

2015

Samuel Richardson and the "Jew Bill" of 1753: A new political context for Sir Charles Grandison

Latimer, Bonnie

<http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/5038>

10.1093/res/hgu112

The Review of English Studies

Oxford University Press

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Oxford University Press in *The Review of English Studies* 275: 66 (2015), 520-539 available at: 10.1093/res/hgu112 .

Samuel Richardson and the ‘Jew Bill’ of 1753

A new political context for *Sir Charles Grandison*

O merciful God, who hast made all Men, and hatest Nothing that thou hast made, nor wouldest the Death of a Sinner, but rather that he should be converted and live; have Mercy upon all *Jews, Turks, Infidels* and *Hereticks...*

—*Book of Common Prayer*

Abstract [192 words]: Comment on the religious politics of Samuel Richardson’s *The History of Sir Charles Grandison* (1753-4) focuses on the text’s Catholic and post-Jacobite aspects. This essay argues that there is a more immediate political context for understanding religious tolerance in the novel: the Jewish Naturalisation Act of 1753. *Grandison* was printed during 1753, when this controversial legislation was passed and repealed. The novel contains Richardson’s only Jewish character, Solomon Merceda, and an exploration of popular debate over the Act reveals similarities between the assumptions and language of the pamphlet literature, and those found in the novel. Although he began printing his text during 1753, Richardson still had opportunities during this year to revise and even to write parts of it. There is also good evidence that friends who read and discussed drafts for him during this period were amongst the Act’s promoters. The essay concludes that the Act is an unacknowledged political context for this important novel that would have been part of original readers’ experience of it, and further suggests that the idea of tolerance which emerges from this reading may inflect our understanding of *Grandison*’s representation of religious difference more generally.

Critics of the politics of Samuel Richardson’s *The History of Sir Charles Grandison* (1753-4) often focus on the novel’s Catholic plot. Such a reading is intuitive: from first publication, discussion of the novel hinged not only upon Sir Charles’s ‘double love’, but upon the questions of religious and national difference which informed the romance. Richardson described the novel as ‘touch[ing] upon’ ‘the Article of Religion’, figuring himself as ‘having been as zealous a Catholic when I was to personate the Lady [Clementina], and her Catholic Friends, as a Protestant, when I was the Gentleman’.¹ In Clementina, readers have detected

similarities to various historical Catholics, and these allusions, coupled with deprecating yet moderate references to the Forty-Five, implicate *Grandison* in contemporary questions over the position of Catholics. Their treatment in the novel is generally seen as tolerant, even sympathetic.²

This essay, however, argues that topical as it is, the Jacobite rebellion, that ‘gigantic historical fact’, is not the only recent political backdrop for *Grandison*.³ Instead, I suggest that scholarship has largely overlooked a less momentous but more immediate source for the novel’s discussion of the tolerance and integration of religious minorities: the Jewish Naturalisation Act of 1753 (26 Geo. II, cap. 26), which was passed and repealed as Richardson readied *Grandison* for press.⁴ Richardson took an interest in the Act, and had connections amongst those responsible for it: at least two were amongst the correspondents with whom he shared drafts of the novel. *Grandison* contains the only Jewish character in Richardson’s fiction—the minor libertine Solomon Merceda—and this may be no coincidence.⁵ Merceda’s characterisation and treatment can be read as a reflection of the debates over the place of Jewish people in England which raged in the spring and summer of 1753, and seeing the novel through this lens illuminates not simply Merceda himself, but the religious tolerance which forms one of the novel’s major concerns. To make this case, it is necessary to refresh the reader’s memory as to Merceda’s character, and briefly to explicate the Act itself. The essay goes on to argue that there are evident textual parallels between *Grandison* and the discourse surrounding the Act. Additionally, Richardson followed the controversy over the Act, and finally, the timescales and circumstances of *Grandison*’s revision mean that he had chance to make alterations in light of a debate in which he was deeply interested.

I) *Grandison*’s greatest malefactor

Whereas *Clarissa* (1747-8) featured the protean mastermind Lovelace, *Grandison* has for its antagonist the less compelling Sir Hargrave Pollexfen. Like Lovelace, Sir Hargrave kidnaps the heroine, but unlike his predecessor, he is unsuccessful, repents, and dies a Christian death: an unsatisfying villain. Looking more closely, though, it emerges that Sir Hargrave is actually not (as one might expect) the novel’s chief engine of wickedness: that distinction falls to one of his companions, the minor character Solomon Merceda. Whilst Merceda may

appear to be merely another of the text's company of rakes, in fact, much of the responsibility for the story's moral disorder is his. When the heroine is abducted, and her attendants drugged, it is 'Two of *Mr. Merceda's footmen*' who do the dirty work, and 'Mr. Merceda's house near Newbery' where she is to be imprisoned.⁶ When Sir Hargrave's corrupt servant confesses the plan, he notes that 'Mr. Merceda had [another] scheme on foot at the same time, which he was earnest to engage me in; but it was too shocking' (*Gr.*, 1: 172). When the libertines go on their escapade to France, it is Merceda who eggs on the others: he is described as 'the greatest malefactor' (*Gr.*, 4: 433). The first time that Sir Charles meets the rakes, he exclaims, 'Mr. Merceda! I have heard of Mr Merceda' (*Gr.*, 2: 248). This is a compliment afforded to no other, suggesting that, uniquely, Merceda's reputation precedes him. Merceda is also reported as sounding different to the others because of his Portuguese accent (*Gr.*, 2: 247). He is part of *Grandison's* genteel English society—but also different, tacitly beyond the pale.

Merceda's singularity extends further than shady schemes and foreign speech, however: he is also Jewish, the only Jewish character in Richardson's fiction. His Jewishness, and the extent to which it is problematic within Protestant English society, form a subtext to his interactions with the novel's Christian gentlemen. For example, when Sir Charles is delivering a monologue against duelling, he argues that it is unchristian—but then pauses awkwardly over the inapplicability of his argument to his Jewish auditor:

[I]t is dreadful to reflect, that the man who would endeavour to support his arguments against this infamous practice of duelling, by the Laws of Christianity, tho' the most excellent of all Laws (Excuse me, Mr. Merceda, your own are *included* in them) would subject himself to the ridicule of persons who call themselves Christians. I have mentioned therefore [as supporters of duelling] Heathens and Mahometans; tho' in this company, perhaps – But I hope I need not, however, remind any-body here, that that one doctrine of returning *good* for *evil*, is a nobler and more heroic doctrine than *either* of those people, or *your own*, Mr. Merceda, ever knew. (*Gr.*, 2: 264).

Sir Charles moves skittishly around Merceda's difference: in a series of remarkably tangled syntactical constructions, he at first politely 'includes' Merceda's religious 'Laws' within Christianity. A sentence later, however, it becomes clear that this tolerant acceptance is underpinned by a distinct moral hierarchy. Stumbling over the phrase 'Heathens and Mahometans', Sir Charles inexplicably fails to complete his sentence on duelling, defensively interrupting himself to note that the Christian doctrine of 'returning *good* for *evil*' is superior to the teachings of heathens, Muslims, or, indeed, Jews like Merceda. These three groups are evidently associated as retrograde and inferior. This cryptic moment is particularly odd in a

novel often celebrated for its religious tolerance. It becomes easier to understand, however, if we consider this interaction as a direct reflection of the debates over Jewishness and toleration that were catalysed by the Jewish Naturalisation Act, or ‘Jew Bill’, as it was colloquially known. This act was made law in 1753 and resulted in a feverish debate over the terms on which Jewish people could be included in Protestant English society.

II) The Jewish Naturalisation Act

The London Jewish community of the mid-1750s was a thriving one. Thomas Perry traces about 500 Jewish people living in London after the Restoration; by 1753, this had swelled to ‘perhaps 8000’.⁷ Contemporary estimates range from 1-2,000 to 10,000, although their reliability is obviously variable.⁸ Immigration, as opposed to the native birth-rate, was a major source of growth; the majority of London Jews in the 1750s were arrivals from abroad or second-generation immigrants, meaning that the popular English conception of ‘the Jew’ was of a foreigner.⁹ This would later be exploited in the controversy over the Act.

These immigrants fall, broadly, into two categories: Ashkenazim, who hailed from eastern and central European countries, and Sephardim, largely of Iberian descent, like Solomon Merceda. The Ashkenazim were poorer and tended to integrate less well; they accounted for most of the Jewish pedlars and small-dealers, and were associated in the English cultural imagination with the figure of the wandering Jew. Although perceptions of their financial power were exaggerated, the Sephardim, by contrast, traded on a larger scale; wealthier and more politicised, they were arguably laxer about religious observances, shaved, and dressed in English fashions.¹⁰ A number married into the Protestant middle and upper classes.¹¹ They were both part of and on the margins of London commercial society—and they suffered particularly from a set of restrictions on international trade.

In common with Catholics and other non-Anglicans, British-born Sephardim already laboured under civil disabilities, whilst those who had been born abroad suffered additional impediments as aliens, including being unable to engage in colonial trade, except upon payment of special tariffs and port fees.¹² None of these restrictions was specific to Jewish people – they were aimed at non-Anglicans and at aliens – but despite this, they affected the Sephardic community disproportionately because of that group’s association with international trade, and the fact that many were first-generation immigrants. Even worse, the normal solutions were unavailable to them. Ordinarily, anyone suffering from the restrictions on aliens *qua* aliens could become naturalized through a private Act of Parliament –

cumbersome and expensive, but possible. However, such an act required taking the sacrament. Whilst Christian aliens could do this, it was a sticking-point for Jewish foreigners. In these circumstances, the Sephardic Jewish community of London sought a form of naturalisation especially for non-native Jews.

Naturalisation (of foreign-born Jews *and* Protestants) was a hot topic throughout the 1740s, with the debate intensifying in the 50s. As early as 1693, the Whigs had produced a bill for a general naturalisation of foreign Protestants, with the eminent merchant Josiah Child arguing for the inclusion of Jews, too, as a boost for the economy.¹³ Child's arguments were unsuccessful, but they would inform the later controversies.¹⁴ In 1740, the topic of naturalisation was revived by the passage of the Plantation Act, which applied to colonial Jewish people and Quakers. This may have encouraged the London Jewish community, because in 1742, the congregation of the Sephardic Bevis Marks synagogue engaged a solicitor, Philip Carteret Webb, as their lobbyist for new naturalisation procedures, forming a regular committee in 1746 devoted to the cause. In that year, the 'Irish Jew Bill' was defeated only narrowly, suggesting the possibility of later success. In both 1747 and 1751, the indefatigable Robert Nugent brought naturalisation bills for Protestants before the Westminster Parliament.¹⁵ Neither passed, but significantly, the failure of the 1751 bill was attributed to its omission of Jews:

it was the general Talk of the Town [that] were the *Jews* included, many Rich from among them might be drawn over: Nay, the Debate, when the Bill was thrown out in the House of Commons, greatly turned upon that...it was a common Topick of Conversation, particularly at the Close of the Session of 1752.¹⁶

The author of these remarks, 'Philo-Patriae', is probably a ministry propagandist, so we might take his assessment of a desire for Jewish naturalisation with a pinch of salt: the later fury over the '53 Act does not bear him out. However, pamphlets from the mini-controversies in 1747 and 1751 show that Jewish naturalisation did form part of an on-going debate.¹⁷ In 1752, Joseph Salvador, a leading light in the Sephardic Jewish community, decided to use his government contacts finally to push legislation through.

A respected financier, Salvador had the ear of government figures. On January 14th, 1753, Salvador sent the Duke of Newcastle, brother to the Prime Minister, a brief formal memorandum outlining the Sephardic community's requirements. This paper, surtitled 'Mr. Salvador's Paper concerning the Jews', survives in the British Library's Newcastle Papers and makes this request:

that any Person professing the Jewish Religion whom it may in future be thought proper to Naturalize, shall in Lieu of taking the Holy Sacrament take the Oaths of Supremacy & Allegiance, or such other Oaths as may be thought proper, on or before the Second Reading of the bill for Naturalizing him, in either of the Houses of Parliament...¹⁸

There follow seven ‘Reasons’, stressing the modesty of the proposal. It will only be open to such Jews as Parliament sees fit to naturalise, so it will not provoke a free-for-all; Jewish money has been useful to the government; and the measure will appeal to ‘the Rich’, since no one else could afford a private Act of Parliament. The change which Salvador proposes is, simply, that Jewish people applying for naturalisation could take the Oath of Supremacy instead of the sacrament.

This apparent technicality, however, would provoke a strident pamphlet war that would rage throughout the spring and summer of 1753, and was ugly even by the standards of eighteenth-century partisan politics, with the most hysterical material imagining compulsory mass circumcision, ritual slaughter of Christian infants, and the establishment of a Jewish theocracy as the logical and necessary consequences of this bill.¹⁹ As a result of this single, unassuming sheet of paper, the Sephardic population of London would be rocketed to an unwelcome national prominence, as the focal point of a furious row over the desirability of a Jewish presence in England.

III) An ill-grounded clamour: *Grandison* and the ‘Jew Bill’ controversy

At first, the nascent Bill was uncontroversial. It got as far as a third reading in the Commons with a comfortable margin of 95 in favour, and 16 opposed.²⁰ Its passage seemed assured. However, 1754 would be an election year—and as the Bishop of Oxford noted wryly to the Earl of Hardwicke, an election is ‘an occasion, upon which all kinds of Weapons are taken up, & an ill-grounded Clamour is one of the readiest’.²¹ By spring of 1753, campaign planning was well underway. The fact that the notoriously latitudinarian Whig ministry was passing a measure in favour of Jews was an unexpected gift to the anti-Pelhamites.

Beginning in May 1753, the opposition sponsored articles in the *London Evening Post* attacking it.²² After the royal assent on 7th June, the outcry swelled. Some was no doubt in earnest, but much of the pamphlet war was cynical politicking, dishonestly inflating the measure’s importance by suggesting that it meant a general naturalisation or access of political power for Jewish people. Nonetheless, despite the factual inaccuracies and

overblown rhetoric of this debate, it revealed deep-rooted anxieties about the relationship between Jewishness and Englishness. These attitudes, flushed out by the 1753 controversy, became especially visible during these months—and it is these tropes which can be glimpsed in Richardson’s writing of Solomon Merceda.

The controversy (perhaps unsurprisingly) unleashed some rabidly anti-Semitic material, imagining graphic violence inflicted upon Christians by newly empowered Jews. However, putting to one side sheer sensationalism, there are revealing themes which run through the opposition—and also, interestingly, the defence. A major concern of the opposition is that Jewishness will in some way swamp, disrupt, or usurp Englishness. This is evident in the fear that naturalised Jewish gentlemen would be able to buy estates (in fact, they already could) and thus both physically possess English territory, and dispose of the Church livings associated with land ownership.²³ Legally, this fear was ungrounded, but this did not prevent opponents suggesting that the legislation aimed at the ‘Disinherison’ of ‘native’ Englishmen, allowing rich Jewish men to buy out English landowners with trade fortunes, to take control of the Church, and ultimately to realise (as ‘Britannia’ put it) ‘a *Restoration of the Jewish Kingdom*’.²⁴ Quickly, such putative ambitions translate to theocracy: ‘Britannia’ is representative of many in implying that Judaism is the new Jacobitism. ‘Archaicus’, for instance, similarly saw Parliament being turned into a Jewish ‘Sanhedrin’.²⁵ The anti-Jacobite angle is obviously being exploited here, but what is really behind such rhetoric is a sense that Jewishness and Englishness are fundamentally incompatible: there is a perpetual political struggle between the two, in which one must always master the other, with no possibility of peaceable incorporation. William Romaine is typical when he claims that

our state can have no natural-born Subjects but Christians, and a natural-born Jew Christian Foreign Englishman, is such a Medley of Contradictions, that all the Rabbies [*sic*] in the World will never be able to reconcile them.²⁶

This deliberately twists the meaning of the Act (which is *not* about ‘natural-born’ Jewish people, but about foreign-born Jews being *naturalised*) and turns the debate into a referendum on how far one can be ‘English’ and ‘Jewish’ at the same time. Implicitly, the different elements of identity of an ‘English Jew’ are incompatible, and one must overwhelm the other. Various campaigners take up this note: Jonas Hanway described the result as ‘as *unnatural a mixture* in the body *politic*, as *bread* and *arsenic* in the human body’.²⁷ With such rhetoric, the opposition shifted the terms of the debate from the letter of the Act to the broader and more emotive question of whether or not Jewish people were welcome in Britain at all.

Ministry writers engaged with these points by stressing the economic benefits of Jewish immigration. The propagandist ‘Philo-Patriae’ estimates non-naturalised Jews’ recent contributions to the economy as ‘upwards of *fifteen hundred Thousand Pounds*’.²⁸ A ‘True Believer’ sanguinely explained that only ‘the Rich and Opulent among them’ would immigrate as a result of the Act.²⁹ ‘A By-Stander’ thought that the Act would ‘give Encouragement to only a *Few Rich Jews* to come and settle among us’.³⁰ Underneath this veneer of tolerance and optimism, however, the ‘pro’ campaigners actually rely on similar ideas to those opposed, revealing a shared sense of Jewish people as enemies to be overcome. In these pamphlets, qualities such as charity and tolerance unexpectedly become means of erasing troubling Jewish difference.

As Philip Carteret Webb, the lobbyist for the Act, noted, Jewish people were often framed as *perpetui inimici* of the Church.³¹ A ‘True Believer’, also writing in favour, remarked that Jewish people were regarded as ‘the perpetual and invincible Enemies of the Christian Faith’.³² The trope of Jews-as-*inimici* occurs, in these supposedly tolerant pamphlets, surprisingly often. The idea is captured in a phrase which forms a keynote in the literature: the expression ‘Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Hereticks’. ‘Philanthropos’ ends a pamphlet with the fervent invocation of God’s mercy upon these groups—a mercy which will be manifest in their conversion.³³ The ‘True Believer’ also invokes the phrase, and Leonard Howard notes that ‘the Church has commanded us...to pray for the conversion of all *Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Hereticks*’.³⁴ The formulation is, of course, taken from the Third Solemn Collect of the Book of Common Prayer, adjuring Christians to pray for their enemies:

O merciful God, who hast made all Men, and hatest Nothing that thou hast made, nor wouldest the Death of a Sinner, but rather that he should be converted and live; have Mercy upon all *Jews, Turks, Infidels* and *Hereticks*...³⁵

The recurrence of this verbal tag suggests that it was drummed into the vocabularies of Church-goers of this period. The formula reflects a proselytizing Christianity, which recognises Jews, Muslims, and free-thinkers as enemies – but which sees its superiority to them as constituted in the distinctively Christian ability to seize the moral high ground by wishing one’s foes well. Tolerance is thus a consciously wielded tool, predicated upon the ultimate convertibility of the enemy, whose inferior faith will be incorporated into the dominant belief system. The welcome implicit in the Naturalisation Act would absorb not just the ‘Riches’ of Jewish people, but also their very—distinctive and threatening—identities.

Indeed, ‘Philo-Patriae’, who wrote two tracts in favour of the Act, saw Jewish people as ‘Adversaries’, and thought that the Act’s purpose was ‘to bring *Jews* here...to attempt

their Conversion'.³⁶ He also sees Judaism as a precursor stage of Christianity, naturally ready to be 'improve[d], amplif[ied], and extend[ed]' into a more refined doctrine.³⁷ Nor is this the logic of an isolated crank: the inaptly named 'Unprejudiced Christian' saw the Act as 'communicating to the Indigent [Jews] the riches of Christianity', and suggested that naturalised Jews could be forced to attend sermons 'in order to their Conversion'.³⁸ Andrew Henderson believed that the Act offered a 'powerful Motive of soft perswasion, that in time they may embrace the Christian Religion'.³⁹ Most strikingly, Leonard Howard, writing for the ministry, opines that

The hatred of *one* supposed to be an *enemy*...was a *Jewish tenet and precept*; but the language of the Christian religion is quite different... The conversion of the *Jews* may be the consequence of this Bill, that the Christian religion may *spread* and *increase*...through *charity* and [a] *benevolent Spirit*...such conversion, with regard to posterity, might in time extirpate *Judaism* out of these kingdoms.⁴⁰

This is a 'tolerance' which unabashedly envisages the destruction of that which it tolerates. At bottom, Howard and other pro-Act writers agree with the opposition on the dangers of Jewishness. They simply see the incorporation implied by the Act as an effective way of containing these perils.

If we turn back to *Grandison* with such rhetoric in mind, the awkwardness around Solomon Merceda's foreignness and Jewishness seems not adventitious, but topical. Sir Charles's uncharacteristic stumbling in his anti-duelling speech, where he breaks off in the midst of lamenting the inferiority of 'Heathens and Mahometans', recalls the language of the Collect. Read in light of the pamphlets, the obvious continuation of his sentence is 'Jews'—and it is at this point that he stops, abruptly and in confusion. It is this element which he cannot politely identify, as he pointedly remarks, *in this company*. Like the pro-Act pamphleteers, Sir Charles gallantly 'includes' Merceda's 'Laws', positioning them as ripe for development into English Christianity—whilst also noting firmly that they remain inferior, unable to rise to the doctrine of 'returning *good for evil*'. As in the imagination of the Collect and many of the pamphlets, it is this capacity which separates Sir Charles the Christian from Merceda the Jew: Judaism remains inferior to the 'nobler and more heroic doctrine' of Christianity (*Gr.*, 2: 264). The logic of such coercive inclusion and Protestant moral superiority is familiar from the discourse around the Act; Sir Charles's interaction with Merceda cannot be read as a generic Grandisonian gesture. It has a distinct political flavour.

In fact, Merceda's story throughout the novel follows the fate of naturalised Sephardic immigrants as figured by pro-Act commentators. Despite recognition of his foreignness and difference, Merceda is initially tentatively included, making one amongst the novel's band of

libertines, one of Sir Hargrave's 'three intimates'. As the novel progresses, however, his difference becomes more problematic; his conversion is urged, even by his fellow-libertines, in light of the exemplary Protestant tolerance of the hospitable Sir Charles: 'See what a Christian can do, Merceda. Will you remain a Jew, after this?' (*Gr.*, 2: 254). Like others in the novel, Merceda is represented as being overwhelmed by Sir Charles's Christian magnanimity: 'He has won me to his side. By the great God of Heaven...!' (*Gr.*, 2: 252). Unlike the novel's other converts to Sir Charles's goodness, however, a persistent unease remains around Merceda.

Agreeable to the narrative traced in the pamphlet literature, Merceda is overcome by 'unexceptionable goodness' and the superiority of Anglican doctrine, promising, along with the Catholic Bagenall, to '*turn over a new leaf*' (*Gr.*, 2: 287). Even so, his character as the novel's principal villain appears irredeemable. Merceda, who has used the English estate he has purchased (the house at Newbery) for nefarious purposes, and who has corrupted the English lower classes in the person of the suborned Wilson, proves stubborn. Whether his original conversion is insincere or simply inefficacious is unclear, but he continues to play the part of the 'greatest malefactor', leading the others astray, until his immorality leads to direct physical consequences in the ill-fated Abbeville episode in Volume 4. There, he is set upon by irate Christians, seriously wounded, and tries to convert again in exchange for his life: 'Merceda is in a still more dangerous way...His recovery is despaired of; and the poor wretch is continually offering up vows of penitence and reformation, if his life may be spared'. Interestingly, his injuries include attempted castration: 'he has, it seems, a wound in his thigh, which...but for his *valiant* struggles against the knife which gave the wound, was designed for a still greater mischief' (*Gr.*, 4: 443). Motifs of violent circumcision and castration were used in the discourse around the 'Jew Bill' to figure Jewish threats to the British body politic, and native retaliation.⁴¹ Just before the start of Volume 6, after having been believed 'pretty well recovered', Merceda unexpectedly worsens and 'die[s] miserably' (*Gr.*, 5: 665). After his death, he is periodically reinvoked, with insistent further references to the revolting nature of his death, which is 'all horror and despair', and represents the severest punishment of all the libertines' (*Gr.*, 6: 147; 7: 461). In case of any doubt as to how we should read Merceda, the index to the third edition (1754) firmly stamps his character as 'a Portuguese Jew' who remains 'the worst of the three intimates'.⁴² Here, Merceda's villainy and Jewishness are retrospectively understood as commensurate; his abject and painful conversion is not the beginning of acceptance and reformation, but a prelude to his total and

emphatic obliteration from the novel's community, which is ultimately comprised entirely of Christians of various denominations. The ideal society visible at the novel's close has been achieved in part through the negation of the threat which Merceda represents: his sting is drawn through his pitiful conversion and eventual 'extirpation'. This is a similar social vision to that found in the 'benevolent' Christianity of the discourse around the Act. When we consider that Merceda is Richardson's only Jewish character, and that he is an Iberian Jew at that, it becomes difficult to see these similarities in a novel of this year as coincidental: instead, I suggest that the politics of the Act is clearly played out in *Grandison*.

Of course, the Act's inclusive promise (however problematic) was short-lived. Although the controversy was fomented, it awakened real resentment, far more than the Act's sponsors had imagined possible.⁴³ Whether whipped up or spontaneous, popular indignation was dangerous mere months before an election. The correspondence of Philip Yorke (the son of the Act's sponsor, Lord Chancellor Hardwicke) reveals increasing realisation of the peril. In June 1753, Yorke's secretary Thomas Birch writes to his patron that

The Clamour against that Act is now evidently design'd to influence the Election next Year; & the Rage of the people is scarce governable. The Bishop of Norwich was insulted for having voted for it. . .the Boys at Ipswich in particular calling out to him for Circumcision, & a paper being fix'd up to one of the Churches, that the next Day being Saturday his Ldp would confirm the Jews, & the day following the Christians.⁴⁴

By August, Birch reports that the Archbishop of Canterbury is being heckled during service with cries of 'No Jews' and opines that 'the Affair is more serious than I at first thought it'.⁴⁵ It became increasingly 'serious' as the summer advanced, until the opposition won out. Never standing on principle where political gain was in question, in the autumn of 1753 the Pelham administration repealed the Act, Philip Yorke remarking with wry pragmatism that

The Domestick Politicks of this Summer will make but a contemptible figure in History, wch can record nothing else than the Art employed by Faction to swell a most inoffensive Bill into a national Grievance, & the Success wth wch the Weak & the Credulous have been deluded into the grossest of Absurdities. . .I see ye Common Council have instructed their Representatives to obtain a Repeal of the Jew Bill, & if such a Motion shd be made, It will be pretty difficult to withstand it. . .⁴⁶

The government, despite its use for Sephardic Jewish loans, would not risk votes. That year, Parliament was recalled early, and in November, the Act was repealed—many of those who had been in favour, like Richardson's friend Sir George Lyttelton, now making speeches against it, arguing that the 'present temper of the nation' required it to be given up.⁴⁷

The ‘Jew Bill’ controversy was thus a short-lived, if fiery, affair. *Grandison*’s participation in its language and assumptions is logical if we consider that the novel was being redrafted as the Act was passed and then repealed. Despite the similarities between the pamphlet literature and *Grandison*, however, the student of Richardson’s last novel may entertain an objection: the author had begun to print the novel (in February 1753) before the controversy seized the public imagination (later in the spring). In the following section, I suggest that Richardson would indeed have had time to revise his text after the spring, and that his interests and connections during this period provide further good reasons for thinking that he would be sufficiently interested in the Act to shape his text with it in mind.

IV) Richardson’s 1753 revisions of *Grandison*

Richardson’s concern for the well-treatment (or otherwise) of Jewish people did not begin in 1753: in 1742, he had published Defoe’s *Tour*, with added content about the massacre of the Jews of York in 1189, highlighting the anti-Jewish nature of the episode. Richardson’s extra material notes how the Jews were ‘the Objects of Envy and Hatred’ because of their success ‘in Traffick’, and how they were wrongly set upon; in an interesting parallel to Merceda, they offer to convert, but are ‘miserably slaughter’d’, by ‘worse than *Paganish Cruelty*’.⁴⁸ Richardson printed further editions, retaining this material, in 1748 and 1753. The Jewish Naturalisation Act, however, was of particular interest to him.

Richardson welcomed the Act as an expression of tolerance, recording his approbation in a series of letters to Elizabeth Carter. On June 12th, days after it became law, he sent her a new pamphlet which he describes as ‘a little paper’ and which, he implies, explains the Act and expresses his own opinion of it.⁴⁹ It is evident from Carter’s response that this opinion is positive, and in a minority: she thanks him for the pamphlet and notes that it has helped her to combat negative interpretations of the Act amongst her acquaintance.⁵⁰ However, as the summer progresses and senior Whig opinion turns against the legislation, so does Richardson’s. By mid-August, he is opining that the Act should be repealed on pragmatic grounds:

It must not be expected, that the clamours raised about the Jews’ Act, will subside until the next elections are over. The foolish, the absurd cry, will then be stilled. But, as the Jews get no great matter by this Act, methinks I would wish them to declare, that, seeing

it is likely to excite popular prejudices against them...they will humbly petition the legislature in the next session to repeal it.⁵¹

Richardson takes a similar line to Birch, Yorke, and other Whig insiders: the Act is desirable, but public opinion is too strong. Jewish attempts at incorporation have become, for Richardson, perverse catalysts of social unrest. Interestingly, in late August 1753, Richardson visited Oxfordshire—the part of the country where the debate raged most fiercely.⁵² This could only have confirmed his change of heart. It was during these months, when Richardson moved from interested support to reluctant condemnation, a period when the Act was clearly in his mind, that he was also in the midst of revising his draft novel.

No part of the manuscript of *The History of Sir Charles Grandison* remains to us, barring a tiny, scored fragment attached to a letter in the Forster Collection—and it is thus very difficult to reconstruct the exact process of redrafting and editing prior to formal publication.⁵³ Fortunately, for the purposes of this argument, given the textual parallels, it is only necessary to establish that Richardson was *able* to revise his text during the relevant timeframe of late spring and summer 1753. As Jocelyn Harris has meticulously detailed, the novel was written reluctantly, amidst the press of business of different kinds. Between 1749 and 1751, Richardson was gathering material from his correspondents to shape the embryonic work, exchanging ideas with many friends.⁵⁴ Work stalled periodically, but by February 1753, Richardson was running printed sheets off his press. By late April or early May 1753, he probably had Volume 1 in printed form, with Volume 2 appearing in proof in July.⁵⁵ During early August, printing was interrupted by the Irish piracy episode, during which Richardson's employees sold printed but unpublished sheets of the new novel to a Dublin bookseller.⁵⁶ As a result, Richardson arrested printing on 4th August, to prevent any further access; at that point he had the first six volumes in an early printed state. Significant changes were less likely, if not impossible, after this.

This does not mean, however, that the text was stable. Harris's study of the novel's composition notes that

The period of printing was...to extend from the nine months Richardson anticipated to a full year, and he used that time to circulate portions of the manuscript, single proof sheets and bundles of proofs that were probably sewn roughly into 'books', requesting correction and comment...[A]lthough there is plenty of evidence for the exchange of the work in various forms, there is little to show its actual effect. Much of the comment must however have been given orally.⁵⁷

Harris remarks on the difficulty of pinning down what was being revised when, and when we can say with certainty that the text was no longer being altered. She proposes that Richardson's requests for comment were driven by a need to decide the conclusion to the novel (still unwritten in spring 1753) and to pre-emptively gather material for the third edition, which Richardson characteristically had in view even before the publication of the first.⁵⁸ There is also, however, clear scope for the existing text of that *first* edition, which he was still compiling and revising, to have been touched by the pamphlet war that raged most fiercely between May and September of 1753.

In a letter sent in late November 1753, Lady Bradshaigh, who had not looked at the printed sheets run off in February, remarked that 'I find many alterations from the Manuscript' of the previous year—suggesting that Richardson did make a number of changes between the end of 1752 and publication at the end of '53.⁵⁹ Indeed, Richardson was soliciting revisions on manuscript *and* printed portions of the text throughout the spring of 1753. In March, he sends Thomas Edwards 'the last Volume'—this is presumably 'last' in the sense of 'latest', as the conclusion was not completed until later—requesting 'Blame or Correction'.⁶⁰ It is not certain whether the 'volume' is in manuscript or print, but the use of the term 'volume' suggests a set of printed sheets.

Revisions continued throughout the early summer. In mid-June, Richardson sent his friend Thomas Birch draft volumes of *Grandison* to read, and on June 27th, Birch was immersed in them.⁶¹ On July 7th, in the same letter containing a discussion of the 'incessant and increasing Clamours...agst. the Jews Bill', Birch mentions that Richardson had recently 'read to me his preface in print', and commented on having that week had sight of the marked-up manuscript of *Grandison*, 'much abridg'd'.⁶² In mid-July, Richardson sends two letters to female correspondents indicating that he was still revising: on July 15th, he teases Susanna Highmore about her lack of help in this process, and on the 20th, he tells Sarah Wescomb that she can have the first two volumes in published format in 'Two or Three Months'. At that point, Richardson had 'three Setts' of the first volume printed, although these seem to have been in flux, because in the meantime, he is sending her some 'first Shts.' which she must return to him 'because of the Private Marks in the Margin, which make them of particular Use to me'.⁶³ If the 'first Shts.' (certainly printed matter) contained 'Private Marks' which would later be 'of Use', this suggests that Richardson was making changes to the printed sheets of the early volumes he was circulating. As Harris points out, 'Richardson was of course in a uniquely favourable position to revise [his printed text] on the thoughts of

the moment', because of his ready access to the presses on which it was printed.⁶⁴ Merceda is first mentioned towards the end of Volume 1, and then appears along with Sir Hargrave's other rakish companions in early Volume 2. These mentions are brief in each case, mere clauses or one-sentence asides such as 'Mr. Merceda had a scheme on foot at the same time, which he was earnest to engage me in; but it was too shocking' (*Gr.*, 1: 172) or 'Mr. Merceda! I have heard of Mr Merceda' (*Gr.*, 2: 248). In fact, although Merceda is woven into various scenes throughout the novel, it is almost always the case that any mention of his particular wickedness or difference is parenthetical or at most a single, brief line, very occasionally a free-standing paragraph; so are the mentions of his eventual conversion and demise.⁶⁵ Richardson could easily have created the brief asides, which occur periodically through these early volumes, inflecting Merceda's character as uniquely virulent, 'the greatest malefactor'. These could even have been inserted as late as proof stage, as he is soliciting comments using proofs, and revising at proof stage was not unheard-of in this period.⁶⁶ The timescales of the novel's redrafting and printing thus permit Richardson time and opportunity for revision in light of the discourse around the Act, which was at its height in mid-summer 1753. The contention is further strengthened when we consider that two of the friends with whom he was discussing his draft-novel at this time, Thomas Birch and Thomas Edwards, connect Richardson to a circle of active Whigs lobbying for and defending the 'Jew Bill'.

Birch was a man who kept his finger on the pulse of 1750s politics. Spending much of the year at his country seat, Wrest Park, the Whig grandee Philip Yorke required regular updates on the metropolitan literary and political scene. This was Birch's job: as Yorke's secretary, for years he compiled weekly newsletters for his patron. This correspondence reveals Birch's function within the 'Jew Bill' controversy, as a hub for the Whig propaganda counter-offensive. He was closeted, for instance, with Yorke and with Yorke's other private secretary, Daniel Wray, on the day Salvador's memorandum was sent.⁶⁷ Birch helped manage the ministry's pamphleteers: he organised the efforts of Josiah Tucker, reading drafts of his two substantial pamphlets and seeing them through the press.⁶⁸ He kept abreast of all the material in the controversy, shrewdly attributing anonymous pamphlets.⁶⁹ He also attended the Parliamentary debates on the Bill, and reported back to Yorke, forming his patron's attitude to the legislation. He is a key orchestrator of the campaign—and it was during this period that Birch was seeing Richardson regularly, hearing him read from his novel and discussing with him the 'abridg'd' draft. For example, in May 1753, Birch attended Parliament at least four times, during the month when the Bill was being debated most hotly

and then passed.⁷⁰ Within a fortnight, Richardson had sent Birch the draft volumes. The following week, Birch attended a social gathering with Richardson and others, at least one of whom, Wray, was also involved in supporting the Act.⁷¹ Birch was very close to Wray, an acquaintance of Richardson's who had received gift-volumes of *Clarissa*, and he regularly saw George Lyttelton and Nicholas Hardinge, also both Parliamentarians and acquaintance of Richardson's who were involved with the Act. Especially given that, during this period, Richardson was printing for the Commons, and this was one of the hottest political questions of the summer, it is hard to believe that the 'Jew Bill' did not form a frequent topic of discussion in Richardson's social circle in these crucial months.

Thomas Edwards was involved in *Grandison* from the earliest stages, and continued to correspond with Richardson over it during spring 1753. He was also friendly with Birch and Daniel Wray—and with Philip Yorke, staying at Wrest Park in 1747, 1748, and 1753.⁷² Examining Edwards's correspondence during the period 1751-3, one finds that he was writing regularly to Wray, Birch, and Richardson, alternately consulting the latter on his forthcoming *Trial of the Letter Y* (1753) and soliciting updates on *Grandison*. As well as his literary labours, throughout 1753, Edwards was laying the ground for the '54 Whig campaign in his constituency, drinking 'bad Ale' with floating voters in an effort to wash the 'Old Interest' out of them.⁷³ Like Richardson, Edwards touted the Act's benefits to his acquaintance: in August, he is blithe about the local gentlemen-farmers' coming around, but by September, he is exerting himself so far as to accompany a wool-gatherer on a walk between Waddesdon and Aylesbury, to convince the man of his 'heresy' in criticising the Act. In the same letter, he describes himself as the '*Custos Rotulorum*' in the local 'paper war' over the law.⁷⁴ In the week that the Act was repealed, Edwards met Birch together with Wray and the ministry pamphleteer Tucker.⁷⁵ This again suggests that the Act must have been at the forefront of discussion in Richardson's circle. Additionally—although the evidence here is less clear—the friendship with Birch and Edwards intriguingly connects Richardson to a third key figure.

The Hon. Philip Yorke, who would become Viscount Royston and the second Earl of Hardwicke, was closely involved in the Act's passage. His father, the first Earl and Lord Chancellor, probably helped to draft the original Bill along with Webb, and discreetly masterminded the campaign which others ran in a more hands-on fashion.⁷⁶ Birch had been Yorke's tutor, and the men maintained a close relationship.⁷⁷ Yorke is mentioned only in passing in Eaves and Kimpel's standard biography of Richardson—where he is documented

taking part in early discussions about *Grandison*—but he and Richardson had many acquaintance in common: Speaker Onslow, Elizabeth Carter, Catherine Talbot, Hester Mulso, and others.⁷⁸ Richardson is a regular figure in Birch’s newsletters, both as a star in London’s literary firmament and as an acquaintance. For instance, Birch reports the October 1752 fire at Richardson’s as an item of personal interest, offering a detailed account nearly a page long, estimating the damage at £600, and noting the destruction of ‘the Journals of the House of Commons’.⁷⁹ Birch kept Yorke abreast of the progress of *Grandison* throughout 1752 and ’53.⁸⁰ His correspondence also suggests that during this period Yorke and Richardson were exchanging papers, with Birch acting as a conduit. On June 24th 1753, Yorke’s brother James wrote to Birch, demanding some papers and instructing that ‘if they are not to be found [in your Study] after y^c most carefull search...borrow them of Richardson, & send them down to Wrest’.⁸¹ A few days later, Yorke also wants a book; he says plaintively that

I should be glad if the 3^d Vol: of S^r T. Roe can be found any where. It is one of the best of them, & if It lies not deep in your Barathrum, It must have been returned to Richardson with the Sack of Papers.⁸²

Birch responds apologetically, explaining that he has searched fruitlessly for the ‘stray’d Volume of Sr. Tho. Roe’ and other material:

I have spoken to Mr. Richardson about it, who told me that he had not look’d upon any of the papers since they were return’d; but that when he is [at] leisure, he will examine them, &, if he shall find the Volume wanting, will send it to me.⁸³

At this remove, it is unclear what all the exchanged material is—barring the *Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe*, which Richardson had edited and printed in 1738-9—and why it is being sent. This is a grainy historical snapshot of an established relationship. As Richardson’s biographers note, calculating the extent of the printer’s intimacy with other men, especially professional acquaintance, can be difficult, as he did not think ‘business’ correspondence worth preserving, and also many of his interactions with such men were personal rather than epistolary and thus remain undocumented.⁸⁴ At this remove, responsible speculation as to the contents of the ‘Sacks of Papers’ is not possible, but what *is* clear is that Richardson is exchanging material with an important connection of the Pelham administration in the very month when the pamphlet war over the ‘Jew Bill’ was getting going, when he was deep in revisions of his draft novel—and also planning its conclusion and subsequent editions.

I thus suggest that in addition to the textual parallels between *Grandison* and the literature surrounding the Act, there is contextual evidence implying that both that the Jewish Naturalisation Act must have loomed large on Richardson’s political horizons during these

months, and that the author had opportunity to edit the earlier volumes of his half-printed novel with the events of the spring and summer in mind. In addition, however, there is also the novel's conclusion and index to be considered: places where, as mentioned, Merceda crops up again, and which were under revision and possibly even still being written during the autumn of 1753, when the Act was obviously doomed. In letters from October 1753, Richardson reflects with satisfaction that the pirates cannot have the final parts of the novel, indicating that he may still have been writing.⁸⁵ These volumes, revisited at a period when public opinion and governmental policy had condemned the Act, revert to Merceda, even though he had died in Volume 5. In Volume 6, when Merceda has been dead for over 150 pages in the modern Oxford World's Classics edition, we have Harriet's parenthetical remark, to the effect that Merceda's 'exit...was all horror and despair' (*Gr.*, 6: 147). Merceda is resurrected yet again in the penultimate letter in Volume 7, but the really interesting example comes from the index. Appended to the third edition—which, remarkably, was published only five days after the first—the index was compiled during late '53 and early '54, expressly to control interpretation of the text.⁸⁶ As mentioned above, this pinpoints Merceda's character as 'a Portuguese Jew' who is the 'worst of the three Intimates'.⁸⁷ Such a description, penned in the final weeks of 1753 or the beginning of 1754, by a man with an interest in the 'Jew Bill' and connections to Whig lobbyists, cannot *but* be read in the context of that debate.

V) Conclusion

The History of Sir Charles Grandison has been read as modelling the post-Jacobite Protestant nation in the 1750s, and often, too, as an unusual expression of tolerance towards Catholics. The novel's project of 'tolerance' is, however, even more topically political than has been recognised. *Grandison* emerges in this reading as a novel which is not merely post-Jacobite, but whose politics are specifically those of the period 1747-54—or even of 1753. Most obviously, this analysis helps us to recapture a context which must surely have felt immediate to *Grandison's* first readers: it is hard to imagine that the story of the conversion and convenient death of an Iberian Jewish gentleman would not have struck a chord. By the end of this 'tolerant' novel, Merceda has been restored to his expected position as a cultural bogey with which to frighten the unrepentant, returned to his place in the Collect's morally irredeemable quartet of infidel, heretic, Turk, and Jew. Although it is beyond the scope of this

essay to do more than hint at any wider ramifications of this reading, Merceda's disturbing fate may have other implications for how we think about *Grandison*.

Although Richardson's connections with Birch, Edwards, and Yorke are hardly original revelations, it is worthwhile, given his allegedly Tory politics, to pause on his dealings with the Whig supporters of the 'Jew Bill': in some sense, the Merceda subplot offers materials for a 'Whig reading' of the novel. Such a reading highlights the tricky cultural politics of tolerance, which emerges not so much as a principle of right, but as a strategy for enforcing social and cultural cohesion. By focusing on Merceda's treatment, we can see that tolerance is not only a mode for dealing with Italian Catholics. The novel's understanding of religious difference is sometimes misconstrued as a neat split between native Anglicans and continental Catholics, but this line is, in reality, blurred: the English Bagenhall declares himself a '*Roman Catholic*' (*Gr.*, 2: 266), and the novel includes the semi-marginalised O-Haras, Methodist converts. Sir Charles Grandison negotiates these different faiths—recusants and enthusiasts included. They are all kept in moral awe, subordinated through the hero's domineering magnanimity, which is a deliberate policy resulting in the predominance of Sir Charles's brand of Anglicanism. Sir Charles is, of course, in many respects framed as 'an unimpeachable Whig patriot', and his ambiguous tolerance of Merceda may be part of this identity.⁸⁸

Just pages before Harriet's recapitulation of Merceda's terrible end, Sir Charles makes a speech *against* 'diversity of religions', opining that were he king, he would permit variety—but *not* gladly. Instead, he would convert the heterodox through the 'excellence' of his own faultless example (*Gr.*, 6: 141). For his fellow-Christians, this strategy is effective in neutralising any political dissent: 'the surface tolerance of the novel... masks an intolerant elimination of internal distinctions in the service of... a single nation and a single religion'.⁸⁹ For Merceda, his implicit moral waywardness is too great, and even as a convert, he cannot be allowed to live on in Protestant English society. This disruptiveness is inseparable from his identity as 'a Portuguese Jew', but, looked at another way, his 'extirpation' is a variation on the fate of awed silence met by so many of Sir Charles's moral enemies. Merceda's character is, in some sense, the result of a political flash in the pan during a few months in 1753—but also another example of the novel's simultaneous accommodation of and shying away from religious difference.

¹ SR to Alexis Claude Clairaut, 5 July 1753, in *Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson*, ed. John Carroll (Oxford, 1965), 238.

² See, amongst others, Margaret Anne Doody, 'Richardson's Politics', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 2 (1990), 113-26; Ewha Chung, *Samuel Richardson's New Nation: Paragons of the Domestic Sphere and 'Native' Virtue* (New York, 1998); Teri Doerksen, 'Sir Charles Grandison: The Anglican family and the admirable Roman Catholic', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 15 (2003), 539-58; Patricia Brückmann, "'Men, women, and Poles": Samuel Richardson and the romance of a Stuart princess', *Eighteenth-Century Life* 27 (2003), 31-52; Patrick Mello, "'Piety and Popishness": Tolerance and the epistolary reaction to Richardson's *Sir Charles Grandison*', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 25 (2013), 511-531.

³ Doody, 'Richardson's politics', 123.

⁴ Richardson's thoughts on the Act are referred to briefly by Doerksen (545) and Mello (516), amongst others, but no critic to my knowledge explores these hints.

⁵ In *Clarissa*, Priscilla Partington's keeper is evidently Jewish, but never appears to the reader; and in the continuation of *Pamela*, a character dresses up as a rabbi for a masquerade, but neither has a speaking part (and one is presumably not actually Jewish).

⁶ Samuel Richardson, *The History of Sir Charles Grandison* (1753-4), ed. and intro. Jocelyn Harris (Oxford, 1986), 1: 173-4. Hereafter cited parenthetically within the text as 'Gr.'.

⁷ Thomas W. Perry, *Public Opinions, Propaganda, and Politics in Eighteenth-Century England: A Study of the Jew Bill of 1753* (Cambridge, MA, 1962), 5-6. Perry's remains the only book-length study of the Act.

⁸ 'Philo-Patriae', *Considerations on the Bill to Permit Persons Professing the Jewish Religion to be Naturalized by Parliament...* (London, 1753), 17; 'Orthodox Member of the Church of England' [Leonard Howard], *An Earnest and Serious Address to the Freeholders and Electors of Great-Britain...* (London, 1753), 30; *The Other Side of the Question. Being a Collection of What Hath Yet Appeared in Defence of the Late Act, in Favour of the Jews* (London, 1753), ivⁿ.

⁹ Cf. Todd Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England*, rev. ed. (Ann Arbor, MI, 1999), 166-191.

¹⁰ Frank Felsenstein, *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes: A Paradigm of Otherness in English Popular Culture, 1660-1830* (Baltimore, MD, 1995), 205; Endelman, *Jews of Georgian England*, 120-121, 132-3, 171-2.

-
- ¹¹ Perry, *Public Opinion, Propaganda, and Politics*, 7.
- ¹² Dana Rabin, 'The Jew Bill of 1753: Masculinity, virility, and the nation', *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 39 (2006), 157-171: 159.
- ¹³ Josiah Child, *A New Discourse of Trade...* (London, 1694), 140-144.
- ¹⁴ There are reprints of Child's *Discourse* in 1718, 1745, 1751, and 1775. Amongst others, 'Philo-Patriae' addresses Child's points in *Further Considerations* (London, 1753), 19-22.
- ¹⁵ Perry, *Public Opinion, Propaganda, and Politics*, 15-18, 34-6.
- ¹⁶ 'Philo-Patriae', *Considerations*, 23-4.
- ¹⁷ E.g., *Seasonable Observations on the Naturalization Bill, Now Depending in Parliament...* (London, 1748); *Further Reasons for Including the Jews in the General Naturalization Bill* (London, 1751).
- ¹⁸ Joseph Salvador to the Duke of Newcastle, January 14th [1753], London, British Literary, Additional 33053.
- ¹⁹ See Rabin, 'Masculinity, virility, and the nation', 160-163; as an example, 'Archaicus' imagines naturalised Jewish people crucifying Christian children in *Admonitions from Scripture and History, from Religion and Common Prudence, Relating to the Jews* (London, 1753), 24.
- ²⁰ *Journals of the House of Commons*, May 7th 1753, 809.
- ²¹ Oxford to the Earl of Hardwicke, July 3rd 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 35592, 93^f.
- ²² See, for example, the letter from 'Old England' in the *London Evening Post* for 24th May 1753.
- ²³ The Act included a clause preventing disposal of Church livings by Jewish landowners. See 'A Gentleman of Lincoln's Inn' [Philip Carteret Webb], *The Question, Whether a Jew, Born Within the British Dominions, Was, before the Making the Late Act of Parliament, a Person Capable, by Law, to Purchase and Hold Lands...* (London, 1753), esp. 40-41.
- ²⁴ 'Britannia', *An Appeal to the Throne against the Naturalization of the Jewish Nation...* (London, 1753), 12, 21-2.
- ²⁵ 'Archaicus', *Admonitions*, 26.
- ²⁶ [William Romaine], *An Answer to a Pamphlet, Entitled, Considerations on the Bill to Permit Persons Professing the Jewish Religion to Be Naturalized...* (London, 1753), 60.
- ²⁷ [Jonas Hanway], *Letters Admonitory and Argumentative, from J—s H—y...* (London, 1753), 22.

-
- ²⁸ ‘Philo-Patriae’, *Considerations*, 20.
- ²⁹ ‘True Believer’, *An Apology for the Naturalization of the Jews* (London, 1753), 20-21.
- ³⁰ ‘A By-Stander’, *A True State of the Case concerning the Good or Evil which the Bill for the Naturalization of the Jews May Bring...* (London, 1753), 8.
- ³¹ [Webb], *The Question*, 6.
- ³² ‘True Believer’, *Apology*, [1].
- ³³ ‘Philanthropos’, *A Letter to a Friend in the Country, on the Subject of the Jew Bill* (London, [1753]), 28.
- ³⁴ ‘True Believer’, *Apology*, 22; [Howard], *Earnest and Serious Address*, 11.
- ³⁵ *Book of Common Prayer* (rev. ed. 1751), the collects for Good Friday, [n. p.].
- ³⁶ ‘Philo-Patriae’, *Considerations*, 15, 7.
- ³⁷ ‘Philo-Patriae’, *Further Considerations*, 3.
- ³⁸ ‘Unprejudiced Christian’, *Apology for the Jews...* (London, 1753), 33, 43.
- ³⁹ ‘A Christian’ [Andrew Henderson], *The Case of the Jews Considered...* (London, 1753), [14].
- ⁴⁰ [Howard], *Earnest and Serious Address*, 15-25.
- ⁴¹ Rabin, ‘Masculinity, virility, and the nation’, 160-161.
- ⁴² Richardson, *The History of Sir Charles Grandison...*^{3rd} ed. 7 vols (London, 1754), 7: 392.
- ⁴³ Historians of the Act disagree as to whether the reaction was manufactured for electioneering purposes. Perry believes it to have been *faux*-outrage, but Rabin suggests that there was a ‘tremendous popular furor’ (see Chapter 6 of Perry, *Public Opinion, Propaganda, and Politics*, 72-122; Rabin, ‘Masculinity, virility, and the nation’, 157).
- ⁴⁴ Thomas Birch to Philip Yorke, June 23rd 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 35398, 120^r.
- ⁴⁵ Birch to Yorke, August 11th 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 145^{r-v}.
- ⁴⁶ Yorke to Birch, Oct 4th 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 168^{r-v}.
- ⁴⁷ Lady Bradshaigh to Richardson, Oct 14th 1753, London, National Art Library, Forster Collection XI, 33^r. Cf. Lord Lyttelton, ‘Speech on the repeal of the act called the Jew Bill, in the year 1753’, in *The Works* (London, 1775), 541-4. The original speech was made on November 23rd (Perry, *Public Opinion, Propaganda, and Politics*, 156).

⁴⁸ [Daniel Defoe], *A Tour Thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain...* (1724-7), rev. ed., 4 vols (London, 1742), 3: 152-5. Contrast the original three-volume edition's rendering of the incident (3: 153-160). Eaves and Kimpel note this expansion as significant of Richardson's views on Jewish people (T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson: A Biography* (Oxford, 1971), 549-552).

⁴⁹ SR to Elizabeth Carter, June 12th 1753, reprinted in *The Monthly Magazine* 228: 33 (1812), 538.

⁵⁰ Carter to SR, June 22nd 1753, in *The Monthly Magazine*, 539.

⁵¹ SR to Carter, August 17th 1753, in *The Monthly Magazine*, 540.

⁵² Perry *Public Opinion, Propaganda, and Politics*, 95-100. SR to Edwards, September 19th 1753, London, National Art Library, Forster Collection XII, 86^f.

⁵³ See Edwards to Richardson, June 24th 1752, London, National Art Library, Forster Collection XII, 52^{r-v}.

⁵⁴ For a thorough account of the consultation involved in writing *Grandison*, see Jocelyn Harris's doctoral thesis, 'Sir Charles Grandison and the little senate: The relation between Samuel Richardson's correspondence and his last novel' (University of London, 1968). See also Harris's introduction to the Oxford World's Classics version for the main points of the printing history.

⁵⁵ Harris, 'Grandison and the little senate', 437.

⁵⁶ See Kathryn Temple, 'Printing like a postcolonialist: The Irish piracy of *Sir Charles Grandison*', *Novel* 33 (2000), 157-174, as well, of course, as Richardson's discussions of the incident: *The Case of Samuel Richardson, of London, Printer...* (London, 1753) and *An Address to the Public...* (London, 1754).

⁵⁷ Harris, 'Grandison and the little senate', 203.

⁵⁸ For insertions into the final volume, see Jocelyn Harris, 'The reviser observed: The last volume of *Sir Charles Grandison*', *Studies in Bibliography* 29 (1976), 1-31: 5. For early planned revisions to the third edition, see Harris, 'Introduction', xi.

⁵⁹ Harris quotes Lady Bradshaigh as saying in early 1753 that she did not want to 'peep' at the printed sheets ('Grandison and the little senate', 204). Lady Bradshaigh to Richardson, Nov 27th 1753, London, National Art Library, Forster Collection XI, 43^r. Richardson confirms that 'you must find many Alterations in the Print from that Part of the Work you saw in Manuscript' (Richardson to Lady Bradshaigh, Dec 8th 1753, London, National Art Library, Forster Collection XI, 49^{r-v}).

⁶⁰ Richardson to Edwards, March 7th 1753, London, National Art Library, Forster Collection XII, 75^r.

⁶¹ Birch's diary, June 27th 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 4478C, 233^v.

⁶² Birch to Yorke, July 7th 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 35398, 129^v.

⁶³ Richardson to Susanna Highmore, July 15th 1753, in *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, ed. Anna Laetitia Barbauld, 6 vols (London, 1804), 2: 287. Richardson to Sarah Wescomb, July 20th 1753, London, National Art Library, Forster Collection XIV, 93^f.

⁶⁴ Harris, 'Introduction', xi.

⁶⁵ Most mentions of Merceda are derogatory (of the approximately dozen mentions, about 9 might be considered to paint him as worse than the others). Several of these mentions are very short (5-8 words), most about two lines on the modern printed page (c. 30 words) and the longest a brief, free-standing paragraph of around 60 words.

⁶⁶ See, e.g., Bruce Redford's comments on Boswell's editorial process in *Designing the Life of Johnson* (Oxford, 2002), especially Chapter One. I am grateful to Jocelyn Harris for this source.

⁶⁷ Birch's diary, Jan 14th 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 4478C, 224^{f-v}.

⁶⁸ Tucker to Birch, Aug 23rd 1756, London, British Literary, Additional 4291, 154^f.

⁶⁹ E.g., Birch to Yorke Sept 15th 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 35398, 160r-162v; Birch to Yorke Oct 13th 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 35398, 172v-173r.

⁷⁰ Birch's diary, various entries for May 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 4478C 229^f-232^f. The Hardwicke Marriage Act was also being debated at this time, and it is likely that Birch was attending as a general monitor.

⁷¹ Birch's diary, July 13th 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 4478C, 234^f.

⁷² Thomas Edwards to Yorke, Oct 11th 1747, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 1011, 22-5; Edwards to <illegible>, Nov 19th 1748, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 1011, 61-3; Edwards to Daniel Wray, Aug 1st 1753, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 1012, 111.

⁷³ Edwards to Daniel Wray, April 4th 1753, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 1012, 90.

⁷⁴ Edwards to Wray, Aug 1st 1753, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley MSS 1012, 111; Edwards to William Hillier, Sept 19th 1753, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 1012, 122-3.

⁷⁵ Birch's diary, Nov 29th 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 4478C, 240^f.

-
- ⁷⁶ For the suggestion that Hardwicke helped to pen the Act, see Felsenstein, *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes*, 207. Perry notes Hardwicke's behind-the-scenes correspondence with his son (e.g., *Public Opinion, Propaganda, and Politics*, 133). Hardwicke père was, of course, also the Attorney General responsible for the prosecution of the *True Briton* episode of the early 1720s (Eaves and Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson*, 34).
- ⁷⁷ Gunther, *Thomas Birch*, viii.
- ⁷⁸ Eaves and Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson*, 369-370.
- ⁷⁹ Birch to Yorke, Oct 7th 1752, London, British Literary, Additional 35398, 102^r.
- ⁸⁰ See, e.g., letters from Birch to Yorke in London, British Literary, Additional 35398 on Nov 18th 1752 (113^v), July 7th 1753 (129^v), Aug 25th 1753 (152^v), and Sept 29th 1753 (166^r), *inter alia*.
- ⁸¹ James Yorke to Birch, June 24th 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 35398, 122^r.
- ⁸² Yorke to Birch, June 28th 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 35398, 124^r.
- ⁸³ Birch to Yorke, June 30th 1753, London, British Literary, Additional 35398, 126^r.
- ⁸⁴ Eaves and Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson*, 161.
- ⁸⁵ SR to Lady Bradshaigh, Oct 5th 1753, FC MS XI, 30^v.
- ⁸⁶ Jocelyn Harris, 'Learning and genius in *Sir Charles Grandison*', in R. F. Brissenden and J. C. Eade (eds) *Studies in the Eighteenth Century IV* (Canberra: Australian National University, 1979), 187; Harris, 'Reviser observed', 2.
- ⁸⁷ Richardson, *The History of Sir Charles Grandison* (3rd ed.), 7 vols (London: 1754), 7: 392.
- ⁸⁸ Doody, 'Richardson's politics', 123.
- ⁸⁹ Doerksen, 'The Anglican family', 544.