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Introduction

Text, Writer, Reader, World

This reprinting of the Third Edition of Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa* is a significant event. The text is extremely rare, and few modern readers of *Clarissa* are familiar with it. In North America it is particularly hard to find. The National Union Catalog lists only two copies in the Western Hemisphere (at the Yale Beinecke Library and at the University of Vancouver) although there are others: the copy the author presented to Mrs. David Garrick is in the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library, and a copy apparently owned by Mirabeau while he was a member of the Constituent Assembly is at the University of Kentucky and was loaned to AMS Press for this reprinting. Not only does the Third Edition present the most complete text of *Clarissa*, but its unique apparatus and graphic devices have not been printed as part of the novel since 1751. These striking and unusual characteristics now make the Third Edition the reference of choice for serious scholars working on *Clarissa*.

This reprinting of the Third Edition of *Clarissa* is part of a larger enterprise. No text of importance exists truly by itself,
within a vacuum. The text carries with it its own history of reading and response. For this reason, the eight volumes of the Third Edition of *Clarissa* will be followed by another eight volumes containing, first, all the various materials Richardson himself published about his novel—materials which include early versions of prefaces and postscripts, extended character descriptions, formal responses to early criticism, even complete books. These eight later volumes will also contain responses of the novel's readers over the last 250 years, responses which take the form not only of essays but also of poems, songs, and illustrations. Since its inception in the mid-eighteenth century, *Clarissa* has been the center of a continuing dialogue between author and reader. The Third Edition of *Clarissa* is now reprinted in the context of the two and a half centuries of discourse the novel has generated. In this presentation of *Clarissa*, then, one may read not only a central work of eighteenth-century Europe in its best textual presentation but also the history of that work's reception. One may perceive shifting patterns of response to the novel's various issues, the changing values and attitudes not only of literary criticism but also of the culture that criticism and novel both reflect and seek to shape.

As in a play, where the script is a field for interaction between actors and audience, so *Clarissa*'s "Dramatic Narrative" (VIII, 280) became a field for interaction between author and reader, and as some playwrights hope performance will emotionally affect and change the way audiences deal with the world, so Richardson hoped to affect and change readers of *Clarissa*. Indeed, the Third Edition of *Clarissa* is remarkable because it graphically presents the novel's text as a field for dialogue between author and reader, between reader and world. The Third Edition may be viewed as the climax of a sustained imaginative effort of seven or eight years. That imaginative work had a dynamic of its own, involving an intimate engagement between writer and readers that is reflected and presented in the text of the Third Edition.

It has become a cliché to say that the real work of writing is rewriting, that the best writers quickly write a first draft, have it read by others to see whether the writing is effective, and then rewrite, revise, reshape on the basis of their readers' reactions. Samuel Richardson is a writer whose works fully exemplify this process and its effects. The first draft of *Pamela* was written in a two-month burst (November-December 1739). The novel was read aloud as it was being written since members of Richardson's family would come to see him at night, asking to hear more of Pamela's adventures. When finished, the manuscript was sent to a few friends and then rewritten. Indeed, Richardson chose to revise *Pamela* for a year before he finally published it in November 1740; it was received with such extraordinary success that within a year and a half Richardson had rewritten the book six times for six new editions; he had also written a sequel, and revised that three times for three editions. By the summer of 1742, the three and a half years of imaginative work which went into writing *Pamela* reached a kind of closure with the publication of a handsomely printed and lavishly engraved octavo edition. (Yet at the end of his life, Richardson returned to *Pamela*, revising it again, over fifteen years after his first inspiration.)

While finishing his final revision of *Clarissa*, Richardson began writing *Sir Charles Grandison* (published 1753–54). As the Third and Fourth Editions of *Clarissa* came off his printing press in 1751, he was already reading aloud the beginning of his new work to the young men and women who had become part of the by-then-famous author's inner circle. A sketch by Susanna Highmore, drawn in May 1751, shows "Mr. Richardson reading the Ms. History of Sir Cha. Grandison at North End" to three young men and three young women, who sit attentively and reflectively, ready to respond. In a way, *Sir Charles Grandison* is a work written entirely in response to readers' reaction to Richardson's earlier novels, to reader demand. Admirers of the writer of *Pamela* and *Clarissa* urged him to give them a portrait of "a good man," and an extensive correspondence between author and readers charts the compositional process of the novel. For three and a half years, various versions of the manuscript were passed around, responded to, rewritten, reread, revised and published, then
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Richardson spent seven or eight years writing Clarissa, twice as much time as he spent in writing either of his other novels. The novel went through at least three major revisions before it was published, and the first two editions (1747-48, 1749) were in fact two further revisions of the work. The Third and Fourth Editions, published simultaneously in 1751 in, respectively, duodecimo and octavo forms, amount to a sixth major revision of the novel. These two editions differed only in price, the duodecimo Third being cheaper than the expensive octavo Fourth; otherwise, the text and apparatus of the Third and Fourth Editions are virtually the same. In 1759, Richardson published Clarissa again; this edition, which Richardson also called the “fourth edition” (it is the fourth time the novel appeared in duodecimo volumes), is a page-by-page reprint of the earlier Third Edition. Although significant changes were made in the apparatus of this 1759 edition of Clarissa, the actual text of the eight-volume novel remained unrevised and unchanged. Although Richardson revised both Pamela and Grandison before each of their different publications, Richardson did not revise Clarissa before this last publication of the novel in his lifetime. One may say, then, that the process of writing Clarissa stopped in 1751.

The 1759 edition establishes the primacy of the text of the Third Edition. It exactly duplicates the pagination of the Third Edition. While in the Second and Third Editions there may be on every page more than a dozen changes in spelling, capitalization, or punctuation, most pages of the 1759 edition have no changes whatsoever, either substantive or accidental. The 1759 edition contains only five changes in the novel’s epistolary text; it drops five paragraphs detailing the novel’s publication history from the Preface, and it omits the Collection of Sentiments from the eighth volume partly because the Collection had been published in a separate volume in 1755 (a note at the end of the 1759 edition refers the reader to that volume). As Shirley Van Marter, after collating the 1751 and 1759 editions, concludes: “The fact that there are literally no other additions, deletions, or alterations means that for all practical purposes Richardson’s work on Clarissa closed with the expanded edition of 1751."

The editors of almost all the twentieth-century editions of Clarissa have in fact agreed. The editors of the Shakespeare Head Edition of 1930, a limited edition formerly considered the standard but long out of print, said they had followed all the Third Edition’s “inconsistencies of spelling and punctuation...as faithfully as possible.” An Editorial Note to the Everyman’s Library edition of Clarissa repeats the claim of following the Third Edition while modernizing spelling and punctuation. But neither of these claims is true: neither of these versions follows the 1751 text. The Shakespeare Head and Everyman editions do not present the most salient feature of the Third Edition text—marginal bullets placed before each line of added material. Both of these modern reprints drop paragraphs in the Preface which discuss the novel’s publishing history, and neither edition presents us with the final “Collection of Sentiments.” In effect, the Shakespeare Head edition gives us the 1759 Clarissa. The Everyman edition, based, really, on Victorian editing principles, presents a modernized—and notoriously error-filled—version of the 1759 novel. While Richardson had the right to close the process of revision and consider the text of Clarissa finished, for us great interest lies in a text which displays the process of its composition, which opens authorial intention as an area for study. This is why serious scholars of Richardson today prefer to use and read the Third Edition.

We do not know where or when Richardson got the idea for Clarissa, when he began writing the novel, or exactly when he finished the first draft. Since he was engaged in the writing of Pamela till the summer of 1742, it is not likely that he began writing his next work before then. But in June 1744, the poet Edward Young wrote a letter to Richardson defending the tragic ending against “Your critics.” A month later, Richardson’s close friend, the dramatist Aaron Hill, wrote: “I have, again and again, re-perused and reflected on that good and beautiful design I send you back the wide and arduous plan of. It is impossible, after the
wonders you have shewn in Pamela, to question your infallible success in this new, natural, attempt. But you must give me leave to be astonished, when you tell me you have finished it already! It seems clear on the basis of epistolary evidence first brought together by Duncan Eaves and Ben Kimpel that the first draft of Clarissa not only was written in two years—from the summer of 1742 to the summer of 1744—but that by summer 1744 it was already being read and criticized by some of the author’s friends. On the basis of this reading and criticism, Richardson was revising his draft; to help him in rewriting the manuscript, he had drawn up a detailed summary of the novel, “a wide and arduous plan,” which, it is clear from Hill’s letter, he was also asking friends to read.

By January 1745, Hill was reading this first revision of Clarissa in a series of vellum volumes, interleaved with blank pages for his comment. The fact that Richardson had this version bound in vellum implies a rather careful state of revision. The vellum would have been used to protect from damage a serious manuscript—not his first thoughts, scribbled hurriedly on random sheets. Later that year, the volumes were being read by the Poet Laureate, Colley Cibber, and by Laetitia Pilkington, the poet and former friend of Swift, best known perhaps for her scandalous memoirs. Both of these readers were so caught up in the story that they urged the author to change the catastrophe; as Pilkington wrote, “Spare her virgin purity, dear Sir, spare it! Consider, if this wounds both Mr. Cibber and me (who neither of us set up for immaculate chastity) what must it do with those who possess that inestimable treasure?” By the end of 1745, however, Cibber had been so moved by Richardson’s story that he was writing passages (apparently at Richardson’s request) for the author to insert in Clarissa’s letters as she lay dying—as was Edward Young. Richardson told Young that he found Cibber’s suggestions too passionate to be used, and while Young’s suggestions were “admirable,” he felt they would be more appropriate at a later point in the novel, when Clarissa was even closer to death and when her spirit was more “above the world, and above [her] resentments.”

We have no way of knowing whether Young’s passages were used, of course, and Richardson’s comment could be seen as a nice way of putting someone off; indeed, he goes on to say that Young’s suggestions are “only . . . too exalted for the rest of the work, or they are entirely comformable to the frame I have designed she shall then be in.” In this early revision, Richardson was clearly rewriting with a vision of the whole, reworking passages to delineate an action through which characters changed and developed over time.

In January 1746, Richardson sent Hill “the First Part” of a thorough revision, “mostly new, or alter’d much from what you saw it before. I wish you may be able to read it, because of the Interlineations, &c.” He noted that “Several Persons have seen them in the Interim; not always with my Inclination: Yet I hoped to benefit by them more than I have. I have run them over since any Body saw them, and alter’d again. Being extremely, yet justly diffident. (But will shew them to no body after they have your Perusal; and, as I hope, Correction.)” Among the persons who had read and commented on the last version of the novel, besides Cibber, Pilkington, and Young, were George II’s chaplain, Dr. John Heylin, and his wife; the daughter of Richardson’s physician, Peggy Cheyne; and the surgeon John Freke and one of his friends. Richardson tells Hill that their reactions mattered since “Wherever my mind was upon the Balance, or doubtful, I have given it against myself.” Implying that Hill was the best of all these readers, Richardson invites him to read through the new revision and urges him to focus on a specific problem: “Length, is my principal Disgust, at present. Yet I have shorten’d much more than I have lengthen’d; altho’ it will not appear so by this first Parcel; having taken in a Month in Time. The fixing of Dates has been a Task to me. I am afraid I make the Writers do too much in the Time.” Richardson’s first revisions of Clarissa had apparently taken the form of elaborations of the text; in 1744, he had told Young that he was “apt to add three pages for one I take away.” But this third version of Clarissa—Richardson’s second revision—seems to have been notable for condensation; he stresses
how he has "shorten'd much more than [he has] lengthen'd." The
ultimate result of such contraction of the novel would be the
remarkable density of the opening installment, a density derived
from summarizing once complete letters and from "taking in a
Month in Time." In a later letter to Hill, Richardson described a
similar summarizing technique he used to shorten episodes show­
ing Clarissa and Lovelace alone together at Mrs. Sorlings's farm
and in London, noting also the necessity of revising yet again to
ensure the kind of emotional impact he wanted the situation to have
for a reader:

I . . . put many of the Repetitions of the same Facts, as
Lovelace, and as the Lady gave them, by way of Notes: And
alter'd them, they breaking in upon the Narration; and his
wicked Levity turning into a kind of unintended Ridicule half
the serious and melancholy Reflections, which she makes on
her Situation; So I alter'd them back: But yet, preserving only
those Places in his, where his Humour, and his Character are
shewn, and his Designs open'd, have put many others, into a
merely Narrative Form, referring for the Facts to her, &c. So
of some of hers, vice-versa. 18

At one time or other, Clarissa must have been much longer than
any version we have: all the letters merely summarized, para­
phrased or quoted by different characters or by the Editor in the
various printed editions of Clarissa seem to have been at some
time written out in full. Hill ultimately answered Richardson's
request for help in editing his manuscript and produced an
abridgment of the first few letters. To be printed in a later volume
of this series, Hill's abridgment provides fascinating hints as to
what early manuscript versions of Clarissa were like since Hill
told Richardson that "there was nothing in [his abridgment] but
what was literally your own—Except merely a connective Bit of a
Phrase here and there." 19 Among other things, we learn that at one
time Mr. Diggs, James Harlowe's surgeon, had written a letter
describing the swordfight with which the novel begins. By the
time of the publication of the First Edition, Mr. Diggs writes no

letter and practically disappears: his prognosis of James's recovery
is mentioned in a sentence in the second paragraph of Anna
Howe's opening letter.

By the fall of 1746, Richardson had prepared what he called a
"Compendium" of the novel, which had now been cleanly written
out in thirty vellum volumes. Like the earlier "wide and arduous
plan," this "Compendium" (apparently an early form of what later
came to be the Table of Contents, providing a summary of every
letter in the text) had been written out to help Richardson in
revising the novel yet again. He was still anxious to shorten the
text, and asked again for Hill's help. This was when Hill sent
Richardson his abridgment. Richardson was dismayed: he did not
like the cuts. 20 Yet as he began his third revision of Clarissa—
creating, indeed, a fourth manuscript version—he sent out the
manuscripts to new readers, for comment and advice. It was in the
fall of 1746 that Sophia Westcomb and her friend Ann Vander­
plank began to read the novel; by spring 1747, Westcomb had
finished it, reporting how soothing Clarissa's arguments in her
afflictions had been to her mother who was suffering with gout and
suggesting, at Richardson's urging, some cuts: for example,
Lovelace's imagined scheme to abduct and rape Anna Howe. 21

From 1742 to 1747, Clarissa had gone through three exten­
sive revisions and existed in four complete versions. In 1744,
1745, and 1746, Hill and Young expected soon to see a published
Clarissa in print; instead, each year they were asked to read and
comment upon a new manuscript revision. In 1747, Richardson
did begin to publish what was his fourth version of Clarissa. The
first printed edition of Clarissa—the successor to at least three
previous separate manuscript versions—was published in three
installments: the first two volumes came out in December 1747;
the second two volumes in April 1748, and the last three volumes
in December 1748. 22 Two weeks before the first installment
appeared, Richardson wrote to Young: "What contentions, what
disputes, have I involved myself in with my poor Clarissa, through
my own diffidence and want of a will! . . . Two volumes will
attend your commands, whenever you please to give me your
direction for sending them. Miss Lee [Young’s step-daughter] may venture . . . to read these two to you. But Lovelace afterwards is so vile a fellow, that if I publish any more I don’t know (so much have some hypercritics put me out of conceit with my work) whether she, of whose delicacy I have the highest opinion, can see it as from you or me.” Richardson’s reference to “contentions” and “disputes” brought on by “hypercritics” reveals a penalty of so much pre-publication reading—suddenly there were many people who felt authorized to shape the work and who could be unhappy with Richardson’s final decisions. Indeed, the reactions of some hypercritical readers have put the author “out of conceit” with his work. Thinking of the delicate Miss Lee, Richardson in a rare moment admits that Clarissa can be considered—apparently had been declared by some early readers—racy, sensational, controversial.

Concerns expressed in this letter to Young—anxiety about readers’ reactions and a reluctance to impose compositional authority—are repeated in the original Preface to the First Edition:

But yet the Editor . . . was so diffident in relation to this Article of Length, that he thought proper to submit the Letters to the Perusal of several judicious Friends; whose Opinion he desired of what might be best spared.

One Gentleman . . . advised him to give a Narrative Turn to the Letters; and to publish only what concerned the principal Heroine . . .

This Advice was not relished by other Gentlemen . . .

They were also of Opinion, That the Parts and Characters, which must be omitted, if this Advice were followed, were some of the most natural in the whole Collection . . .

Others, likewise gave their Opinions. But no Two being of the same Mind, as to the Parts which could be omitted, it was resolved to present to the World, the Two First Volumes, by way of Specimen; and to be determined with regard to the rest by the Reception those should meet with.

If that be favourable, Two others may soon follow; the whole Collection being ready for the Press: That is to say, if it be not found necessary to abstract or omit some of the Letters, in order to reduce the Bulk of the Whole. 24

This original Preface was never to appear again in Richardson’s lifetime; it was dropped entirely from the Second Edition, and a new Preface was written for the Third Edition. In this unique First Edition Preface, under the guise of an editor of a correspondence, Richardson tells a history of Clarissa’s composition. He gives Clarissa’s new audience an account of the manuscripts’ readers, and the book’s first readers are told that they are not in fact Clarissa’s first readers. The Preface explains that the book they are about to read has already had a history, has in fact been shaped by the reactions of earlier readers. Indeed, Richardson asserts that in this first publication of Clarissa, this sort of compositional process will continue. He says that “the whole Collection [is] ready for the press”—but that “whole Collection” is not an irremediably finished product, an inviolable set of pre-established volumes. The “Collection” can be reshaped, revised, adjusted, depending in part on his audience’s reactions; the Editor will “be determined with regard to the rest by the Reception [the first two volumes] should meet with.” In other words, Richardson states in his Preface what his writing practice over the years reveals: the text of a work under the author’s hand is in principle in flux, unfinished, open always to reshaping, refining, rewriting. Such instability is an essential feature of the text in process, and readers are partners in the shaping process of the text.

And as readers responded to the first installments of his novel, Richardson did continue to revise. After the second installment came out, he wrote to Hill: “I have so greatly alter’d the two last Volumes, that one half of the Sequel must be new written.” 25 In a Postscript appearing at the end of the last volume of the final installment, he took account of the “many Anonymous Letters” he had received during Clarissa’s publication. 26 In particular, he engages two issues raised by his first readers: the desire for a happy ending and criticism of the novel’s length. It is here, in fact, that
we can begin to study Richardson’s intentions as a force in the shaping of his book. All the manuscript versions of Clarissa—like those of Pamela and Sir Charles Grandison—are lost. But the initial publications of Clarissa (as well as Pamela and Grandison) were always continuations of the compositional process. Richardson’s revisions in print can be charted and observed; authorial intentions can thus be tracked and studied. Indeed, as we shall see, Richardson wished those intentions to be observed, and in the printing of the Third Edition, with the use of a variety of typographical devices, he created a clear record of the history of his revision of Clarissa. The Third Edition also records through its apparatus a variety of reader reactions to the novel. In sum, the publication of the Third Edition of Clarissa presents a nexus of writer, reader, text, and world.

The Second Edition of Clarissa was published in June 1749. Like the First, it was in seven volumes. Anticipating a demand for a new edition as he was publishing the final three volumes in December 1748, Richardson had printed twice as many copies of that last installment of his novel. The Second Edition thus consists of these last three volumes of the First Edition, prefixed by four newly revised volumes. One can say that the Second Edition is in fact a rewriting of the opening volumes of Clarissa, a revision of the first two of the novel’s original three installments. The revisions are extensive, including thousands of grammatical improvements and stylistic changes as well as new editorial footnotes, passages of newly written material, and letters restored from earlier manuscripts. The Second Edition is also notable for the first appearance of a lengthy Table of Contents; in this Table, each letter of the novel is summarized, and it adds about fifty pages at the beginning of the first volume of the Second Edition where it appears complete (in fact, as the Second Edition was published, the Table was also printed as a separate pamphlet). Probably inspired by the “wide and arduous plan” and “Compendium” Richardson had previously drawn up as aids in his revisions, the Table of Contents is in later editions of Clarissa divided up and the relevant sections placed at the end of each volume where the Table functions for readers as an aide-mémoire before they proceed to the next part of the text. The Table of Contents still functions well as a trot for Clarissa; it has the further interest of presenting, in its italicized sentences, a reading of the novel Richardson himself wished readers to recognize.

The pattern of revision begun in the Second Edition continued in the third and fourth printings of the novel, the duodecimo and octavo editions that appeared simultaneously in 1751. All the changes made in the first four volumes of the Second Edition are kept in the Third and Fourth Editions, but the 1751 texts introduce some new changes in those volumes while they contain for the first time in print changes Richardson made in the final segment of the novel. Richardson had completed this last revision and the Third Edition was in fact being printed in the summer of 1750—the date appears on the title page of every volume except the first—but final publication was delayed so the octavo Fourth Edition could appear at the same time. The Third Edition in eight volumes is one volume longer than the previous editions. In his revised and expanded Preface to the edition, Richardson explains why. The Preface is significant for narrating the history of the novel’s publication, as the Preface to the First Edition had indicated the history of the novel’s composition. The part of the Preface which retells the publication history begins:

It is proper to observe, with regard to the present Edition, that it has been thought fit to restore many Passages, and several Letters, which were omitted in the former merely for shortening-sake; and which some Friends to the Work thought equally necessary and entertaining. These are distinguished by Dots or inverted Full-points. And will be printed separately, in justice to the Purchasers of the former Editions.

Fault having been found, particularly by elderly Readers, and by some who have weak Eyes, with the Smallness of the Type, on which some Parts of the Three last Volumes were printed (which was done to bring the Work, that had extended to an undesirable Length, into as small a Compass
as possible) the present Edition is uniformly printed on the larger-sized Letter of the three made use of before. But the doing of this, together with the Additions above-mentioned, has unavoidably run the Seven volumes into Eight. 31 (I, ix-x)

The “Three last Volumes” had been printed only once before, in December 1748, when Richardson had crowded what should have been eight volumes into seven by a smaller type; as he had then told Aaron Hill, “Ashamed as I am of the Prolixity, I thought I owed the Public Eight Vols. in Quantity for the Price of Seven.” 32 One of Richardson’s goals in preparing the Third Edition was simply to improve the physical appearance of his book; that was a primary reason for issuing the book in the larger octavo version. To republish any book implies a market, implies demand; here, Richardson says he reprints precisely to accommodate readers’ demands for a better-looking book and, in the Fourth Edition, for a more expensive book. The luxurious octavo edition in seven volumes is proof that there was an up-market for Clarissa, and except for the second paragraph quoted above from the Preface (which was omitted as unnecessary in the octavo edition), the text of the octavo is the same as that of the cheaper Third Edition in eight duodecimo volumes, which was the basis for the 1759 printing of Clarissa, the last published in Richardson’s lifetime.

The consistently large type does not alone account for the extra volume of the Third Edition. The real reason the Third Edition is longer than either of the first two is that in it Richardson “restore[d] many Passages, and several Letters, which were omitted in the former merely for shortening-sake.” In the Preface to the First Edition, he had said he would shorten the text if the public seemed to demand it; now that Clarissa had become a popular and critical success—in its third printing in only three years—he would accede to the wishes of “Friends to the Work” and restore formerly cut passages, passages which readers—apparently of the earlier manuscript versions—“thought equally necessary and entertaining.” One friend to the work who had not been happy with the previous truncated versions was Samuel Johnson who told Richardson that “Though Clarissa wants no help from external Splendour I was glad to see her improved in her appearance but more glad to find that she was now got above all fears of prolixity, and confident enough of success, to supply whatever had been hitherto suppressed.” 33 Incorporating all the revisions and additions already made to the Second Edition, the Third Edition also contains over two hundred pages of added material: several whole letters, new scenes from eight to ten pages long, many new elaborative paragraphs, and several editorial footnotes. Richardson clearly thought that the additions were a selling point of the new editions: title pages to both the Third and Fourth Editions advertise the fact that “Many Passages and some Letters are restored from the Original Manuscripts.” And although Richardson asserts in his new Preface that he will print all the additional material “separately, for the sake of doing justice to the Purchasers of the former Editions,” fairness was only one aspect of what was also a shrewd marketing ploy: a sizable group of people who had already invested in either the First or Second Editions of Clarissa (an expensive novel at a guinea for seven volumes) would want their sets to be complete and were likely to buy a volume of additional material if it were made available to them.

Richardson published Letters and Passages Restored From the Original Manuscripts of the History of Clarissa in 1751, concurrently with his two new editions. This 315-page volume was carefully prepared. It contains all the apparatus found in the new editions except the summary Table of Contents—i.e., the new “Sonnet to the Author” by Thomas Edwards which opens the first volume, the new Preface, the expanded Postscript, the closing verses “To the Author of Clarissa” by John Duncombe, 34 as well as the extraordinary new “Collection of . . . Moral and Instructive Sentiments, Contained in the Preceding History.” This Collection of Sentiments, “presumed to be of General Use and Service,” Richardson also considered a selling point; it was advertised, along with the Table of Contents and the fact of passages restored, on the title page of the 1751 editions. With all the new apparatus, Letters and Passages Restored also contains all the major additions to the text. Each of these new passages is carefully keyed to
the volume and page in either the First or Second Edition where the material should appear. Although its list of added passages is incomplete, and although it does not record the numerous stylistic changes Richardson made in his text, the supplementary volume of *Letters and Passages Restored* usefully indicates the different patterns of revision in the Second and the Third Editions.

The additions to the Third Edition of *Clarissa* have generated controversy in our own day. Conducted for the most part in academic periodicals since the 1960s, the controversy has obscured the importance of the text of the Third Edition, which records and presents itself as a revised text. The salient characteristic of the 1751 editions of *Clarissa* is the presentation of the additional materials. As Richardson himself emphasizes in his Preface, "These [additions] are distinguished by Dots or inverted Full-points." That is, Richardson took the "Full-point," the piece of type which prints a period at the end of a sentence, and turned it upside down or "inverted" it to create a "Dot"—we would call it a "bullet"—which he then placed neatly in the margin next to each line of a new passage (see in this volume, for example, pages 298–309). In this way, all of the new passages compiled in *Letters and Passages Restored* are bulleted in the 1751 editions—as well as several others not included in that supplementary volume. In the Third Edition, added passages are bulleted if they are at least as long as a single line of type. By using this new typographic device, Richardson in effect records the history of his text's development—that is, one can see what was first published and what was added to later editions. Thus, Richardson presents his text as a piece of "writing to the moment," the result of a compositional process which people can, while reading the Third Edition, witness as if it were occurring before their eyes.

Richardson's assumed relation to his fiction—that of an editor to epistolary manuscripts—is not simply a pose. Central to Richardson's vision and activity as a literary artist is the truth that a writer is in essence an editor, that is a reader and re-writer, a reviser, of text. From its inception, *Clarissa,* like *Pamela* before and *Grandison* after, was the result of a rewriting or editing process, a process which did not stop but continued through the first publications. Since writing is, in its essence, a process of rewriting, a text can never be stable, fixed, or static unless a writer leaves it alone—and even then a text is only momentarily set aside since the living writer can always return. How many other passages could Richardson have restored from early manuscripts?

Though not singular in the eighteenth century (Pope and Thomson are also writers notable for revising new editions of their work in response to the reactions of their readers), Richardson's attitude toward writing and the literary text accords uncannily with our current theory of textual scholarship. According to this theory, editions should be prepared which present the literary work as a work in progress, as a text in process; we should be able to see the development, the changes in a text. If one assumes that a change is made for some reason, to produce some effect, we can thus deduce from the changes the writer's intention—indeed, authorial intention would be recorded as "a textual force." For some current schools of critical theory, of course, there is no such thing as an author's intention, or if there is, it is of little account. But a textual editor must confront a particular text, generated at a particular time, in a particular place, by a particular person. If editors can, they should open up for study the history of a text's creation, should display a text as it constituted itself in the process of writing. Such a "genetically edited" text would present, in a series of graphic marks, the process of development from draft through revision to publication. The result would be a "synoptically notated edition"; perhaps in our time the prime example of such an edition is Hans Walter Gabler's edition of Joyce's *Ulysses* (1984). I say, "in our time," for surely the 1751 editions of *Clarissa,* with their lines of revised and added material distinguished by marginal bullets, can be considered "genetically edited" texts, early versions of "synoptically notated editions."

The theory of textual scholarship has its fashions. Fredson Bowers and the bibliographic school dominant in the 1950s and 1960s felt that the best edition would recover the "initial purity" of a writer's text. According to this school, a work was corrupted by
revisions made after a text was greeted by an audience; thus, an editor should strive to reproduce the Edenic simplicity of an author’s “original intentions,” as revealed in the manuscript or first edition, before they had been complicated or contaminated by readers’ reactions. (Had Richard Sheridan followed this directive, *The Rivals* [1775] would never have been a hit). Within the context of this bibliographical theory, Mark Kinkead-Weekes wrote his influential article of 1959, “Clarissa Restored.” Using the published volume of *Letters and Passages Restored* as well as a handwritten list Richardson had prepared of the “most material” changes made in the Second Edition, Kinkead-Weekes argued that most changes were not “restorations from original manuscripts” but revisions designed to counteract misreadings of contemporaries; the cumulative effect of Richardson’s changes, he said, was to make crude a subtle and complex analysis of moral behavior. Kinkead-Weekes then called for republishing the text of the First Edition as revealing Richardson’s “real intention.” Kinkead-Weekes evidently did not know the history of *Clarissa’s* composition. Since we have lost all manuscript versions of the novel, we cannot recover Richardson’s “real intention”; indeed, since Richardson’s way of writing was to sketch a first draft and then mold it through revision after revision over nine years of sustained work, his “real intention” can have no simple textual meaning. Kinkead-Weekes also seems to have disregarded the textual nature of the Third Edition, if he ever saw a copy. Although he refers to the Third Edition in “Clarissa Restored?” his quotations are taken from the Shakespeare Head edition of the novel which does not include the marginal bullets before each line of added or restored text. Indeed, in “Clarissa Restored?” Kinkead-Weekes never mentions the bullets, “Dots, or inverted Full-points” used in the Third Edition to distinguish the added passages. Instead of calling for a reprint of the First Edition, he could have called for an edition of the text which would follow Richardson’s synoptic example, for such an edition would make every reader aware of the kinds of changes the author made in his text. Kinkead-Weekes eventually got his wish for a published First Edition; in 1985, Angus Ross edited *Clarissa* for Penguin-Viking, and presented us with the First Edition text.

Although spelling and punctuation were modernized, the Penguin *Clarissa* was a significant advance on what was available before; it presented readers with a text Richardson’s contemporaries actually read, and by being affordable and available, it helped displace from classrooms and bookstores various abridged versions of *Clarissa*. For those familiar with the Shakespeare Head or Everyman Editions of the novel, however, the simple truth was that the First Edition was less satisfying than later versions of *Clarissa*. Not only are parts of the novel missing, but what is there is remarkably different from what one knows. As Shirley Van Marter observes, First Edition purchasers of *Letters and Passages Restored* would have got the information they needed to speak intelligently about major new scenes and letters, but they would have had no idea of how thoroughly the author had reshaped his book. From the First to the Second Edition and then from the Second to the Third, there are literally thousands of small changes, one or two dozen per page, all of which are designed to heighten and intensify the language of the novel. A large part of these changes in wording are grammatical corrections, more specific modifiers, better pronoun reference, the spelling out of abbreviations and contractions, the making of vivid dialogue in the change of indirect to direct discourse—in general, improved prose. A well-programmed computer could print out all the stylistic changes of this type that Richardson made; his own system of Dots could not begin to indicate them all, so he did not even try. A complete synoptic edition would probably be unreadable (as the synoptically notated edition of *Ulysses* is), and a reading text would have to be presented on a facing page. Yet the editorial enterprise would be worthwhile since the changes are meaningful.

For example: one series of extensive changes has to do with names and formal and informal modes of address. The First Edition’s “Dr. Lewin” becomes consistently “Dr. Lewen” in the Second and Third Editions; Mrs. Smith’s servant “Sarah” becomes “Katherine.” About a hundred changes concern the way
Lovelace speaks of his family: Aunt Betty Lawrance becomes Lady Betty Lawrance, Aunt Sarah becomes Lady Sarah, "my uncle" becomes "Lord M." or "my Lordship." Such changes emphasize the social class of the characters rather than their family relationships; when the characters appear on the scene, the reader is more likely to think of them and their behavior as socially representative. In the First Edition, Lovelace often called Clarissa "Lady," hoping to seduce by flattering her vanity; Clarissa remarks to Anna, "Lady he calls me, at every word, perhaps in compliment to himself. As I endeavour to repeat his words with exactness, you'll be pleased, once for all, to excuse me for repeating This. I have no title to it. And I am sure I am too much mortify'd at present to take any pride in that, or any other of his compliments" (III, 94; Penguin 421). In the Second Edition, that paragraph is deleted, and Lovelace calls Clarissa "woman," "person," "sweet creature," "Fair-one," but not "Lady." The most obvious and systematic change of this sort is the consistent alteration in Clarissa's letters of "mamma" and "papa" to "Mother" and "Father." From the First to the Second Edition, Shirley Van Marter counted 305 such changes in Volume I alone—38 more from the Second to the Third. Discussing these alterations, she particularly regrets this change: "His heroine thereby lost a charming dimension that had helped to humanize her. This vivid sign of her own warm-hearted affection for her parents made their cruelty more poignant to watch." Perhaps. But I believe we witness two patterns of change in Richardson's revisions here. First, not all the "mamma" s and "papa" s are changed. When Clarissa writes about her parents to Anna Howe, she refers to them as "Mother" and "Father," but when she is talking with one of her parents, she uses—and reports—the more familiar "mamma" and "papa." Within the formality established as Clarissa uses "Mother" and "Father" in descriptive and reflective paragraphs, the terms "mamma" and "papa" in the dialogue become even more striking. Within the formal and normative context established by "Mother," there is more—not less—emotional impact as Clarissa veers from the even more formal "madam" to "mamma" in such a speech as this: "And for the sake of these views, for the sake of this plan of my Brother's, am I, Madam, to be given in Marriage to a man I never can endure!—O my dear Mamma, save me, save me, if you can, from this heavy evil!" (I, 118). Clarissa's conversations with her father are few; there is poignancy in her calling Uncle John Harlowe her "second papa" since she hardly ever calls her father "papa." This makes it all the more affecting when, in her delirium after the rape, she writes as her second "mad paper" an appeal to her father, an appeal which turns pathetically on her right to use the familiar term of address: "But . . . my Papa—Yes, I will call you Papa, and help yourself as you can—for you are my own dear Papa, whether you will or not—And tho' I am an unworthy child—yet I am your child—" (V, 304). Questions of possession and will, of affection, identity, and choice—questions at the heart of this novel in so many ways—are raised here. Precisely because reference to Mother and Father has been normative in the novel, the use of "mamma" and "papa" carries an emotional power; the emotional meaning of the familiar terms is recovered and generated within the formal context.

The change of "mamma" and "papa" to "Mother" and "Father" reflects another pattern of revision: Richardson's more extensive, but increasingly precise use of capitals and italics. In the First Edition, fewer words are capitalized or italicized than in the Second and Third Editions. In all editions, italics are used to graphically express vocal emphasis in dialogue; in the Second and Third Editions, they become also a device to emphasize meaning. Richardson's use of capitals in the later editions is subtle and has varying effects. He does not capitalize every noun, as some have asserted, but significant words are capitalized; they may be adjectives, as when Clarissa observes that after her Grandfather willed her his estate, her Father could not bear for her to be "Sole, . . . and Independent" (I, 74). Throughout the Second and Third Editions, "Mother" and "Father" as well as "Sister," "Brother," "Uncle," and "Grandfather" are all capitalized. The effect of the repetition of these capitalized words is to give the
characters of Clarissa’s family almost allegorical force: Mrs. Harlowe becomes everyone’s Mother, torn between demands of husband and child; the sibling rivalry generating conflict among Clarissa, Arabella, and James is like the fights we have with Sister and Brother; the patriarchal rage of Mr. Harlowe is what happens if we dare offend an archetypal Father. Before the action of the novel had begun, Clarissa is wont to reflect, the Harlowes seemed the perfect family, content and happy with one another; under the pressure of circumstance, the happy picture breaks to pieces, and some nightmare vision is realized instead. Richardson’s characters are both particular and exemplary; he is, perhaps, the first great modern psychologist of the family. By partially allegorizing the members of the Harlowe family, by capitalizing and making characters of the abstract nouns of relation, Richardson exposes and warns of potentialities within the dynamics of these relationships: our homes the scene, ourselves the actors here. Such stylistic revisions are true refinements, as words and capitals more precisely articulate emotional nuances between characters within the text and evoke more insinuating associations between reader, character, and event. 

One can say that the novel-text of Clarissa, the epistolary correspondence the Editor presents to us, is itself largely concerned with writing and reading. The writing and reading of each other’s letters is a central activity of the principal characters, and the problems of writing and reading are in fact commented on throughout the text. Thus, after reading Clarissa’s first letters, Anna Howe detects what she feels is an unconscious truth; engaging in some explication de texte, she quotes and analyzes Clarissa’s writing. She presents her reading by editing Clarissa’s text, rewriting Clarissa’s letter, quoting significant phrases (the italicized quotations not only present Anna’s reading but also indicate the pressure of a mocking speaking voice): “You are pleased to say, and upon your word too! That your regards (a mighty quaint word for affections) are not so much engaged, as some of your friends suppose, to another person. . . .—So much engaged!—How much, my dear?—Shall I infer? Some of your friends suppose a great deal. You seem to own a little” (I, 60). She urges Clarissa to examine her heart, to determine “the true springs and grounds of this your generosity to that happy man” and draws a conclusion: “It is my humble opinion, I tell you frankly, that on enquiry it will come out to be LOVE—Don’t start, my dear!” (I, 62). As the last phrase suggests, Anna’s own writing is a kinetic test; she has deliberately shaped a reading experience to call forth an emotional reaction. By reading Anna’s letter, Clarissa is to discover the state of her heart: “don’t you find at your heart somewhat unusual make it go throb, throb, throb, as you read just here?—If you do, don’t be ashamed to own it—it is your generosity, my Love! that’s all” (I, 62).

Anna’s writing does generate an emotional reaction in Clarissa: “You both nettled and alarmed me, my dearest Miss Howe, by the concluding part of your last. At first reading it, I did not think it necessary, said I to myself, to guard against a Critic, when I was writing to so dear a Friend” (I, 63). Writing may wound, criticism hurts, and defensively, Clarissa wonders first about the character and motives of the writer; on second thought, however, she turns her attention to herself as she tries to analyze her own emotional reaction and her earlier letter: “Let me enter into the close examination of myself which my beloved friend advises. I did so; and cannot own . . . any of the throbs you mention.—Upon my word I will repeat, I cannot. And yet the passages in my Letter upon which you are so humourously severe, lay me fairly open to your agreeable raillery. I own they do. And I cannot tell what turn my mind had taken to dictate so oddly to my pen” (I, 63). Clarissa the writer here acknowledges the possibility of unconscious intention, some “turn of mind” which opened up potential meanings in her prose not deliberately intended. But Anna-the-reader’s reactions lead Clarissa to revise, to try to state more clearly what she did intend: “But, pray—now—Is it saying so much, when one, who has no very particular regard to any man, says, There are some who are preferable to others? . . . Mr. Lovelace, for instance, I may be allowed to say, is a man to be preferred to Mr. Solmes; and that I do prefer him to that man: But,
Introducing, this may be said without its being a necessary consequence that I must be in Love with him. Indeed, I would not be in Love with him... for the world" (I, 63-64). Even rewriting, revision, restatement may not achieve desired effects, however; as Anna says, "Indeed, you would not be in Love with him for the world!—Your servant, my dear... But let me congratulate you, however, on your being the first of our Sex that ever I heard of who has been able to turn that Lion, Love, at her own pleasure, into a Lap-dog" (I, 66). One of the major puzzles of the book—the nature and depth of Clarissa's feelings for Lovelace—is raised within the context of another puzzle, the relationship of writing and reading, their interactive dynamics and their various intentions and effects.

One lesson of this early exchange—that one cannot discern a writer's intention on the basis of a reader's reaction—is emphasized later when Lovelace reads a number of Anna's letters to Clarissa. He makes a serious misjudgment about Clarissa which leads to terrible consequences: "It is the cruellest of fates," writes Lovelace, quoting from Anna's letter, "for a woman to be forced to have a man whom her heart despises.—That is what I wanted to be sure of.—I was afraid, that my Beloved was too conscious of her talents; of her superiority!—I was afraid that she indeed despised me—And I cannot bear to think she does... Let me perish, if I marry a woman who has given her most intimate friend reason to say, she despises me!" (IV, 186). Yet again, there are times when reading can lead one to an understanding of intention; after reading the letters Lovelace wrote to Belford, Clarissa ultimately understands him better. Such understanding may even lead to a discovery of one's own heart, as the Harlowes find when they eventually read the whole series of letters as edited by Anna and Belford.

Four specific places within the Third Edition open up the writer's intention, where writer engages reader in a direct way, unmediated by the novel-text. They are the newly revised Preface, wherein the novel is described and the printing history narrated; the new, expanded Postscript, "in which Several Objections that have been made, as well to the Catastrophe as to different Parts of the preceding History, are briefly considered"; several editorial footnotes, many of which were added to the Second Edition and retained in the Third; and finally, the passages of added material marked by dots or bullets. With this open presentation of his authorial intention, Richardson also prepared the Third Edition so that it would contain a record of reader reaction. The novel had generated a dialogue between writer and reader, the essential elements of which are presented in the Third Edition. The apparatus of the Third Edition—in particular, the poems to the author and the Collection of Sentiments as well as some passages in the Postscript—records a range of reactions to Clarissa which the writer acknowledges by incorporating them, making them part of the official presentation of the novel.

In the last paragraph of his new Preface, Richardson describes an audience of readers of different attitudes and responses to his novel and feels obliged, for a particular reason, to consider and respond to them:

Different persons, as might be expected, have been of different opinions, in relation to the conduct of the Heroine in particular Situations; and several worthy persons have objected to the general Catastrophe, and other parts of the History. Whatever is thought material of these shall be taken notice of by way of POSTSCRIPT, at the conclusion of the History; for this Work being addressed to the Public as a History of Life and Manners, those parts of it which are proposed to carry with them the force of an Example, ought to be as unobjectionable as is consistent with the design of the whole, and with human nature.

(I, xi)

Richardson feels called upon to respond to antagonistic and negative criticism of two particular aspects of his novel; he responds, in eighteenth-century critical terms, to questions of plot and character. Critics of the plot objected to "the general Catastrophe," that is, to the rape and death of Clarissa; critics of character questioned the heroine's "conduct... in particular Situations." Such criticism had to be confronted since the objections were rooted in ideological attitudes Richardson's novel questions. The
readers criticizing the heroine’s character seemed to believe that Clarissa herself was to blame for the catastrophe, for had she behaved otherwise at certain moments the catastrophe could have been avoided. On the other hand, readers who criticized the plot wished the good Clarissa to escape the humiliation and horror she experiences at the hands of Lovelace and the members of her family. The criticism of plot and character “might have been expected,” Richardson says, and certainly in the course of writing and rewriting his manuscript, he had met with those responses from his earliest readers. But since the book is meant to have an impact—since, he says, “parts . . . are proposed to carry with them the force of an Example”—he will discuss these reactions in his Postscript, after readers of the Third Edition have had their own experience of the work. There, he hopes to make his history “unobjeetable,” or at least to explain his conduct, by referring to psychological realism—“human nature”—and to his reason for writing the work at all, “the design of the whole,” or the concept of his work.

The rape and death of Clarissa were essential to Samuel Richardson’s original concept of his work; without this catastrophe, the author would never have written his novel at all. It was his intention to write a book with an unhappy ending. At times, in fact, he could sound like a Hollywood producer as when he acknowledged to Aaron Hill in January 1747 that “the Tragical . . . Catastrophe . . . cannot recommend it as to Sale, as a prosperous and rewarded Virtue could.”48 An audience wants a happy ending, then as now, and Clarissa would frustrate that desire. By publishing the First Edition in three parts, however, Richardson seems deliberately to have awakened that desire. After the publication of the second installment, he was besieged with letters from readers who begged him for a happy ending; among others, James Thomson, author of The Seasons, George Lyttleton, the man to whom Henry Fielding dedicated Tom Jones, and Fielding himself “became zealous Contender[s] for the Piece ending, as it is called, happily.”49 Richardson complained to Hill that the sale had “suffered by the Catastrophe’s being too much known and talked of . . . I had never . . . designed that the Catastrophe should be known before Publication; But one Friend and another got the Mss. out of my Hands; and some of them have indiscreetly, tho’ without any bad Intention, talked of it in all places.”50 But Richardson knew from experience how readers could react. In June 1745, Colley Cibber was reading the part of a manuscript that later became the second installment. When Cibber was told by Laetitia Pilkington, another early reader, that rape was imminent, “he lost all patience, threw down the book [one of Richardson’s vellum volumes], and vowed he would not read another line . . . “What! (said he) shall I, who have loved and revered the virtuous, the beautiful Clarissa . . . bear to stand a patient spectator of her ruin, her final destruction? No! . . . I cannot bear it!” When Pilkington told him Clarissa would die, Cibber said: “‘G-d d-n him, if she should; and that he should no longer believe Providence, or eternal Wisdom, or Goodness governed the world, if merit, innocence, and beauty were to be so destroyed.”51 Cibber did finish the novel, becoming in fact a great believer in its design, sending Richardson (apparently at his request) sample letters for Clarissa to write in the last part of the novel.52 And Cibber’s reading experience was not unique. During the novel’s first publication, many readers wrote to Richardson, pleading with him to provide his hero and heroine with a happy ending. One reader, like Cibber before her, told Richardson that she would refuse to read the last installment if the story were to end unhappily, that Richardson was cruel to inflict such pain on his interested readers. The author enticed her to read the last volumes, and she, like Cibber, came to admire the “Design.” Indeed, the letters that passed between Richardson and this reader, Lady Dorothy Bradshaigh, generated a lifelong friendship, an ideal but unusual relationship between an author and a reader.

Part of Richardson’s design, seemingly calculated by the novel’s original publication, appears to have been to awaken in his readers the great hope against hope that Cibber and Lady Bradshaigh experienced. The book somehow would not “work” unless readers had become so emotionally involved and so hopeful that
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they wanted to avert the aesthetically inevitable ending. One can argue that in writing letters begging for a happy ending, Clarissa's first readers were indeed acknowledging that it was not probable: why ask for a happy ending if one did not apprehend unhappiness to come? Speaking to the point in his original Postscript, Richardson in fact defended his conduct primarily by appealing to the text itself: "These Letters [in favor of a fortunate Ending] having been written on perusal of the first Four Volumes only, before the complicated adjustment of the several parts to one another could be seen, or fully known, it may be thought superfluous, now the whole Work is before the Public, to enter upon this argument, because it is presumed, that the Catastrophe necessarily follows the natural progress of the Story." Upon perhaps only this one point do later readers of Clarissa agree: all admire Richardson for not capitulating to the wishes of his contemporary audience and writing a happy ending to his story. Today no literary historian seriously argues that Clarissa would be a better book if it did not end tragically—but anyone undertaking a dramatization had better be prepared to face protests against the tragic ending from potential producers as well as to hear suggestions as to how the ending could be changed.

In both the original and the revised Postscript, Richardson spends much of his time defending the ending of Clarissa against readers who wished it to end happily. Near the end of his revised Postscript, he does note that he received "many Letters that have been written on the other side of the question, that is to say, in approbation of the Catastrophe" (VIII, 299)—but, on the basis of the Postscript, one could otherwise think that all the book's first readers wished for a happy ending. The Postscript, indeed, preserves for us this reaction to Richardson's novel. Richardson's defense against this reading involves him in a theoretical discussion of the merits of Tragedy, in which good people suffer, as opposed to Poetical Justice, in which the good are rewarded and the bad punished. His argument rests finally on the assertion that Tragedy better prepares us to cope with the world-as-it-is since in this world, bad things do happen to good people. Explaining how

Tragedy prepares us to live in the world, Richardson stresses again and again the significance of a reader's emotional response, emphatically endorsing Aristotle's notion of catharsis as interpreted by Rapin and Addison. Indeed, the design of Clarissa lay precisely in gaining certain emotional ends: "As the principal design of Tragedy is to raise commiseration and terror in the minds of the audience, we shall defeat this great end, if we always make Virtue and Innocence happy and successful" (VIII, 281). And again: "Terror and Commiseration leave a pleasing anguish in the mind, and fix the Audience in such a serious composure of thought, as is much more lasting and delightful, than any little transient Starts of Joy and Satisfaction" (VIII, 281). The value of such an emotional experience lies not only in its being corrective; the experience also softens and comforts the reader: "Such an example corrects the insolence of human nature, softens the mind of the beholder with sentiments of pity and compassion, comforts him under his own private affliction, and teaches him not to judge of mens [sic] virtues by their successes" (VIII, 283). "Tragedy . . . makes man modest, by representing the great masters of the earth humbled; and it makes him tender and merciful, by shewing him the strange accidents of life, and the unforeseen disgraces to which the most important persons are subject . . . It prepares and arms him against disgraces, by shewing them so frequent in the most considerable persons; and he will cease to fear extraordinary accidents, when he sees them happen to the highest part of Mankind. And still more efficacious, we may add, the example will be, when he sees them happen [sic] to the best" (VIII, 286). When Richardson spoke of the social impact of his work, hoping Clarissa might introduce a "Reformation of Manners," his hope rested on the fact that his work had emotional power and that a profound emotional experience of a work of art could indeed affect behavior. Richardson believed that art could effect change and took seriously his social responsibility as an artist. Richardson's design in writing Clarissa was not merely formalistic, did not entail only matters of plot and character. His aesthetic involved a kinetic principle and had a social aspect. The text was nothing if
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not read and experienced; in large part, the text was the reader's experience. But that experience had a particular shape because a writer created events which led to deliberately planned effects. The outcry against the tragic ending of *Clarissa* and the wish for poetic justice rested on the perception that Clarissa was good and deserved reward, not suffering. Sensitive to Clarissa's humiliation, Lady Bradshaigh protested against the unhappy ending. Her sister Elizabeth Echlin went so far in her endeavor to spare Clarissa the worst as to write an alternative ending in which Clarissa dies unviolated and Lovelace is reformed. Women in particular wished Richardson to find some way for Clarissa to live, and the wish had, as Richardson acknowledged, "the appearance of humanity and good-nature for its supports." But this "apparent humanity" evidently derived in Richardson's eyes from a wish of readers to deny what he presented as the necessary effects of the social dynamics exposed by the novel. It seems of the essence of Richardson's enterprise to expose a culture whose attitudes toward women were hostile and murderous.

A more insidious denial of the book's intended impact and tragic ending lay in an attack against the character of the heroine. Some readers, and particularly men, wished to think that Clarissa could have avoided being raped had she behaved differently to Lovelace, that in some way she brought her fate upon herself. Richardson knew that this reaction to the novel was possible. Even such a sympathetic reader of the early manuscript versions as Aaron Hill had been surprised to learn that Richardson fully intended Clarissa to be a cultural role model, "an Example to her sex." If Richardson wished to protest against the social myth that blamed the victim for the crime of rape, the character of Clarissa had to be faultless with regard to Lovelace. In the Second Edition, he made his defense by adding a series of editorial footnotes to the text, all of which are kept in the Third; expanding the First Edition's established practice of presenting an omniscient point of view, the new footnotes have been the focus of some recent controversy. Mark Kinkead-Weekes finds them obtrusive and heavy-handed; William Warner and Terry Castle find them instances of the author's determination to control readings of the text. And yet, at the crucial places in question—Clarissa's conversations with Lovelace at the St. Albans inn immediately after her abduction, and her later conversations with Lovelace at Mrs. Sorlings's farm and in London—Richardson made no substantive changes. Richardson had the chance to rewrite scenes, but he did not do so; he did not add or restore passages to the text of the controversial letters themselves. Instead, his footnotes draw the readers' "Attention... to what lies before them," and what lay before them in the Third Edition was essentially the same as in the First and the Second. There is no retreat on Clarissa's character. Richardson did not try to accommodate readers who criticized his heroine by making her character more stereotypically feminine and sweet. If anything, he emphasizes her intelligence, wit, and assertiveness, the very qualities for which Lovelace loves her. Indeed, one of the largest additions in the Third Edition is a whole new argument between Clarissa and Lovelace, one of the angriest (III, 131-141, 161-165), one which emphasizes Clarissa's willingness to stand up for herself. Richardson's footnotes remind a reader that at the point where they appear, divergent readings are possible—indeed, other readings are acknowledged: "Clarissa has been censured as behaving to Mr. Lovelace... with too much reserve, and even with haughtiness" (III, 14), "the lady has been particularly censured... as over-nice in her part of the above conversations" (IV, 106-107). Intruding upon the text; disrupting it, such footnotes, like a Brechtian alienation device, make readers attend more critically to what they read while at the same time they are forced to become more aware of what they
think about what they are reading. To be sure, the editorial footnote offers an editorial reading, but it also tells the reader about other possible readings. Indeed, one purpose of the footnote seems to be to record these various readings, if only to cast a doubt upon their appropriateness. While these footnotes say that careful reading is required, they also urge a reader to suspend judgment and entertain possibilities. 59

The character of Clarissa was not the only one to which readers were to pay careful attention. As the First Edition came out, many readers wished Lovelace to reform. It is not surprising that most of the changes in both the Second and Third editions—more than half of all the added material noted by bullets—appear in the third and fourth volumes of the novel, which record the two-month period when Clarissa and Lovelace are together, during which time Lovelace "tests" her character and attempts to seduce her. It is indeed a critical phase of the novel: will Clarissa be seduced, or will Lovelace be moved by her goodness and innocence to marry her? Despite his own moral sense, despite his real affection for Clarissa, Lovelace ultimately chooses to violate her brutally. In all editions Lovelace kills his conscience; in the Third, he dramatizes a debate with Love, which Love loses. It is a somber truth of Clarissa that love need not soothe the savage breast; the course of the novel denies a sentimental wish to believe that love can or must always change character for the better.

Richardson argued that Lovelace’s principles lead him to rape, and those principles are revealed in three crucial letters that remain the same in all editions of the novel (III, 71–89). Footnotes added in the Second Edition and retained in the Third draw a reader’s attention to these letters as they are about to be read, and footnotes which appear in later volumes refer readers back to the letters. Among some late twentieth-century critics, it has become a cliché to announce that additions to the novel emphasize Lovelace’s heartlessness. Some of these additions do so—for example, Lovelace’s letters arguing that human cruelty to animals evinces an essential cruelty in human nature (IV, 13–19). But concern with readers’ reactions to Lovelace dates back to responses to Richardson’s earliest manuscripts and seems to have caused his first revisions. In a letter to Aaron Hill (29 October 1746), Richardson recalled: “I once read to a young Lady Part of his Character, and then his End; and upon her pitying him, and wishing he had been rather made a Penitent, than to be killed, I made him still more and more odious, by his heighten’d Arrogance and Triumph, as well as by vile Actions, leaving only some Qualities in him, laudable enough to justify her [Clarissa’s] first liking.” 60 He rewrote to prevent a response to Lovelace as a handsome, dashing rake-hero, a stereotypical love-object. On the other hand, Lovelace was not to be simply hated and execrated. A balance was to be created in the character, a complex reaction was to be awakened in the reader. Although some of Richardson’s revisions reinforced qualities in Lovelace that readers wished to overlook, he never took away from the character’s brilliance, wit, or pointed social perceptiveness.

Richardson’s changes do emphasize Lovelace’s tendency to abuse power when he attains it. Among the added passages to the Third Edition is Lovelace’s scheme to abduct and rape Anna Howe and her mother (IV, 252–61). This letter seems a genuine restoration from the original manuscripts. In 1746, Sophia Westcomb had recommended the letter be cut if Richardson wanted to shorten his text, and in the First Edition, the editor summarizes the letter, saying it was not included “as he [Lovelace] does not intend to carry it into execution” (IV, 196; Penguin 671). For Shirley Van Marter and Angus Ross, 61 the addition, or rather, the reinstatement of the gang-rape plan constitutes a heavy-handed attempt to make Lovelace a more evil man. Other critics, however, have found this psychologically revealing letter to exhibit quite remarkably Lovelace’s ability to fantasize, his imagination, or, as the editorial summary in the First Edition puts it, “the wantonness of his invention.” Under the grim playfulness of fantasy, the letter shows Lovelace contemplating the possibility of rape, a possibility he had before abhorred. His fantasy of being brought to trial shows his recognition of what his society condones. It shows him realizing that if he were indeed to commit a rape, he would
probably be acquitted in a trial and be free from any social condemnation. Part of the business of Richardson's book is to convince the public to take more seriously the crime of rape, "a crime thought too lightly of," as Clarissa herself reflects (VII, 213). Lovelace's fantasy letter is not only a brilliant display of the narcissism of phallic power, but it is also a severe exposure of how his society really works; Lovelace is not simply an evil delinquent, but his society is a rape society, a society constructed in favor of rape and possession. For Lovelace's fantasy letter is prophetic: after the rape, the victimized Clarissa is the social outcast while the rapist Lovelace is socially accepted at Colonel Ambrose's ball. Lovelace's imagined abduction letter reminds the reader of his real capacity for violence; Lovelace did abduct Clarissa. It also shows Lovelace able to put the blame on the victim since society, he imagines, would blame Anna Howe and her mother both for enduring the rapes and for bringing such a charming man as himself to trial. He counts on society's perception of him as stereotypical love-object, handsome, dashing rake-hero. It is a sign of a major change in Lovelace's character that the day before he dies, he accepts complete responsibility for the tragic events of this last year of his life and acquits Clarissa of bringing the rape on herself.

Additions to the Third Edition of Clarissa do not consistently emphasize the darker side of Lovelace's character, however. Several show him capable of self-recrimination while others open new perceptions on the role of Mrs. Sinclair and her partners as accomplices in the crime. Indeed, in one respect Richardson refused from revision to revision to make Lovelace worse than he was. Responding again to the reactions of his readers, he notes in the Postscript that "some worthy and ingenious persons" thought "that if Lovelace had been drawn an Infidel or Scoffer, his Character, according to the Taste of the present worse than Sceptical Age, would have been more natural" (VIII, 291). Lovelace was to be a bad man, but not absolutely evil; at least, readers were not to be able to make the easy (and false) reflection that no Christian could do such things. Throughout the novel, Richardson shows the difference between faith professed and behavior practiced in an age less skeptical than hypocritical. In the case of Lovelace, Richardson hoped that his readers' emotional involvement could lead by reflection to self-discovery: "And this farther hint was meant to be given, by way of inference, that the man who allowed himself in those liberties either of speech or action, which Lovelace thought shameful, was so far a worse man than Lovelace. For this reason is he every-where made to treat jests on sacred things and subjects, even down to the Mythology of the Pagans, among Pagans, as undoubted marks of the ill-breeding of the jesters; obscene images and talk, as liberties too shameful for even Rakes to allow themselves in; and injustice to creditors, and in matters of Meum and Tuum, as what it was beneath him to be guilty of" (VIII, 292). Lovelace is a villain whose crime against humanity and affection cannot be too severely judged, but, as this list of Lovelace's virtues makes clear, he is not a man too bad to be true. Diabolism is not Richardson's subject but rather the social attitudes that can encourage a human being to act viciously. Here again, Richardson seems to hold with Aristotle that a reader's recognition of character is essential for the tragic effect.

Previous discussions of Richardson's revisions of Clarissa have tended to emphasize how the writer became increasingly insistent on his various intentions; they have not always asked why he was so insistent, blaming either the lack of sophistication of the novel's first readers or the naiveté of a writer who could think his intentions were at all relevant. Both views neglect the fact that Richardson treated his readers' reactions with real respect, believing that any intentions he hoped to realize depended in fact on those reactions; this is why in his Preface and Postscript to the Third Edition, he discusses his readers' reactions at length and with seriousness. In this regard, some of the most interesting changes in Clarissa are those he made in accordance with readers' desires, the changes he made to strengthen intentions he found affirmed by his audience's reactions.

One of these changes concerns revisions he made in the character of Charles Hickman. In the revised Postscript, Richard-
son observes: “Some have objected to the meekness, to the tameness, as they will have it to be, of the character of Mr. Hickman” (VIII, 292). He points out that the criticism is, in fact, somewhat simplistic and refers to passages in the text which reveal Hickman’s “spirit,” advising the reader of an epistolary novel not to accept any character’s characterization of another character without considering the correspondent’s own personality and point of view—in Hickman’s case, both Anna and Lovelace have ulterior motives in treating the man ludicrously. Richardson, however, ingeniously admits that the criticism is partially true as he explains his original intention in creating the character: “Nevertheless, it must be owned, that it was not proposed to draw Mr. Hickman, as the man of whom the Ladies in general were likely to be very fond . . . in his character it was designed to shew, that the same man could not be every-thing; and to intimate to Ladies, that in chusing companions for life, they should rather prefer the honest heart of a Hickman . . . that they should chuse, if they wished for durable happiness, for rectitude of mind, and not for speciousness of person or address” (VIII, 294). Hickman was not ever intended to be a cultural role model—he was not to be perceived as the foil of Lovelace—but he was created to help enforce the intention stated in Richardson’s original Preface, to warn readers against believing “that dangerous, but too commonly received Notion, ‘That a Reformed Rake makes the best Husband’” (First Edition, I, viii).

“However,” Richardson went on to say, “by way of accommodation” to his readers’ desire that Hickman be more of a foil to Lovelace, he had “inserted” “Two Letters” (II, 133–37) in the Third Edition, “which perhaps will give Mr. Hickman’s character some heightening with such Ladies, as love spirit in a man.” These two letters are true additions, distinctly not restorations. Yet Richardson was suspicious of his readers’ desire to see replicated in Hickman the culturally stereotyped idea of masculinity implied by the desire for “spirit” in a man—a desire even of “Ladies . . . who had rather suffer by it, than not meet with it.—Women, born to be controil’d! Stoop to the Forward and the Bold, Says Waller—And Lovelace too!” (VIII, 294). To get readers to question the cultural assumptions that lie behind the stereotyped gender roles projected in a culture’s art and literature was a major impulse behind the writing of Clarissa. The “masculine” attitudes of the spirited Lovelace ultimately lead to the rape of Clarissa. Richardson discusses this major concern of his novel only in this part of his Postscript, and in his revision of Hickman’s character, he both accommodated and criticized his readers’ desire for such an assertive masculinity. Compared to Lovelace’s masculine “spirit” which aggressively manifests itself in his attempt to possess, control, and dominate Clarissa by the act of rape, the newly added letters which show Hickman’s “spirit” release Anna Howe from an engagement he fears to be inhibiting and disagreeable to her. In standing up for himself, Hickman also would restore the woman he loves to an independence she senses she desires, revealing in his spirit of self-assertion a respect both for self and other. Among other things, one may see in this refinement of Hickman’s character a turning in Richardson’s mind to his next novelistic problem, the creation of a good man. In this regard, it is interesting to note that the ultimate test of Sir Charles Grandison’s moral character concerns his treatment of women, particularly of women who love him.

In describing the changes he made in Hickman’s character, Richardson takes us behind the scenes, as it were, allowing us to glimpse the kind of complex interactions that took place between writer and reader, intention and reaction, in the composition of Clarissa. He also reveals a hope to influence society by changing the attitudes and values of his individual readers and, consequently, their behavior. If women could be made to admire men who were less aggressive, rapacious, and tyrannical, and if they would then choose marriage partners accordingly, men would change and society would be improved. Richardson believed that writing could change attitudes and values, could change people, and so effect changes in society on the largest scale. Such a belief makes him a prototypical figure of the Enlightenment. Indeed, as an Enlightenment printer, he was trained to perceive himself as an
agent of change, disseminating ideas and information through his press. His profession would lead him to endorse Johnson's radical belief that it was a writer's duty to make the world better. But Richardson believed in no simple theory of didacticism. The reworking of *Clarissa*, based as it was on the author's intellectual engagement with his readers, shows how much Richardson valued discussion. The book itself presents a series of what we may call "thought experiments," through which readers may see what kinds of actions different values and choices lead to.

Part of the Third Edition of *Clarissa* consists of testimonials from readers that his novel had indeed made the world better. In the Preface, Richardson said:

An ingenious Gentleman having made a Collection of many of the Moral and Instructive Sentiments in this History, and presented it to the Editor, he thought the design and usefulness of the Work could not be more strikingly exhibited, than by inserting it (greatly enlarged) at the end of the last volume. (I,xi)

It is significant that Richardson says the "Collection of Sentiments," as it has come to be called, was in fact suggested by one of the book's first readers, a reader who had been so moved by *Clarissa*’s potential impact that he could abstract and categorize the observations he found within it. Richardson recognized within this reader's compilation a "striking exhibition" of "the design and usefulness of the Work"—which is to say, his own intentions in writing. And so, "greatly enlarged," it now appears at the end of *Clarissa*, as a kind of grand index to the novel, an index which alphabetically lists "The most Important Concerns of Private Life," which the History of Clarissa, according to the title page, "Comprehends." Indeed, if we read the Third Edition through to its end, after the experience of the narrative, the Collection of Sentiments forces us to use the story to reflect upon various aspects of our own lives. Under such headings as "Controil. Authority.," "Education.," "Friendship.," "Love.," various sentences from the novel are ranged for us to ponder and consider. Citing volume and page after each quoted passage, the index then returns a reader to the novel text where, as Richardson says in the Preface, the "Reflection, or Observation, is to be found, either wrought into the practice of the respective correspondents, or recommended by them as useful theory to the Youth of both Sexes" (I, xi). I. A. Richards once said that a book is a machine to think with. The Collection of Sentiments turns *Clarissa* into such a machine as it reminds readers again that the novel has presented characters with different opinions, values, and sentiments, which inform, which indeed determine, their behavior; the Collection encourages readers to think about these ideas, to discuss them, to consider how they may influence life.

The Collection of Sentiments appears only in the duodecimo and octavo editions of 1751; it does not appear in the 1759 edition. In 1755, Richardson had taken and enlarged it yet again, publishing the Collection from *Clarissa* with similar ones abstracted from *Pamela* and *Sir Charles Grandison* in a new volume called *A Collection of the Moral and Instructive Sentiments, Maxims, Cautions, and Reflections, Contained in the Histories of Pamela, Clarissa, and Sir Charles Grandison*. The 1759 edition of *Clarissa* notes the omission of the Collection and directs the reader to the 1755 volume, which Richardson occasionally referred to as "the Pith and Marrow of Nineteen Volumes" of his collected writing. The Collection of Sentiments is missing from all twentieth-century reprints of *Clarissa*, and only in this reprinting of the Third Edition can modern readers see again how the Collection exhibited the design and usefulness of the work. That exhibition is not a simple matter. Under "Reflections on Women," for example, the compiler of the Collection notes that the section is "Designed principally to incite Caution, and inspire Prudence, &c. by letting them know what Libertines and free Speakers say and think of the Sex" (VIII, 379). The sentences which follow, cited from letters and speeches of Antony Harlowe, James Harlowe, Jr., and Anna Howe as well as of Lovelace, present a remarkable list of anti-feminist sentiment from a wide cross-section of characters, showing the depth and range of cultural
stereotype that the novel challenges. Similarly, in the section entitled “Parents. Children,” the compiler records this sentence: “Harsh and cruel treatment humbles a Child, and makes her seem cheap in her own eyes, ii. 190”; he then adds in brackets, “Is she not then in the way to become the easy prey of a man whom otherwise she would have despised?” (VIII, 366). The section is there to illustrate one of the grand morals of Clarissa—“To caution Parents against the undue exercise of their natural authority over their Children” (Preface, I, viii)—but it also goes beyond the text in asking readers to consider the source of delinquent behavior in youth, our psychological need for love, and the desperate behavior such need may generate. The Collection of Sentiments thus urges readers to consider once again various issues raised by the novel. Ranging these issues in abstract categories, the Collection presents a variety of ideas and opinions about each of them; the Collection directs the reader’s attention to assumptions and doctrines that shape attitudes and influence behavior not only in the text but in one’s own life. As a whole, the Collection asks the reader to consider how thought and opinion affect human behavior.

In the Third Edition, Richardson begins and ends the novel-text of Clarissa with poems written in tribute to the author by two of Clarissa’s first readers. In the Renaissance, such poetic blurbs were printed not only in fictions but also in scholarly works. The two poems in Clarissa present what Richardson apparently felt to be the highest accolade he could be given. Both attest to the novel’s power to arouse the emotions and to influence social life for the better. The opening sonnet by Thomas Edwards is an apostrophe to Richardson: “O Master of the heart! whose magic skill/The close recesses of the Soul can find,/Can rouse, becalm, and terrify the mind,/Now melt with pity, now with anguish thrill.” According to Edwards, Richardson’s artistry lies not so much in psychological acuteness but in the power to move the reader: the Master of the heart opens the close recesses of the reader’s Soul. This extraordinary power has been used “to mend the Age,” “To lead our Youth to Good, and guard from Ill.”

Edwards ends his sonnet with the assertion that the compassion generated by Richardson’s tragedy is the great proof of his artistry: the “true tears” of “each honest heart” affected by Clarissa signify that “Nature... Owns and applauds the labors of thy pen” (I, ii).

The praise that Johnson gave Richardson in his introduction to Rambler 97—that it was written by the author “who taught the passions to move at the command of virtue”—is foreshadowed by John Duncombe in the verses “To the Author of Clarissa” which close the text of the Third Edition. Richardson was so pleased by Duncombe’s poem that he could ironically and self-deprecatingly say in a letter to Hester Mulso, “But think you, Madam, that a scribbler must not be vexed, to find that the events of seven tedious volumes are pathetically comprised in a copy of verses of one hundred lines?” The poem indeed rereads the novel, reimagining—reimagining—in verse, scenes particularly significant to the poet. The verses end with this reflection:

O if a Sage had thus on Attic plains
Improv’d at once and charm’d the list’ning swains;
Had he, with matchless energy of thought,
Great Truths like these in antient Athens taught;
On fam’d Ilyssus’ banks in Parian stone
His breathing Bust conspicuous would have shone;
Ev’n Plato, in Lyceum’s awful shade,
Th’instructive page with transport had survey’d;
And own’d its author to have well supply’d
The place his Laws· to Homer’s self deny’d.

(VIII, 302–3)

The lines may surprise us with their assertion that Richardson is greater than any of the ancients, but at the time the view was shared by a critic of such stature as Diderot who in his Eloge ranks the works of Richardson with those of Moses, Homer, Sophocles, and Euripides. The lines from Duncombe’s poem present an attitude toward art which seems to be particularly endorsed by the author-editor himself as he explains Duncombe’s allusion in a footnote:
By the Laws of Plato’s ideal Commonwealth, Homer was deny’d a place there, on account of the bad tendency of the morals he ascribes to his Gods and Heroes. “But (says the philosopher) as it is fitting that every degree of merit should have its proper reward, pour fragrant oil on the poet’s head, and crown him with a woollen wreath, and then banish him to some other city.” Plato de Repub. lib. 3. (VIII, 303)

In Book 10 of the Republic, Socrates reconsiders—and reaffirms—his belief that the artistic imagination must be controlled and narrowed or the artist should be expelled from the ideal city. Stressing again the extraordinary power of art, Socrates says—using an image a Clarissa would understand—that he must do “as people who were in love with somebody, if they believe their love to be no good to them: they don’t want to give it up, but they must.” Socrates regrets the necessity, and says “that if imitation and poetry made to please can give some good reason why she ought to be in a well-ordered city, we should be glad indeed to receive her back home, since we are quite conscious of her enchantment for us.” But these champions of literature must prove “that she is not only delightful but helpful for constitutions and human life.” It has been thought that Aristotle’s defense of “imitation” in the Poetics was in fact a response to this loophole in Socrates’ argument, that the therapeutic theory of katharsis indeed provides a way to keep art in the ideal state. At any rate, it is the Aristotelian argument Richardson uses to defend his artistic enterprise. In exciting our feelings, Clarissa purges them of the subjective and self-centered and enlarges our capacity for sympathy, joining emotion to an intellectual, to a social awareness. In the Postscript, Richardson cites Aristotle to defend the emotional and moral regeneration intended by the tragedy of Clarissa. The last word is that of a reader whose praise of Richardson’s artistic enterprise heralds a modern age, finer in its sympathetic inclusiveness than that of the Ancients.

The Third Edition presents Clarissa as a text informed by authorial intention and made significant by reader reaction. It seems appropriate, then, for this reprinting of the Third Edition to round out and continue the story recorded in that 1751 presentation of the novel. The eight volumes of the Third Edition are only the first half of the AMS Press Clarissa Project. The three following volumes contain all of Richardson’s published commentary on Clarissa, including the earlier versions of Preface, Postscript and other apparatus, material originally written for inclusion in the novel that was cut and never restored but gathered in a supplementary volume. Formal responses to early criticism, and two complete books, Letters and Passages Restored and the later Collection of Sentiments. The five last volumes of The Clarissa Project continue the Third Edition’s story of reader reaction to Clarissa as they present responses to the novel from the novel’s first publication to our own time. As Richardson imagined a community of readers, so succeeding volumes of The Clarissa Project have been compiled and are introduced by a community of Richardson scholars, friends to the work who have made the study of the writer and his novel’s an important part of their intellectual lives.

Reading through the criticism of Clarissa from the last two hundred and sixty years, one is impressed by the continuing vitality of the novel, the challenge and inspiration it has been to succeeding generations. More than most works of fiction, Clarissa has provoked continuing controversy and has elicited extreme reactions among its readers—not, perhaps, surprising for a text which treats in such direct and radically intimate ways such socially significant matters as property, marriage, gender roles, sexuality, family dynamics, death and dying. This reprint of the Third Edition of Clarissa as well as the complete Clarissa Project presents a compelling and significant story from our cultural history as the volumes here presented chronicle and record the continuing interaction of text, writer, reader, world.

Florian Stuber
New York, 1990
A Note on Errors in the Third Edition

There are three errors in the Third Edition. Anna Howe's letter of April 6 should be dated April 9 (II, 238). Two lines were omitted in the Postscript (VIII, 298), which should read as follows (the omitted lines are enclosed in brackets):

She was very early happy in the conversation-visit of her learned and worthy Dr. Lewen, and in her correspondencies, not with him only, but with other Divines mentioned in her last Will. Her Mother was, upon the whole, a good woman, who did credit to her birth and her fortune; [and was able to instruct her in her early youth: Her Father was not a free-living, or free-principled man:] and both delighted in her for those improvements and attainments, which gave her, and them in her, a distinction that caused it to be said, that when she was out of the family, it was considered but as a common family.

And finally, although Richardson noted in his Postscript that some readers had objected to the length of the opening scenes at Harlowe-Place, he chose to add to them. He had earlier complained to Aaron Hill that compressing the action at the beginning of his novel had made the fixing of dates a chore to him. In order to restore an extended scene to this section of Clarissa, he was forced to repeat the calendar day of Tuesday, March 21. That, and the slip of April 6 for April 9, are the only chronological errors made in the year Clarissa chronicles.

Notes

1. Unless otherwise noted, all quotations from Clarissa will be taken from the Third Edition, 8 vols (London, 1751), and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

2. In his Eloge, Diderot said that part of the excitement of reading Clarissa was to become engaged with the mind of Richardson.


4. Grandison was "virtually finished" in 1754, but a posthumous fourth edition, published in 1762, incorporates revisions Richardson made in the last year or so of his life. These changes were minor and substantially fewer than those made in editions of the early 1750s. On the compositional process of Grandison, see Jocelyn Harris's introductory material to her edition of the novel (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1972), her unpublished thesis "Sir Charles Grandison and the Little Senate: The relation between Samuel Richardson's correspondence and his last novel" (University of London, 1968), R. C. Pierson, "The Revisions of Richardson's Sir Charles Grandison," Studies in Bibliography, 21 (1968), 163--89, and the relevant section of Eaves and Kimpel's Biography, 365--418.

5. The text of the 1751 duodecimo and octavo editions is essentially identical except that a paragraph in the Preface of the
duodecimo edition is omitted from that of the octavo (quoted below) and two lines accidentally omitted from the Postscript of the duodecimo edition appear in the Postscript of the octavo edition which then goes on to repeat the error made in the duodecimo edition (see “A Note on Errors in the Third Edition,” following this Introduction). Because of its larger size, the octavo edition of 1751 is in seven volumes, but text is distributed differently from the seven-volume texts of the First and Second Editions. Because of the added material and larger-sized typeface, the Third Edition appears in eight duodecimo volumes, which page-for-page are reprinted in the eight duodecimo volumes of the 1759 edition. It is worth noting that by referring to his three novels as works in “Nineteen Volumes,” as he consistently did after 1754, Richardson thinks always of Clarissa in the eight-volume form of the Third Edition. See, e.g., his letters to Thomas Edwards, c. 1 Aug. 1755, and to Lady Echlin, 7 July 1755, qtd by Eaves and Kimpel, Biography, 421, as well as his letter to Lady Bradshaigh, 9 Oct. 1756, Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson, ed. John Carroll (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 329.

6. The first posthumous edition of Clarissa (1764) contains no significant changes. However, the editions of 1792 and 1810 both claim to incorporate “final corrections made by the author.” The authority for these claims is not at all clear, and some changes suspiciously seem to have been made to fit the fashions of the times.


8. The Editorial Note added to the 1968 reprint of the 1932 Everyman’s Library edition of Clarissa in 4 vols. (London: Dent), says that “in common with other reprints, this edition follows the 1751 text, omitting, however, the Author’s Preface, the verses ‘to the Author of Clarissa,’ and the ‘Collection of Sentiments’ ” (IV, 583).


10. Letter from Aaron Hill to Samuel Richardson, 24 July 1744, ibid.

11. Ibid., 416–28, elaborated in the Biography, 205–220. Eaves and Kimpel tell the story of Clarissa’s composition very well, but I am not so sure how well they read that story. I disagree with two of their interpretive conclusions: I do not think that Richardson’s effort to shorten the text was “largely in vain,” nor do I think that his stylistic revisions rob the text of the “freshness” which they consider to be the decidedly original quality of Richardson’s prose.


14. Ibid.


16. Ibid.

17. Letter to Edward Young, 1744, Selected Letters, 61.


20. Hill’s abridgment of the novel led to a quarrel. See Peter Sabor, “Publishing Richardson’s Correspondence: “The
Introduction


29. Regarding the Table of Contents, Richardson told Hill that it was meant to be “a Help to [readers’] Recollection, and to their Understanding of [Clarissa], in the Way I chose to have it understood in.” Letter to Aaron Hill, 12 July 1749, Selected Letters, 126.

30. Sale, 57.

31. The second of these two paragraphs was omitted in the Preface to the Fourth (octavo) Edition (London, 1751), I, vii. The paragraph appears only in the Third Edition.

32. Letter to Aaron Hill, 7 November 1748, Selected Letters, 99.

33. Letter to Samuel Richardson, 9 March 1951, qtd by Eaves and Kimpel, Biography, 315.

34. The verses appear anonymously in Richardson’s printed volumes. He identifies the authors by writing their names in the copy of the octavo edition he presented to Susan Highmore, now in the Yale Beinecke Library. Sale also identifies them, 57.


36. Those who find fault with Gabler’s edition of Ulysses do so because they share his editing theory and question whether Gabler indeed recorded all Joyce’s revisions.


38. Ibid., 170.


41. These are Van Marter’s conclusions as well.

42. For others, see the two articles by Shirley Van Marter. From my own study of the different editions, I believe she correctly identifies many patterns in Richardson’s revisions. However, her statistics are not always reliable, and I disagree with some of her interpretations.
43. We know from Richardson’s correspondence with Westcomb that before the First Edition “Belford” was called “Greenville.” See Eaves and Kimpel, “Composition of Clarissa,” 421.


45. Kinkead-Weekes doesn’t like this. See “Clarissa Restored?” 163.

46. Van Marter errs by saying so.

47. A full reading of Richardson’s many stylistic revisions will not be possible until there is a complete list of the thousands of changes he made from the First to the Second and Third Editions. We need a computerized variorum edition, which can generate such a list from its data base. Until such a variorum edition can be made, Shirley Van Marter’s reports on her own collation are a valuable start.

48. Eaves and Kimpel, “Composition of Clarissa,” 424. Cf. his letter to Hill of 10 May 1748, written after the publication of the second installment of the First Edition: “I find, Sir, by many Letters sent me, and by many Opinions given me, that some of the greater Vulgar, as well as the less, had rather it had had what they call, an Happy Ending. This will be of Prejudice to the Sale,” Selected Letters, 87.

49. So Richardson recalled in a letter to Johannes Stinstra, 2 June 1753, qtd by Eaves and Kimpel, Biography, 295. On 7 November 1748, just before the final installment of Clarissa came out, Richardson told Aaron Hill that Clarissa was a “Piece . . . of the Tragic Kind . . . But how have I suffered by this from the Cavils of some, from the Prayers of others, from the Intreaties of many more, to make what is called a Happy Ending!—Mr. Lyttleton, the late Mr. Thomson, Mr. Cibber, and Mr. Fielding, have been among these.” Selected Letters, 99.

50. Ibid., 86–87.


52. Considering the outrageous way Colley Cibber disowned and abandoned his daughter Charlotte Charke, I believe Cibber could have provided a model for Richardson’s portrayal of the Harlowe patriarchs.


54. There is, too, a theological aspect to the entire discussion of the Catastrophe of Clarissa. Colley Cibber asserted that the death of Clarissa would shake his faith in God: “he should no longer believe Providence, or eternal Wisdom, or Goodness governed the world, if merit, innocence, and beauty were to be so destroyed.” It is hard to believe in the existence of a wise and good God when faced with suffering in the world, but as Richardson reflects in his Postscript, such is the test of faith Christianity imposes: “what is the Poetical Justice so much contended for by some . . . but another sort of dispensation than that with which God, by Revelation, teaches us, He has thought fit to exercise mankind; whom placing here only in a state of probation, he hath so intermingled good and evil, as to necessitate us to look forward for a more equal dispensation of both” (VIII, 280). By a clever and paradoxical argument, Richardson accuses his critics of questioning the wisdom and goodness of Providence: “shall man,” he asks, “imagine, that he can make a better dispensation; and by calling it Poetical Justice, indirectly reflect on the Divine?” (VIII, 288). Although Richardson was aware of the theological implications of his literary management and, indeed, of literary criticism in his time, the emphasis in his Postscript falls on the Aristotelian defense of Tragedy, that is to say, on emotional and social effects of the literary art.
55. Lady Elizabeth Echlin, _An Alternative Ending to Richardson's "Clarissa,"_ ed Dimiter Daphinoff, Swiss Studies in English No. 107 (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1982). Her manuscript, bound with a pencil sketch of Richardson and a number of his letters to her, is in the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library in New York City.

56. See the similar arguments of Terry Eagleton, _The Rape of Clarissa_ (Minneapolis: U of Minn P, 1982).

57. I, 58, 64, 69, 71, 89, 90, 126b, 281, 287; II, 23–24, 27, 106, 157–58, 233, 242, 253, 276, 291, 305; III, 14, 24, 77, 79, 109, 119, 129, 131, 146, 153, 156, 240, 241a, 244, 314, 318, 332, 335; IV, 23, 24, 42, 77b, 106–7, 151b, 186, 334; V, 43. Most of these new notes provide simple cross-references, and they are not marked as additions in the Third Edition. The editorial note on II, 274, is marked as an addition, but it appeared in the First Edition.


59. The notes defending Clarissa's character and her behavior were added in the Second Edition and sustained in the Third; while other notes were added to the Third Edition (III, 252, 267; IV, 346; V, 14b, 72, 206; VI, 193; VII, 117, 225; VIII, 276), none of them concerns this issue.

60. _Selected Letters_, 73–74. He retold the story in a letter written to Lady Bradshaigh as the last volumes of the First Edition were being published: “I try'd his Character, as it was first drawn, and his last Exit, on a young Lady of Seventeen. She shewed me by her Tears at the latter that he was not very odious to her for his Vagaries and Inventions. I was surprized; and for fear such a Wretch should induce Pity, I threw into his Character some deeper Shades” (15 December 1748, _Selected Letters_, 113).


62. In letters to Thomas Edwards, c. 1 Aug. 1755, and to Lady Echlin, 7 July 1755, qtd by Eaves and Kimpel, _Biography_, 421.

63. Letter to Mulso, 13 July 1750, Barbauld, _Correspondence_, III, 161; qtd by Sale, 57.

64. “O Richardson, Richardson, homme unique à mes yeux, tu seras ma lecture dans tous les temps! Förcé par des besoins pressants, si mon ami tombe dans l'indigence, si la médiocrité de ma fortune ne suffit pas pour donner à mes enfants les soins nécessaires à leur éducation, je voudrais mes livres; mais tu me resteras, tu me resteras sur le même rayon avec Moïse, Homère, Euripide et Sophocle; et je vous lirai tour à tour.” “Éloge de Richardson,” _Oeuvres esthétiques_, ed. Paul Vernière (Paris: Garnier, 1959), 33.
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Letter XLIII.

MisClariissa Harlowe, To Mifs Howe.

Tuesday, March 21.

Would you not have thought, my dear Mifs Howe, as well as I, that my proposal must have been accepted: And that my Brother, by the last article of his unbrotherly Letter (where he threatens to go to Scotland if it should be hearkened to) was of opinion that it would.

For my part, after I had read the unkind Letter over and over, I concluded, upon the whole, that a Reconciliation upon terms so disadvantageous to myself, as hardly any other person in my case, I dare say, would have proposed, must be the result of this morning's conference. And in that belief I had begun to give myself new trouble in thinking (this difficulty over) how I should be able to pacify Lovelace on that part of my engagement, by which I undertook to break off all correspondence with him, unless my friends should be brought by the interposition of his powerful friends, and any offers they might make (which it was rather his part to suggest, than mine to intimate) to change their minds.

Thus was I employed, not very agreeably, you may believe, because of the vehemence of the tempests I had to conflict with; when breakfast-time approached, and my judges began to arrive.

And oh! how my heart fluttered on hearing the chariot of the one, and then of the other, rattle thro' the court-yard, and the hollow-founding footstep giving notice of each person's stepping out, to take his place on the awful bench which my fancy had formed for them and my other judges!

That, thought I, is my Aunt Hervey's! That my Uncle Harlowe's! Now comes my Uncle Antony! And my imagination made a fourth chariot for the odious Solmes, altho' it happened that he was not there.

And now, thought I, are they all assembled:

And now my Brother calls upon my Sister to make her report! Now the hard-hearted Bella interlaces her speech with invective! Now has the concluded her report! Now they debate upon it!—Now does my Brother flame! Now threaten to go to Scotland! Now is he chidden, and now soothed!

And then I ran thro' the whole conference in my imagination, forming speeches for this person and that, pro and con till all concluded, as I flattered myself, in an acceptance of my conditions, and in giving directions to have an instrument drawn to tie me up to my good behaviour: While I supposed all agreed to give Solmes a Wife every way more worthy of him, and with her the promise of my Grandfather's Estate, in case of my forfeiture, or dying unmarried, on the righteous condition he proposes to entitle himself to it with me.

And now, thought I, am I to be ordered down to recognize my own proposals. And how shall I look upon my awful judges? How shall I stand the questions of some, the fit surliness of others, the returning love of one or two? How shall I be affected!

Then I wept: Then I dried my eyes: Then I practiced at my glass for a look more cheerful than my heart.

And now [as anything stirred] is my Sister coming to declare the issue of all! Tears gushing again, my heart fluttering as a bird against its wires; drying my eyes again and again to no purpose.

And thus, my Nancy [Excuse the fanciful proximity] was I employed, and such were my thoughts and imaginations, when I found a very different result from the hopeful conference.
...For about Ten o'clock up came my Sister, with an air of cruel triumph, waving her hand with a light flourish—

Obedience without reserve is required of you, Clary. My Papa is justly incensed, that you should presume to dispute his will, and to make conditions with him. He knows what is best for you: And as you own matters are gone a great way between this hated Lovelace and you, they will believe nothing you say; except you will give the one only instance, that will put them out of doubt of the sincerity of your promises.

What, child, are you surprised?—Cannot you speak?—Then, it seems, you had expected a different issue, had you?—Strange that you could!—With all your acknowledgments and confessions, so creditable to your noted prudence!—I was indeed speechless for some time: My eyes were even fixed, and ceased to flow. But, upon the hard-hearted Bella's proceeding with her airs of insult, Indeed I was mistaken, said I; Indeed I was!—For in you, Bella, I expected, I hoped for, a Sister—

What! interrupted she, with all your mannerly fringes, and your defpising airs, did you expect, that I was capable of telling stories for you?—Did you think, that when I was asked my own opinion of the sincerity of your declarations, I could not tell them, how far matters had gone between you and your Fellow?—When the intention is to bend that stubborn will of yours to your duty, do you think I would deceive them?—Do you think I would encourage them to call you down, to contradict all that I should have invented in your favour?

Well, well, Bella; I am the last obliged to you; that's all. I was willing to think, that I had still a Brother and Sister. But I find I am mistaken.

Pretty Mopsey-eyed Saul! was her expression!—

And was it willing to think it had still a Brother and Sister? And why don't you go on, Clary? [mocking my half-weeping accent] I thought too I had a Father, and Mother, two Uncles, and an Aunt: But I am mis-taken, that's all—Come, Clary, say this, and it will in part be true, because you have thrown off their authority, and because you respect one vile wretch more than them all.

How have I deserved this at your hands, Sister?—But I will only say, I pity you.

And with that disdainful air too, Clary!—None of that bridled neck! None of your scornful pity, Girl!—I beseech you!

This sort of behaviour is natural to you, surely, Bella!—What new talents does it discover in you!—But proceed—If it be a pleasure to you, proceed; Bella. And since I must not pity you, I will pity myself: For nobody else will.

Because you don't, said she—Huff, Bella, interrupting her, Because I don't defer it—I know you were going to say so. I will say as you say in every-things; and that's the way to please you.

Then say, Lovelace is a villain.

So I will, when I think him so.

Then you don't think him so?

Indeed I don't. You did not always, Bella.

And what, Clary, mean you by that? [brillling up to me]—Tell me what you mean by that reflection?—Tell me why you call it a reflection?—What did I say?

Thou art a provoking creature—But what say you to two or three duels of that wretch's?

I can't tell what to say, unless I knew the occasions.

Do you justify duelling at all?

I do not: Neither can I help his duelling.
Will you go down, and humble that stubborn spirit of yours to your Mamma?
I said nothing.
Shall I conduct your Ladyship down? [offering to take my a clined hand].
What! not vouchsafe to answer me?
I turned from her in silence.
What! turn your back upon me too!—Shall I bring up your Mamma to you, Love? [following me, and taking my struggling hand] What! not speak yet! Come, my fullen, silent dear, speak one word to me—You must say two very soon to Mr. Solmes, I can tell you that.
Then [gushing out into tears, which I could not hold in longer] they shall be the last words I will ever speak.
Well, well [insultingly wiping my averted face with her handkerchief, while her other hand held mine, in a ridiculing tone] I am glad anything will make thee speak: Then you think you may be brought to speak the two words—Only they are to be the last!—How like a gentle Lover from its tender bleeding heart was that!
Ridiculous Bella!
Saucy Clary! [changing her sneering tone to an imperious one] But do you think you can humble yourself to go down to your Mamma?
I am tired with such stuff as this. Tell me, Bella, if my Mamma will condescend to see me?
Yes, if you can be dutiful at last.
I can. I will.
But what call you dutiful?
To give up my own inclinations—That's something more for you to tell of—in obedience to my Parents commands; and to beg I may not be made miserable with a man that is fitter for any-body than me.
For me, do you mean, Clary?
Why not? since you have put the question. You have a better opinion of him than I have: My friends, I hope, would not think him too good for me, and not good enough for you. But cannot you tell me, Bella, what is to become of me, without insulting over me thus?—If I must be thus treated, remember, that if I am guilty of any rashness, the usage I meet with will justify it.
So, Clary, you are contriving an excuse, I find, for somewhat that we have not doubted has been in your head a great while.
If it were so, you seem resolved, for your part, and so does my Brother for his, that I shall not want one.—But indeed, Bella, I can bear no longer this repetition of the worst part of yesterday's conversation: I desire I may throw myself at my Father's and Mother's feet, and hear from them what their sentence is. I shall at least avoid, by that means, the unfitterly insults I meet with from you.
Hey-day! What is this you? Is it you, my meek Sister Clary?
Yes, it is I, Bella; and I will claim the protection due to a child of the family, or to know why I am to be thus treated, when I offer only to preserve to myself the liberty of refusing, which belongs to my Sex; and, to please my Parents, would give up my choice. I have contented myself till now to take second-hand messengers, and first-hand insults: You are but my Sister: My Brother is not my Sovereign. And while I have a Father and Mother living, I will not be thus treated by a Brother and Sister, and their servants, all setting upon me, as it should seem, to make me desperate, and to do a rash thing,—I will know, in short, Sister Bella, why I am to be constrained thus?—What is intended by it?—And whether I am to be considered as a child or a slave?
She stood aghast all this time, partly with real, partly with affected surprize.

And
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And is it you? Is it indeed you?—Well, Clary, you amaze me! But since you are so defirous to refer yourself to your Father and Mother, I will go down, and tell them what you say. Your friends are not yet gone, I believe: They shall assemble again; and then you may come down, and plead your own cause in person.

Let me then. But let my Brother and you be absent. You have made yourselves too much parties against me, to sit as my judges. And I desire to have none of yours or his interpositions. I am sure you could not have represented what I proposed fairly: I am sure you could not. Nor is it possible you should be commissioned to treat me thus.

Well, well, I'll call up my Brother to you.—I will indeed.—He shall justify himself, as well as me. I desire not to see my Brother, except he will come as a Brother, laying aside the authority he has unjustly assumed over me.

And so, Clary, it is nothing to him, or to me, is it? that our Sister shall disgrace her whole family? As how, Bella, disgrace it?—The man whom you thus freely treat, is a man of birth and fortune:

He is a man of parts, and nobly allied.—He was once thought worthy of you; and I wish to Heaven you had had him. I am sure it was not my fault you had not, altho' you treat me thus!

This set her into a flame: I wish I had forborne it. O how the poor Bella raved! I thought she would have beat me once or twice: And the vowed, her fingers itched to do so—But I was not worth her anger: Yet she flamed on.

We were heard to be high.—And Betty came up from my Mother to command my Sister to attend her.—She went down accordingly, threatening me with letting every one know what a violent creature I had shewn myself to be.

Let. 44. Clarissa Harlowe. Tuesday Noon, March 21.

I have as yet heard no more of my Sister: And have not courage enough to insist upon throwing myself at the feet of my Father and Mother, as I thought in my heat of temper I should be able to do.

And I am now grown as calm as ever; and were Bella to come up again, as fit to be played upon as before.

I am indeed sorry that I sent her from me in such disorder. But my Papa's Letter threatening me with my Uncle Antony's house and chapel, terrifies me strangely; and by their silence I am afraid some new storm is gathering.

But what shall I do with this Lovelace? I have just now, by the unsuspected hole in the wall (that I told you of in my Letter by Hannah) got a Letter from him.—So uneasy is he for fear I should be prevailed upon in Solmee's favour; so full of menaces, if I am; so refraining the usage I receive [for, how I cannot tell; but he has undoubtedly intelligence of all that is done in the family]; such protestations of inviolable faith and honour; such vows of reformation; such preening arguments to escape from this disgraceful confinement—O my Nancy, what shall I do with this Lovelace?

LETTER XLIV.

Miss Clarissa Harlowe, To Miss Howe.

Wednesday Morning, 9 o'clock.

My Aunt Hervey lay here last night, and is but just gone from me. She came up to me with my Sister. They would not trust my Aunt without this ill-natured witness. When she entered my chamber, I told her, That this visit was a high favour to a poor prisoner, in her hard confinement. I kissed her hand. She, kindly faluting me, said, Why this distance to your Aunt, my dear, who loves you so well?

She
fee (a), is determined to carry this point, or to abandon Harlowe-place, and never to see it more. So they are to lose a Son, or to conquer a Daughter—the perversest and most ungrateful that ever Parents had! This is the light he places things in: And has undertaken, it seems, to subdue me, if this advice be followed. It will be further tried; of that I am convinced; and what will be their next measure, who can divine?

I shall dispatch, with this, my Answer to yours of Sunday last, begun on Monday (b); but which is not yet quite finished. It is too long to copy: I have not time for it. In it I have been very free with you, my dear, in more places than one. I cannot say, that I am pleased with all I have written.—Yet will not now alter it.—My mind is not at ease enough for the subject.—Don't be angry with me. Yet, if you can excuse one or two passages, it will be, because they were written by

Your Clarissa Harlowe.

(a) In his Letter, p. 301. (b) See Letter xl.
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that were he a moral man, she would prefer him to all the men
for ever saw. Yet is persuaded, that she could freely give up the one
man, to get rid of the other, as she had offered to her friends. Her deli-
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their deliberations, and the result of them, will be, when they are all
assembled. Her Proposals rejected. Her Sister's cruel insults on the
occasion produce another warm dialogue between them. Her Sister
leaves her in a fury. She is greatly disturbed at the contents of a
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XLV. From the same. Another visit from her Aunt and Sister. The
latter spitefully insults her with the patterns. A tender scene between
her Aunt and her in Arabella's absence. She endeavours to account
for the inflexibility of her Parents and Uncle.

END of Vol. I.