With this issue, the Blake Newsletter concludes its first year of publication. The response from Blake scholars has been generous and enthusiastic, and we thank our many contributors and correspondents for their support, something it has been impossible to do adequately in individual correspondence.

Our only serious problem at the moment is, paradoxically, the success of the Newsletter. We produced 120 copies of #3 and found that this was about the limit that our resources of time, energy and assistance will allow. If most of our original subscribers re-subscribe, and if new subscriptions continue to come in at the present rate, we will soon reach a point where we can no longer fill new orders. The alternative to this would be to find some institutional support which would allow us to have the physical production of the Newsletter done professionally, along with perhaps the mailing and addressing of copies. The point to be emphasized is that we can continue as at present for an indefinite time, but we cannot continue to grow without changing our present arrangements for publication and distribution. We do not in any event plan to alter the informal nature of the Newsletter.

Most subscriptions to the Newsletter expire with this issue. If you have received Numbers 1-4 and wish to receive Numbers 5-8, please remember to resubscribe. Extensive tally-keeping and reminder-sending would seriously interfere with work on our June issue, which is scheduled for June 15. We once more welcome contributions of news, notes, queries, and discussion items. The deadline for submissions is June 1.

The June issue will include a checklist of recent articles on Blake, including reviews. If you know of any that are likely to escape us, please let us know.
It is a piece of good fortune that the long missing letter of Blake to Hayley (16 July 1804) which found its way into the hands of Goodspeed of Boston recently did then find its way into the generous hands of Frederick W. Hilles, who at once gave the full text to the world in the Autumn 1967 Yale Review (pages 85-89). To top that generosity, Professor Hilles sent, with offprint, a xerox copy of the letter.

Collation turns up two flaws in the transcript. In the 13th line of the letter, as printed, "from" should read "fears", thus: Mr P was at Brighton with Mr Hoare - fears that so good" etc. In the 11th line from the end the ampersand (&) should be an etcetera (&c), thus: "I will again read Clarissa &c [end of line] They must be admirable [space] I was too hasty in my perusal of them to perceive all their beauty." Professor Hilles responds: "You are so right about fears . . . . As to 'Clarissa &c!, you may be right . . . . the curve above the line . . . doesn't look like a c but . . . ." With either reading, Blake's "they" could refer, as Hilles in the Yale Review suggests, to the letters in the Richardson Correspondence—or to that book's six volumes. But "Clarissa &c" must mean: The novels must be better than I supposed.
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