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7. The French Clarissa

*Clarissa* took Paris by storm! It was read, translated and adapted by such authors as Rousseau,1 Diderot, La Clos, Prévost, Suard, and Le Tourneur. English editions and French translations proliferated throughout the eighteenth century. Samuel Richardson (1689-1761) saw four editions through the press during his lifetime: the first in seven volumes in 1748, the second in 1749, which consists of only the first four volumes of his novel; the much revised, eight-volume third in 1751, and the fourth in 1759.2 L’Abbé Antoine François de Prévost (1697-1763) was its first translator in 1751 with what might best be described as a creative abridgement of Richardson’s first edition.

Much has been written about the Prévost 1751 translation and the elite audience for which he wrote it. One critic comments that ‘the translator was careful not to shock too deeply the habits of the French reading public.... If he lightened the volume of moral preaching, he also took care to soften the strokes of the Englishman’s realism.’3 Precisely because he does not ‘soften the Englishman’s realism,’4 it is the 1785-86 translation of Richardson’s third edition by Pierre Prime Félicien de Le Tourneur (1737-1788) that I would like to discuss here.

According to Thomas O. Beebee, it appears that Prévost was as much a source for Le Tourneur as Richardson was.5 The texts of all the later editions and translations are like palimpsests, or ‘manuscripts in which a later writing is written over an effaced earlier writing.’6 The 1785 Le Tourneur text is the most complete of the translation palimpsests, with the authoritative 1751 *Clarissa* shining through.7 On the other hand, it appears that Le Tourneur did not translate all of Richardson’s third edition. For instance, he leaves out one of the last sentences in the novel which states that Lovelace ‘refused ghostly attendance and the Sacraments in the Catholic way.’8 Nevertheless, Le Tourneur generally seems more faithful in adhering to Richardson’s intentions in the third, and what most critics consider the most complete and authoritative, 1751 English edition.

Margaret Doody observes that Richardson imparted ‘a revolutionary quality which suggests the possibility of expressing a new message in fiction.’9 Le Tourneur, in staying closer to the third edition of *Clarissa* than Prévost does to the first, is, in this sense, revolutionary, and more
revolutionary than Prévost. Le Tourneur, like Richardson, makes Clarissa more victimized than she appears in the Prévost translation. This more insidious victimization reveals her greater need to rebel. Also, by ‘revolutionary,’ I mean that Le Tourneur, like Richardson, pays close attention to the realism of everyday detail and to the description of characters from all walks of life. Le Tourneur comments in his dedication to Monsieur, the brother of the king, that ‘Quoi-que la scène & les personnages soient placés dans la vie commune, la nature & le coeur y sont au fond les mêmes qu’auprès du trône; et les Princes ne sont vraiment heureux que par les mêmes sentiments qui font le bonheur de l’homme de toutes les classes.’ In a more modern interpretation, men of all classes might be stretched to include women.

Furthermore, Clarissa is a novel of feeling, and as Rita Goldberg comments, ‘In France … the novel of feeling seems to have been linked on the whole to an interest in feminism.’ Richardson is indeed creating a novel of feeling and being realistic in his revolutionary mode, and he does not hesitate to express a genuine portrait of the victimized heroine in the eighteenth century.

Richardson, a well known printer whose novels, Pamela, Clarissa, and Grandison derived from the domestic conduct books of his day, instructed his readers how to act in difficult social and psychological situations. Prévost, creator of Manon Lescaut, and translator of Richardson’s three novels, was well-known in mid-eighteenth century literary circles. Pierre Prime Félicien de le Tourneur(1737-1788), secrétaire to Monsieur, the brother of Louis XVI, and close to the circle of Marie Antoinette, was comparatively little known. Primarily a translator, he translated Young’s ‘Night Thoughts,’ the works of Ossian, and was important in introducing the school of melancholy into French thought and literature. He was the first translator of the complete plays of Shakespeare into French, and was also noted for his contribution of the word ‘romantique’ into the history of literature through his Discours des Préfaces Anglaises. Although Mary Cushing, a biographer of Le Tourneur, dismisses in a few pages Le Tourneur’s translation of Clarissa - saying that most eighteenth-century French readers of Richardson would be satisfied with the Prévost translation, and that the real lovers of Richardson would go back to the original English text - I believe that the realism afforded the French text by Le Tourneur’s careful rendering is important in revealing the genuine plight of Clarissa as an eighteenth-century heroine.

In 1972 in the Bibliothèque Nationale I came across a copy of Le Tourneur’s translation of Clarissa in twenty volumes, dedicated to Marie Antoinette. I was impressed with the beauty of the edition - its binding, its format, its typography, its illustrations by Chodowiecki of Berlin.
Then I discovered that there were at least four Le Tourneur editions of *Clarissa*, including one dedicated to Monsieur, Frère du Roi who was later to become Louis XVIII. A careful glance at the various versions of *Clarissa* reveals that the Le Tourneur follows the third edition faithfully. We must not, however, overlook the fact that Le Tourneur is quite eclectic about using italics, leaving out passages of poetry and amalgamating paragraphs. Yet, this can only be contrasted with Prévost’s omitting whole volumes — one of which includes Clarissa’s ordering her coffin and her return as a corpse to Harlowe Place. Even Diderot, as Margaret Doody comments, ‘rebukes’ Prévost by implication for considering Clarissa’s return to Harlowe Place a scene ‘which could be omitted.’

In the process of examining some of the key passages of the novel, I drew upon the two English editions, the first 1748 as reproduced by Angus Ross; the heavily revised English third (1751); the Prévost of 1751; and its continuation (1766, 1777, and 1784), as well as the Le Tourneur (1785-86). I looked at the departure from Harlowe Place, the fire scene, Clarissa’s escape to Hampstead and her manipulated return to Mrs. Sinclair’s brothel, the rape scene, and some of the death scenes.

During Clarissa’s flight from Mrs. Sinclair’s brothel to Hampstead, Lovelace comments to Belford on woman’s subjected state. The desire to have women completely subject to the male prerogative is heightened in the Le Tourneur translation, compared with the Prévost. But before we make this comparison, let us first look briefly at the English editions from which they come. The first edition reads:

She is cast from a state of independency into one of obligation. She never was in a state of independency; nor is it fit a woman should, of any age, or in any state of life. And as to the state of obligation, there is no such thing as living without being beholden to somebody. Mutual obligation is the very essence and soul of the social and commercial life - Why should she be exempt from it? - I am sure the person she raves at, desires not such an exemption - has been long dependent upon her; and would rejoice to owe further obligations to her than he can boast of hitherto.

The English third edition comments:

She is cast from a State of Independence into one of Obligation. She never was in a State of Independence; nor is it fit a woman should, of any Age or in any State of Life. And as to the State of Obligation, there is no such thing as living without being beholden to some-body. Mutual obligation is the very essence and soul of
the social and commercial life: — nous soulignons why should she be exempt from it? — I am sure the person she raves at, desires not such an exemption; — has been long dependent upon her; and would rejoice to owe further obligations to her than he can boast of hitherto.\textsuperscript{18}

Except for the capitalization, there is little difference between the Richardson first edition and the Richardson third. But, according to Kinkead-Weekes,\textsuperscript{19} the changes in italics and capitalization were no mere accident. Richardson purposely is making the third edition more didactic. He exemplifies the eighteenth-century idea that literature is to teach and delight. In comparison with Prévost, Le Tourneur is teaching also. I quote the Prévost:

\begin{quote}
Elle se voit tombée de l’indépendance, dans un état de constrainte & d’obligation. Jamais elle n’a connu l’indépendance; & c’est un état qui ne convient à aucune femme, de quelque âge & de quelque condition, qu’on la suppose. A l’égard de celui d’obligation; qu’on me nomme quelqu’un, parmi les vivans, qui n’y soit point assujetti. Les obligations mutuelles sont l’essence & comme l’âme de la société. Pourquoi seroit-elle dispensée de cet aimable joug? Celui, dont elle fait aujourd’hui l’objet de sa fureur, ne souhaite pas d’en être exempt. Il a \textit{dependu} longtemps d’elle. Toute sa joie seroit de lui avoir plus d’obligation qu’il ne peut s’en vanter jusqu’à présent.\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}

The Le Tourneur emphasizes the subjection:

\begin{quote}
Elle se voit tombée de l’indépendance dans un état d’assujettissement & d’obligation. Jamais elle n’a connu l’indépendance; & c’est un état qui ne convient à aucune femme, de quelque âge & de quelque condition qu’on la suppose. A l’égard de celui d’obligation, qu’on me nomme quelqu’un parmis les vivans, qui n’y soit point assujetti. Les obligations mutuelles sont l’essence & l’âme de la vie sociale. Pourquoi seroit-elle dispensée de cette commune nécessité? Celui dont elle fait aujourd’hui l’objet de sa fureur, ne souhaite certainement pas d’en être exempt. Il a \textit{dépendu} longtemps d’elle, & toute sa joie seroit de lui avoir plus d’obligation qu’il ne peut s’en vanter jusqu’à présent.\textsuperscript{21}
\end{quote}

In this passage is revealed the revolutionary quality of Le Tourneur’s prose. Clarissa, the heroine, is fallen from what she thought was a situation of independence - her family’s former devotion to her, and her grandfather’s legacy - to a state of subjection and familial powerlessness. In fleeing from her family’s demands that she marry Solmes to reliance
upon Lovelace for setting her up independently, she realizes that she has merely exchanged one sort of tyranny for another. She is completely subject to Lovelace's will. In contrast with Prévost's using the word, 'contrainte,' to describe Clarissa's situation, Le Tourneur uses the stronger word, 'assujettissement,' with its binding overtones of complete subjection to reveal Clarissa's relationship with Lovelace. The word, 'assujettissement,' with its connotation of subjection emphasizes the heroine's need for revolt. Le Tourneur's 'commune nécessité' or 'common necessity' in contrast with Prévost's 'aimable joug' or 'loveable yoke' suggests the greater need for revolution in the Le Tourneur translation. While Prévost, with his 'aimable joug,' projects a lighter or more teasing tone to suggest Lovelace's control over Clarissa, Le Tourneur represents the seriousness of Clarissa's captivity. In using this more serious tone, Le Tourneur is obviously allowing the English 1751 edition to show through. In this manner Le Tourneur emphasizes the social and psychological subjection of women. He strongly suggests the ways in which eighteenth-century men, or at least upper-class libertines, see the condition of women. Also, Le Tourneur seems to be underlining his teaching, as noted in the preface, that the Princely reader to whom he dedicates his volume has the same heartaches as the middle-class Clarissa.

The greater sense of realism, the depiction of women in all walks of life is apparent in the fire scene. Here it is discovered that the cookery maid was reading the story of Dorastus and Fawnia, *The Winter's Tale* story, when the curtains caught fire and gave Lovelace the chance to find his Clarissa in charming deshabille. *The Winter's Tale*, the story of Dorastus and Fawnia, tells of Pandosto's jealousy because of the possible relationship between his wife, Bellaria, and his friend Egistus. He thinks that Bellaria's child is illegitimate. He puts Bellaria in prison where she dies, and sends the child Fawnia in a boat out to sea. The child is found by a shepherd and is brought up as a shepherdess. Dorastus, Egistus's son, falls in love with her. After a long tale, identities become known, and Dorastus marries Fawnia and ends his life in quiet content.

Interestingly enough, this reference to Dorastus and Fawnia is present in the English 1748 edition and in the English third edition. The Prévost translation simply calls it a 'conte des Fées'; the Le Tourneur says it is 'un conte des Fées,' then notes in a footnote that it is 'L'histoire de Dorastus and Fawnia.' Again one wonders whether the omission of the story in the Prévost is mere abridging of the text or whether there is not a symbolic relationship between the Dorastus and Fawnia story and the Lovelace and Clarissa story which Prévost wishes to leave out. Pandosto is blind to his wife's goodness just as Lovelace is blind to
Clarissa's genuine virtue until he rapes her and loses her. Le Tourneur calls oblique attention to the story, while Prévost ignores it altogether.

The Prévost shortening of the novel leaves out the important symbolism of the English tale. The symbolism of the scene is important to the novel as a culmination of Clarissa's sexual attraction to Lovelace, and, of course, his to her. Again Le Tourneur, by leaving the story in his translation, is maintaining all the details of the progressively intensifying sexual tension between Clarissa and Lovelace. By omitting the story, Prévost weakens the scene.

The rape scene is the most obvious example of the revolutionary quality of the Le Tourneur translation. Like the two English editions, Prévost reports Lovelace's version of the rape. The third edition reads:

And now Belford, I can go no farther. The affair is over. Clarissa lives. And I am Your humble Servant.

R. Lovelace.

This is all that is in Prévost. He omits Clarissa's retelling of the rape in the letters to Anna Howe, which is included in both English editions and in the Le Tourneur. Here Lovelace depicts the rape concisely and from the male point of view. Prévost's text is not at all 'revolutionary' in depicting the need for change in the portrayal of women's fate in the eighteenth century. Clarissa is merely a pawn to Lovelace's will. It is well known that Prévost suppresses many passages that could be repetitious, so it is partly for the sake of abridgement that Prévost leaves out Clarissa's telling of the rape. But it is also significant that the rape, at least from Clarissa's point of view, is omitted from the Prévost. The woman's point of view, part of the psychological realism of the novel, is not there.

The fact that the woman's point of view is missing from the Prévost and is present in the Le Tourneur translation is important. It would support the eighteenth-century idea of Le Tourneur's teaching - through psychological realism - as the preface indicates, the royalty, Monsieur, the brother of the King, and Marie Antoinette. This is the artist's teaching of the benevolent despot, like Byron's Don Juan's teaching of Catherine the Great or Haydn's teaching of the Princes Esterhazy. Le Tourneur's teaching and delighting of the royalty, as in his use of more victimizing language to describe Clarissa's plight, is relevant to the dangers of authority that pervade Richardson's novel. These are the misplaced authority of parents to determine their children's marriages and the insidiousness of the deluding nobleman, Lovelace, to gain control of Clarissa. Early on in the novel, Clarissa speaks of the 'great motive paternal authority' under which she suffers. Prévost translates these
words merely as 'l'autorité paternelle.' Le Tourneur, like Richardson, italicizes this authority to show the need for change in the social strata of the eighteenth century.

Clarissa's victimization by the 'women' and her consequent rape is reported in the English first edition:

Thus was I tricked and deluded back by blacker hearts of my own sex, than I thought there were in the world; who appeared to me to be persons of honour: and, when in his power, thus barbarously was I treated by this villainous man. I was so senseless that I dare not aver that the horrid creatures of the house were personally aiding and abetting; but some visionary remembrances I have of figures flitting, as I may say, before my sight.... I will say no more on a subject so shocking as this must ever be to my remembrance.  

This passage is also printed in the third English edition, again with more capitals than the first. It is omitted from the Prévost but is present in the Le Tourneur:

C'est ainsi que je fus jouée et ramenée par surprise, trompée par des coeurs plus noirs que je ne croyais qu'il s'en pût trouver dans mon propre sexe, par des femmes qui me paroissoient être des femmes d'honneur & de considération: & c'est ainsi que je fus barbarement traitée par le scélérat quand il me vit retombée sous son pouvoir.

Again, with the word 'pouvoir,' the power struggle in the revolutionary text is apparent. Le Tourneur reveals the revolutionary rather than the illusory aspects of Clarissa's consciousness. Clarissa continues:

J'étois tellement stupide & sensible, que je n'ose pas assurer que les horribles créatures de la maison prêtassent en personne leur ministère à ses complots. Mais j'ai dans la mémoire des images de figures de femmes qui me passoient pour ainsi dire devant les yeux, & en particulière celle de l'affreuse Sinclair.... Je briserai sur un sujet le plus révoltant qui puisse jamais rester dans mon souvenir.

In these passages, the pathos of women, the victimization of Clarissa, not only by Lovelace but by other women, is apparent. Clarissa tells her story of the would-be Lady Betty and Lady Charlotte who come for her and trick her back to Mrs. Sinclair's brothel. She speaks of the 'tea' which
'had an odd taste,' the beer for her consuming thirst. Throughout these passages, the reader is given the image of woman as victim, powerless to determine her own fate. That Clarissa's version of the story is edited out of the Prévost translation is significant. Prévost wants to tell a good story without offending too much the delicate ears of the elite French society, his audience. He is not concerned with the victimization of woman. The fact that Le Tourneur retains this scene, suggests that he is indeed more revolutionary than Prévost in depicting realistically the masochistic suffering of Clarissa.

In remaining closer to the Richardson third edition, than Prévost does to the first, and in presenting us with a more detailed text of Clarissa's situation, Le Tourneur, in contrast with Prévost, is giving us a more revolutionary text. Through the use of more dramatic language, in his refusal to edit out - as Prévost does - some of the sexual overtones of the fire scene and the rape, Le Tourneur gives us the provocations in Clarissa's plight which might well prove a revolutionary warning to such dedicatedes as Monsieur and Marie Antoinette. By his very translation and by his dedication to Monsieur, and Marie Antoinette, Le Tourneur is implying that the royalty are subject to the same misfortunes as the middle-class Clarissa, and can gain insight and knowledge by studying the effects of her tragic life.

MILDRED SARAH GREENE
Arizona State University
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