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On Original and Final Intentions, or Can There Be an Authoritative *Clarissa*?  

**FLORIAN STUBER**

GIVEN the mass of recent criticism and renewed interest in *Clarissa*, it does seem strange that no authoritative text of Richardson’s masterpiece exists. Readers not content with one of the Condensed Book versions available have had to make do with the accessible but error-filled and now prohibitively expensive Everyman edition. Critics with access to good libraries have relied upon the more accurate Shakespeare Head edition, albeit reluctantly, since it, like the Everyman, incorporates the notorious revisions Richardson made in his text throughout his lifetime. The situation seemed about to be ameliorated in the 70s when it became known that John Carroll was preparing an “authoritative” edition of *Clarissa* for the Oxford English Novel series, using the first edition of the novel for his copy-text. The Oxford English Novel series is now defunct, having run out of money before *Clarissa* was published. While Carroll’s edition would surely have been better than nothing, its nonappearance is perhaps a blessing in disguise. The choice of the first edition for copy-text of an “authoritative” *Clarissa* would have been, I believe, an unfortunate one—even though it seems to accord with mainstream thinking in textual criticism and does accord with an unquestioned—and unexamined—consensus among *Clarissa*’s critics.

Most textual critics agree that the manuscript or, that lacking, the edition which was printed from the manuscript, should become the copy-text. Since the goal is to present the text which the author intended, the author’s manuscript remains the most obvious sign of his original intentions. However, with *Clarissa*, a prospective editor faces a very complicated history of the text: the manuscript versions of the novel are missing, and of the five editions which Richardson supervised through his printing press, no two are exactly alike. Carroll’s choice of the first edition as copy-text, while it seems to accord with the idea of recovering *Clarissa*’s “initial purity,” also seems to have been influenced by the arguments of Mark Kinkead-Weekes in “Clarissa Restored?” In that highly regarded article, Kinkead-Weekes asserts that the many passages and letters which
Richardson claimed to have restored from the original manuscripts to later editions of *Clarissa* were actually additions—that is, revisions of the novel prompted by misreadings of his contemporary audience. "Which represents Richardson's real intention," Kinkead-Weekes rhetorically asks, "the novel he wrote expecting an audience capable of appreciating it, or the revision for one he found careless, superficial, and sentimental?" Convinced by Kinkead-Weekes, most of *Clarissa*’s critics believe that the first edition does represent "Richardson's real intention," and Carroll's choice of copy-text accommodates that belief.

In this essay, I shall retell, as briefly as possible, the history of the printing of *Clarissa*. On the basis of this history, I shall argue that the third edition, as it was originally published by Richardson, would be the wisest choice for copy-text of an authoritative edition of the novel. In so doing, I shall also question the assumption that the recovery of an author’s "original intentions" is necessarily the wisest goal for a textual critic.

While reading the letters Richardson wrote to friends in the three years preceding the publication of *Clarissa*, one is struck by an anxious tone, which seems to reflect two major concerns. Almost any popular novelist about to publish his second novel could sympathize with the first: would Richardson be able to maintain with *Clarissa* the fantastic popularity he had achieved with *Pamela*? "The unexpected success of the other thing," Richardson told Edward Young, "instead of encouraging me, has made me so diffident!—And I have run into such a length!"8 That second source of worry was uniquely Richardson's own: *Clarissa* was a very long novel, and its very length could jeopardize its success. Although the enthusiastic praises of friends who were reading *Clarissa* in manuscript could mollify Richardson's doubts of the novel's artistic merit and emotional impact, many of them shared his concern with the book's length. Through extensive revision, Richardson had made his book tighter, but greater shortening was not possible. He knew that his epistolary method was the primary cause of the novel's emotional effect: because his characters wrote letters "to the moment," while their hearts were "wholly engaged in their Subjects," events were "brought home to the Breast of the . . . Reader."9 At the same time, telling the story by means of letters was the chief reason for *Clarissa*'s length.

To get around the problem, Richardson used a publishing tactic later revived by Charles Dickens and then regularly used by all major novelists until the time of James Joyce:10 *Clarissa* was first issued in installments. The first two volumes were published in December 1747; volumes III and IV in April 1748; and volumes V through VII in the following December. In his Preface to the first volume, Richardson justified the publication of his novel in parts by referring to his "diffidence in relation to this Article of Length": he asserted that he had

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 favorable, 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.11

Despite that disclaimer, Richardson seems to have designed the installments to ensure a most favorable reception. Not only was the novel issued in positions which readers could afford, but each of the first two parts was made to end on a note of suspense in the best cliff-hanging tradition. Volume II ended with the news that Clarissa Harlowe had indeed "gone off" with a man, leaving Anna Howe (and, one suspects, all her readers) "astonished, confounded, aghast, and all impatience for particulars." The second installment ended on a more ominous note: Clarissa had escaped from Lovelace; but as the fourth volume closes, he arrives at her hideaway in suburban Hampstead determined to have her return with him to the brothel. Following the last letter, an editorial note emphasizes the sense of urgency: "The Remainder of this Work will be published at once; and that as soon as indispensable avocations will permit." The publishing tactic worked. Not only was the novel a success, but readers became intensely involved with the heroine's distresses; after the publication of the second installment, Richardson received hundreds of letters urging him to provide *Clarissa* with a happy ending. Sales were great enough for him to anticipate a demand for a second edition, and so he printed a double number of the last installment, having the three volumes ready to be issued with volumes I through IV of a new edition.

For a textual critic, the first edition of *Clarissa* is notable for four items which were never again to appear to the public in the same form.13 The original Preface to the work was not suitable for later editions of a novel whose success allowed its author to be less "diffident in relation to the Article of Length"; in fact, these later editions contain passages and letters which Richardson claimed to have restored to the novel from the original manuscripts. Following the Preface, "A Brief Account of the Principal
other criticisms (which Richardson apparently felt were due to hasty and careless reading) were to be "obviated, tho' covertly" in the Table. 14 These covert obviations were made by italicizing certain sentences in the detailed summaries of the letters, and in an article which appeared in the Gentleman's Magazine of July 1749, Richardson publicly emphasized the fact:

We shall add, that the author has prefixed to his second edition, a table of contents; which he has so drawn up, that the reader will see, by the distinction of a different character, where the answers may be found, in the work itself, to particular passages that had been thought objectionable. . . . And this he has had the justice to print separate, for the sake of the purchasers of the first edition.15

Richardson knew that separate publication of this Table could have hurt the sale of Clarissa since by buying only volume I or the little pamphlet, a reader was in possession of the entire story. But, as he explained to Aaron Hill,

I had not a View principally to my Profit, but hoped to do some good by my Clarissa . . . . And I thought this necessary also, for the sake of those who had read it, at the distant Periods in which it was published (Two Volumes, and Two, and Three) and would not choose to read 7 tedious Volumes over again, as a Help to their Recollection, and to their Understanding of it, in the Way I chose to have it understood:16

In the third and subsequent editions, however, Richardson printed at the end of each volume its particular portion of the Table.

A more subtle, but significant change took place on the Title-page for the second edition. The original title had been: "ClariSSA | Or, the HISTORY | of a | YOUNG LADY: | Comprehending | THE most Important Concerns of Private LIFE. | And particularly shewing, | the DISTRESSES that may attend the MISCONDUCT | Both of PARENTS and CHILDREN, | In Relation to MARRIAGE." The original title emphasizes the "DISTRESSES" which Clarissa depicts. In line with his plan of printing the novel in intriguing installments, Richardson used the title-page to emphasize the novel's emotional appeal—Clarissa's "DISTRESSES" are suspenseful and affecting. If in the first edition Richardson tended to stress the fact that Clarissa would delight, in the second edition he began, covertly, to stress that it would teach. The shift of emphasis from a primarily aesthetic to a primarily didactic purpose was carried out by means of italics in the Table of Contents; on the Title-page, it is made by means of capitalization. No longer is Clarissa "particularly shewing DISTRESSES" but rather "the Distresses that may attend the MISCONDUCT | Both of PARENTS and CHIL-
DRENNON, | In Relation to MARRIAGE." A book that deals particularly with "MISCONDUCT" is fundamentally concerned with principles of behavior; it calls for a reader's attention to questions of morals and ethics. In the third edition of Clarissa, Richardson's didactic purposes would become even more overt.

Three months after the publication of the second edition of Clarissa, Richardson began revising his text for the third. In May 1750, there was a demand for it, and he began printing two new editions, one in duodecimo (the third) and one in octavo (called the fourth). Although Richardson planned to publish the third edition in 1750—the date appears on the Title-page of all the volumes except the first—he delayed its appearance until the octavo version was completed, and both editions were published simultaneously in April 1751.

The contents of the two editions are exactly the same, but the third edition expands the novel from seven to eight volumes while the fourth edition maintains a seven-volume division which, however, differs from that used in the first and second editions. In the Preface to the third edition, Richardson explains the presence of the additional volume (the second paragraph below was omitted, of course, from the Preface to the fourth edition):

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 inserted 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. 17

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, feeling that because of his prolixity he owed the public the contents of eight volumes at the price of seven." 18 But, in view of the fourth edition, it is too much to assert, as Frederick W. Hilles does, that "the seven volumes of the first edition disguise the basic structure" of Clarissa. 19 Although Clarissa is tightly organized, Richardson seems not to have emphasized the structure in the physical distribution of the text. Any literary critic who tries to relate the literary structure to the volume division of either the third or the fourth edition obviously walks on dubious scholarly ground.

The greater length of Clarissa was due not only to added passages and a consistent large type but also to new additions to the accompanying apparatus. Richardson's new Preface to the novel is noteworthy for its description of this apparatus and for its capsule history of the printing of the text. Its importance must excuse my lengthy quotation:

The work having been originally published at three different times; and a greater distance than was intended having passed between the first publication and the second: a Preface was thought proper to be prefixed to the third and fourth volumes; being the second publication. A very learned and eminent Hand [Warburton] was so kind as to favour the Editor, at his request, with one. But the occasion of inserting it being temporary, and the Editor having been left at liberty to do with it as he pleased, it was omitted in the Second Edition, when the whole Work came to be printed together; as was, for the same reason, the Preface to the first Volume; and a short Advertisement to the Reader inserted instead of both. That Advertisement being also temporary, the present Address to the Reader is substituted in its place.

In the Second Edition an ample Table of Contents to the whole Work was prefixed to the first volume: But that having in some measure anticipated the Catastrophe, and been thought to detain the Reader too long from entering upon the History, it has been judged advisable to add (and that rather than prefix) to each Volume its particular Contents; which will serve not only as an Index, but as a brief Recapitulation of the most material passages contained in it; and which will enable the Reader to connect in his mind the perused volume with that which follows; and more clearly shew the characters and views of the particular correspondents.

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. The Reader will accordingly find it there, digested under proper Heads, with References to the Pages where each Caution, Aphorism, Reflection, or Observation, is to be found, either wrought into the practice of the respective correspondent, or recommended by them as useful theory, to the Youth of both Sexes. 20

A textual critic cannot easily dismiss Richardson's emphasis on the "temporary" nature of the first two editions of Clarissa. His careful account of all the changes he made in the text and the apparatus gives the third edition
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. Indeed, Johnson considered the fourth “the Edition by which I suppose Posterity is to abide.” Whether a textual critic should agree with Johnson’s supposition is open to question. The unique seven-volume division of the fourth edition makes it an anomaly in Clarissa’s printing history, and, what is more important, except for the volume-division, it follows exactly the text of the third edition. Its real importance is that it makes doubly clear Richardson’s didactic purposes, for to issue a novel in octavo was to treat it with unusual seriousness. Histories, encyclopaedias, and dictionaries were customarily printed in octavo; for a novel to make such an appearance was to elevate it, definitively, above the genre of Romance. A weighty book was not for entertainment during idle hours; its very size would demand it to be taken seriously. Great care was lavished on its production, although the edition, because of its expense, was a small one, and Richardson sent many copies as gifts to his personal friends.

The fifth and last edition of Clarissa to be printed in Richardson’s lifetime was published in 1759. The title-page proclaims it to be the Fourth Edition—it is the fourth duodecimo edition—and its eight volumes were printed page for page from those of the third. Some omissions in the apparatus are notable, however: the Collection of Sentiments has disappeared from its place in the eighth volume. In 1755, Richardson had extracted “the pith and marrow of Nineteen Volumes” and had published A Collection of the Moral and Instructive Sentiments, Maxims, Cautions, and Reflexions, Contained in the Histories of Pamela, Clarissa, and Sir Charles Grandison. A note referring the reader to the 1755 book appears at the end of the 1759 Clarissa as an explanation for the Collection’s absence. Other changes are as easily explained. The five paragraphs from the 1751 Preface quoted above were omitted because they were of no practical importance in introducing the 1759 edition. Also omitted were the “Dots” Richardson had prefixed before all the “restored” lines in the third and fourth editions. By the time this fifth Clarissa appeared, the text had been set and there was no need to distinguish any new material: there was none to distinguish.

There would seem to be little question, then, as to which edition of Clarissa represents Richardson’s final intentions. The third edition carries with it manifest signs of authority: its Preface recounts the history of Clarissa’s publication and pronounces the third edition definitive; its apparatus is of the elaborate and finished sort one associates with an encyclopaedia; great pains were taken in the printing of the text—every line of restored or revised passages was prefixed by a “Dot,” and these passages were reprinted in Letters and Passages Restored so that owners of the first and second editions could possess a full and complete copy of Clarissa. Moreover, the third edition formed the basis for the last edition of the novel to appear during Richardson’s lifetime. If a textual critic followed Richardson’s example in printing an authoritative edition of Clarissa, the whole question of choosing a copy-text would become, in a manner, academic.
in effect, choose to read either the first, second, or third editions of the novel; he could then judge for himself whether the later restorations added to or detracted from the first version of Clarissa.

That they do detract is a point argued at length by Mark Kinkead-Weekes in his article, "Clarissa Restored?" As he sees it, the first edition of Clarissa was too subtle for its audience. Instead of being shocked by Lovelace's wickedness, early readers were taken in by his superficial charm; consequently, Clarissa's delicacy was misread as prudery; these misreadings contributed to the sentimental outcry over the tragic ending; as a result, the moral meaning of the book was distorted. Kinkead-Weekes points out that passages which Richardson claimed to have restored from the original manuscripts seem strangely designed to counteract these misreadings: Lovelace's wickedness is emphasized, Clarissa's delicacy is defended, and the moral lessons are underlined. Kinkead-Weekes concludes that most of the changes were probably not restorations at all but revisions whose cumulative effect makes a complex analysis of moral behavior cruder.

Now, the first problem here is that not all Richardson's "additions" were revisions. Some are very obviously restorations. Throughout the first and second editions, passages supposedly written by the Editor occasionally note that he is omitting or summarizing a letter in order to shorten a long text. Thus, in the first edition, the Editor explains that he omits Lovelace's fanciful scheme to kidnap Anna Howe "as he [Lovelace] does not intend to carry it into execution"; Elias Brand's two recantation letters are omitted from the first and second editions (the Editor explains) "as they are long, and as the reader has already been led into his singular character, and as this collection has run into an undesirable length." Yet these three letters were restored in full to the third edition. The letters which pass between Lovelace and Joseph Leman concerning the rape of Miss Betterton were summarized and passages from them were quoted by the Editor in the first edition; they are given in full in the second and third.

For many shorter passages, there is no external evidence of editorial comment to indicate a probable manuscript source. Yet some of these are quite good and written in Richardson's best manner: the highly praised altercation scene between Clarissa and her sister at Harlowe Place and Lovelace's instructions to his friends before the Partington party are examples. Others, such as the later additions to the character sketch of Clarissa in Anna Howe's last letter, are not so good. In most cases, however, for a prospective editor to try to decide which passages were actually from early manuscripts and which were later revisions would be sheer speculation. The whole enterprise becomes even more dubious when one considers how Richardson wrote Clarissa.

T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel have reconstructed the history of Clarissa's composition by bringing together from Richardson's correspondence all references to the work-in-progress. Although the complete story can never be known, certain points are clear. The first draft of Clarissa had been written by sometime in 1744; this, the original manuscript, was sent piecemeal to Richardson's friend Aaron Hill in 1745 and was also being read by Edward Young and Colley Cibber. During that year, Richardson was engaged in a thorough revision of the entire novel; in January 1746, he sent Hill "the First Part" of a version "mostly new, or alter'd much from what you saw it before." Although Richardson's ostensible object in his revision had been to shorten the text, the novel had grown under his hands from sixteen to thirty handwritten vellum volumes. From 1746 to 1747, the author was busy "pruning" his "overgrown work." This third version of Clarissa became the first edition of the novel; in 1748, he was still revising during the summer of 1748, before the last volumes were published. On 10 May 1748, Richardson told Hill that he had "so greatly altered the two last volumes [i.e., Volumes III and IV of the first edition which had been published in April], that one half the Sequel must be new written.

Since all the manuscripts of the novel have been lost, the nature of the early revisions can be gleaned imperfectly at best; however, I cannot share Eaves and Kimpel's view that Richardson's attempt to shorten Clarissa was in vain. Their own research shows, for example, that Richardson had at one time included all the surreptitious correspondence that took place between Lovelace and Clarissa during her imprisonment at Harlowe Place; in all the printed versions, Clarissa summarizes these letters for Anna Howe. In one of the early manuscript versions, the letters of Clarissa and Lovelace which described similar scenes at Sorlings' farm and the brothel had also been given in full; in October 1746, Richardson told Hill that he had 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 Humor, and his Character are shown, and his Designs open'd, have put many others, into a merely Narrative Form, referring for the Facts to hers, &c. So of some of hers, vice versa.
From the last two volumes, Richardson cut some forty pages of Clarissa’s religious meditations; these he never restored to the novel, but he did print them in a spin-off volume entitled *Meditations Collected from the Sacred Books . . . Being Those Mentioned in the History of Clarissa*. The book was not offered to the public but was distributed privately to friends in 1750.

It is the way Richardson revised his text which is of crucial importance for a textual critic. He sent out manuscripts to a number of his friends and asked for their comments; on the basis of their reactions, he revised his text. This is not to say that Richardson followed their advice. Many of his advisers wanted *Clarissa* to end happily, but Richardson never changed his original plans for a tragic ending. But his friends were of help in letting him know when his intentions were being misunderstood. When that was the case, he refined what he had written by making certain elements clearer. This means that the revisions made in the second and third editions of the novel were part of a continuing process that had begun in 1744.

More important still, Richardson continued to revise the last three volumes of *Clarissa* after the first four volumes had been printed. Some of those revisions could have been prompted by criticism of the first two installments. And who is to say whether the revisions in the second edition (of which the last three volumes of the first were still a part) were not made to better connect volumes I through IV with what then had become volumes V through VII? With this in mind, might not one best consider the eleven volumes of *Clarissa* which preceded the third edition to be examples of a work-in-progress which did not approach its final form until 1751? Richardson says in the Preface to that edition that the occasion for inserting prefaces and advertisements before had been “but temporary.” Within weeks after the publication of all editions except the third, Richardson had been at work revising texts. He never changed the third even when he had a chance to revise it for the 1759 edition.

It seems to me that the principles of textual criticism, at least of its “scientific” variety, often rest upon a Fallacy of Original Intention. Before compiling a definitive or authoritative text, an editor must take into account the way his author wrote. A prospective editor of Henry James’s novels may hold the New York Edition suspect because James revised his early works for that edition years after the original inspiration had vanished. But does the same reasoning apply to the editor of James Joyce, who, after the serial publication of *Ulysses*, immediately made revisions which took the form of elaborate additions to the text? In the case of Samuel Richardson, who sketched a first draft and then molded it through revision after revision through nine years of sustained work—who is to say what his “original intention” was? Indeed, does that phrase still carry with it any meaning? All one can be sure of is where Richardson felt the job was finished, and that was in the third edition of 1751. The third edition, therefore, should be copy-text for an authoritative edition of *Clarissa*. And, if an editor followed Richardson in printing the text with “dots” or inserted Full-points” before the lines of “revised” or “restored” passages, the reader could himself analyze and judge the wisdom of Richardson’s later additions.

## NOTES


2. *Pamela* is currently available in two authoritative versions: one, edited by T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971), uses the first edition (1740) as copy-text and includes the introductory material Richardson added to the second edition (1741); the other, edited by Peter Sabor with an introduction by Margaret A. Doody (Harmandsworth, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1980), represents Richardson’s final version of the novel, incorporating revisions he was making to the text at the time of his death (1761; see note 33 below). Surprisingly, we also have an authoritative *Sir Charles Grandison*, edited by Jocelyn Harris (London: Oxford University Press, 1972). We lack only an authoritative edition of Richardson’s sequel to *Pamela* and, of course, *Clarissa*.


6. For example, Fredson Bowers has said that the scientific editor aims “to recover the initial purity of an author’s text and of its revision . . . and to preserve this purity.” “Téxtual Criticism,” in *Aims and Methods of Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literature*, ed. James Thorpe (New York: MLA, 1969), p. 24.

9. Indeed, Joyce’s three novels were among the last works by a major writer to be issued in parts. The effect of publishing by parts and Richardson’s precedent were noted by the painter Maclise in 1839; at a dinner celebrating the success of Charles Dickens’ *Nicholas Nickleby*, Maclise praised “the reality of Dickens’ genius” and remarked how there had been nothing like him issuing his novels part by part since Richardson issued his novels volume by volume, and how in both cases people talked about the characters as if they were next-door neighbors or friends, and how as many letters were written to the author of *Nicholas Nickleby* to implore him not to kill poor Smike as had been sent by young ladies to the author of *Clarissa* to “save Lovelace’s soul alive.”


10. William M. Sale gives a complete description of each edition of *Clarissa* in his *Samuel Richardson: A Bibliographical Record of His Literary Career with Historical Notes* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936), pp. 45–64. In reconstructing the history of the novel’s publication, I, of course, indebted to Sale’s work as well as to my own investigation of the various texts.


13. Letter to Aaron Hill, 7 November 1748, as paraphrased by T. C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel in “The Composition of *Clarissa* and Its Revision Before Publication,” *PMLA*, LXXXIII, 2 (May 1968), 416–428. The article is summarized in this paragraph.

17. Ibid.
18. In the first sentence of *Reading Clarissa*, William Warner says, “It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of the curious publication history of *Clarissa*” (p. vii). I agree. On the same page, however, Warner tells us that the “last edition published by Richardson [was] the third,” apparently overlooking the fourth and completely neglecting the fifth, published eight years later and three years before Richardson’s death. Warner’s “detailed account of *Clarissa*’s publishing history,” as Terry Castle calls his book, is thus based on a fundamental error in fact.

In the penultimate chapter of Castle’s *Letters*, she herself discusses *Clarissa’s* publishing history. She err, too, either in counting editions or affixing dates as she bemoans the fact that “nineteenth-century editions of *Clarissa* incorporate most of the additions and changes Richardson began making in the second edition (1751) and completed in the third (1759).” Upset that “as we read the novel today, we confront not only an epistolary sequence, but also the intrusive ‘editorial’ apparatus Richardson added...most notoriously, a plethora of footnotes, in which Richardson, assuming the guise of ‘Editor,’ cross-references certain letters in the correspondence, supplies gratuitous information, and comments on events described by the letter writers,” Castle seems unaware that readers never confronted a pure epistolary sequence. Ninety percent of the footnotes, particularly the cross-references and those supplying “gratuitous information” (whatever that means), were present in the first edition of the novel. For this Fiedleresque paragraph from *Ciphers* (it is, alas, one of several), see page 175.

28. As quoted by Eaves and Kimpel, *ibid.*.
29. Eaves and Kimpel are unsure whether there were three or four manuscript versions of *Clarissa* before Richardson began publishing the first edition. The epistolary evidence is not clear. I am inclined to believe with them that there were four, but we know definitely there were three.
30. As quoted by Eaves and Kimpel, “Composition of *Clarissa*.”
31. As quoted by Eaves and Kimpel, *ibid.*.
32. Concern over Lovelace’s character dates back to 1744. In a letter to Aaron Hill (29 October 1746), Richardson said:

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.

(Letters, pp. 73–74). Years later, as the last volumes of the first edition were coming forth, he repeated the story to Lady Bradshaigh:

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. And as he now stands, I verily think that had I made him a worse Man, he must have been a Devil.—*For Devils believe and tremble.*
(15 December 1748, *Letters*, p. 113). Lady Bradshaigh was not the only reader of the first edition who wished Lovelace could be saved; thus Richardson added still deeper shades to the character in the second and third editions (e.g., by restoring to the text Lovelace’s letter describing his scheme to kidnap Anna Howe).

33. Comparing *Clarissa’s* history with *Pamela’s* is instructive. While Richardson did not change *Clarissa’s* text after 1751, he seemed never to have done with *Pamela*. *Pamela* went through eight editions in Richardson’s lifetime, and each is different from the last. Indeed, when Richardson died in 1761, he had just about finished reworking his first novel yet again. This thorough revision, what Eaves and Kimpel call “almost a complete rewriting” (“Introduction” to *Pamela*, p. xv), was published posthumously by his daughter Anne in 1801. That text forms the basis of Peter Sabor’s Penguin edition of *Pamela*.

34. I foresee a Joycean Kinkead-Weekes arguing that the original version of the Cyclops chapter in *Ulysses* is better than the final one: after all, don’t the added illustrations of “Gigantism,” the chapter’s technique, only “make unnecessarily obvious what was already perfectly clear?” (“Clarissa Restored?” p. 169). Of course, Joyce did not set out deliberately to ruin his creation and was a consummate craftsman—a tact and a talent Richardson, apparently, did not have.

**Hopes Raised for Johnson:**

**An Example of Misleading Descriptive and Analytical Bibliography**

**ALLEN H. REDDICK**

This paper discusses a problem inherent in all scholarship, but one to which researchers using and relying on original materials are particularly vulnerable. The problem, mainly due to human fallibility, is that assessments and descriptions of original materials are frequently incorrect, and inadvertently hide evidence and mislead scholars.

I take as my focus in this discussion a copy of the first edition in two volumes folio (1755) of Samuel Johnson’s *Dictionary* at the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale. The copy, first catalogued by the library in 1977 (call number 1977 Folio 17), is accompanied by the following brief statement of description, explanation, and analysis. It signals an important find for scholars of the *Dictionary*:

A unique copy of the first edition: the only known copy preserving a page slit for cancellation but not removed. It was intended that the unsigned leaf [5 C 2] of vol. 1 should be cancelled because the last word on the recto, “Completement,” had been mis-spelled “Competement,” a serious defect in an alphabetical arrangement.

By error, the unfaulty leaf [5 C] was removed, the faulty leaf [5 C 2] was mounted on the stub, though slit for cancellation, and the corrected leaf [5 C 2] was inserted as the following leaf.

The re-setting of leaf [5 C 2] permitted not only the correction of the spelling “Completement” but also the expansion of many of the locations for the illustrative quotations, to accord with the practice throughout the work. Thus, under “Complacency. 2.” the reading “Milton” in the original leaf was expanded to “Milton’s Paradise Lost, b. iii, 1. 274” and under “Complement. 1.” the reading “Spenser” was altered to “Hubberd’s Tale.”

The faulty leaf [5 C 2] has the press numbers “4” on the recto and “3” on the verso; the corrected leaf has no press numbers. Presumably the pressmen working with the numbers 4 and 3 had short words for the careless compositor whose error caused the extra labor.