Richardson then appeals to the reader, asking him whether the author should ignore such dishonourable behaviour: ‘Does it become the character of a man valuing himself for the sincerity and plain-dealing, thought I, to let Mr Faulkner imagine me such a poor creature, either in spirit or understanding as to be so blinded by his self-deception?’[[510]](#footnote-510) Richardson does not want to appear to be aiding and abetting the Dubliners’ printing practices. This slim tract is peppered with insults and slurs to Faulkner’s character which is the formal first step in instigating a duel, as Stephen Banks explains: ‘There were certain offences against the dignity of a gentleman that, if they were committed, were regarded to be so heinous that it was difficult for the recipient to retain his place in society unless he took steps to requite them…A gentleman could be many things, but he could not be a coward.’[[511]](#footnote-511) Clearly, Richardson is implying that Faulkner was a coward for not distancing himself from the other Dublin printers and their unethically obtained manuscript. The connection between Richardson’s accusations in *An Address to the Public* and a duel to defend honour is not random, but rather is informed by the author’s preoccupation with duelling in *Sir Charles Grandison* and his early work *Six Original Letters upon Duelling* (written in 1741, published posthumously in 1765). The attitudes towards duelling presented in these works provide not only provide insight into how Richardson viewed Faulkner and the Dublin’s printers invasion of his work, but also how he viewed himself as a gentleman and man of honour. These perspectives in turn influence the (misguided) language in *An Address to the Public.*

The duel, an institution of violence in late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth century England, was a battle to ‘defend personal and family honour…a routine and public ritual.’[[512]](#footnote-512) Duelling was an institution centred on upper-class gentleman, but as the culture of politeness expanded throughout the eighteenth-century, the definition of what constituted a gentleman became increasingly vague.[[513]](#footnote-513) Banks describes politeness as ‘the recognition of interests. That is to say that the polite gentleman recognised the interest of others around him in society and acknowledged those interests by adopting pleasing demeanour and modes of conciliation in social interaction.’[[514]](#footnote-514) If this politeness was called into question, then it was considered compulsory among some circles in the eighteenth century to duel to refute the slander. Richardson, as an aspiring, moral middle-class tradesman, strongly objected to the practice of duelling and focused on this topic in one of his earliest tracts, *Six Original Letters upon Duelling*. Not much has been written about this rather undistinguished tract, but Pettit observes that *Six Original Letters* was probably composed of rejected material from *Familiar Letters*, demonstrating once again Richardson’s tendency to reuse and repeat themes.[[515]](#footnote-515) The statements that Richardson made in *Six Original Letters*, such as ‘[It is] so arrogant, in taking upon one’s self to be both our own judge and jury’, and ‘There is more true bravery in forgiving an injury than in resenting it’, ran the risk of sounding too radical to the very aristocratic audience that Richardson wanted to court, and the document remained unpublished until after his death. [[516]](#footnote-516) When *Six Original Letters* was printed in 1765, it was fully titled *Six Original Letters upon Duelling, written by the late Mr Samuel Richardson, Author of the History of Sir Charles Grandison*, demonstrating the tract’s undeniable, thematic link with Richardson’s final novel – a novel which analyses the nature of the gentleman.

Print Duels

While Richardson felt unable to publish his bold and controversial platform against duelling in the format of a non-fiction tract, he was liberated in fiction and allowed his *Grandison* characters to be mouthpieces for these views. Sir Charles Grandison was designed to be the epitome of upper-class politeness, an exemplar for all, but he finds himself in a difficult position when he is challenged to duel several times, most importantly by Sir Hargrave Pollexfen over Harriet’s position. Richardson repeatedly and knowingly presents Sir Charles and his readers with a conflict of class and morality: Sir Charles eschews duelling, but how can he disregard this institution and still maintain his status as gentleman? James Bagnell, acting on behalf of Sir Hargrave Pollexfen poses this question to Harriet in a letter urging her to marry the villain and save Sir Charles: ‘You might easily believe, that the affair betwixt Sir Hargrave Pollexfen and Sir Charles Grandison could not, after so violent an insult as the former received from the latter, end without consequence.’[[517]](#footnote-517) Richardson presents Sir Charles’s response as the solution: ‘I write a long letter because I propose *only* to write…let any man insult me upon my refusal, and put me upon defence, and he shall find that numbers to my single arm shall not intimidate me…My life is not my own; much less another man’s mine.’[[518]](#footnote-518) As Sylvia Kasey Marks astutely observes, this statement confirmed Sir Charles as a new type of ideal gentleman, and his ‘verbal response to a succession of challenges would have received high marks from the conduct book writers.’[[519]](#footnote-519) Not only was Richardson attempting to extinguish duelling, he was also forming a new model of politeness and Christian gentlemanliness. Sir Charles’s magnanimous and pious statements are repeated throughout the seven volumes of *Grandison*, but still Richardson did not feel satisfied in his crusade. Richardson employs the paratextual material to push further his anti-duelling agenda and address readers’ concerns about Sir Charles’s behaviour. He acknowledges possible objections and then tackles Sir Charles’s avoidance of the duel: ‘It has been objected by some persons, that a man less able by strength of skill to repel an affront, than Sir Charles appears to have been, could not with such honour, have extricated himself out of difficulties on refusing a challenge.’[[520]](#footnote-520)To overcome this weakness and convince the reader that Sir Charles acted correctly, Richardson goes into a lengthy and persuasive discussion of honour and summarizes, again, his views of duelling:

Refusing a Duel is a duty to ourselves, our fellow creatures, and our maker. And whoever acts on these principles, the more reproach he undergoes for it, rather than be driven, like a coward, by the scoffs of his fellow subjects, to rebel against the sovereign of the universe, will have more delightful unconsciousness of a strong inward principle of piety and virtue, and the more distinguished reward from the final judge of all, who alone disposes of that Honour which shall never fade.[[521]](#footnote-521)

While Richardson’s anti-duelling stance is abundantly clear, it is interesting that he allows for one caveat, expressed in Sir Charles’s letter to Sir Hargrave Pollexfen – angry words can be written, but blows cannot be exchanged. In essence, Richardson permitted a paper duel – a written defence – to protect one’s honour. This emphasis on the written word as a vehicle to ensure justice is a major motivating factor for Richardson’s attack on Faulkner in the press. Richardson took great and personal offence to the unauthorized printing of his manuscripts and saw this as an affront to his character. Richard Cronin explains how writers and artists could interpret a violation of their work as a violation of themselves: ‘The artist’s body becomes an allegorical representation of his paintings, and the same technique might serve to characterize a writer…It was a mark of the new prose that it searched the body for indicators of character.’[[522]](#footnote-522) Faulkner, who was primarily a printer, could not know what it was like to be violated as an author. Richardson and Faulkner were to fight with words, and in this battle of books, Richardson used his imagination, his early polemical works, and novelistic techniques as potent and, until recently, effective ammunition.

As we have seen, Richardson’s *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* were manipulative, fanciful tracts influenced by his earlier experiments in polemical tracts and fictions. The earliest copies of *An Address to the Public* were printed by Richardson, freely distributed, and then bound in the third edition of *Grandison.* This means that the first readers of *An Address to the Public* were not necessarily interested members of the public willing to spend a few shillings, but simply those passing by who had been handed a leaflet. The second audience for the *Address to the Public* were not actively seeking out the work, but rather happened across it in their edition of *Grandison.* Thus, it is hard to say how involved and captivated general members of the public were in this ‘scandal’, although as we will see later, these works had a detrimental effect on Faulkner’s career. Richardson challenged Faulkner to a print duel on false premises, because neither the integrity nor the quality of the author’s final novel was compromised by Dublin’s involvement. In fact, it is likely the cheaper prices and greater circulation only helped *Grandison*’s cultural reach and may have only reduced slightly Richardson’s commercial success. In this battle of books, the physical qualities of London and Dublin editions of *Grandison* are witnesses and will be crucial evidence in undermining Richardson’s bold claims in his tracts.

*Sir Charles Grandison* in London and Dublin

As both a printer and an author, Richardson was sensitive to the appearance of the paratextual material and its consequences on the ‘visual, nonlinguistic meaning that supplements the text’s words’.[[523]](#footnote-523) Because the binding was selected by the reader after the book was purchased, the title-page functioned both as an advertisement, or ‘bill of fare’, for the narrative and as an important first impression. [[524]](#footnote-524) The wording and formatting of the title-page was typically the responsibility of the publisher, and Richardson’s dual role as writer and publisher meant that his title-pages directly reflected his intentions.[[525]](#footnote-525) While it was possible for a novel to enter the marketplace without a frontispiece, illustrations, or other graphics – like most of Richardson’s editions – all had to have a title-page, regardless of the budget.[[526]](#footnote-526) There was no uniform formula for a title-page and, as Janine Barchas points out, a title-page acted as a strong indicator of a publishing house’s ‘practices and desires’. This first printed page was intended to influence the literary interpretation of text.[[527]](#footnote-527) With this in mind, the 1754 edition discussed in this chapter is a pristine example of how Richardson wanted his readers first to meet *Grandison*.

The 1754 *Grandison*’s long, detailed title-page in varying sizes of Caslon’s pica roman font, informs the reader that this is another true story, compiled by the editor of *Pamela* and *Clarissa*, and that the narrative is followed by ‘Historical and Characteristical Index’ and a ‘Brief History’ in which Richardson complains of the Dublin printing practices[[528]](#footnote-528) (Figure 13). These three statements about authorship, and the two different types of supplementary, paratextual material, are all treated in similar font sizes. Barchas describes many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century title-pages as ‘hurly-burly’ and ‘cacophonous’, but Richardson’s title-page, albeit cluttered, reads more as a graceful decrescendo, with strong accents on ‘History’, ‘Series of Letters’, ‘An Historical and Characteristical Index’, ‘A Brief History’, and ‘London’, winding down to a publishing imprint. It is clear that Richardson wanted his readers to be impressed with a stately, ornamental, legitimate, and virtuous text, and to bind, package, display, and read their *Grandison*s in a similar manner. These visual qualities are illuminating expressions of Richardson’s efforts to control the text as both printer and author.

Richardson believed that the choice of font could help shape the reader’s interpretations of the novels, add further depth to his characters, and control the narrative. [[529]](#footnote-529) Dr Cheyne’s letters complaining about the type-face and paper quality of *Pamela,* discussed in Chapter One,influenced Richardson’s decision to improve the physical appearance of his works, and he continued this practice in the formatting of *Clarissa* and *Grandison*. Richardson uses Caslon’s pica roman not only on *Grandison*’s title-page but also in the main body, creating consistency. According to Stephen Price, eighteenth-century readers considered Caslon’s pica roman an appropriate, respectable choice, fitting for a serious, didactic text. [[530]](#footnote-530) Developed in 1720, but not used with any regularity until 1734, Caslon pica roman was a popular and very English typeface in Richardson’s time.[[531]](#footnote-531) Richardson occasionally varied the font size for different editions in an effort to make his work more accessible to ‘elderly readers and some who have weak eyes’, or to give the impression of realism in the characters’ correspondence in *Clarissa,* but he rarely ever strayed from the conservative Caslon’s pica roman. [[532]](#footnote-532) The inclusion of the header and ornamented capital on the opening page of each *Grandison* volume work as filigreed foils to the narrative’s sober undertones, and remind the reader that this is a story of the highest quality about one of society’s finest (fictional) men. The physical qualities of *Grandison*, as the author’s final fictional work, can be interpreted as representative of what Richardson’s preferences for the most effective formatting and visual techniques.As we have seen in Chapters One and Two, there were a myriad of possibilities for how the writer(s) and readers could represent *Pamela.*

Experiments and Revisions

Of the three novels, *Clarissa* was arguably Richardson’s most successful foray into visual enhancements: four editions of the novel came directly from his printing press, all contained an engraved musical score[[533]](#footnote-533) in a rare use of a script face, which was an innovative and indulgent fusion of type-face and illustration. [[534]](#footnote-534) Barchas points out that this musical page ‘alludes to the materiality of book-making’ and I argue that this musical page, combined with all the other choices of type-faces, supplementary material, illustrations, and textual ornaments, points to the author/printer’s firm belief in the power of the book as a physical object. [[535]](#footnote-535) In a departure from *Clarissa,* *Grandison* balances elegance with the simplicity characteristic of all but one edition (the octavo sixth edition, 1742) of *Pamela*. Thus *Pamela* and *Grandison* function as important book-ends for Richardson’s adventures into more sophisticated verbal and visual expressions. The physical qualities of both of these novels will be interwoven into the following discussion of eighteenth-century print culture and publishing practices.

Interestingly, the first six volumes of the seven-volume *Grandison* published in Dublin by the ‘pirates’ do not list the Irish printers involved: Exshaw, Saunders, Ewing, and Wilson*,* and the seventh only mentions Saunders. This may be evidence of a hurried, disorganized, and predatory printing process.[[536]](#footnote-536) This rapid printing pace is also manifested in the quick release of *Grandison* instalments. As with his other two novels, Richardson released *Grandison* in duodecimo instalments in London. [[537]](#footnote-537) However, in Ireland, Faulkner learned that the Dublin printers had twelve sheets on larger paper (octavo) and in larger type, revealing that Richardson was planning to print both octavo and duodecimo editions at the same.[[538]](#footnote-538) David Blewett explains Richardson’s publication schedule for *Grandison*:

The first edition (seven volumes in duodecimo) of *Grandison* was published in instalments: vols 1-4 in November 1753, vols 5-6 in December 1753, and vol 7 in March 1754. The second edition in octavo was published at the same time, but in six volumes. It was extensively revised, as was the third edition (in duodecimo) of 1754.[[539]](#footnote-539)

Blewett notes that both the second and third editions were ‘extensively revised’ by Richardson. This was an attempt by the author not only to correct mistakes in earlier editions, but also to distinguish his work from the Dublin editions. Dublin printers often claimed that they ‘revised’ London editions by correcting typographical errors, and were therefore, in part creating a ‘new’ work. This, in their minds, made them beyond reproach for their reprints.[[540]](#footnote-540) A brief survey of the most important revisions Richardson made to *Grandison,* from Robert Pierson’s collations, will illustrate how much effort the author put into the smallest details to make his text more consistent and to distinguish it from the Dublin editions.

Of the eight editions of *Grandison*, four have significant revisions: the second (1754), the third (1754), the fourth (1756/1762), and a London edition (1810).[[541]](#footnote-541) Richardson, an impressively thorough editor, exercised great control over the text and made 928 corrections to the second edition. The corrections of greatest significance to this thesis are Richardson’s interest in italicizing words, the improvement to characters’ diction, and the addition of footnotes. Craig posits that Richardson italicized 369 words to give the reader the impression that the character was ‘speaking a dialogue aloud in a play’. I add that these corrections would also be a direct visual signal to a concerned and discerning reader that they were in possession of a legitimate, up-to-date edition of Richardson’s novel, particularly if they compared it with a Dublin edition also for sale at a shop or with their friends’ copies. For example, Richardson’s friend, the poet Edward Young, changed the title of his plays right before publication so that the Irish could not make the correction before printing.[[542]](#footnote-542) Richardson, a ‘middle-class’ tradesman, took great pains to polish his character’s language and make their statements appropriate to their stations.[[543]](#footnote-543) The author received many suggestions from friends and readers, particularly his North End circle and Lady Bradshaigh, discussed in Chapter Four and in each revised edition, Richardson continued to improve the forms of address and reduce affectation.[[544]](#footnote-544) These in-depth efforts to increase the veracity of the text could not be repeated by the Dublin printers, who only hurriedly scanned for errors. Richardson also lightly seasoned his text with footnotes, something he had also experimented with in *Pamela* and *Clarissa*. This aided readers’ memories as they waded through *Grandison,* and enhanced Richardson’s posturing as editor. It was also a very clear statement by Richardson that the text was his, and that only he possessed the power to make links and connections among the volumes. [[545]](#footnote-545) These small and effective changes to the text were an expression of Richardson’s desire tightly to control his text and shield it from the Dubliners.

The most important narrative revision to the Dublin edition was the inclusion of an Editor’s note written by Richardson. In the Editor’s note, Richardson reflects on the lessons the near-perfect Sir Charles teaches the reader, responding to and anticipating some of his readers’ protests about the hero’s unconvincingly saintly behaviour. Most importantly, Richardson preaches a doctrine of tolerance and understanding that will be undermined by his later attitude towards the Dublin printers:

The God of Nature intended not human nature for a vile and contemptible thing: and many are the instances, in every age, of those whom he enables, amidst all the frailties of morality, to do it honour. Still the *best* performances of human creatures will be imperfect; but, such as they are, it is surely both delightful and instructive to dwell sometimes on this bright side of things.[[546]](#footnote-546)

How different this concluding sentiment is to the stormy final statement of the London edition’s *An Address to the Public*: ‘What are these Booksellers of Dublin, that they think themselves intitled [sic] to prey upon the property of every man in every nation round them; yet join to hunt down any other subject of the same Prince, if he attempts to get bread among, or near, them?’[[547]](#footnote-547) Richardson cannot bring himself to consider the bright side of Irish reprints, namely that Dublin’s interest in the author’s works would enhance sales for them and not for him, and he instead uses *Grandison* as a vehicle to launch a nationalist attack.

The influences and obvious connections among Richardson’s early polemical works and successful novels with *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* led Richardson to believe that *Grandison* was not only his novel, but his property: ‘The editor [Richardson] who had also great reason to complain of the Treatment he with in his *Pamela* on both sides of the water, cannot but observe that never was the work [*Grandison*] more the property of any man than that is his.’[[548]](#footnote-548) Richardson believed he had total ownership of his book; after all, he had participated in every aspect of *Grandison*’s creation, from the first germ of the story to its final draft, from choice of font to number of volumes. Richardson’s use of the word ‘property’ to describe his work flags up this term for further examination. Fysh identifies three qualities that encourage Richardson to consider *Grandison* as his property: first, that Richardson owned the copy and all the materials that had gone into producing it; second, that the work was original, and third, that the work was moral.[[549]](#footnote-549) Richardson believed that a moral and original work, produced by a moral author, allowed the author greater right to that property.[[550]](#footnote-550) He expresses this sentiment in the concluding note of *The Case of Samuel Richardson*: ‘N.B. This is not a contention between Booksellers of England and Ireland, and on a doubtful property, but between a lawful proprietor for a *New* and *Moral*  work.’[[551]](#footnote-551) The onus was on the author to protect this property and in ‘claiming authority for[…]ownership of his works, Samuel Richardson participated in the creation of the role of the modern author and claimed it for himself.’[[552]](#footnote-552) But Fysh’s interpretation and Richardson’s stance are complicated by the fact that Richardson claimed to be the editor, not the author, of these works. In the mid-eighteenth century, anonymous authorship was more a tradition than an actual incognito, and the public often knew the true identity of the author through word of mouth.[[553]](#footnote-553) This antiquated trope stunted the growth of an author as a professional, as Barchas explains: ‘While pseudonymity and anonymity stimulate generic innovation and enable the genre-wide counterfeiting of authority with the fictional frontispieces, they simultaneously delay the establishment of individual reputation based on genuine authorship.’[[554]](#footnote-554) If Richardson was willing to publicly declare himself author, then his claims in *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson* had traction, but if he insisted on keeping up the façade that he was only the editor, the rightful owners of the texts were the eponymous heroines and heroes themselves – Pamela, Clarissa, and Sir Charles. Consequently, Richardson’s works would not only be un-*original*, and the morality of the text would have to be attributed to the characters, not the author. If these were true stories, as Richardson loved to insist, then wasn’t Richardson pirating the work from them? This argument was never presented to Richardson and the author placed all the blame on Faulkner.

The Prince and the Pirate

Just who was this George Faulkner, so unfortunate as to be cast as Richardson’s arch villain in his two tracts? A look into Faulkner’s biography suggests that the author was overstretching his claims. Faulkner, considered the ‘best known and most important [Irish] bookseller of the century’,[[555]](#footnote-555) by modern scholars, was also dubbed both the ‘Prince of Dublin Printers’ by Jonathan Swift and the ‘Hibernian Atticus’[[556]](#footnote-556) by Lord Chesterfield. Lord Chesterfield even encouraged Faulkner to reprint London editions at a lower price, personally requesting a cheaper copy of Boner’s *History of the Popes*.[[557]](#footnote-557) Information about Faulkner’s background is hazy, but the little available information creates a portrait of a determined printer. Faulkner began his career as an apprentice to the Dublin printer Thomas Hume, and then travelled to London to work for the printer William Bowyer. When Faulkner returned to London in 1724, he bought two newspapers, *The Dublin Post Boy* and *The Dublin Journal*. In the latter, thirty years later, he would refute Richardson’s aggressive accusations of piracy. Faulkner, a Protestant, entered into a partnership with the Catholic printer, James Hoey (?-1775), however, their business relationship quickly deteriorated. A possible cause for this break-up may have been a disagreement over the *Dublin Journal*. Although Hoey printed a periodical he called the *Dublin Journal*, Faulkner began to print his own *Dublin Journal* in March 1725, which was an ‘entirely distinctive publication’.[[558]](#footnote-558) Faulkner’s *Dublin Journal* outshone Hoey’s publication. This rivalry reveals the increasingly competitive, political, and sharp practice of print in a rapidly developing Dublin. The other prominent printers in Dublin at this time, the Exshaws, Peter Wilson, and Samuel Fairbrother, had developed successful businesses and later crossed paths with Faulkner in the reprinting of *Grandison*.[[559]](#footnote-559) These printers were also key figures in advancing what is now considered by scholars such as Maurice Craig and Colm Lennon as Ireland’s golden age of book-binding and printing. As Craig has confirmed, it was one of Richardson’s accused ‘pirates’, Samuel Fairbrother, a member of the King’s Stationers, who held the share of responsibility for producing the journals of the Irish House of Lord and Commons from 1723 to 1749. Fairbrother’s works were of such fine quality and innovation that they record the evolution of bookbinding and mark the craft’s ‘period of its greatest achievement’ in Ireland. [[560]](#footnote-560) Lennon confirms Ireland’s ‘golden age’, stating that ‘both the numbers of those involved in printing and its allied activities and the volume of material that emanated from printing presses increased exponentially during the eighteenth-century.’[[561]](#footnote-561) Of all these successful printers, Faulkner was the only positively reviewed printer in a 1766 public evaluation of Dublin masters, held by the journeymen-printers, who would later call themselves the Amicable Society of Printers.[[562]](#footnote-562)

Faulkner was not only the most successful printer in an increasingly sophisticated and developing Dublin, he was also a prominent and visible member of the local community. While Faulkner’s work with the Irish will be discussed in a later section of this chapter, it is important to remark here that Faulkner was known as an active Protestant-Catholic intermediary, working to smooth tensions in Dublin. Richardson saw Faulkner as a ‘highly charged representative of Irish piracy’ because of his prominence in the community and his interest in Irish Nationalism,[[563]](#footnote-563) suggesting that Faulkner’s reputation was well-known. He was also admired for his hospitality and interest in mixing and breaking down social barriers. Eighteenth-century Dublin had a more relaxed social life, ‘the professions were more intermixed and ranks more blended’ than in London,’[[564]](#footnote-564) and Faulkner brought this attitude into his own home, where ‘people of the most varied kind gathered there upon occasion and all were welcome.’[[565]](#footnote-565) Faulkner’s print-shop was a landmark in Dublin and considered an icon of Irish life. [[566]](#footnote-566) Faulkner was popular and social, if not somewhat of an affected fop, and his warm and vibrant relationship with the printing community stands in direct contrast to Richardson’s sober and earnest treatment of employees.

While Richardson pointed to Faulkner as a thief, the disenfranchised Dubliners embraced the ethos of Robin Hood. Samuel Madden, in his powerful pamphlet, *Resolutions for Irish Gentlemen* from the late 1790s, captures the spirit of frustration many Irish felt from the arbitrary rules imposed by England that had been building throughout the eighteenth-century. Madden expresses the Irish people’s willingness to unite and break from the yoke of English oppression:

If we consider it [Ireland] as possessed and managed by a people allied to, and descended from a nation where trade and agriculture, arts and science, wealth and liberty flourish to the highest degree, we might hope a large share of all those blessings would have been our lot, and descended down to us as the inheritance of our ancestors, who were sent hither to enlarge the British empire and commerce[…]Reflect how little use Great Britain has yet made of those advantages she might have drawn from a full planting our country, and improving our manufactures, and how wretchedly we have managed our trade, so as only to impoverish us and our tillage, so as to starve us, how we have sent away our wealth or goods for everything we did not want, and made our mobility and gentility our factors abroad to help every nation but us.[[567]](#footnote-567)

Many Irish saw their right to reprint and have a functioning printing industry as a matter of principle and honour; many wanted Ireland to be treated as an autonomous kingdom and this is one of the main reasons London and Dublin printers chafed. [[568]](#footnote-568) In his *Dublin Journal*, Faulkner espoused the view that circumventing strict English law was virtuous and patriotic, and we can see how Faulkner embodied Madden’s later philosophy. Richardson brought these Anglo-Irish issues to the forefront of his dispute with the Dublin printer, and Temple explains the consequences of Richardson’s actions: ‘In response to Irish claims that English overreaching had prompted a perfectly legal reprinting of *Grandison*, Richardson branded the Irish “pirates’’ – transforming a commercial matter into a highly politicized dispute involving crimes against the nation.’[[569]](#footnote-569) Temple’s acknowledgment of the political connotations of the term ‘pirates’ and this chapter’s earlier discussion of Richardson’s romantic use of ‘pirates’ were blended into an unstable emulsion.

Despite this collision of two printing cultures and practices, most relationships between London and Irish printers were amicable. Irish printing relationships were considerably more casual and perhaps this perplexed Londoners such as Richardson who operated in formal terms as dictated in his *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum*. In Dublin, deals were ‘struck in person, over dinner, at the tavern, or in the coffeehouse, and sealed with a handshake.’[[570]](#footnote-570) In London, the different roles in book production were segregated and practices more formal.[[571]](#footnote-571) It is important to remember that London printers also had to deal with local and provincial ‘piracy’: during the publishing of John Gay’s *Beggar’s Opera*, there were over twenty-one London booksellers pirating copies.[[572]](#footnote-572) London printers also ‘pirated’ books by Irish writers, because the transportation costs would have made them more expensive in the capital. For example, William Bowyer reprinted at least 60 Irish books between 1729 and 1767.[[573]](#footnote-573) Even more interestingly, Maslen has discovered that Richardson himself participated in the re-print trade.[[574]](#footnote-574) Dublin printers produced between 750 and 2,000 copies of each edition, comparable to the quantity being produced in London, and were generally about half price.[[575]](#footnote-575) Because most authors sold their copyrights, it was the London/Dublin booksellers, not the writers, who lost money to Irish/London reprints. In fact, as Adrian Johns’ theory that London authors cried ‘piracy’ in an attempt to increase publicity suggests, reprints most likely enhanced the author’s exposure and boosted sales.[[576]](#footnote-576)

As Richardson’s two tracts have demonstrated, many embittered authors relied on the familiar medium of print to air their grievances. Nick Groom observes that this was a common approach to piracy, with the ‘victims taking the law into their own hands and seeking redress through a literary “sentence’’ such as public humiliation reported in sensational pamphlets.’[[577]](#footnote-577) Yet there was legislation that established parameters (albeit rather vague) for copyright and more authors and booksellers became emboldened enough to bring these issues into court, starting with the implementation of the Statute of Anne (1710). Before the pivotal 1710 Statute, issues of copyright and printing were controlled by the Stationers’ Company, who had the sole power to grant rights to print a book. Only booksellers and printers could be admitted as members to the Stationers’ and this centralized business structure was motivated by the censorial Licensing Act (abolished on 1695), which sought to suppress all controversial writing not in support of the Church or State.[[578]](#footnote-578) Under this system there was no method of regulating printing and one printer could print what his competitor had released only the day before. Booksellers were eager to remedy this situation and thus looked to a statute for change.

The Legal Environment

TheStatute of Anne, ‘an act for the encouragement of learning by vesting in the copies of printed books in the authors or purchasers of such copies, during the times therein mentioned,’[[579]](#footnote-579) was conceived of as an extension of the Stationers’ Company tradition and formalized a system that gave both authors and publishers ‘standardized, time-limited privileges as of right.’[[580]](#footnote-580) The Statute of Anne’s two main purposes were, in theory, to encourage the writing of books, and to legitimize printing and publishing practices.[[581]](#footnote-581) The act also required a public deposit of nine copies of each book to be distributed to various colleges and libraries, something that booksellers would desperately try and avoid by not registering their works.[[582]](#footnote-582) The Statute of Anne enabled authors to hold their own fourteen-year long copyrights independent of the guild,[[583]](#footnote-583) however, its primary intention was not to advance the vague and fledgling notion of authorship, as many historians believe.[[584]](#footnote-584) Rather, theStatute of Anneattempted to prevent booksellers from copying already published works, and primarily concerned itself with issues of printing and reprinting books.[[585]](#footnote-585) Groom identifies two significant consequences of the Statute of Anne’s implementation; first, that it gave all persons, not just authors, the right to acquire copyright, and second, that it was not concerned with authors’ interests, but was a right to ‘which a book was subject, and not the whole property interest in the book.’[[586]](#footnote-586) In short, the Statute of Anne was intended to be about books and booksellers, not authors; a ‘trade regulation statute enacted to bring order to the chaos created in the book trade’.[[587]](#footnote-587) It was an effort to strengthen the role of ‘legal sanctions’ in Darnton’s communications circuit discussed in the Introduction.

The Statute of Anne also strove to add structure and organization to the communications circuit, by clarifying the role of the booksellers and printers. It is commonly touted as the ‘first copyright act’, but as Bently astutely points out, the term ‘copyright’ is not a term present in the Act.[[588]](#footnote-588) Bently continues to explain the contemporary concept of copyright:

If ‘copyright’ is the right to control copying, then I think there is not much harm in the statement. But if one understands ‘copyright’ to mean the rights of the authors, or the regime of regulation of literary and artistic works, or a regime of regulation related to but distinct from laws of patents and designs, then we need to be much more wary.[[589]](#footnote-589)

Thus, the *Statute of Anne* was a copyright law in the simplest interpretation of the term, and it anticipated and facilitated a period when authorship would become more formally and legally associated with ownership. This transition in meaning and application occurred during the period between 1710 and 1774: ‘In 1710, copyright was the right of the publisher to the exclusive publication of a work[…]by 1774, copyright had come to be the right of an author.’[[590]](#footnote-590) In this sixty-four year transitional period, bookended by the Statute of Anne and *Millar v Taylor,* in which an author was declared the sole person responsible for deciding how and when to publish his work,authors and booksellers were perplexed by the vagaries of the Statute and its implications for piracy. [[591]](#footnote-591) At first, booksellers welcomed the *Statute of Anne* and registered their titles with the Stationers’ - in 1710, 678 titles were registered - but over the next fifty years, the average number of titles registered per year declined to a mere fifty.[[592]](#footnote-592) Many booksellers found the registration prices too high, the protection of the *Statute of Anne* inadequate, and chose completely to ignore it.[[593]](#footnote-593) As we have seen, Richardson and Faulkner, as late as 1753, struggled to find absolutes in the grey matter.

Dealing with Dublin – A Different Model

Another case involving Faulkner, a London printer, Benjamin Motte, and the writer Jonathan Swift, provides an illuminating parallel to how different writers and publishers waded through the murkiness of the *Statute of Anne* and found their own ways to enforce laws and assert authorship and ownership. Both Richardson and Swift’s reactions to Faulkner highlight another philosophical and cultural consequence of the *Statute of Anne* not mentioned by these historians – the further development and shaping of English and Irish identity – demonstrating that Richardson was motivated by nationalism. When the *Statute of Anne* was originally passed, Ireland was independent and therefore exempt from English law; this had profound implications on the disputes that developed across borders. Pollard points out that in 1710, Dublin had so few printers (probably fewer than ten) that Ireland was considered insignificant in the printing industry.[[594]](#footnote-594) By 1735, Ireland had a more powerful presence in printing and *Motte v Faulkner*, which ‘resulted in the granting of injunction to restrain publication of the Pope and Swift *Miscellanies*’, brings issues of Irish identity and culture to the forefront of the copyright discussion. *Motte v Faulkner* involved the successful London and Dublin printers in contentious dialogue over the publication of Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* (first published in London in 1726 by Motte, and then by Faulkner in Dublin in 1735). Faulkner’s publication of *Gulliver’s Travels* was considered authoritative and was his most successful product. The Dublin printer’s dealings with Swift were not always placid, but their dynamic, frequently rebellious relationship generated improved editions and shifted some focus onto the Irish printing situation as a whole. Swift’s initial prevention of Dublin and London piracies also provides a good guideline for how Richardson should have dealt with the distribution of his *Grandison* manuscript. Instead of posting flyers in his workshop and making his employees sign oaths, Richardson should have followed the lead of Swift or John Gay. As Bently explains, Swift hedged his bets and ‘under the guidance of Pope, Gay, and Erasmus Lewis he had spread the publication of *Gulliver’s Travels* [1726] between no less than five printers to guard against piracy.’ [[595]](#footnote-595) Gay, frustrated by the plethora of pirated *Beggar’s Opera*s, contacted printer-cum-politician, John Barber, who negotiated with Thomas Astley, a prominent London ‘pirate’, and set up an arrangement ‘whereby Astley paid some damages, promised to sell no more pirated copies, and, in return, became a legitimate printer in Gay’s publication.’[[596]](#footnote-596) Instead of working with the system, Richardson worked against it. His choice to attack Faulkner with anti-Irish, nationalistic sentiment only inflamed the issue, causing the London and Dublin communications circuits to become entangled and locked.

Faulkner and Swift’s relationship began in earnest in 1732, when Faulkner undertook the printing of Swift’s *Queries relating to the Sacramental Text* and *Considerations upon Two Bills[…]Related to the Clergy of Ireland.*[[597]](#footnote-597) In *Queries*, Swift protested against the repeal of the Test Act (1673, extended to Ireland in 1704), which required any person in a civil or military position to swear an oath of allegiance to the Church of England, and more importantly, to deny transubstantiation.[[598]](#footnote-598) This tract was especially inflammatory in a country divided by Protestant and Catholic beliefs, and Faulkner was imprisoned for his participation in a Pro-Catholic tract. Although Swift was decidedly anti-Catholic, he was infuriated by the way the English exploited the Irish.[[599]](#footnote-599) Faulkner was considerably more tolerant of Catholics, and actively worked to heal the bitter relations in Ireland, but it was not until he met Swift that he began to address both national and international issues. Charles O’Conor explains how Faulkner’s relationship with Swift encouraged Faulkner to address Anglo-Irish tensions:

Since the early days of his association with Dean Swift, he [Faulkner] had imbibed something of the Dean’s own rancour against the shameless ways that Ireland was exploited by English statesmen, though his outlook was more generous than even Swift’s had been and was uncoloured by any sense of personal grievances such as distorted Swift’s version.[[600]](#footnote-600)

As a prominent printer in the community, Faulkner’s workshop was a powerful mouthpiece for the promotion of tolerance. In the early-nineteenth century publication, *The History of Catholics*, Faulkner was retrospectively honoured as the first convert to the Catholic cause, and although he remained a devoted Protestant, his publication of pro-Catholic and Catholic- material and tracts was considered an enormous step in the advancement of Catholic acceptance. [[601]](#footnote-601) Faulkner acted as an ‘intermediary in the community’,[[602]](#footnote-602) garnering support for the Catholic sufferers from the famines of 1740 and 1757, and encouraging the Protestant business members to rise to success and prominence by ethical means. [[603]](#footnote-603) O’Conor describes the rarity of Faulkner’s position as both a tolerant spokesperson for the Catholic cause and a well-known Protestant businessman: ‘By his antecedents and profession, Faulkner was from the first free from the sense of guilty insecurity which harassed those whose rise to affluence and honour was stained by a record of spoliation and plunder.’[[604]](#footnote-604) Faulkner encouraged the Protestants not to pirate or plunder the Catholics in order to create a unified Ireland.

While Faulkner continued to engage with these domestic discordances, he also applied his philosophies to international concerns and joined Swift in being vehemently pro-Irish. In *The Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides,* James Boswell recounts a conversation between Faulkner and Samuel Johnson about the Irish situation. According to Boswell, Faulkner stated that ‘England has drained Ireland of fifty thousand pounds in specie in fifty years’. Dr Johnson asked how this had happened, thinking of Anglo-Irish trade tensions: ‘How so, Sir? You must have a very great trade?’ Faulkner pointed out that this financial drainage was not from trade, but rather, ‘out of the blood and bowels of the poor people of Ireland’.[[605]](#footnote-605) This serves as Faulkner’s unstated thesis in his rebuttal to Richardson’s claims in *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*. Faulkner’s statement alludes to the financial and emotional tensions between England and Ireland, and explains why, even when his fellow printers robbed him of *Grandison* proofs, he still chose to support the Irish. Loyalty to Ireland was an important factor on the Dublin communications circuit.

Faulkner and Swift were not the only literary men to see the English laws and customs as symptomatic of English oppression and the printing press as an ‘agent of change’, Dublin booksellers Patrick Byrne and Patrick Wogan believed their ‘pirated’ Irish works asserted national identity and broadened the market for readers. Cole explains the impact of the booksellers’ attitudes: ‘Byrne and Wogan affirmed that they were enlarging the audience for English writers by printing cheap editions. As Roman Catholics suffering from British penal laws in Ireland, Byrne and Wogan undoubtedly saw copyright as another example of British oppression.’[[606]](#footnote-606) Although, arguably, increasing the Irish audience for English books could be read as a cultural colonisation of Ireland, the Irish were more concerned with having rightful access to works at an acceptable price. Possession of the physical object was more important than the author or contents; it was a symbol of equality and progress. Works had been ‘pirated’ in Ireland, long before the Statute of Anne, but it was only with the growth of the printing industry, the spread of the novel, and intensifying Anglo-Irish relations that the issues were inflated with symbolism and nationalist sentiment.[[607]](#footnote-607) This contentious atmosphere was a catalyst for Swift, and he used his connections with the press to bring particular pet issues to the forefront of the public eye: ‘Among others he strove to manipulate public opinion through pamphlets and broadsides. In doing so, he took advantage of the city’s almost insatiable appetite for printed material and raised the profile of those who printed and published his works in Ireland – most famously George Faulkner.’[[608]](#footnote-608) Whether motivated by business interactions, religious oppression, or a general concern for Irish identity, Irish writers and printers flexed their muscles within the communications circuit, using it as a vehicle for freedom, as Faulkner’s publication of *Gulliver’s Travels* will show.

Although Swift was pleased with Faulkner’s initial work for him, he was resistant to the printer’s proposal to release an authoritative edition of *Gulliver’s Travels.* Swift had already appointed his London printer, Motte, to lead the project, and the author stressed to Faulkner that he would be disappointed if this edition was first published in Dublin. Faulkner defiantly reminded Swift that the legal situation rendered the writer’s permission unnecessary.[[609]](#footnote-609) Motte questioned Swift as to whether he would be the author’s only printer on this important project, and the slippery and unreliable Swift replied: ‘Upon my word, I never intended that any but yr self should be concerned as Printer or Bookseller in anything that shall be published with my consent while I am alive.’[[610]](#footnote-610) This assurance was retracted one week later when Swift signed a contract with another London printer and Faulkner’s former employer, William Bowyer, to print his work.[[611]](#footnote-611) Swift then sent Faulkner a copy of *Gulliver’s Travels*, edited by friend and ‘guardian of the true text’ Charles Ford (1682-1741), with further comments by the author.[[612]](#footnote-612) Swift’s commentary transformed Faulkner’s edition into a prized, authoritative *Gulliver’s Travels* and stood in stark contrast to Motte’s revised and censored edition, edited by Andrew Tooke and printed in 1726.[[613]](#footnote-613) Swift’s decision to support Faulkner’s publication stems not only from his frustration with Motte’s earlier edition, but also from Swift’s pro-Irish sentiment. A statement in the *Queries* captures Swift’s eagerness to support the honest man in his noble cause against bigger, more corrupt powers, ‘there are no qualities incident to the frailty and corruption of human kind, than an indifference, or insensibility for other men’s sufferings and sudden forgetfulness of their former humble state when they rise in the world.’[[614]](#footnote-614) Swift’s statement is an elegant articulation of Faulkner’s philosophy about an ethical rise to success. In the particular printing situation surrounding *Gulliver’s Travels*, Swift considered Motte representative of a country and ethos that was censorious and cruelly indifferent to the plight of the Irish.

Faulkner was quick to puff the exclusivity, quality, and authenticity of his editions of Swift, as an advertisement reveals: ‘N.B. A compleat Edition of that Author’s works can never be printed in England, because some of them were published without his Knowledge, and liking, and consequently belong to different Proprietors’[[615]](#footnote-615) Here Faulkner is disparaging printing piracy, the very method Richardson would later accuse him of supporting. Later, in response to an attempt by rival printer Samuel Fairbrother to capitalize on the Swift mania with an unauthorized release of Swift’s work, Faulkner re-emphasized his product’s authenticity: ‘This is the only genuine collection of this Gentleman’s work that was ever publish’d, excepting that which was done by subscription on four volumes octavo printed on very fine Genoa paper.’[[616]](#footnote-616) This four volume octavo was, of course, also printed by Faulkner. Faulkner’s advertisement addresses the physical quality of the text as a direct signal that the work was genuine. As we have seen in Chapter Two, sham, pirated, and inferior editions often were made of poor-quality materials. The association between quality and authenticity in part explains why Richardson embellished many of his texts with headers, ornaments, and illustrated capitals, as demonstrated in his early edition of *Grandison*. According to Maslen, Richardson had approximately five hundred and twenty-six ornaments to choose from in his printing house.[[617]](#footnote-617) The Irish re-prints of *Grandison*, while still of standard quality, look cheap in comparison to Richardson’s overly ambitious texts. Like Richardson, Swift had specific ideas about the quality of materials he wanted his work printed on; when Faulkner planned to print *A Proposal for Giving Badges to Beggars in All Parishes of Dublin* (1737), Swift requested that Faulkner ‘print the following Treatise in a fair letter, and a good paper’.[[618]](#footnote-618) Faulkner’s claims to quality were legitimate and his puffs were a vehicle for separating himself from other unscrupulous printing practices, as we have seen in Richardson’s *Grandison.*

Motte was threatened by Faulkner and Swift’s partnership because the success of Faulkner’s edition immediately cast the Dublin printer as the author’s premier printer, and deprived Motte of further profit and recognition.[[619]](#footnote-619) Motte launched a lawsuit against Faulkner, *Motte v Faulkner*, and it resulted in an injunction, legally preventing Faulkner from importing some of his Swift editions into England. Faulkner was discouraged from appealing this decision because it would be futile, and Collins explains that contemporary judicial bias meant that London courts were prejudiced against the Irish.[[620]](#footnote-620) Swift’s correspondence with Motte and Faulkner throughout their legal deadlock illuminates some of the complex consequences of the Statute of Anne, namely, inflaming Anglo-Irish relations. Motte wrote to Swift asking for support in the lawsuit and although Swift’s response does not survive, it is evident from the author’s later sentiments that he chose not to help the London printer, and ‘did not exercise the remarkable judicial power attributed to him by Motte.’[[621]](#footnote-621) Swift remarked that Ireland was exempt from the constraint of the Statute of Anne and transformed Motte’s challenge to Faulkner as a springboard for a nationalist crusade.[[622]](#footnote-622) This tension inspired Swift’s memorable rebellious retort, and perhaps emboldened Faulkner in his later dealing with Richardson: ‘If I were a booksellers in this Town [Dublin], I would use all safe means to reprint London Books and run them into any Town in England that I could.’[[623]](#footnote-623) Swift’s comments bolster the role of social conjectures and publicity on the communications circuit that would come into play between Richardson and Faulkner nearly two decades later. The implications of the Statute of Anne may have made for a murky printing situation, but Swift’s and Faulkner’s later view was clear – the Irish must be protected.

*Grandison* ends happily with Sir Charles’s honour reigning supreme and a penitent Sir Hargrave Pollexfen. For Richardson and Faulkner, the two characters in the author’s *An Address to the Public*, the conclusion was not as satisfying and Faulkner became the undisputed victim of Richardson’s print war. The scathing attacks on Faulkner’s honour in *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*, dampened the printer’s reputation. Richardson’s comments fuelled the playwright Samuel Foote’s later jeering characterization of Faulkner as the crippled, comic Peter Paragraph in his mocking play, *The Orators* (1788).[[624]](#footnote-624) Faulkner sued Foote for libel, but the public enjoyed Foote’s unforgiving caricature, and the Dublin printer’s reputation was tainted. Richardson also prevented Faulkner from joining the Society for Promoting Arts, Commerce, and Manufactures.[[625]](#footnote-625) Thus, between the calfskin covers *Grandison*, a whole, previously unwritten narrative exists – two prominent printers, two bitterly entangled countries, one romantic vision and one harsh reality, were all unprotected by one vague law. Just as the format and text of the London edition of *Grandison* is more ornate, prolix, and self-conscious, so are Richardson’s claims in *An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson*. But a simpler truths emerge from the white spaces of the text – Faulkner was not a corrupt pirate, he was a patriot, Dublin editions were not harmful, they were beneficial to the circulation and success of the novel, and the contents of the text had far more resonance than the cover to Richardson’s early readers. With the testimonies of book history, legal context, and culture, the verdict is in and the former verdict of ‘pirate’ is overturned. The covers of the *Grandison*s, of supple leather, stately gold tooling, containing crisp laid pages and primly inked text, speak for their equality and virtue. Perhaps it is time to consider *An Address to the Public* as Richardson’s last and shortest novel.

CHAPTER FIVE

ROCOCO CONFECTIONS AND BAWDY BURLESQUES: THE BOOK ILLUSTRATION OF *PAMELA* AND *JOSEPH ANDREWS* AND THE INFLUENCE OF WILLIAM HOGARTH

Several times throughout the narrative of *Pamela*, characters speak of the eponymous heroine as if she was a two-dimensional, ornamental illustration. Miss Towers calls Pamela an ‘image’, and taps her on the cheek almost as if she were a sculpture: ‘Can the pretty image *speak*, Mrs Jervis? I vow she has *speaking* eyes! O you little rogue,’ said she, and tapped me on the cheek, ‘you seem born to undo, or to be undone!’[[626]](#footnote-626) Mr B also writes of Pamela as an entertaining object, a novel ‘speaking picture’ of art and artifice: ‘As for the girl’s denying, that she encouraged his declaration, I believe it not. ‘‘Tis certain the *speaking picture* with all that pretended innocence and bashfulness, would have fun away with him.’[[627]](#footnote-627) Thus, with references such as these, it is easy to see why the novel inspired so many visual responses in a variety of media – painting, engraving, music, theatre, wax, and writing. The richest and most diverse interpretations of *Pamela* are the illustrations, whether large, free-standing oil paintings or pocket-sized engravings. In fact, these artistic responses by prominent, prolific artists and writers from different genres and generations in eighteenth-century London formed a constellation of writers and artists, including Samuel Richardson, Henry Fielding, William Hogarth, Hubert Gravelot, Francis Hayman, Joseph Highmore, James Hulett, and Thomas Rowlandson. As this chapter will demonstrate, William Hogarth was at the heart of this formation and by following his artistic career, forays into book illustration, and friendships with writers, we are able to reinforce links between Richardson and Fielding, *Pamela* and *Joseph Andrews* and to pair together, for the first time, Joseph Highmore and Thomas Rowlandson. This comprehensive and wide-ranging discussion, including writers, artists, paint brushes, gravers, and cross-generational influences serves to form an important touchstone in Richardson scholarship and reinvigorate recent research.

William Hogarth: His Conversation Pieces, Modern Moral Subjects, and Book Illustrations

William Hogarth (1697-1764), one of the most revolutionary artists of the eighteenth century, is an essential figure in this chapter’s discussion of artistic responses to *Pamela* and *Joseph Andrews* because his modern moral subjects influenced the interpretation and visualization of Richardson and Fielding’s heroine and hero. Although Hogarth was best known for his modern moral subjects, he also experimented with conversation pieces, narrative paintings, comic painting, history painting and book illustration. History painting and book illustrations were the least successful components of his oeuvre and as we will soon see, this weakness, combined with his tendency towards satire, contributed to his failed illustration project for *Pamela*. At the same time, the success of his conversation pieces and modern moral subjects influenced Highmore’s optimistic re-write of *The Harlot’s Progress* and *Marriage-à-la-mode* - *Adventures of Pamela* - and Gravelot and Hayman’s conversation-piece illustrations of the heroine. Therefore, one must examine the general qualities of Hogarth’s modern moral subjects and conversation pieces before beginning discussion of how Highmore, Hayman and Gravelot responded.

Hogarth painted elegant conversation piece portraits of professional and artistic acquaintances in action, and in paintings such as *The Jones Family*, he was able to capture likeness, landscape, and motion (Figure 22).[[628]](#footnote-628) As Ronald Paulson explains, the conversation piece format was innovative:

In the background is the fact that European portraiture in the eighteenth- century was still dominated by the aesthetic bias of the Renaissance and French classicism toward idealized portraiture[…][In Conversation pieces Hogarth] could convey character and social position very precisely by means of the relationship between people, the objects they kept around them, their furniture, and the drama of the resulting interplay[…]Conversation pictures were the first real break with the stereotyped portraiture of the time.[[629]](#footnote-629)

With wide, loose brush strokes, Hogarth sets *The Jones Family* conversation piece in a muted and softly focused landscape with Arcadian trees. Hogarth brings the Jones family into sharper focus - his shrewd eye was sensitive to the specific details of each figure’s face and his tight brush-work on the family members captures the shimmers of silk and the starchiness of lace. However, one cannot help but sense Hogarth’s detachment from the figures as pushes them back into the picture plane. Hogarth is careful to convey the family’s gentility through their poise and balletic postures, but also adds touches of humour, playfulness, and humanity - the spaniel puppy sweetly licks the widow’s fingers and just off-centre of the composition, a small peasant boy wrestles with the family monkey. This staged naturalness has origins in Hogarth’s earlier paintings of theatre scenes such as *The Beggar’s Opera* and *Falstaff examining his Recruits.*[[630]](#footnote-630) In Hogarth’s narrative series and comic illustrations, the influence of these dramatic paintings becomes even more obvious. Here, in the conversation pieces, Hogarth is able to marry the formality of group portraiture and generic Italianate landscape with the spontaneity and informality of human behaviour. This mixture of the formal and informal, the ideal and the real, was Hogarth’s recipe for depicting ‘polite society’. *The Jones Family,* a portrait of a political family, successfully negotiates the rise of middling classes and their interest in appropriating the trappings of upper-class society, but as David Bindman astutely observes, there are occasions, such as the peasant boy with the monkey, when the satirist in Hogarth ‘frequently seems to be on the point of breaking through the surface in these conversations’.[[631]](#footnote-631) The societal developments that Hogarth’s conversation pieces attempt to ‘smooth,’ are challenged and exposed in his narrative series and comic illustrations.

In his more obviously satirical pictures, Hogarth employs the same formulaic juxtapositions - formal and informal, the ideal and the real - but adds biting wit and political commentary. Hogarth’s *The Harlot’s Progress,* his ‘novel in paint’,integrates many of the technical and compositional qualities of the conversation piece, but rearranges them to create a remarkably effective moral message with an undercurrent of dark satire.[[632]](#footnote-632) More importantly, for this thesis, *The Harlot’s Progress* serves as a pivotal image – a warning illustration to vulnerable young women such as the innocent country girl in *Familiar Letters*, discussed in Chapter 2, and of course, to our heroine, Pamela, about the detrimental consequences of naivety and desperation. Although Hogarth’s series, including *Marriage a-la-mode*, *The Rake’s Progress, Four Times of Day*, *Industry and Idleness* were all painted first, they are best remembered in their printed form. Hogarth began his artistic career as an engraver,[[633]](#footnote-633) and engraving was more compatible with Hogarth’s modern moral narratives and his desire to bring every detail into sharp focus. It was also easier to expose the audience to engravings, as there was not a simple system of galleries and collections that made art available to everyone.[[634]](#footnote-634) The public was eager to see Hogarth’s work and there were over a thousand initial subscribers to the engraved series of *The Harlot’s Progress.*[[635]](#footnote-635) *The Harlot’s Progress* was an artistic response to the ‘crackdown’ on prostitution in London and also to the conflicting journalistic portrayals of the prostitute as a sly seductress and a naive, malleable innocent.[[636]](#footnote-636) Hogarth formed the story around a representative, but fictional young country girl, Moll[[637]](#footnote-637) Hackabout, who comes to London. Ronald Paulson suggests that Moll was encouraged to come to London by ‘romances of amorous intrigue’[[638]](#footnote-638) that were in vogue during this period, and this theory will enrich the later discussion of Richardson’s *Pamela* and Fielding’s *Joseph Andrews -* moral works that attempted to counteract the corrupting effects of romances. For now, Paulson’s argument demonstrates that *The Harlot’s Progress* had many different subtexts, making this narrative series readable on several levels. During Moll’s decline into harlotry, she encounters real-life figures in the political drama of contemporary London prostitution: the despicable madam Elizabeth Needham, Justice John Gonson, and the vile rake Colonel Francis Charteris - all of whom would have been familiar to the original viewers.[[639]](#footnote-639) The settings selected were also easily recognisable London scenes, heightening the realism of his efforts.[[640]](#footnote-640) Hogarth’s message is hard-hitting and the series of six images ends with Moll’s death; the professional mourners gathered in this final scene are ironically indifferent to the lessons that should be learned from Moll’s tragedy.[[641]](#footnote-641)

The third plate (Figure 23) is not only a sombre, sharp illustration of contemporary issues, compositionally, it is a conversation piece gone astray – an informal group portrait with active figures has escalated into chaos, an interior scene has degenerated into disarray and the figures have devolved into debauched reprobates. Hogarth brings the shabbily clothed, pock-marked Moll close up to the picture plane and hyperactively fills the bedroom scene with all the symbols of her decay - a witch’s hat and broomstick, overturned jugs, vials of medication, knotted and tumbling bedclothes, and a hissing, arching cat. This scene, like Hogarth’s conversation piece of the Jones family, is contrived, but this time Hogarth is encouraging the viewer not to feel admiration and respect, but a complex mixture of sympathy and disdain. Moll further complicates the viewer’s reaction by both being an object of seduction - there is an alluring glint in her eye, her posture is suggestive - and of deplorable pity for we are witnessing her just seconds before her arrest by Justice Gonson. [[642]](#footnote-642) While *The Harlot’s Progress* is a tale of degeneration and despair, these six images advanced Hogarth’s artistic career and ensured the success of his subsequent narrative series. Just like Richardson’s novels, *The Harlot’s Progress* was pirated and some of the images were even used to illustrate fans.[[643]](#footnote-643) Robert Moore details how Hogarth presented a fan with images from *The Harlot’s Progress* to all of his female servants, but ‘probably more as a graceful gift than a solemn warning.’[[644]](#footnote-644) Paulson and Mild also make the connection between *The Harlot’s Progress* and *Pamela,* and Paulson clarifies this link:

It is misleading to view the *Harlot* series as an anticipation of *Pamela.*[…]Hogarth’s print is packed with complicating detail which establishes a reciprocal pattern of guilt and innocence, cause and effect. While Pamela is a virtuous servant girl, Hogarth’s Harlot is clearly a young girl on the make; in a sense she is the Pamela Fielding detected beneath her virtuous protestations. The effect of virtue threatened, dominating Richardson’s novel, is absent from Hogarth’s print.[[645]](#footnote-645)

Paulson notes that *Harlot* and *Pamela* have an inverse relationship, and this is further strengthened by comparison of *The Harlot’s Progress* and Highmore’s narrative series illustration *Pamela: The Adventures of Pamela.* This chapter’s analysis of Highmore’s work will flesh out considerable visual similarities and demonstrate that the works have a convincing dialogue. The success of *The Adventures of Pamela*, which directly engages with Richardson’s novel, encouraged Hogarth to try his hand at *The Happy Marriage* series (Figure 24), which also responds to Abraham Bosse’s two series of engravings on a similar subject of the happy marriage of a country squire. As Paulson points out, ‘Hogarth almost certainly saw Highmore’s paintings [*The Adventures of Pamela*] but even if he did not, the prints alone offered him a competitor and an alternative version of reality to that depicted in *Marriage-a-la-Mode*.’[[646]](#footnote-646) *The Happy Marriage* was intended to be a counterpart of his tragic *Marriage-a-la-Mode*, but only exists in oil-sketches. Elizabeth Einberg asserts that this series is ‘arguably one of the most brilliant eighteenth-century renderings of swift movement in paint, and is a superb example of Hogarth’s mastery of the medium.’[[647]](#footnote-647) His visually legible, serial images demonstrate his movement towards incorporating the verbal and the visual in his work, and the long-lasting influence of this meeting of sister arts. Charles Lamb’s remark about Hogarth’s – ‘Other pictures we look at – his prints we read’ – also applies to the outstanding visual and literary qualities of Highmore’s Hogarth-inspired *Adventures of Pamela,*[[648]](#footnote-648)which successfully negotiated the differences between the conversation piece and the modern moral subject without hinting at satire.

Hogarth and Book Illustration

Considering Hogarth’s virtuosity with the verbal and the visual, it is surprising that he was not well regarded as a book illustrator. As will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter, Hogarth was invited to illustrate the second edition of *Pamela*, but the commission was not completed. A brief discussion of some of Hogarth’s other illustration projects helps set the scene for this failure. Hogarth was first an engraver and began his career making cheap designs for chap-books, tickets, and other printed ephemera.[[649]](#footnote-649) In 1726, Hogarth and the artist John Vanderbank were working on illustrations for an edition of *Don Quixote*, sponsored by Viscount Carteret and published by J. and R. Tonson.[[650]](#footnote-650) Hogarth had studied under Vanderbank in the 1720s and was invited to work on the *Don Quixote* project simply as an engraver of Vanderbank’s designs.[[651]](#footnote-651) The project must have piqued Hogarth’s interest because he diverged and designed and engraved his own images, choosing subjects that would prove he could do more than just capture the burlesque.[[652]](#footnote-652) Carteret’s *Don Quixote* would have been an excellent opportunity to showcase his artistic skills because Carteret highly valued book illustration, believing it to be akin to history painting and worthy of classification as fine art.[[653]](#footnote-653) As Paulson observes, Hogarth’s illustrations carefully sidestepped the burlesque and in an effort to create ‘higher’ art, went for the blandly comic. This was an error because omitting ‘the burlesque in illustrating *Don Quixote* was to avoid the essential contribution of the novel to English literature and art.’[[654]](#footnote-654) Hogarth’s diluted, comic illustrations seem detached from the text and Vanderbank’s illustrations were chosen for the two most important editions. Like his illustrations for Samuel Butler’s *Hudibras*, which also were not accepted by the editor/printer/publisher, Hogarth published his illustrations as large prints, independent from the text. These enlarged illustrations were more successful because they were physically distant and distinct from the text, relieved from the pressures of illustrating the narrative verbatim. These pages were considerably larger than duodecimo and octavo leaves in books, and allowed Hogarth more space to narrate the drama. However, when the same images were reduced to a leaf in the text, Hogarth’s attempts did not make the cut, and Selwyn Brinton’s dismissive statement that, ‘like the bulk of his illustrations to books, none of these efforts has especial value’,[[655]](#footnote-655) summarizes the general lukewarm reception of Hogarth’s efforts at illustration by contemporaries and by scholars. Hogarth’s two frontispieces for *Tristram Shandy* are notable exceptions to this criticism because there was a strong ‘affinity’ between Hogarth and Sterne’s ‘aesthetic methodologies’.[[656]](#footnote-656) Nancy Walsh convincingly argues that Hogarth’s illustrations either consciously or subconsciously influenced Sterne’s narrative methodology, and both Hogarth’s images and Sterne’s writing reflect a similar attitude towards eighteenth-century aesthetics. Aside from this one notable exception, Bindman’s complaint is apt: Hogarth ‘had no aptitude in mezzotint which was often used for the reproduction...his own gifts and interests were entirely in the direction of the original composition.’[[657]](#footnote-657) Hogarth did not reproduce Old Masters or compromise his vision to satisfy particular editors; he told his own stories and illustrated his own interpretations of the narratives.

The intention of this discussion is not to dwell on Hogarth’s failure as an illustrator, but to show how members of his artistic peer group - Hubert Gravelot, Francis Hayman, Joseph Highmore, and Thomas Rowlandson - experimented with some of his techniques in their attempts with book illustration. Gravelot, Hayman, and Highmore all visited St. Martin’s Lane Academy, and Gravelot[[658]](#footnote-658) and Hayman taught alongside Hogarth, [[659]](#footnote-659) who was promoting and running the Academy.[[660]](#footnote-660) Bindman points out that these members of the Hogarthian circle all share an interest in ‘informality of style, theatrical connections, and despite many of Hogarth’s public pronouncements, a susceptibility to French influence’.[[661]](#footnote-661) After all, Hogarth captured all the ‘expected clichés’ about the French in his *The Roast Beef of England, or the Gate of Calais.[[662]](#footnote-662)* These qualities – theatricality, informality of style, and a response to French art – are essential components of the English Rococo style, which flourished during Hogarth’s time and led to the development of the conversation piece.[[663]](#footnote-663) His connections with Gravelot, Hayman, and most importantly Highmore, meant that Hogarth’s teaching and techniques did in fact influence the other artists’ illustrations.

Hogarth’s relationship with these contemporary figures is relatively straightforward. Gravelot, a former pupil of the rococo master François Boucher, was a friend and colleague of Hogarth.[[664]](#footnote-664) Hogarth and Hayman were members of the exclusive, raucous Sublime Society of Beefsteaks, which Hogarth had helped found in 1735.[[665]](#footnote-665) Hayman also most likely sat for the character of foppish and foolish young gentleman in the second scene of *Marriage-à-la-mode.*[[666]](#footnote-666) Highmore, a close friend,[[667]](#footnote-667) was considered one of Hogarth’s most successful artistic descendants,[[668]](#footnote-668) and his *Adventures of Pamela* is an optimistic variation on *The Harlot’s Progress*.[[669]](#footnote-669) The *Adventures of Pamela* was also contemporaneous with Hogarth’s *Marriage a-la-mode*, and the publication of *Clarissa*. Hogarth and Highmore’s work was also similar enough to be confused - a painting entitled *The Green Room, Drury Lane* and attributed to Hogarth was actually a painting of Clarissa Harlowe’s family by Highmore.[[670]](#footnote-670) Other Highmore paintings of *Clarissa* were misattributed to the Dutch artist C. Troost. Furthermore, for almost one hundred years, Highmore’s *Adventures of Pamela* was mis-attributed to Hogarth.Rowlandson is known as the Hogarth of the late eighteenth-century, having developed his style ‘out of the mode of “character” of Hogarth established in the *Four Groups of Heads* and *Simon Lord Lovat*.[[671]](#footnote-671) There was a little bit of Hogarth in all these artists and in this chapter, I analyse select illustrations from *Pamela* and *Joseph Andrews* - Gravelot and Hayman’s 1742 illustrations for *Pamela*, Highmore’s twelve oil paintings *Adventures of Pamela* (1743), and Rowlandson’s images for *Joseph Andrews* (1792) with constant references to Hogarth in order to demonstrate the connections. Although Gravelot and Hayman’s illustration-conversation pieces are commonly accepted as the most appropriate representations of Richardson’s eponymous heroine, I argue that Highmore’s play on Hogarth’s narrative series, and Rowlandson’s continuation of Hogarthian satire provide the foundation for the most successful renditions of Pamela and also, her male counterpart, Joseph Andrews. Using Hogarthian principles as a foundation, Highmore’s and Rowlandson’s illustrations successfully capture the characters and themes of the texts. Their images also work independently as a readable series. Highmore’s and Rowlandson’s works are book illustration at its finest – fine art.

Hogarth’s relationships with writers

Before turning to Gravelot, Hayman, Highmore, and Rowlandson, it is important to discuss Hogarth’s involvement with Richardson, Henry Fielding, and their novels *Pamela* and *Joseph Andrews*. The following exploration of Hogarth’s involvement with Richardson and Fielding will provide a springboard for an innovative discussion of the qualities that make Highmore and Rowlandson’s illustration successful. *Joseph Andrews* was Fielding’s comic, moral, and thought provoking literary response to the superficial messages of social climbing in *Pamela*; the only well-written commentary on *Pamela* that used the same format and rivaled the text in quality and content. However, given the nature of Fielding’s writing and the picaresque aspects of the narrative, the style of illustrations required for this tale was significantly different than those for *Pamela*. Hogarth’s artistic relationship with Fielding has been well-documented and explored by Ronald Paulson and Peter Jan de Voogd.[[672]](#footnote-672) Hogarth and Fielding first met in the 1730s, when the artist was restructuring the St. Martin’s Lane Academy. For the next two decades, Hogarth and Fielding were rowdy drinking companions[[673]](#footnote-673) and collaborated on social and literary projects. Hogarth provided frontispieces for Fielding’s *Tom Thumb* (1731), *The Miser* (1733), and a design for a woodblock for *The Jacobite Journal* (1747).[[674]](#footnote-674) Their collaboration was fruitful - Hogarth illustrated some of Fielding’s plays and journals to support the author’s social causes and Fielding referred to Hogarth’s paintings in his writing. In *Joseph Andrews*, Fielding explains that neither words nor image could capture Lady Booby’s reaction to Joseph’s rejection, and alluded to Hogarth to support his argument:

No, not from the inimitable Pencil of my friend Hogarth, could you receive such an Idea of Surprize, as would have entered in at your Eyes, had they beheld the Lady Booby, when those last words, issued out from the Lips of Joseph - ‘Your Virtue!’[[675]](#footnote-675)

Fielding carries this technique further in *Tom Jones*, letting the reader’s recollection of Hogarth’s *The Harlot’s Progress* put the finishing touches on the character of Mrs Partridge: ‘This woman was not very amiable in her person. Whether she sat to my friend Hogarth or no, I will not determine; but she exactly resembled the young woman who is pouring out her mistress’s tea in the third picture of the The Harlot’s Progress’.[[676]](#footnote-676) Passages such as these demonstrate that Fielding’s ironic tone was an excellent companion to Hogarth’s satirical style. The references to Hogarth did more than enhance Fielding’s description, they also blurred the fictional world with reality by implying that Mrs Partridge was an existing woman who could actually sit for Hogarth. Hogarth did not produce any illustrations for either *Joseph Andrews* or *Tom Jones*, but Fielding seems to have been satisfied by verbally annexing existing Hogarth works. Hogarth also encouraged viewers of *Marriage-à-la-mode* to turn to the preface of *Joseph Andrews* to understand the idea of comic art,[[677]](#footnote-677) which again linked the visual with the verbal. The idea of comic art was completely novel and both Fielding and Hogarth were key participants in exploring the interdisciplinary nature of this technique, as de Voogd explains:

Both Hogarth and Fielding claimed that they were attempting something entirely new, and their attempts seem analogous.[…]There are cross- references too: Fielding defined his art in terms of the art of the painter, directing the reader to Hogarth and linking his own ‘comic epic’ to Hogarth’s paintings by calling them ‘comic history paintings.’ Hogarth returned the compliment in his subscription ticket to *Marriage-a-la-Mode* where he directed his ‘readers’ to Fielding.[[678]](#footnote-678)

In many ways, Hogarth and Fielding found examples the best way to explain ‘comic history painting’ and the ‘comic epic’, as it was essentially ‘an intermediate genre between romance and burlesque – the comic- and between extremes of goodness and evil – the ridiculous […] between sublime history painting and the burlesque, the idealized and the caricatured, called “character”.’[[679]](#footnote-679) Furthermore, Bindman credits Hogarth with providing Fielding a framework for satire and for initiating a long dialogue about theories of satire and social reform.[[680]](#footnote-680) Theirs was an artistic marriage of moral philosophy.

Hogarth's reactions to contemporary artistic conventions and the details of his involvement with Fielding provide insight into other attempts to illustrate narratives/narrate the visual. Not all marriages of the arts were as well-matched as Hogarth and Fielding’s, and Hogarth’s failed commission for Richardson confirms this point. Fielding, Hogarth, and Richardson had many points of contact, both physically and artistically, but it was most likely Hogarth’s popularity and moral focus that drew Richardson to the artist as a suitable illustrator of *Pamela*. From one of James Boswell’s anecdotes, we know that at least on one occasion Hogarth visited Richardson and this story suggests that the artist and writer did not fall out over the failed illustrations. In fact, it was at Richardson’s house that Hogarth first met Johnson and provides further evidence of the breadth and depth of artistic connections and influences in eighteenth-century London:

Perceived a person standing at a window in the room, shaking his head, and rolling himself about in a strange ridiculous manner. He concluded that he was an ideot, whom his relations had put under the care of Mr Richardson, as a very good man. To his great surprise, however, this figure stalked forwards to where he and Mr Richardson were sitting, and all at once took up the argument, […]he displayed such a power of eloquence, that Hogarth looked at him with astonishment, and actually imagined that this ideot had been at the moment inspired.’[[681]](#footnote-681)

Richardson also called upon Hogarth’s artistic skill to complete a character sketch of a ‘modern fop’ in his early work, *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum*: ‘Perhaps I may be thought to have somewhat heighten’d this description, but at most I have only added two or three pretty fellows of this class, to make up the character of one; and I wish, to complete the ridicule, and to shame some foplings into reformation, the ingenuous Mr Hogarth would finish the portrait.’[[682]](#footnote-682) Richardson took a different approach from Fielding and attempted to coerce Hogarth into producing an illustration for *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum.* Sadly, the majority of the details about Hogarth and Richardson’s plans for illustrating the second edition of *Pamela* have not survived. From the contents of Aaron Hill’s letter to Samuel Richardson, it is known that preliminary arrangements were made for Hogarth to illustrate a frontispiece for the second edition of *Pamela*. Hill writes that, ‘the designs you have taken for frontispieces seem to have been very judiciously chosen; upon pre-supposition that Mr Hogarth is able (and if any-body is, it is he) to teach pictures to speak and think.’[[683]](#footnote-683) However, when the second edition of *Pamela* was published on 14th February 1741, the novel lacked a frontispiece and illustrations.[[684]](#footnote-684) In the introduction to the second and third editions of *Pamela* (14 February and 12 March 1741), Richardson added a brief explanation for the lack of illustrations to these revised volumes.[[685]](#footnote-685) He stated that there had not been enough time for the illustrator to complete the entire project and that the few images were unsatisfactory. As there was no other known illustrator hired by Richardson, these remarks most likely refer to Hogarth:

One was actually finished for that purpose; put there not being time for the other, from the Demand for the new impression; and the Engraving Part of which was done (tho’ no Expense was spared) having fallen very short of the Spirit of the Passages they were intended to represent, the Proprietors were advised to lay them aside.[[686]](#footnote-686)

Richardson justifies the exclusion of images, suggesting that it might be impossible adequately to illustrate the eponymous heroine, for every image would fall short of her perfection, elegance, and amiability.[[687]](#footnote-687) He would be even more dismayed by the illustrations of *Pamela* discussed in Chapter Two. Hogarth was well-respected by Richardson,[[688]](#footnote-688) at first making this criticism unlikely; however, Hogarth was the only potential illustrator mentioned in Hill and Richardson’s exchange of letters on the subject. The engraver and prolific journalist of the art world, George Vertue (1684-1756), does not mention the project or any scandalous fallout. From the fragments of the sparse correspondence between Hill and Richardson during the first months of 1741, Thomas Keymer and Peter Sabor posit that Richardson and Hogarth’s collaboration had failed and that Richardson was displeased with the products of his second ‘designer’.[[689]](#footnote-689) This seems entirely plausible, however, it implies that Hogarth was rejected and then replaced. The correspondence between Hill and Richardson does not provide any information about the fate of Hogarth’s proposed designs, or the attempts by the second ‘designer’, although we do learn that Richardson selected ‘Pamela sorting out her new bundles of clothing’ as the final frontispiece in lieu of the originally planned ‘contemplated suicide’ scene at the pond.[[690]](#footnote-690) Researchers have been left to wonder why Hogarth’s drawings did not make it to publication and to lament that none of the proposed frontispieces or illustrations from 1741 survive. The accepted conclusion is that Hogarth’s and other designers’ visions of Pamela were incongruous with Richardson’s image of the heroine. After all, idealism and perfection were not strong points in Hogarth’s repertoire.

The artistic incompatibility has been suggested by Alan McKillop, who claimed Hogarth’s artistic reputation as a satirist did not correspond with Richardson’s inclination to have Pamela depicted as the epitome of perfection.[[691]](#footnote-691) In fact, Hogarth later satirized one of Gravelot’s illustrations for *Pamela,* in which Pamela reaches out to embrace baby Billy (figure 25). Hogarth plays with this format in the last scene of *Marriage-à-la-mode,* and in this image, the baby reaches with outstretched arms for his dead mother,[[692]](#footnote-692) who has taken poison upon learning of her lover’s death (Figure 26). The unforgiving naturalism of Hogarth’s draughtsmanship also supports this theory, and Ronald Paulson further explains this defining characteristic: ‘If Hogarth paints a wooden leg, it must look exactly and only like a firm piece of timber.’[[693]](#footnote-693) As we have seen, Hogarth was skilled in conversation pieces, narrative series, and comic illustrations and it is entirely possible that he chose to take a satirical, moralizing approach to illustrating Pamela in the manner of *The Harlot’s Progress.* Perhaps he shared Fielding’s disdain for the novel’s artificiality? If this is so, the trademark verisimilitude of Hogarth’s satirical sketches might have revealed tensions and incongruities in Pamela’s character, for if Hogarth drew a servant girl, she would look exactly and only like a servant girl, no matter how high her later status. This detail is important because the scenes that Richardson wanted illustrated - *Pamela showing her bundles* and *Pamela contemplating suicide* - capture Pamela at moral low-points (just as the final scene of *Marriage-à-la-mode* depicts the Countess at her lowest), making the heroine particularly vulnerable (Figure 27). Hogarth’s satirical reading of the situation probably would have illustrated an anti Pamelist reading of the novel, because this group of readers found the heroine’s perfection cloying, Richardson’s moralising condescending, and Pamela’s social climbing and pretenses to virtue distasteful. To anti Pamelists, *Pamela* was a burlesque disguised as a moral, didactic novel. As we saw in Chapter Two, Charles Povey, author of the critique of *Pamela*, *The Virgin in Eden*, summarizes the anti-Pamelist disdain for the novel’s artificiality, providing another interpretation of the burlesque: ‘Good God! What can youths and virgins learn from Pamela’s Letters, more than lessons to tempt their Chastity, those Epistles are only scenes of Immodesty, painted in Images of Virtue, Disguises in Masquerade’.[[694]](#footnote-694) In this reaction, Povey is essentially categorizing Pamela as a masquerade-burlesque, two elements that Fielding picks up on in *Joseph Andrews*. The term ‘burlesque’ was a contentious term in eighteenth-century literary discourse; Richardson’s rival, Fielding, meditated on the differences between the burlesque and the comic in his preface to *Joseph Andrews.* Fielding concluded that the burlesque was an ‘exhibition of what is monstrous and unnatural, and where our Delight, if we examine it, arises from the surprising Absurdity, as in appropriating the Manners of the highest to the lowest’.[[695]](#footnote-695) Furthermore, the comic was not as much about laughter as it was about the class (lower) of the characters.[[696]](#footnote-696) While it would be hyperbolical for modern readers to call Pamela’s gentrification ‘monstrous’ and ‘unnatural’, the narrative’s insistence that ‘ladyhood’ is a concept divorced from birth, class, and fashion would have struck some contemporary readers as improbable, fictitious, and even humorous.[[697]](#footnote-697) Fielding considered *Pamela* a burlesque, and he retaliated with his moral comedy *Joseph Andrews* to usurp and destabilize *Pamela.* In addition to the ‘burlesque’, the word masquerade was associated with prostitution,[[698]](#footnote-698) and Hogarth made this link himself in the second plate for *The Harlot’s Progress -* he places a mask on a small side table in Moll’s bedroom. The elements of the burlesque and masquerade that could be gleaned from *Pamela* may have been revealed by Hogarth’s all too honest graver. There was too much slippage in a society full of readers familiar with the actual events and real characters in Hogarth’s work and *Pamela* might have been tainted by association with *The Harlot’s Progress.*

The subject matter selected for the frontispiece, *Pamela Contemplating Suicide*, would also have proved challenging for Richardson and Hogarth. Within a year of two of Hogarth’s incomplete *Pamela* project, the artist was addressing the theme of suicide in the sixth plate of *Marriage-à-la-mode*, which, as we have seen, was also a direct response to a Gravelot illustration for *Pamela.* Hogarth’s disturbing image of the self-poisoned lady’s last breath suggests that he would have been brutally honest in portraying Pamela’s distress while contemplating suicide. Pamela’s face might have been as pale and contorted as the dying lady’s, and this would not have been in keeping with Richardson’s lofty intentions. As Richardson makes very clear in the narrative of *Pamela*, he wanted readers to imagine the heroine as a modern day Lucretia. Pamela presents this idea to the reader in her refusal of Mr B.: “‘May I,” said I, “Lucretia like, justify myself by my death, if I am used barbarously?”’[[699]](#footnote-699) Richardson most likely conceived of an illustration for *Pamela* that resembled a history painting, not a probing commentary on contemporary society. Although Hogarth executed several large-scale history paintings, those he painted for the Foundling Hospital and St Bartholomew’s reveal that this genre was not his forte.[[700]](#footnote-700) The switch from *Pamela Contemplating Suicide* to *Pamela sorting out her new bundles* implies that Richardson thought a gentler image of his heroine would be realised in a conversation piece format, and may also indicate an effort to guide Hogarth away from the satirical. Hill’s vote of confidence for the artist - ‘Mr Hogarth is able’ - leads us to infer that Hogarth was not out of his depth.[[701]](#footnote-701) But a survey of Hogarth’s work that addresses material wealth from around this period indicates that it was likely Hogarth would have taken a sharp, satirical line with the fetishism of material goods implied by Pamela’s adoration of her bundles. In the construction of this scene, Hogarth could have drawn strong parallel among the heroine, Tom Rakewell of the *Rake’s Progress*, (1734), and the actresses who ape goddesses in *Strolling Actresses Dressing in a Barn* (1738). Tom Rakewell would also been an excellent model for the indulgent Mr B before his reform. In the second scene of Hogarth’s series, he captures the rake indulging in the splendors of luxury and fine clothing, along with his upper-class friends. Here and in *Strolling Actresses,* Hogarth shrewdly satirizes the material trappings of the audience and their self-indulgent, unsupportable ways.[[702]](#footnote-702) In fact, Paulson identifies *Strolling Actresses* as Hogarth’s most Fielding-like work because ‘in his farces and burlesques Fielding showed shabby mortals acting the roles of gods and goddess, kings and queens’.[[703]](#footnote-703) Hogarth’s ability also to satirize the behaviour and opulence of the *ton* was a defining characteristic of his work; a Miss Edwardes paid Hogarth to mock the fashions of 1741 and the result was *Taste in High Life*.[[704]](#footnote-704)We have found parallels in Hogarth’s modern moral series that give some indication of what Hogarth’s *Pamela* would have looked like if he worked within his strongest genre, but there is also evidence of the artist exploring themes from the novel in a less politically invigorated type of narrative painting - the *Happy Marriage.*

In an interesting twist, there are a few surviving oil sketches and engravings after a lost series of paintings by Hogarth that may be a direct, non-satirical response to *Pamela.*[[705]](#footnote-705) Paulson argues that Hogarth’s *Happy Marriage* was a visual retort to the success of Highmore’s *Adventures of Pamela* and Bindman supports this theory.[[706]](#footnote-706) There are two surviving scenes: *The Staymaker* and *The Country Dance*, which seem to warmly embrace the simplicity of a bucolic marriage. [[707]](#footnote-707) In *The Staymaker* the wife of the squire is devotedly attended to by her servants and she is surrounded by plump, playful children. *The Country Dance* depicts the whole panorama of society all spinning and whirling. As Bindman observes, there is no drama, no climax, and no ironic twist.[[708]](#footnote-708) Hogarth was not satisfied with the series and it was never completed.[[709]](#footnote-709) I would like to carry Paulson’s argument that these images were an aesthetic response to Highmore’s *Adventures of Pamela*, particularly *Pamela’s Marriage to Mr B*, one step further and suggest that if Hogarth’s original illustrations were not satirical, then they might have resembled the bland, lackluster images of *The Happy Marriage*. Although we cannot tell from the two surviving images if Hogarth was directly responding to Richardson’s text, it is plausible that he was reacting to Highmore’s work and therefore was at least indirectly commenting on *Pamela.* If this was indeed the case, then Hogarth’s illustrations would have fallen into the disappointingly bland and cautious category of his earlier *Don Quixote* illustrations, further confirming that the artist’s talents were best reserved for original narratives.

Richardson would have been well-aware of Hogarth’s *The Harlot’s Progress* before he even approached the artist and Mild raises an intriguing point - perhaps Hogarth was simply too busy to complete the project within the limits of Richardson’s schedule.[[710]](#footnote-710) The commission for the *Pamela* illustrations came only a few years after the release of Hogarth’s immensely popular *The Harlot’s Progress* and *The Rake’s Progress*, and also around the same time he was producing poignant images of London street life, such as *The Shrimp Girl* (1740-45) and *The Enraged Musician* (1741). During this period Hogarth was unable to engrave his own copperplates because of the high demand for his work,[[711]](#footnote-711) and in the case of *Marriage-à-la-mode,* he outsourced the job to France.[[712]](#footnote-712) The failure of Richardson and Hogarth’s collaboration may ultimately have been a case of poor timing. But whether the artistic jilt was caused by incompatible temperaments or pressures of work, the collapse of Hogarth’s commission and the absence of any illustration in the second and third editions of *Pamela* opened up the novel to many possible visual representations - from Gravelot and Hayman’s rococo confections, to Highmore’s honest heroine, to Lodge’s country girl. Richardson believed he needed a visual narrative with an optimistic, un-Hogarthian conclusion - a *Pamela’s Progress*.

Hogarth’s influence on Gravelot and Hayman’s illustrations for *Pamela.*

In 1741, after Hogarth’s failed illustrations for *Pamela* and after several sham *Pamela* spin-offs had entered the marketplace, Richardson decided to reclaim his vision of the eponymous heroine. Richardson devised an elaborate plan for the sixth edition of *Pamela* - a four-volume octavo set with twenty-nine finely engraved illustrations.All previous editions were duodecimo. T. C. Duncan Eaves represents many Richardson scholars when he claims that Gravelot and Hayman’s illustrations are ‘as excellent as even fastidious Richardson could have desired’,[[713]](#footnote-713) but I expand on Marcia Allentuck’s theory that these images are too simplistic, and offer a new reading of Gravelot and Hayman’s work. [[714]](#footnote-714) Richardson approached the talented engraver, Gravelot, second in popularity as a graphic artist to Hogarth, to work on illustrations for *Pamela*.[[715]](#footnote-715) Gravelot had already established a reputation as a sophisticated illustrator and his images for John Gay’s *Fables* were, in some opinions, part of the ‘most beautiful book published in England at that time’.[[716]](#footnote-716) Richardson’s plan for twenty-nine plates was too ambitious for one artist, so Gravelot brought Hayman into the project to design but not engrave plates.[[717]](#footnote-717) Richardson selected the scenes that were to be illustrated, and it is notable that he did not choose any of the bedroom scenes, popular with other artists such as Highmore.[[718]](#footnote-718) Richardson wanted his heroine to beautiful, sophisticated, and refined. He also wanted images of her to be contained in elegant, expensive volumes worthy of the novel’s moral message. The price of the illustrated sixth edition was £1 4s. and Richardson intentionally priced out many of *Pamela*’s lower and middling class readers. [[719]](#footnote-719) With Richardson as their guide, Gravelot and Hayman were not burdened with the responsibility to further lecture on virtue but instead were free to revel in fine costume and rococo poses. They were essentially charged to create a collector’s edition of *Pamela,* pleasing to read, pleasing to hold, and pleasing to display, because the intended audience would not need such strong visual guidance.[[720]](#footnote-720) They chose to side-step the difficulty of depicting a lower-class woman brought into high society by frequently employing the conversation piece format.[[721]](#footnote-721) The very use of this compositional structure would have signified to readers and viewers that Pamela was genteel. In the first two volumes of *Pamela*, only a few of the illustrations are traditional conversation pieces and the rest are simple compositions, but in the third and fourth volumes, the majority of scenes selected are in the conventional conversation piece format. Thus, as *Pamela* becomes more sophisticated, so does the genre of her illustrations by Gravelot and Hayman. Even when Gravelot and Hayman’s images are not group portraits, the artists still relied heavily on the techniques of the conversation piece - suppression of background, emphasis on figures - to create a real sense of Pamela in conversation. Gravelot and Hayman were too deeply entrenched in a rococo context – a style that was defined by ‘asymmetry, curving, and sinuous line…and a serious interest in pleasure, play, and eroticism…It was first and foremost a style of ornament’.[[722]](#footnote-722) Although the rococo style was seen as appropriate for aristocratic scenes and would have suited Pamela’s later ‘high life’, Gravelot and Hayman’s use of the rococo throughout the early illustrations compromises Richardson’s message of morality and humility. Gravelot and Hayman’s blending of the English Hogarthian conversation piece format and their interest in rococo embellishments created aesthetically pleasing, but superficial, distant, and ‘Frenchified’ images of Pamela.

*Pamela at tea with Lady Davers and friends* (Figure 28) is an elegant, dainty illustration. Three graceful, poised ladies and two fine gentlemen gather in a semi-circle, an arrangement favoured by Richardson and Elizabeth Montagu, for polite conversation. Their well-delineated and balletic postures and excellently crafted clothing makes us wonder if the figures from Hogarth’s *The Jones Family* have not simply been seated in a rococo drawing room, waiting for tea. There is a soft flutter of a fan, a gentle rustle of silks, and ladylike gesticulations as they discuss Lockean concepts of childhood - this is upper class society at its finest. The figures dominate the composition, and the details of the drawing room and its large screen are subdued in order to highlight Pamela and her friends. Hayman places her at the centre of the composition, attentively listening to Lady Daver’s theories, and there is nothing to suggest Pamela’s background. She is as well-dressed as the other ladies, as graceful in her gestures, and on the same scale as the rest of the figures. There is no hint of Carwitham’s country bumpkin from the 1741 illustrations. Hayman’s illustration has all the qualities of a conversation piece: little emphasis on landscape,[[723]](#footnote-723) an innovative gathering of friends and families, a more casual and intimate setting, and a strong dose of politeness.[[724]](#footnote-724) In a comparison of Hogarth’s and Hayman’s conversation pieces, Brian Allen observes that Hayman treats his figures on a much larger scale and is more negligent of the background, and indeed, in this illustration Hayman has crowded the figures together, made the setting bland and generic, and the composition as tight and contained. [[725]](#footnote-725) The background of a conversation piece was traditionally an opportunity for the artist to include symbols and tokens of the family’s material wealth. However, Hayman has seamlessly integrated the former servant girl into an upper class gathering and this would have satisfied Richardson’s desire to focus his readers’ attention on Pamela’s success within society. By utilizing the language of the conversation piece genre, Hayman is choosing to emphasize the eponymous heroine’s gentility within a group setting rather than her individual personality. The reader and viewer lack a sense of the true Pamela and there is not even a lasting impression of what the heroine looks like - she is blank-faced and generically pretty - a less fleshy version of Boucher’s big-eyed, blushing, and sweet-faced darlings. In Gravelot and Hayman’s other illustrations there are no glimpses her wit, pluckiness, and fortitude.

These problems are apparent in Hayman and Gravelot’s illustration of *Pamela examining her bundles,* a scene, as has been discussed, that Richardson wanted for a frontispiece to earlier editions (Figure 29). In this illustration, Hayman captures the moment Pamela is discussing the bundles of her clothing and her deceased mistress’s clothing with Mrs Jervis. Mr B. is hiding behind the curtain and spying on Pamela’s conversation. The high ceilings and tall, swooping curtain are artistic remnants from Hayman’s earlier days as a theatrical scene painter at Goodman’s Fields and Drury Lane Theatre.[[726]](#footnote-726) Even though there is movement and an element of surprise, the scene does not read as dramatic. The figures are arranged in a traditional triangular format, with Mr B. at the apex, and the background, with its rococo plaster work, and one painting, again is subordinate to the figures.Even though Hayman has pushed Pamela up to the forefront of the picture plane, her impression on the viewer is elusive and fleeting. Her head is elegantly turned so that her face is in profile, denying the reader of any satisfactory sense of her facial features. Here again, many of the qualities of the conversation piece and the rococo come into play - an emphasis on figures and their dress, little interest in convincing locations, a strong impression of gentility, a shallow composition, superficial atmosphere, and general sense of flatness. Pamela’s clothing is sumptuous and her gestures refined, but it is unclear from the image what her relationships are with Mrs Jervis and Mr B. The reader and viewer must rely on the accompanying page for an explanation of the scene. Indeed, Hayman and Gravelot’s image could represent many literary heroines and there is nothing that attracts or involves the viewer, and nothing that particularly signals that the subject is Pamela. It is simply a polite, elegant arrangement of three well-turned out figures in a stately rococo room. Pamela is vague and abstract instead of a character who, at this time, Richardson still insisted was a real figure in contemporary society. Richardson’s readership must have felt the same because the sixth edition was a financial failure, and as Eaves recounts, ‘as late as 1772, enough sheets of this edition remained for its re-issuance minus the plates with different title pages’.[[727]](#footnote-727) Gravelot, who later produced illustrations for a Paris edition of *Tom Jones* (1750),[[728]](#footnote-728) was criticized by English readers for making the characters too French, and this is also apparent in *Pamela.* Hayman and Gravelot’s illustrations for *Pamela* are beautiful conversation pieces, but their rococo-confection of a lady was a far-cry from the home-spun, hardworking, devoted and virtuous English heroine that had captivated Richardson’s readers.

Hogarth’s influence on Highmore

For an image of an independent, English heroine, we must turn to Highmore’s narrative series *The Adventures of Pamela* (1743-4), ‘the first English [artist] to attempt to base paintings on a contemporary novel.’[[729]](#footnote-729) Highmore’s illustrations are the most accurate representations of Pamela - his heroine was most likely modeled on his daughter rather than a generic rococo fantasy and he was able to work within a Hogarthian moral narrative framework without exploring satire and the grotesque. Although Mild has directed our attention to them, I am the first scholar to draw out the stylistic similarities between Susanna and Pamela, which greatly enriches our understanding of Highmore’s heroine. Highmore’s portrait of his daughter, Susanna, is a strong point of comparison in our examination of Highmore’s twelve paintings of *Pamela.* In his portrait, Susanna has been interrupted from a reverie but she is unperturbed by the intrusion (Figure 30). She invites us to admire her beauty, grace, and sophistication by holding our gaze with her steady, quiet, and charmingly haughty expression. How different this confident, sumptuous Susanna is to the small, sketchy figure in drab clothing and a milkmaid cap that we studied in Chapter Four’s discussion of North End Richardson reading circle. Susanna’s father, the painter Joseph Highmore, has lovingly captured Susanna’s liquid, delicately-lidded eyes, gently arched eyebrows, perfect nose, and softly pursed lips. A maidenly flush rosies her cheeks, and the silvery, pearlescent hue of her skin is complimented by the shimmering string of pearls that loops down from her stylish pink pompon.[[730]](#footnote-730) Susanna is sensual without any sexual overtones and Highmore is proudly representing his daughter as a both a renowned beauty and intelligent companion. This portrait of Susanna tenderly emphasizes both her most pleasing physical features and her charming character. Highmore’s composition is a duet of feminine, playful pink and velvety, deep blue and he has suggested the well-rounded complexity of his sitter in the colours and fabrics of her stylish, but modest attire. Highmore has set Susanna in a personalized, domestic scene. In her slender, rubicund hands, Susanna holds up a miniature, perhaps alluding to her own artistic skills; as we saw in Chapter Four, Susanna had a fondness for sketching and writing. The plump calico cat perching on her desk, stacks of scrolls and books, and a swinging canary in a golden orb above her head are all fond tributes to Susanna’s excellent education and intellectual curiosity - Susanna herself transformed the Highmore house on Holborn Row into a small menagerie.[[731]](#footnote-731) The crimson curtain that tumbles down the right side of the composition behind the elegantly turned Susanna, as well as the three-quarter length portrait format, are direct references to the techniques of seventeenth-century Flemish masters, Rubens and Van Dyck, who Highmore dutifully studied. This inclusion of drapery within the composition was a play on an earlier tradition of covering paintings with curtains and also allowed the artist to conflate the artificiality of the setting with the reality of the sitter. Highmore clearly evokes the stateliness of Van Dyck in his portrait of his daughter and this poised, preened, and composed Susanna was painted at the same time Highmore was also working on his twelve illustrations for Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela*. There are striking similarities and intriguing artistic connections between this portrait of the genteel Susanna and Highmore’s depiction of the ladylike Pamela.

Warren Mild, who has written the most thorough and authoritative work to-date on Joseph Highmore, posits that Susanna, who was sixteen at this time, was the model for the heroine of Highmore’s *Adventures of Pamela.*[[732]](#footnote-732) Mild observes similarities in the faces of Susanna and Pamela, and indeed, Pamela has Susanna’s dark eyes, finely arched eyebrows, delicate nose, pursed plump lips, and alabaster complexion. Unlike other portrait painters of the period, such as Francis Hayman, whose figures all look exactly the same[[733]](#footnote-733) - blank, bovine eyes, bulbous noses, and large mouths - Highmore did not paint his sitters with formulaic faces or use generic models, and accordingly Highmore’s portraits were considered to be striking likenesses. Highmore’s Pamela is not a blank, rococo ideal, she is a slightly stylized version of Susanna. Of the twelve scenes in Highmore’s Pamela series, the image that best captures the essence of Susanna is the first, *Mr B finds Pamela Writing* (Figure 31). Just as in her portrait, Susanna appears to be interrupted by the viewer, so Pamela is disturbed from her letter writing by the entrance of Mr B. Pamela gracefully turns her elegant, long neck and assumes a posture reminiscent of Susanna’s, although her body is facing the viewer. Pamela’s translucent, fair skin is accentuated by the contrasts of the dark silk gown and her unfathomably dark eyes. In her dainty, finely formed fingers, Pamela holds a quill pen, transforming her into an exemplar of both physical beauty and refined taste - this is a leisurely, ladylike Pamela. Highmore reinforced Pamela’s delicate sensibilities in the attire he has chosen for her; he has dressed the heroine in an elegant but modest day dress with a plain pinner perched on a simple coiffure.[[734]](#footnote-734) Unlike the formulaic settings of Hayman and Gravelot, Highmore treats the setting with considerable detail - one can delight in the painting of *The Good Samaritan* over the mantle-piece, the stacks of books on the bookshelves, the simple, earlier eighteenth-century furniture, and the rustic wooden floorboards. Mr B. is presented to us as a refined country squire, not a continental dandy, and the whole image exudes naturalism, virtue, and simplicity - the spirit of Pamela, with hints of Susanna.

Highmore models his twelve illustrations on Hogarth’s narrative series and accomplished an optimistic rewriting of *The Harlot’s Progress*. If Hogarth’s innocent Moll Hackabout had resisted temptation, it is not hard to conclude from Highmore’s paintings that she could have achieved domestic bliss and social harmony. As Highmore did not meet or correspond with Richardson until after he produced the paintings, he had a certain amount of artistic freedom from the author and Hayman and Gravelot. Mild explains the consequences of Highmore’s artistic freedom: ‘With story-telling as his purpose, [he] drew dramatic incidents which Richardson might have felt were lurid enough in the text not to require graphic attention.’[[735]](#footnote-735) Without the text to support his images, Highmore had to make each painting engaging and self-contained and his selection of scenes provides us further insight into what he interpreted as the most worthy of illustration: I. *Mr B finds Pamela writing*;II. *Mr B. takes liberties with Pamela in the summer house*; III. *Pamela fainting on discovering Mr B. in the closet*; IV*. Pamela with Mrs Jervis, disposing of her bundles*; V. *Pamela setting out from Mr B.'s Bedfordshire house*; VI. *Pamela shows Mr Williams a hiding place for their letters*; VII. *Pamela in the Bedroom with Mrs Jewkes and Mr* B; VIII. *Pamela unexpectedly meets her father*; IX. *Pamela is married*; X. *Pamela is ill-treated by Lady Davers*; XI. *Pamela asks Sir Jacob Swinford’s Blessing*; XII. *Pamela telling nursery tales to her children*. His interest in creating a narrative series enables his paintings to stand alone, as well as work within the group, and most importantly, his images give the heroine a life and character. The illustration of *Mr B. finds Pamela Writing* is readable in its own right - it is clear that Mr B. has burst into the room and that Pamela is slightly startled from her quiet activity. Highmore includes just enough details in the image to make the setting seem familiar and convincing, and clever use of *The Good Samaritan* painting that is placed just behind Pamela’s head, reinforces her purity and piety. Unlike Hogarth, who could not resist turning a narrative series into a tale of degeneration, Highmore was able to convey an uplifting and inspiring message through his honest images, free of rococo ornamentation and frippery.

Highmore had *Adventures of Pamela* on display at his home in Lincoln’s Inn Fields, and it is likely that the engravings of these paintings sold successfully, because Highmore did not repeatedly advertise.[[736]](#footnote-736) Highmore’s series was the catalyst for the relationship between the artist and Richardson - Richardson was curious to meet the artist who had independently and successfully illustrated his works and a fast friendship formed. As we saw in Chapter Four, Highmore’s daughter, Susanna, became an integral member of Richardson’s artistic circle through her father’s connections. Highmore also painted three portraits of Richardson, always in the same pose, a short, rotund man with one hand tucked in his waistcoat.[[737]](#footnote-737) Although Hayman also painted a conversation piece of the Richardson family (1740-41), it was Highmore’s portraits that Richardson had printed and circulated to his closest friends.[[738]](#footnote-738) Highmore was able to capture a pleasing and honest likeness of the artist and a pleasing and honest likeness of his heroine. By continuing Hogarth’s technique of the narrative series, Highmore was able to create readable, effective, and captivating images of Richardson’s heroine that worked with the text and also stood alone as works of art.

Hogarth and *Joseph Andrews*

A discussion of Richardson’s illustrations and Hogarth’s impact on those artists would be incomplete without an exploration of Fielding and Hogarth’s influence on the images for his comic, inverse *Pamela*, *Joseph Andrews* because *Joseph Andrews* is thoughtful, clever re-working of Richardson’s novel. In the following section, I will introduce Hulett’s early illustrations for *Joseph Andrews* and then Rowlandson’s wonderful, partly-Hogarthian comic illustrations that accompanied the 1792 edition. *Joseph Andrews* was a comic and moral response to Richardson’s *Pamela*; I will be the first to instigate an original dialogue between Rowlandson’s illustrations for the novel, and Highmore’s illustrations for *Pamela.* Interestingly, Rowlandson had parodied Highmore’s *The Enraged Husband*, and Edwin Woolf observes that ‘between Highmore’s work as an illustrator...and that of Rowlandson, there is no doubt some connection’.[[739]](#footnote-739) I explore these connections in greater detail, concluding that the Hogarthian elements present in Highmore’s narrative paintings and Rowlandson’s comic illustrations facilitated their successful interpretations of the novels.

The first illustrations for Fielding’s *Joseph Andrews* demonstrate how important it was for the right artist to be commissioned, as the incorrect choice of artist/engraver could undermine the novel’s moral message. For the third edition of *Joseph Andrews*, published in March 1743, Fielding’s bookseller Andrew Millar decided to hire the engraver James Hulett to produce twelve inexpensive illustrations.[[740]](#footnote-740) Martin Battestin considers the illustrated third edition, with its numerous textual corrections, to be an authoritative edition, and this is the first edition that Fielding puts his name on the title-page.[[741]](#footnote-741) The third edition was assumed to be faithful to the narrative strategies and authorial intentions; Fielding wrote *Joseph Andrews* in an attempt to distance himself from his low-brow, bawdy, burlesque theatrical works and the infamous *Shamela*. Fielding wanted to propose what Simon Dickie has termed a ‘benevolent morality’ and make the distinction between ‘good humour’ and ‘good nature’.[[742]](#footnote-742) These literary elements are preserved in the third edition, but the inclusion of Hulett’s illustrations presents the reader with a visual burlesque.[[743]](#footnote-743) Battestin has dismissed Hulett’s twelve engravings as ‘clumsy’,[[744]](#footnote-744) however, the quality and clarity of Hulett’s images befits the relatively modest, inexpensive duodecimo in which Millar packaged the narrative. This illustrated edition of *Joseph Andrews* was printed in two duodecimo volumes, on fairly thin paper, and was commonly found bound in plain calf. The scenes illustrated by Hulett were: *Fanny and Joseph Andrews falsely accused of larceny* (Figure 32), *Parson Adams and Joseph Andrews tied to the bedposts*, and *Fanny and Joseph Andrews getting married*. Janine Barchas has drawn parallels between some of Hulett’s images and softly pornographic French book illustration popular on the Continent at the time,[[745]](#footnote-745) but I believe Hulett’s images appeal to a lower class than those who sought titillating, rococo peepshows. It would be an overstatement to term Hulett’s images ‘indecent’ but he highlighted the more provocative moments of Fielding’s narrative in an attempt to be humorous. Millar selected the scenes to be illustrated.[[746]](#footnote-746) For example, in Hulett’s depiction of the bedroom scene in which Lady Booby tries to seduce Joseph, he positions Lady Booby in the viewer’s direct line of vision and portrays her as unashamedly bare-breasted, just as Fielding describes her (Figure 33). The bland-faced Joseph holds Lady Booby’s hand and stares directly at her bosom, while Slipslop concernedly clasps her hands in the doorway. This bold and obvious image is not representative of the comic nature of Joseph’s ignorance, nor does it mock Richardson’s *Pamela.* Hulett’s image is functional, illustrating the text verbatim, but not capturing any of its spirit or context. In the upcoming discussion of Rowlandson’s illustrations, his portrayal of this scene will be examined, and although the subject and composition is the same - a bare-breasted, Lady Booby in a tête à tête with Joseph, with Slipslop interrupting - it is Rowlandson’s refined draughtsmanship and sharp attention to detail and satire that elevates the scene into a comedy, deserving of an intelligent laugh. Hulett’s insistence on the burlesque in his illustration makes it an unsatisfactory reflection of Fielding’s narrative, but most likely caused a hearty guffaw from certain readers.

Fielding was very clear about the differences between the burlesque and the comic in his preface to *Joseph Andrews*: ‘no two Species of Writing can differ more widely than the Comic and the Burlesque’.[[747]](#footnote-747) As we have seen, Hogarth directed viewers of *Marriage-à-la-mode* to *Joseph Andrews’s* preface for an explanation of comic art. Fielding defined the burlesque as ‘monstrous’, ‘unnatural’, and ‘absurd’, and the comic as a ‘natural imitation’.[[748]](#footnote-748) In fact, this distinction between the burlesque and the comic is a central preoccupation of *Joseph Andrews* because Fielding viewed Pamela Andrews as a servant girl, imitating and adapting the habits of the upper-classes - a burlesque action that threatened social stability, morality, and industry.[[749]](#footnote-749) Considering Fielding’s aversion to the burlesque in this novel, it is unfortunate that Hulett brought this genre to the forefront of the illustrations. Judith Frank points out that the burlesque was a common characteristic of chapbooks[[750]](#footnote-750), and Millar’s frugal publishing techniques (even the font was made smaller in the third edition) must have encouraged Fielding’s readers to make the association between a cheap book and a chapbook. The inclusion of Hulett - an obscure, run-of-the-mill engraver - and his interpretation of Fielding’s narrative would only have increased the novel’s potential audience. Unauthorized abridgments of Richardson’s work, discussed in Chapter Two, suffered a similar fate - they were ‘burlesqued’ and peddled to a lower-class audience after Richardson had tried to refine his readership. Interestingly, abridgements of Richardson outsold Fielding’s.[[751]](#footnote-751) Thus, in the supposed authoritative edition in which Fielding makes a clear distinction between the lower-class burlesque and the more refined technique of the comic, his moral vision was corrupted by the illustrations and the physical format of the book.

Three thousand copies of the third edition containing Hulett’s engravings were printed and made up almost fifty percent of the sixty-five hundred copies of *Joseph Andrews.*[[752]](#footnote-752)Hulett’s illustrations therefore would have had a sizable impact on the novel’s varied reception. Dickie points out that while popular, *Joseph Andrews* was subject to misreadings and misinterpretations: ‘To the vast majority of its initial readers [including those who read the third edition], *Joseph Andrews* was farcical and irreligious. Many simply ignored its claims to moral seriousness, delighting in its comic brawls, beatings, and bawdy incidents at coaching inns.’[[753]](#footnote-753) Dickie builds on the work of scholars such as Jill Campbell and Lance Bertelsen, and attributes this general misreading of the moral to Fielding’s unshakeable reputation for writing burlesques and crude plays, and also to the possibility that the author’s political enemies were intent on thwarting any attempts to improve his career.[[754]](#footnote-754) In general, readers had great difficulty squaring Fielding’s comic situations with their moral lessons. Fortunately, some readers like Anna Barbauld, were able to laugh at the comic episodes, but still absorb the moral message, or as she phrased it ‘laugh so heartily at a character and yet keeping it above contempt.’[[755]](#footnote-755) While these factors no doubt played a role in the reception of *Joseph Andrews*, the visual impact and base appeal of Hulett’s burlesque images were more influential in counteracting the moral, comic elements of the narrative, simply because they were widely disseminated and more accessible to all readers. Hulett emphasized the slapstick humour, practical jokes, and sordid intentions of Fielding’s characters - while ignoring banter, human flaws, and satire - and capitalized on the appeal of the burlesque. It was not until the late eighteenth-century, when Rowlandson produced eight illustrations for Sibbald’s *Joseph Andrews* - *Young Adams catechised by Parson Adams, Great Purity of Joseph, Hostess discharges Pan of blood into the face of Parson Adams, Parson Adams and Fanny examined as Robbers before the Justice, Escape of Parson Adams from a Perilous Hunting Adventure, Ducking scene in the Game of Ambassador, Fanny refused imminent Hazard by Joseph Andrews*, and *Parson Adams surprised by Lady Booby in a suspicious situation with Mrs Slipslop* - that the delicate balance between comic and moral aspects of Fielding’s narrative were successfully re-presented.

Hogarth’s influence on Rowlandson, and the success of his illustrations for *Joseph Andrews*

Art historians have observed that Hogarth introduces the tradition of comic art at the beginning of the eighteenth-century and that Rowlandson (1756-1827) carries on a version of this art form into the nineteenth-century. Paulson argues that Hogarth and Rowlandson are ‘representations of the change that took place in the signifying structure of graphic art between the age of the emblem and the age of romantic expression.’[[756]](#footnote-756) It is natural then to see Rowlandson as Hogarth’s artistic descendant, and just as there are differences between each generation, so there are stylistic differences between their works. As we have seen, Hogarth’s work was ‘solid’ and ‘stagelike’, the figures are confined safely within the composition, and his lines are assertive and definitive. In contrast, Rowlandson’s works often depict a flurry of motion, a scuttling of line, and the figures and action burst out of the composition.[[757]](#footnote-757) Vic Gatrell attributes many of their artistic differences also to the overwhelming popularity of prints in the 1790s – a medium which had only begun to develop in the mid- eighteenth century - which he believed ‘freed Rowlandson from the need to peddle didactic messages’[[758]](#footnote-758) that had preoccupied Hogarth fifty years before. Rowlandson was able to apply Hogarth’s humour and rely less on the format of the modern moral narratives.[[759]](#footnote-759) Rowlandson essentially adapted the best of Hogarthian character to his period. Considering Hogarth’s close artistic relationship with Fielding, who could be more fitting than Rowlandson to illustrate *Joseph Andrews* for the following generation?

Rowlandson, who trained first as a painter, was an opportunistic artist, and worked in whichever medium he could make a profit.[[760]](#footnote-760) He was an astonishingly productive printer, producing over ten thousand drawings and sketches.[[761]](#footnote-761) Rowlandson also published his prints in unlimited editions[[762]](#footnote-762) and sold them for a penny plain, or tuppence coloured.[[763]](#footnote-763) He was able to apply his skills as a prolific printmaker to book illustration and Fielding’s *Joseph Andrews* was not his only project. Edwin Wolff observes that Rowlandson successfully produced images for Oliver Goldsmith, Tobias Smollet, and to a ‘lesser degree’, Lawrence Sterne.[[764]](#footnote-764) These illustrations, including those made for *Joseph Andrews*, were created during Rowlandson’s ‘early mature phase’ or ‘transitional phase’, which lasted from the late 1780s to 1800.[[765]](#footnote-765) Rowlandson was encouraged to pursue book illustration by Rudolph Ackermann, a bookseller and publisher, and after his work on Fielding, Thomas Tegg, a low-end book and print-seller, was his primary source of employment.[[766]](#footnote-766) The artistic characteristics which define this developmental stage, and which are present in his illustrations for *Joseph Andrews* include placing figures in situations where they can behave ‘either gracefully or awkwardly’[[767]](#footnote-767), lines becoming more descriptive, a celebration of curve, less concern with exact portraiture, and an interest in satire.[[768]](#footnote-768) Although Rowlandson’s work has frequent references to the rococo style - flattened surfaces, light, tonality and atmosphere - his illustrations are still overwhelmingly English and Hogarthian in their totality.[[769]](#footnote-769) Rowlandson’s adventures in book illustration culminated in an artistic collaboration with the writer William Combe**.** Rowlandson produced images for Combe’s poems and this was a successful pairing; together they produced *The Schoolmaster’s Tour, The Tours of Dr Syntax*, *English Dance of Death,* and *Dance of Life*. Today, Rowlandson is best remembered for his comic panoramas of eighteenth-century life, such as *Vauxhall Gardens*, and his cheeky, pornographic prints like *Solitary Diversion,* but I agree with Vic Gatrell’s statement that Rowlandson’s ‘contributions to illustrated books are[...]some of his best works.’[[770]](#footnote-770) Rowlandson’s illustrations for *Joseph Andrews* display his talent for responding to complex qualities of Fielding’s text.

Rowlandson introduces the reader to a lanky, fresh-faced Joseph Andrews in the opening illustration, *Young Andrews catechised by Parson Adams* (Figure 34)*.* The scene, unlike the seven other chaotic, noisy images interleaved in the text, is one of relative calm and quiet. These scenes to be illustrated were selected by the printer J. Sibbald - as the caption under each image clearly states - but Rowlandson illustrated his own interpretation, highlighting the touches of humour in the text.[[771]](#footnote-771) While servants prepare for the next meal in the kitchen, Parson Adams quizzes the slouching, humble Joseph Andrews on the number of books in the New Testament, their titles, and their contents.[[772]](#footnote-772) Mrs Slipslop leans with interest over the back of Parson Adams’ chair as Joseph impressively answers the questions, her dress dangerously close to the fireplace. In the corner, a small cat huddles by the grate for warmth and the dog at Parson Adams’ feet gazes up obediently and attentively, mirroring Joseph’s expression and posture. The inclusion of such coded details reminds us of Hogarth’s heavily symbolic compositions and Rowlandson introduces the reader to these characters and fore-grounds the text’s imminent eruption into humour, ribaldry, and chaos. Rowlandson preserves his formula of attributing contrasting characteristics to the opposite sex - thin, comely, young women are counterbalanced by corpulent, flaccid old men. But in this series of illustrations, Rowlandson makes a slight, but significant alteration by depicting Joseph with attractive, effeminate qualities - the very same that Fielding instilled in this character, the male Pamela. This juxtaposition of physical characteristics is where Rowlandson’s work derives most of its power and impact, and his formula also reflects the tensions within Fielding’s narrative. [[773]](#footnote-773) Jill Campbell points out several conflicts, inversions, and contrasts within *Joseph Andrews* that set up key dichotomies. She describes Joseph as a ‘cross-dressed Pamela’,[[774]](#footnote-774) a young man with ‘compromised gender identity’,[[775]](#footnote-775) and an ‘opaque and external’ character - all of these complexities are hinted at in Rowlandson’s images.[[776]](#footnote-776) One of the most important tensions identified by Campbell and accentuated by Rowlandson’s images is Joseph’s delicate femininity: ‘When Fielding describes Joseph’s physical appearance, he carefully denies him certain masculine characteristics, and indicates their absence is in fact a source of his beauty.’[[777]](#footnote-777) In one of the many character sketches of Joseph, Fielding writes that ‘His Hair was of nut-brown Colour, and was displayed in wanton Ringlets down his Back. His Forehead was high, his Eyes dark, and as full of Sweetness as of Fire...His Lips full, red, and soft.’[[778]](#footnote-778) Rowlandson identifies Fielding’s emphasis on Joseph’s feminine charm and reinforces these essential traits by placing Mrs Slipslop (who was not originally written into this scene) on the other side of the rotund Parson Adams - Joseph Andrews and Mrs Slipslop are same height and their posture and positioning - bowed heads and on either side of Parson Adams - forms an inverted triangle with the Parson at the apex. Joseph Andrews and Mrs Slipslop are drawn sketchily with quick, angular lines - crooked elbows and bent knees - and Rowlandson has not filled in their garments, faces, or any other features with ink, in order to create a sense of lightness and contrast. Parson Adams, all bulging curves and folds, is made the focal point of the composition by Rowlandson’s tight hatching and strokes which create an impression of dark, heavy fabric. The feminine is light, the masculine dark. This triangular arrangement of figures is interrupted by a misshapen circle of light, pouring in through the kitchen window. The haze of light encompasses Joseph Andrews in a soft halo, gently shines down on the Parson’s troublesome wig, and entirely avoids Mrs Slipslop. Rowlandson is signaling to the reader that Joseph Andrews and Parson Adams are the two main protagonists of this story. In Cruikshank’s early Victorian illustrations, the emphasis has shifted entirely to Parson Adams, the true source of the novel’s comedy. This first introductory illustration is the calm before the comic, vigorous flurry of activity, violence, and energy - a literary feat for Fielding and artistic mastery from Rowlandson.

When the reader reaches the second of Rowlandson’s illustrations (Figure 35), on page eleven, a number of comparative images may spring to mind - Joseph Highmore’s elegant *Pamela in the Bedroom with Mrs Jewkes and Mr B*, Carwitham’s clumsily suggestive engraving *Pamela in the bedroom,* and Rowlandson’s raucous and contemporary *Damp Sheets* (1791) (Figure 36), Hulett’s simple illustration from *Joseph Andrews*, and even the final, bawdy scene illustrated by Rowlandson from this volume, *Parson Adams Surprised by Lady Booby in a Suspicious Situation*. All of these images employ the same formula of an intimate bedroom scene: a servant girl interrupting a private assignation between the couple; the bedroom is usually a tangle of rumpled drapery, shifts immodestly slip off women’s shoulders, and there is a general air of dishabille. The bedroom scenes in both *Pamela* and *Joseph Andrews* were the parts of the novel most vulnerable to misrepresentation by artists. In fact, it is in the bedroom scenes of Rowlandson and Highmore that we can view the true measure of their success in negotiating the moral message of the text and the readers’ expectations. The scene that Rowlandson is depicting is one of Fielding’s most obvious and iconic inversions of the *Pamela* narrative - Lady Booby is desperately trying to seduce the virginal Joseph in her bedchamber, while the blushing Joseph awkwardly rebuffs all her advances, to the detriment of his employment. While many illustrations of this original scene in *Pamela*, with the exception of Highmore’s independent interpretation, all rely on the viewer’s knowledge of the novel’s narrative, Rowlandson allows his illustration to tell its own story - enhancing, not relying on, Fielding’s writing. Furthermore, Rowlandson allows the characters to aid in telling the story because they are complex and full of thought, with readable eyes, facial expressions, and gestures. In this sense, Rowlandson is faithful to Fielding’s requirements for a talented artist that are explained in the preface to *Joseph Andrews*: ‘It hath been thought a vast Commendation of a Painter, to say his Figures *seem to breathe*, but surely, it is a much greatest and nobler Applause, *that they appear to think.*’[[779]](#footnote-779) Rowlandson produces dynamic, thoughtful characters primarily through visual clues and compositional structure. There is a stark contrast between Lady Booby’s state of undress and Joseph’s formal attire; Lady Booby’s loose hair is covered by a nightcap, her ruffled, untied shift has slipped boldly to expose her breasts, and she has neglected to pull the blanket, which spills onto the floor, over her chest for modesty. Even the nude statute on her mantle piece, with one hand coyly placed across her chest, is more modest than Lady Booby. One of her plump hands clutches Joseph’s fist, while the other’s palm faces up, as if coaxing and cajoling. Her body and the bed is positioned (with some minor compromising of perspective for effect) so that Lady Booby is fully exposed to the viewer, and her body openly embraces the audience. In contrast, Joseph Andrews is wigged, frocked, and tightly breeched, his body twists away, perched on the edge of the chair and primed to escape from Lady Booby’s embarrassing supplications. The scene is emotional, as the viewer can tell from the twisting body language, and the bedroom air is steeped in sexual tension. The tension is written on the small, but readable faces of Lady Booby and Joseph - Lady Booby’s eyes turn pleadingly towards Joseph, her lips parted in speech; Joseph’s eyes are downcast, small patches of colour rise to his cheeks, and his lips are firmly pursed. Although her view would have been blocked by the huge, sloppy swathes of curtains, Lady Booby’s eyes also direct the viewer’s gaze to the portrait of the deceased Squire Booby on the bedroom wall. The corpulent, pouting man is another observer of this scene, and a reminder of the scale of Lady Booby’s indecent proposal.

Rowlandson’s illustration is awash with anticipation; the scene is building up to a climax, indicated by the steaming, spilling kettle on the fireplace. The viewer can almost hear the hiss of the water as it bursts from the spout; the curls of steam also enhance the sexual atmosphere of Lady Booby and Joseph Andrew’s encounter. In fact, Rowlandson’s illustration is richly visual and auditory. The sound of Lady Booby’s pleas and Joseph’s modest murmurs mix with the gurgling kettle, the faint rapping on the door from Mrs Slipslop and the clink of china tea cups as she places the tea tray on the table. Lady Booby and Joseph, however, give no indication of having heard Mrs Slipslop interrupt their tête à tête and Mrs Slipslop’s face looks unwitting, as if she has yet to discover what is happening. The viewer can imagine that the next scene would show the women shrieking, Joseph jumping up with extreme discomfort - the scene resembles the humiliation and chaos in *Damp Sheets,* in which a maid interrupts a man and woman in a compromising situation. Interestingly, this image of Lady Booby attempting to seduce Joseph is placed before the scene occurs in the novel, intensifying the buildup of Fielding’s narrative, and the inclusion of Mrs Slipslop to create a more readable and engaging composition is an example of Rowlandson’s artistic license.

*Pamela* and *Joseph Andrews*

*Joseph Andrews* is a masterful novel and narratively, it is strongest at the points when Fielding directly refers to and subverts *Pamela’*s well known plot. Fielding turned Richardson’s novel upside down, countered its prudish, somber, and controlled themes, and challenged the efficacy of *Pamela*’s didacticism. Campbell points out the complexity of Fielding’s theory of characters: ‘Fielding maintains that the only knowledge we can have of characters in novels and characters in the world is the knowledge we can construe from the outside.’[[780]](#footnote-780) Rowlandson’s techniques were well-suited to creating character from external signs and coaxing comedy out of energetic images. Everything that was potentially burlesque about *Pamela,* such as the bedroom scenes and the sly gropes from Mr B, is made comic in *Joseph Andrews*. As Homer Goldberg explains, Fielding rejected ‘the prudential and essentially negative copybook morality of *Pamela*, stressing purity, discretion, propriety and conquest of the passions,’ and instead promoted ‘impulsive virtue, stemming from benevolent feelings rather than Richardson’s overestimated precepts.’[[781]](#footnote-781) *Joseph Andrews* is vivacious when *Pamela* is priggish, humorous when *Pamela* is sober. If *Pamela* pushes copybook morality, then its bland and formulaic illustrations by Hayman and Gravelot espouse colouring book morality. However, the contrasts of *Joseph Andrews* and *Pamela* can further be brought into the light when comparisons are drawn between Rowlandson’s *The Great Purity of Joseph Andrews* and Highmore’s *Pamela in the Bedroom with Mrs Jewkes and Mr B.* Rowlandson and Highmore’s illustrations, which were essentially novels in pictures, are the two most successful series of images for Fielding and Richardson.

Highmore and Rowlandson

The most immediate difference between Rowlandson’s and Highmore’s works is the choice of medium - Rowlandson’s illustration is an interleaved engraving in a duodecimo and Highmore’s work is an oil painting measuring 62.7 x 75.7 cm - but this is equalized by the fact that Highmore’s series of twelve *Pamela* paintings were painted primarily to be turned into prints (30.0 x 37.2 cm)[[782]](#footnote-782), engraved by Antoine Benoist and Louis Truchy, with English and French titles, and sold for two and one half guineas a set.[[783]](#footnote-783) The use of French engravers and French captions, points to the popular reception of *Pamela* in France, where the novel was praised by Diderot. Hogarth also took inspiration from Highmore’s bilingual captions and arranged for the descriptions of *Marriage-a-la-Mode* to be written in French as well as English.[[784]](#footnote-784) These prints were accompanied by a short printed proposal that described each picture, but unfortunately none survive.[[785]](#footnote-785) Rowlandson was a printer who painted, and Highmore a painter also produced prints of his work. Highmore’s illustrations were physically and commercially independent of Richardson’s text, and he depicted scenes, such as the bedroom ones, that Richardson did not allow Hayman and Gravelot to include.[[786]](#footnote-786) If the print versions of Rowlandson’s and Highmore’s illustrations are compared, it becomes clear that Rowlandson’s *The Great Purity of Joseph Andrews* is a direct inversion of the engraving Highmore’s *Pamela in the bedroom* (Figure 37). The engravings are mirror images of each other, with the action taking place on the right-hand side of Rowlandson’s composition and on the left-hand side of Highmore’s, due to the contemporary technique of producing a mirror image of the painting the engraver was copying. In Highmore’s painting *Pamela in the Bedroom*. a more modest Mrs Jewkes pulls the covers around herself in a neatly-made and smartly curtained bed - no long curtains or messy sheets here. Mrs Jewkes’ cap is pulled tightly over her head and Highmore has positioned the figure in the bed so that the viewer can clearly see her plump but blank face. Highmore does not make Mrs Jewkes as grotesque as Richardson’s characterization: ‘a broad, squat, pursy, fat thing, quite ugly,’[[787]](#footnote-787) so as to avoid the burlesque. Pamela is depicted in profile,[[788]](#footnote-788) a position that Rowlandson alludes to in his *Great Purity* scene, her head modestly turned down, her gaze averted. Pamela’s hair is modestly covered in a night-cap, but the rest of her body betrays more sexual undertones. Pamela’s shift slips teasingly off her shoulders, just stopping before becoming a truly immodest Lady Booby. Pamela’s skirts are pulled above her knees, she is slowly and gingerly undoing her ribbon garters, and is about to begin unrolling her stockings. Is Pamela innocently or knowingly performing a striptease? Unlike the distant, cold illustrations we have explored by Gravelot and Hayman, Highmore captures the emotional complexity of the scene and is confident from his technical skill and restrained composition that the viewer will interpret the image correctly. While the distance of Gravelot and Hayman’s images allow the viewer only to look, Highmore’s image urges the viewer to become more active and he invites us on Pamela’s adventures.

Highmore’s scene is one of order and composure - the room is tastefully but sparsely furnished, the tables uncluttered, and the floor is clean. Unlike Gravelot’s fashionable, rococo rooms, Highmore’s interiors are more modest and dated, suggested that Highmore was aware Richardson had set *Pamela* in the 1720s.[[789]](#footnote-789) Bare floorboards guide the viewer’s eye to Pamela, but the visual line is interrupted by an unoccupied chair, covered with the heroine’s discarded dress. This chair also acts as a barrier between the disrobing Pamela and the viewer, reminding the viewer that he or she is at risk of becoming an inappropriate voyeur and complicit in the upcoming, attempted rape. The rich colour and sombre tonality of the painting increases the serious, meditative mood, and the only light source is the bright candle on the side-table which acts as a spotlight on the undressing heroine. Highmore has limited his palette to a muted crimson, faded brown, starchy white, and watery blue. The brushstrokes are controlled, the lines of the figures are graceful and composed, and there is a sense of delicacy, which is about to be shattered by Mr B’s outburst.

In the corner of the bedroom where Rowlandson has his Mrs Slipslop burst into the scene, Mr B, disguised as Nan, hides in the corner. Highmore has painted Mr B so convincingly as a woman, that unless the viewer knew the story of Pamela, she would assume that it was really a maid. There is something absurd and over-dramatic about the action that follows, and Highmore cleverly ‘freezes’[[790]](#footnote-790) the scene before the chaos erupts, letting the viewer remember *Pamela Swooning.* Mr B, dressed as Nan, reveals his identity as he crawls into bed with Pamela and tries to seduce her. The element of narrative transvestism discussed in Chapter Two is articulated in Highmore’s image by a cross-dressing Mr B. Just as in his first attempt to conquer Pamela, Pamela falls into a fit. Highmore sensed the wit and ‘touch of absurdity’ that Richardson uses to preserve Pamela’s virtue in both scenes,[[791]](#footnote-791) and he conveys this to the viewer by juxtaposing Pamela’s ignorance with Mr B’s desperate and ridiculous attempt to hide as a lowly servant. Fielding certainly satirized this cross-dressing in *Joseph Andrews.* Mild argues that *Pamela in the bedroom with Mrs Jewkes and Mr B* is the weakest in the series - he views it as unnecessary repeat of *Pamela Swooning*, the third painting. Mild has overlooked the fact that Highmore is clearly alluding to the third scene in *The Harlot’s Progress -* in which Moll is shown as a common prostitute in her bedroom, about to be arrested. This image would have been familiar to viewers of Highmore’s paintings and prints, and this allowed Highmore to manipulate Hogarth’s formula - replacing the syphilitic prostitute, the brothel keeper, ragged bed, and Justice Gonson with an innocent, virginal heroine, a pitiable maid, a clean and austere bedroom, and a gentleman disguised as a maid. Whereas Hogarth’s image captures the climatic moment of Moll’s decline - she is carried off to Bridewell Prison - Highmore makes this scene Pamela’s greatest triumph of virtue. This clever reversal of the *The Harlot’s Progress* is also an artistic victory for Hogarth’s student - Highmore has built on and transformed Hogarth’s series. *Adventures of Pamela* was not just a narrative series of images, but a readable novel in pictures - something Hogarth had not quite achieved in his social series.[[792]](#footnote-792)

As we have seen, Rowlandson was also able to retell and revise a novel with pictures. Rowlandson did not shirk from the challenge of depicting commotion and focused on the highest moments of narrative tension in his work for *Joseph Andrews*. In the final illustration for *Joseph Andrews* (Figure 38), Rowlandson returns to the bedroom scene, this time catching the characters in dramatic uproar and gender confusion. Rowlandson has captured the moment that Lady Booby bursts into Slipslop’s bedroom, interrupting the scuffle between Parson Adams and Slipslop, whom he has mistaken for Beau Didapper. Beau Didapper had crept into Slipslop’s room, thinking it was Fanny’s bedroom, and proceeded to pretend to be Joseph. Slipslop seizes this opportunity to prove her chastity and virtue to her mistress and screams: ‘Murder! murder! rape! robbery! ruin!’[[793]](#footnote-793) Parson Adams comes to the rescue, but in the dark, confuses Slipslop for the man and offender and lets Didapper escape. When Lady Booby rushes onto the scene, she shines a light on a scantily clad Parson Adams and Slipslop. This is a humorous reversal of the Rowlandson’s second scene, in which Slipslop interrupts Lady Booby attempting to seduce Joseph Andrews and Rowlandson repeats many of the same motifs in this illustration: the bed sheets and bed linen have been rumpled in the fight between Slipslop and Parson Adams and a pitcher of water has been overturned. The bedside chair is covered with cast-off garments, considerably more untidy than the similar chair in Pamela’s bedroom scene by Highmore. Beau Didapper’s lace shirt and diamond buttons, the clues that will identify the intruder, are at Lady Booby’s feet. Slipslop’s shift has slipped down to her waist, exposing grotesque and misshapen breasts, her face is contorted into a hideous scowl, and her gestures are savage. It is no wonder Parson Adams mistook her for a witch.[[794]](#footnote-794) The bumbling Parson Adams is clearly humiliated when Lady Booby (with her bosom spilling out of her nightdress) breaks up the dispute. Fielding has him entirely naked in his version of the scene, but Rowlandson mercifully covers Parson Adams in his shirt and nightcap. The smoke from Lady Booby’s candle is reminiscent of the steam from the kettle in Rowlandson’s earlier bedroom drawing, and indeed, if the two illustrations were placed side-by-side, they would look like consecutive scenes in a sequence of stills. In juxtaposition with the bedroom scene in *Pamela*, it is the man, Parson Adams, who is the victim of a woman’s scheme. Even more strikingly, Rowlandson’s illustration for *Joseph Andrews* is another variation of his *Damp Sheets* print - Lady Booby’s bursting bosom and attire are similar to the chambermaid’s in *Damp Sheets*, and their faces have the same innocent shock. The scrawny gentleman in *Damp Sheets* is also jumping with surprise, and he wears the same nightcap and shirt. The tense flexing of his foot is repeated in Mrs Slipslop’s, the candle has a plume of smoke, the bed linen and canopy curtains are rumpled, but in *Damp Sheets*, the pitcher of water is not overturned. The tropes, which are all characteristic of Hogarth and are perfected by Rowlandson, transform the illustrations of *Joseph Andrews* into self-sufficient works of art.

This chapter has brought the art and literature of Richardson’s *Pamela* and Fielding’s *Joseph Andrews* together for an illuminating finale for this thesis about the visual and physical reception of Richardson.This chapter has explored the influence of Hogarth’s conversation pieces, narrative prints, satires, and comic sketches on Gravelot and Hayman’s, Highmore’s, and Rowlandson’s illustrations for *Pamela* and *Joseph Andrews*. We have seen how Gravelot and Hayman applied the conversation piece format to their twenty-nine illustrations and relied too heavily on the techniques of the fashionable rococo. The overuse of these conventions created a Pamela who was a beautiful decorative object set in a vague, quasi-Arcadian landscape, not a sympathetic, personable English heroine, and directly contributed to the octavo, sixth edition’s financial failure. Richardson’s plans and instructions for Hayman and Gravelot’s illustrations were too ambitious and arrogant. Highmore, more humbly responding directly to Hogarth’s modern moral narratives, applies the narrative format to his *Adventures of Pamela*. He created a convincing flesh-and-blood Pamela by using his own daughter for inspiration, and by setting his scenes in realistic, simply furnished country rooms. Highmore’s *Adventures* are an optimistic revision of Hogarth’s *The Harlot’s Progress* and capture the progressive spirit of Richardson’s narrative while still creating an elegant, but grounded heroine. Rowlandson incorporates Hogarth’s satirical and comic traits in his interpretation of *Joseph Andrews* and his sharp attention to detail, playfulness, and superior draughtsmanship creates dynamic and memorable images of Joseph, Parson Adams, Lady Booby, and Fanny. We can read Highmore’s and Rowlandson’s paintings as easily as we can read Richardson’s and Fielding’s texts. From this innovative comparison of artists, authors, and texts, we have found a way to reinvigorate the discussion of *Pamela* illustrations and enrich our understanding of the novel’s complex history of visual representation.

This discussion of Highmore’s and Rowlandson’s illustrations of *Pamela* and *Joseph Andrews* has drawn on the communal and collaborative themes discussed in Chapter Four, and re-examined prominent figures such as Susanna and Joseph Highmore in a different context. Just as it took a small community of friends to help Richardson write his novels, so it also required a select group of inspired artists to create satisfactory images of Richardson’s eponymous heroine. The images of *Pamela* and *Joseph Andrews* discussed in this chapter stand in contrast to the less sophisticated sham, spurious, and unauthorized continuations and abridgments of Richardson’s first novel. John Kelly’s *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life*, Charles Povey’s *The Virgin in Eden* and Francis Newbery’s *The History of Pamela* all explore different interpretations of Richardson’s narrative and experiment with variations on the heroine’s virtue. These works were outside Richardson’s control and sphere of influence and are illustrative of how the general public received his controversial novel. Thus, we have moved from the public to the private, and from the verbal to the visual.

CONCLUSION

Over five chapters, this thesis has demonstrated the importance of analysing the physical qualities of books and paintings to create a comprehensive picture of *Pamela*’s multimedia reception in the eighteenth-century. In this conclusion, I will summarise the arguments and findings of each chapter and then demonstrate how my interdisciplinary approach can be applied to further aspects of *Pamela*’s reception, namely *Pamela*’s reception in America and *Pamela*’s reception in the nineteenth-century. This broader context shows us the pertinence and influence of the topics explored in this thesis and enables us to continually re-examine *Pamela*’s fascinating treatment in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with sensitivity to all aspects of its visual and verbal culture.

In Chapter One, I addressed important issues in *Pamela* that directly shaped the physical appearance of the novel and, as I argued, the visual representations the heroine. Most Richardson scholars have focused specifically on the complex themes of the narrative - the heroine’s journey of sexual and self-awareness; attitudes towards servants and social climbing; Pamela’s multivalent body; tensions between surface and depths; art and artifice; and ‘fabric and fabrication’ – but have not extended these explorations further to examine their influences on the reception of the novel, its treatment as a physical object and its role in shaping the images and illustrations of the heroine. I demonstrated that the confusion *in* the novel informed the diverse and dynamic reception *of* the novel throughout the eighteenth-century. I focused on unpacking several of these key themes in the narrative, such as masquerade and self-definition, and then making connections with the culture *outside* of the book. In effect, the narrative of *Pamela* and the book history of *Pamela* are Richardson’s detailed experiments in trying to create a seamless and convincing progression from humble origins and to high life. True to the nature of experimentation, there are many missteps and digressions and *Pamela* reads as a masquerade with frequent costume changes. Indeed, the physical object develops just like its heroine. Throughout the four volumes of *Pamela*/*Pamela II*, the heroine appears to the reader in the form of a peasant, shepherdess, mistress, calculating tease, social climber, Quaker, dutiful wife, and devoted mother. It is not until the conclusion of the fourth volume that Pamela has an epiphany and fully accepts herself – expressed in the didactic bedtime story she narrates to her children about the peerless and virtuous Prudentia. By the conclusion of the narrative, Pamela has convinced all the characters who doubted her honesty, virtue, and fitness for her role as an upper-class wife and fashioned herself as a model for generations to come. Similarly, by this point in the printing process, Richardson had concluded that finely printed but un-illustrated, duodecimo volumes were the best vehicle and packaging for the story of his heroine.

Although Pamela was able to convert all the characters in the narrative, there remained many sceptical readers *of* the novel and much of *Pamela*’s reception is defined by Richardson’s determination to guide all his readers to the correct reading of *Pamela* the novel and Pamela the heroine. It was not unusual for an eighteenth-century author to be dissatisfied and frustrated with his readership. As we have seen, Fielding made numerous corrections and revisions to *Joseph Andrews* throughout his lifetime and Swift waged a political crusade with the publication of his work in London and Dublin. However, as a printer and author Richardson was afforded the unique opportunity to control the print-runs and physical appearances of his texts. Richardson’s emphasis on the book as a physical object in his practice enables my thesis to approach the variety of editions, copies, sham and spurious works, and illustrations with a strengthened understanding of their importance in shaping the novel’s reception. Writers and artists, whether talented or opportunistic, responded to the confusion, multi-valency and interpretative possibilities of *Pamela* and created a plethora of works that reflected the interconnection between the visual and verbal in eighteenth-century culture

Within the first year of *Pamela*’s publication, at least sixteen *Pamela* related publications were known to Richardson and the number only grew in the years to follow. Of this motley collection of novels, pamphlets, poetry, plays and opera, Fielding’s *Shamela* and Eliza Haywood’s *The History of Betsey Thoughtless* have received the majority of scholarly attention. However, each work contributed to the reception and book history, and this thesis has focused on five important participants – Carwitham’s illustrations in Kingman’s *The Life of Pamela*, Kelly’s *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life,* Povey’s *The Virgin in Eden*, Newbery’s *The History of Pamela* and Fielding’s *Joseph Andrews.* I have discussed how the first four of these works, albeit more modest in construction and authorial talent, responded directly to the novel and heroine’s lowly origins. To Richardson and other heartily devoted Pamelist readers, these works appear regressive and, in some cases, subversive, because they focused on Pamela’s humble background and naïveté. In fact, once Richardson realised *Pamela*’s acceptance into a broader and more sophisticated audience than well-intentioned servant girls, he campaigned to refine his heroine and his book. His decision to write *Pamela II* was a direct response to the publication of the spurious *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life*, which in turn must have inspired his decision to commission a deluxe, octavo edition with illustrations by Gravelot and Hayman. Richardson had experimented with illustration once before, in his revision of L’Estrange’s *Aesop’s Fables* and Pamela herself promotes the *Fables* early in her narrative. As I have detailed in Chapters Two and Five, this sixth edition (1742) did not sell well and Richardson never again experimented with illustrations for any other editions of *Pamela* or his two other novels.

In this thesis, I make the case for the value of analysing this selection of sham works and argue that whether spurious, sham, or misguided, such publications played an important role in shaping the book history and visual culture of *Pamela* by emphasizing different aspects of the heroine’s character. Authors such as Kingman, Kelly, Povey, and Newbery were not appealing to the upper-classes, but rather to readers more similar to the novel’s original, intended audience. Although there are passages in Kelly’s *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* that suggest he wanted to assert the remnants of his respectable breeding and education, the dominant intention of the project was to imitate Richardson’s *Pamela* in its early, simple duodecimo state. The mixed and matched *Pamela/Pamela’s Conduct in High Life* sets that survive are evidence of Chandler, Ward, and Kelly’s success. *Pamela*’s early years in the marketplace were a flurry of constant costume changes: Pamela the heroine switched from rustic clothing to fine fashion and back again while *Pamela* the novel was printed in both high and low formats with spurious *Pamela*-publications masquerading as authentic. In many ways, *Pamela* was a public Pygmalion, with the many different writers and readers acting as sculptors. In the blurry illustrations, quickly printed texts and flimsy bindings of sham *Pamelas* we see how they created a simple, virtuous servant girl who became a model of purity and a figure to emulate.

Some eighteenth-century readers, such as Lady Hannah Haslerig did more than admire *Pamela* and instead argued that they were models *for* Pamela. This small sub-set of *Pamela* related publications lies outside the scope of this thesis, but I propose that further work needs to be done on the bindings and narratives of Lady Hannah Haslerig’s *The Memoirs of the Life of Lady H-, the Celebrated Pamela* and James Parry’s *The True Anti-Pamela, or Memoirs of J. Parry* would be a valuable contribution to *Pamela* research and help provide an even more comprehensive picture of publishing and printing practices in mid-eighteenth century Britain. These works are examples of vanity publishing. I will briefly introduce the docile and well-mannered *The Memoirs of the Life of Lady H-,* to provide a contrast to the spurious *Pamela* works focused on in this thesis and to further show *Pamela*’s role as a literary Pygmalion. Lady Haslerig’s slim, pocket-sized octavo comprises sixty-seven pages of dull and plodding narrative, but provides an insightful contrast to more driven and charged works like *The Virgin in Eden*. As the British Library copy has been entirely rebound, it is currently not possible to conduct a detailed analysis of many of the physical components of the text, but the *Memoirs* portable size and flimsy paper suggests a cheaply and hurriedly produced edition.[[795]](#footnote-795) In fact, Lady Haslerig is so eager to begin that she glosses over the preliminary material with this (ironically lengthy) justification:

The subject of this treatise is so remarkable an instance of the Reward of Virtue that it is worthy to be communicated to the world as a Pattern to the Present and Future age either in High or Low life. The facts are related in their natural colours and the reader will not be kept in suspence by the artful clue of Romantic Amusements. And as the Design of these Memoirs is to enforce the Practice of Virtue by an example of the Reward attending it, in as concise and plain a manner as possible, the usual formation of a dull and tedious preface, or an unprofitable introduction shall be omitted.[[796]](#footnote-796)

Here Lady Haslerig demonstrates that she is aware of the continuing criticism of Richardson’s decision to include a long, laudatory preface, and ensures the reader that the lack of preliminary material is not an oversight, but is intentional. One must linger for a moment on the diction in this passage: Lady Haslerig refers to her work not as a novel but as a ‘treatise’, implying seriousness of intention and uses words such as ‘facts’, ‘plain’, ‘design’ and ‘practice’ to continually reassure the reader that her work is not one of indulgent fantasy. This assertion of purpose and omission of a true preface effectively functions as the ‘preface’ to Lady Haslerig’s work. It reads awkwardly and is incompatible with the tenor of the text. Lady Haslerig ironically and immediately jumps into a romantic rendition, explaining that Pamela was born to lowly parents in Northamptonshire and was so innately virtuous and refined that she refused to play with children in the fields.[[797]](#footnote-797) After this laboured and saccharine anecdote, the narrator intrudes to reaffirm the validity of Pamela’s virtue: ‘...if we consider how far the indecent liberties taken by boys and girls, corrupt and inflame their Imagination, as they advance to Years of Ripeness; this early Prudence and Discernment, to avoid those idle opportunities which gave offence to her chaste mind, ought not to be passed over in silence.’[[798]](#footnote-798) This firm belief in Pamela’s natural goodness engages Lady Haslerig in direct dialogue with Povey who believed Pamela was purely contrived and artificial. Lady Haslerig rarely but effectively takes on these detractors’ voices in her own text and then dismisses the Anti-Pamelist assertions as inconsequential The mother-in-law’s complaint to her son, the husband of the heroine, perfectly captures the essence of the Anti-Pamelist attitude: ‘“I tell you, child, you are infatuated,” answered Lady H- and in speaking these words her excessive Passion caused her to burst into Tears. “The young witch takes Advantage of your scrupulous conscience, and makes a prey of your innocent and youthful mind! - Believe me, she is an artful cunning Slut!”’[[799]](#footnote-799) The mother-in-law’s remarks bear a striking resemblance to Povey’s tirade and also to Fielding’s humorous, coy *Shamela.* But it is only in Lady Haslerig’s work that this is quickly undermined by a thorough and detailed history of Pamela that rivals Richardson in its thoroughness.

Unfortunately, these anecdotes are cheapened by a rushed writing style that gives the impression of an unedited stream of consciousness with no redeeming moral. The plot is superficial, self-congratulatory and the reader soon gets the distinct impression that Lady Haslerig is a reincarnate of Narcissus, intoxicated by self-love with the blank page as her reflective pool. There is an element of the unscrupulous in Lady Haslerig’s decision to praise herself as the most beautiful, virtuous and discussed woman of the day and this transforms her inherent goodness into a flat affectation. Her style is a hyperbolized misinterpretation of Richardson, the great lover of fine detail. Richardson does not dwell on Pamela’s physical appearance to make his novel realistic, whereas Lady Haslerig waxes lyrical about her appearance: ‘Pamela was then just entered into her seventeenth year, and had the healthy natural Bloom usually to be seen in the faces of country girls but her cheeks not quite so ruddy, for they had the colour of the blushing Rose; her lips might vie with the most beautiful coral and her Teeth with the whitest Ivry; and the nicest Artist could not for a sett more exact and regular.’[[800]](#footnote-800) This is Lady Haslerig’s attempt to paint a portrait in adjectives and enter herself into the debate on art and artifice, but she lacks the fundamental assets of quality, refined diction, and narrative skill to become a serious contender. Ultimately, instead of reacting to the *Pamela* controversy in the manner of Kelly and Fielding, Lady Haslerig takes a distinct approach and inserts herself into the burgeoning canon of spin-offs. Her ideas, often heavily painted in artifice, reveal yet another interpretation in the heated *Pamela* debate. *Memoirs* is vanity writing in its most immodest form.

Richardson reacted to these sham and spurious publications with disgust and indignation. His objections were primarily made on moral grounds and he asserted the authenticity of his *Pamela* by promoting the novel alongside the adverts of *Pamela’s Conduct in High Life*. The main intention of these pompous puffs, detailed in Chapter Two, was to insist on the superiority and factual basis of the story. Chandler and Ward, who had managed to successfully package their product as a fairly convincing *Pamela* continuation, also imitated Richardson’s puffs – further irritating the printer/author and increasing the impression of authenticity. In these early encounters with opportunistic writers from Grub Street and the complications of printing and copyright during the mid-eighteenth century, Richardson confined his professional and personal outrage to issues of morality and authenticity. However, by the release of *Grandison* nine years later, the issues and implications of rogue printers and publishers intensified and his frustration reached a climax. No longer satisfied with small skirmishes on slight issues, Richardson waged a print battle with Dublin ‘pirates’. He challenged the honour of prominent printers, such as George Faulkner, on issues of morality and authenticity and voiced his protests in a far more public audience – circulating his tracts freely on the streets and inserting them into his editions of *Grandison*. The effectiveness of Richardson’s print campaign, however misguided, permanently damaged Faulkner’s reputation, and it is only recently that scholars have returned to analyse the lasting implications of his tracts on our understanding of eighteenth-century Anglo-Irish print culture.

As Chapter Three has demonstrated, Richardson’s claims that Faulkner’s involvement in the pirating of *Grandison* corrupted his virtuous novel are far from correct. I explored the possible reasons for Richardson’s disproportionate outburst to the supposed violation of his works. If Richardson was reacting to the financial implications of a cheaper Dublin edition, his worries largely would have been assuaged by two facts: first, that his successful printing business provided him with financial security and secondly, that Faulkner had offered to refund him the seventy guineas for the rights. Richardson vehemently protested Faulkner’s respect for the unspoken Dublin printing practices. These customs ensured that once the future publication of a novel had been declared by one Dublin printing house, no other Dublin printers could print this work. However, one of the most important contributing factors in the Irish ‘piracy’ was Richardson’s inability or unwillingness to understand the rapidly changing practices of the printing world. Not only did he prescribe three strict conditions on granting Faulkner printing rights that slowed down the Dubliner’s receipt of manuscripts and printed declaration of publication, he also failed to foster any loyalty among his employees, who were ultimately responsible for the theft and distribution of the sheets.

Richardson’s archaic and out-of-touch views of apprenticeship and printing practices are most clearly expressed in one of his early works, *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum*, which I discussed in Chapter Three. *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* emphasized Richardson’s paternalistic, controlling attitude towards his employees, his early puffery and advertising tactics, and his interest in paratextual material. Most importantly, *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* was a starting point for Richardson’s writing and here he began the practices, habits and tactics that would be applied to his later print battle with Faulkner. The tone and diction of Richardson’s pocket-guide for printing apprentices demonstrates how he was ultimately unable to write a factual text without undercutting the message with heavy-handed didacticism and paternalism. I agree with scholars such as Pettit and McKillop that there are strong connections between *The Apprentice’s Vade Mecum* and Richardson’s other works of fiction and non-fiction, including *Pamela*, *Clarissa, Grandison¸ Six Letters on Duelling, Familiar Letters, An Address to the Public* and *The Case of Samuel Richardson,* and throughout this thesis, I have focused on the influences and veins running through Richardson’s own varied oeuvre. Although his fiction and non-fiction works focused on dramatically different topics, Richardson’s texts consistently display his romanticism, didacticism, and hyper-sensitivity. Richardson ‘the author’ is present in texts that are supposed to be fairly objective and factual, but ultimately these texts employ fictional and rhetorical tropes. This, in turn, colours his report of the Dublin ‘piracies’ and Richardson spun a fanciful romance out of what should have been a rather inconsequential difference in business practices.

I re-categorized Richardson’s *An Address to the Public* as Richardson’s shortest novel and considered the print culture and legal context that demonstrates the romance and fancifulness of the printer/author’s condemnation of Faulkner. After a lengthy explanation of Dublin printing practices during what was considered a ‘golden age’ of printing, I turned to other Anglo-Irish copyright disputes to demonstrate again that Richardson’s tract was clouded with fiction. Although Richardson was not alone in battling with copyright and control over printing of works during this period, his motivations for pursuing Faulkner suggest anti-Irish and nationalistic sentiment. I described other disputes involving Jonathan Swift, Benjamin Motte and Faulkner to highlight the English laws and printing practices as symptomatic of English oppression. Richardson challenged Faulkner’s honour in print and permanently damaged his reputation, but in the context of Irish print culture, Faulkner was acting as a respectful tradesman and loyal Dubliner. Along with scholars such as Mary Pollard and Kathyrn Temple, I argue that Faulkner was not a pirate, but a patriot, and I enhance the strength of our approach with evidence from the physical qualities of specific London and Dublin editions of *Pamela* and *Grandison* to overturn Richardson’s claims of piracy.

In my research of the issues of reprints and Dublin piracies, I came across discussions of the book trade between the Colonies and Dublin; Feather summarises the situation, building on the issue of the 1710 Statute: ‘In fact, Ireland was not subject to the 1710 Copyright Act until after the 1801 Act of the union. The Irish Trade developed its own conventions and patterns of commerce. There was, at least until 1776, a flourishing trade with Britain’s North America.’[[801]](#footnote-801) Although the American reception of *Pamela* lies outside the scope of this thesis, it presents an excellent opportunity for a research paper, built on the same interdisciplinary model presented here. In fact, as I mention in Chapter Two, Newbery’s *The History of Pamela* was considerably more popular in America and thirteen editions were printed before 1819. Bannet observes that British readers were ‘more interested in “continues” of Pamela which showed her in “in high life”’ whereas American readers preferred abridgments, and *Pamela* was considerably more successful than *Clarissa*.[[802]](#footnote-802) Bannet’s arguments bolster Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse’s claim that *Pamela* was ‘not necessarily a scion of earlier English prose fiction but of Mary Rowlandson’s popular American captivity narrative’.[[803]](#footnote-803) Furthermore, *Pamela* was the first novel printed in America in 1744, by Benjamin Franklin.[[804]](#footnote-804) As an interesting aside, Mason Chamberlin painted portraits of both Samuel Richardson and Benjamin Franklin. Substantial support for Bannet’s and Armstrong and Tennenhouse’s claims could come from an analysis of ‘American’ editions of *Pamela* both in its original and abridged formats and moreover, illuminating connections could be made among these arguments, the physical objects, and American images of *Pamela*. Robert Feke, an American painter of obscure origins but considerable influence, painted a modest portrait of Pamela in puritan attire that stands in direct contrast to Mercier’s coy temptress. The approaches and arguments presented in this thesis could be applied on a much smaller scale to the reception of *Pamela* in America and provide further evidence of the novel and heroine’s flexibility and adaptability to different classes and cultures.

In Chapter Four, I made the transition from the printing and production of the book to the world of the reader. I questioned the traditional model of eighteenth-century as a solitary and isolated activity, and used visual and written evidence to argue that it was a social, dynamic and communal event. I analysed portraits of Richardson, the North End reading circle and Lady Bradshaigh to understand how prominent members in the author’s ‘community’ perceived and presented themselves. The North End circle frequently met at Richardson’s North End summer-house and Susanna Highmore shows us a close-knit of friends listening and reacting to the author’s reading of the text. These readers saw themselves as more than just friends of the author and formed a family, casting Richardson as patriarch. The spaces in which Richardson and his friends wrote and read played an important role in shaping their communities and relationships and I identified the summer-house and closet as two of the most prominent settings in Richardson’s novels and in the writing of his novels. Both the summer-house and the closet could function as private and public spaces and in this chapter, I identified their very social role in defining the parameters of the author’s relationships with the North End circle and Lady Bradshaigh. In fact, as I argued, although Richardson and Lady Bradshaigh formed their friendship through correspondence and not from meetings; their exchange of portraits, manuscripts and other tokens of affection demonstrate how reading and writing could be social even when people were separated by distances. Whether his readers gathered physically around the author in his North End summer-house, like his circle, or corresponded with him over great distances, their discussions, comments, and visual images are testament to reading as a physical, emotional, and social activity. These communities, whether real or imagined, read Richardson in a multi-media manner, and as this chapter demonstrates, we cannot discuss the book history of *Pamela* without acknowledging the visual, verbal, written, and physical evidence for how books were treated and received in eighteenth-century Britain.

The final chapter of this thesis built on the communal and collaborative themes in Chapter Four and moved into an even broader discussion of the visual and physical reception of Richardson. I introduced Hogarth, Gravelot, Hayman, Highmore, Rowlandson, and *Joseph Andrews* and presented them as a community of artists, united by their interest in *Pamela*. In my analysis of *Pamela* and *Joseph Andrews* illustrations, I demonstrated that Gravelot and Hayman’s images were too fashionable and rococo for Richardson’s humble heroine, that Highmore’s *Pamela* was more convincing and that *Joseph Andrews* and Rowlandson’s illustrations were a direct inversion of *Pamela* and Highmore’s *Adventures of Pamela*. I am the first scholar to discuss all these artists in this manner and to compare Highmore and Rowlandson. I argued that we can read the visual images presented by Highmore and Rowlandson as easily as we can read Richardson’s and Fielding’s texts, and more importantly, that we cannot understand the reception of these novels without exploring their visual representations.

The introduction of Rowlandson into this thesis brings us to the close of the eighteenth-century, and what has been forgotten is that *Pamela* long-outlived her author and in appeared in a variety of formats throughout the nineteenth-century. At the close of the nineteenth century, we can find stately Richardson anthologies with elegantly engraved images alongside cheaply printed abridgments for children. In an article from the 8th of August 1883 entitled *Richardson in France*: *The Rehabilitation of the Author of Clarissa*, a spirited, anonymous writer muses on why Samuel Richardson, frequently regarded as the first true English novelist, was consistently overlooked by his contemporaries in their celebration of the great national authors and British literary heritage. The acutely observant critic laments that in the same decade that W.F. Woodington’s bust of Henry Fielding and William Morris’ stained glass windows dedicated to Chaucer were created, Richardson’s achievements were acknowledged in a comparatively less ostentatious form. Instead of spectacle and publicity, Richardson is remembered quietly by the booksellers Sotheran & Co. in their publication of a deluxe, twelve volume edition of the author’s complete works. The author discounts this publication, writing that ‘nothing is done for Samuel Richardson’[[805]](#footnote-805) beyond this publication and explains that Richardson is out of fashion in Victorian England: ‘fifty years ago it might have been fairly said that the ideal industrious apprentice was only recollected by his own country has having, in a namby-pamby work called *Pamela* furnished a theme for the ridicule of Fielding’s *Joseph Andrews*.’[[806]](#footnote-806) While the critic occasionally makes speculative and judgemental remarks that smack of Victorian romance, his observations present us with a view of *Pamela*’s position in late-nineteenth century society.This shift in Richardson reception, from causing a cultural sensation in the eighteenth-century to being considered as merely an object of ridicule by some in the nineteenth-century would be a further opportunity for a research paper employing this thesis’s interdisciplinary approach. The varied reception of Richardson, from the impassioned, poetic accolades of Denis Diderot’s *Éloge de Richardson* (1762), in which he declares the English author the ‘true painter of the nature of life’[[807]](#footnote-807) to Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s scathing annotations of *Clarissa*, in which he writes that *Pamela* and *Clarissa ‘*poison the imagination of the young with continued doses of *tinct. lyttae*’ is continued throughout the nineteenth century.[[808]](#footnote-808)The critic of this newspaper article makes another interesting point that is worth exploring in further detail – while Richardson may have been out-of-fashion in England, he was still popular in France:

One explanation of the survival of Richardson in France while his reputation was dormant in England, as ancient locutions have been preserved in America while they have died out in their native country, is to be found in careful study of the female heart. Like Balzac, he essayed to represent what the women of his felt and thought, and it must be admitted that Richardson possessed extraordinary advantages in the portrayal of feminine emotions.[[809]](#footnote-809)

This anecdote is followed by an assertion that Richardson’s sensitivity and femininity appealed more to the passionate and effeminate French, while seeming superfluous to the intellectual and masculine British. The highlighting of Richardson’s interest in the feminine is expressed in Chapter Two’s discussion of his narrative transvestism. Indeed, to the author of this article, to the many readers of *Pamela*, *Clarissa,* and *Sir Charles Grandison*, and to contemporary critics, Richardson – surrounded by daughters and adoring female fans – was master of the ‘windings of the female mind and the turns and desperate bounds of the female heart.’[[810]](#footnote-810) According to our critic, Richardson enjoyed enduring popularity in France since *Pamela*’s first translation in 1741, over which the author maintained substantial control,[[811]](#footnote-811) and Sotheran & Co. were trying to ‘rehabilitate’ Richardson with their luxury edition. Although it at first seemed incongruous to memorialize Chaucer and Fielding with public monuments and only pay tribute to Richardson in twelve, morocco bound, octavo volumes with raised spines and gold tooling, these works are an appropriate memorial for the printer/author who explored morality and virtue in pen, ink, and paper. Stained glass windows and busts remember the men, not their crafts, and an elegant, deluxe octavo edition of Richardson’s works would have pleased the printer/author who yearned for such a luxury publication to be accepted in his own lifetime. Our Victorian critic leaves us with a poetic advertisement for the Sotheran & Co edition, writing that: ‘On Horatian principle, however, republication nearly a century and quarter after his death, with a critical introduction by Mr Leslie Stephen, is an earnest of that true immortality beyond the endurance of molten images and the power of the storm.’[[812]](#footnote-812)

This critic is writing at what is possibly a particularly formative moment in *Pamela*’s reception – a Richardson Renaissance, instigated by the commemorative edition by Sotheran & Co. These twelve volumes contain a reprint of *Pamela* that appeals to Victorian culture, but this overly elegant and stylized heroine now only survives in institutional libraries and rare book dealers’ offices. In direct contrast to this Victorian Pamela is Upton Sinclair’s rewrite, *Another Pamela; or Virtue Still Rewarded* (1950)*,* which translates Richardson’s story into mid-twentieth century culture, demonstrating the heroine’s archetypal presence. Sinclair’s Pamela is poorly educated and a Seventh-Day-Adventist who works for a wealthy Southern Californian family. Sinclair’s novel, although clever and well-written unlike other spurious *Pamela*s was never reprinted. *Pamela* appears to us today not as one type, modified and translated for our times, but as many different and contradicting images. As this thesis has demonstrated, *Pamela* had many costume changes in the two-and-a-half centuries that span the gulf between the modest duodecimo, first edition printed on cheap paper and in poor typeface, to the flimsy, paper-back fourteenth edition – selected by the editors of Penguin books as the most authoritative edition – that we read today. As the wealth of critical material and scholarly discussions of *Pamela* in the twenty-first century demonstrates, *Pamela* is ever-changing but immortal.
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