



University of Richmond UR Scholarship Repository

Bookshelf

2015

The Other Rise of the Novel in Eighteenth-Century French Fiction

Olivier M. Delers

University of Richmond, odelers@richmond.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/bookshelf>

 Part of the [French and Francophone Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Delers, Olivier. *The Other Rise of the Novel in Eighteenth-Century French Fiction*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2015.

NOTE: This PDF preview of *The Other Rise of the Novel in Eighteenth-Century French Fiction* includes only the preface and/or introduction. To purchase the full text, please click [here](#).

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bookshelf by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

UR
FAC
PQ
648
.D545
2015

The Other Rise of the Novel in Eighteenth-Century French Fiction

Olivier Delers

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE PRESS

Newark LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND

Introduction

Writing the Rise of the French Novel

Our hero—we will call him I__ W__—is feverishly jotting down notes in the empty study hall of Saint John’s College when he notices a mysterious package on the table next to him. The thick envelope is open and curiosity gets the best of him. He stretches over, grabs it, and takes out five brown leather books with a dark patina that are surprisingly small and begging to be explored. They leave just a hint of that pleasant musty smell that emanates from old books forgotten on library shelves for too long. They are not too different from the books scattered on his table. The young student has been absorbed in the great novels of the eighteenth century: *Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded*; *The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling*; *The Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe of York, Mariner*; *The Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Famous Moll Flanders*. Actually, absorbed is quite an understatement—to say he has been utterly fascinated would be more accurate. There’s something about these stories: how they seem to follow the great economic transformations of the time, how their heroes and heroines are each portrayed as individuals with a singular set of motivations and feelings; how the writing, the craft of telling stories itself, could not be more different from the style of the romances that preceded them. The apprentice scholar is looking for connections—for a story to tell—and the different threads are slowly forming a coherent whole.

He cannot resist opening one of the strange books in front of him. The title page reads: *The History of the Chevalier des Grieux, Written by Himself*. Translated from the French. London, 1767, volume 1. Quite a coincidence, a French eighteenth-century novel. Let’s see, what else is there? Here’s volume 2. The next one is *Julia, or the New Eloisa*, “a series of original letters

collected and published by J. J. Rousseau.” This was published by Alex Donaldson, and “Sold at his shop, No 48. St Paul’s church-yard, London; and at Edinburgh.” The name, even the street number sound familiar: Donaldson probably published one of the early editions of Defoe or Richardson that our hero has checked out recently. *The New Eloisa*, a long novel apparently, in three volumes, penned by the famous *philosophe de Genève*, the father of the *Social Contract*. And because a lover of books is almost always a lover of stories, I__W__ starts reading.

He starts reading about Des Grieux’s burning passion for Manon and notices the two lovers’ tendency to squander money on the pleasures of eighteenth-century Paris. Promiscuous and hungry for money, but incapable of preserving the wealth she amasses, Manon is indeed an unusual courtesan. She is quite different from Roxana, he tells himself, as Defoe’s heroine carefully accumulates her lovers’ gifts and uses that leverage to rise through the ranks of the nobility. Night after night, I__W__ devours the two French novels, following the characters to the shores of Louisiana and to the remote Alpine setting of the Haut Valais. After reading the passionate epistolary exchange between Saint-Preux and Julie, he chuckles at the thought of Mr. B. writing long sentimental letters to Pamela, complaining about her unwillingness to give in to his advances. He is also puzzled by the last part of Rousseau’s novel. Why Clarens? Why a self-sufficient agricultural utopia of feudal inspiration at the dawn of the French Revolution? But let us leave our hero to his reading in the quiet halls of St. John’s College for the time being. He has more to read; he has just heard about an intriguing novel from the seventeenth century, *The Princess of Clèves*, and he has bought in a Cambridge bookshop a worn copy of a novel that few anthologies list, *Letters Written by a Peruvian Princess*, by a Mme de Graffigny. And in his early twenties, Ian Watt—for we can now reveal his name—is already plotting his first book, *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Prévost, Graffigny, and Rousseau*.

Unfortunately, literary scholars are not granted the luxury of traveling back in time to fashion an alternative universe devoid of the heavy weight of established interpretive paradigms. Would the study of the early modern French novel be in a different place today if Ian Watt actually *had* written his *Rise of the Novel* about Prévost, Graffigny, and Rousseau instead of Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding? Undoubtedly. Not only did Watt’s famous book relegate the eighteenth-century French novel to the back row of literary history after its author, in a short and sweeping statement, declared it “too stylish to be authentic,”¹ it also imposed an analytical framework that could be neither adapted to the specificities of a different national tradition, nor easily discarded as being irrelevant. The result is striking: except for Thomas DiPiero’s *Dangerous Truths and Criminal Passions* in 1992, almost none of the many studies of the eighteenth-century French novel directly addresses the

vexing question of how the novel as a genre is somehow connected to the social and economic changes that were taking place in the seventeenth and eighteenth century in France.²

Of course, invoking Ian Watt's legacy might be seen as a false premise for thinking about the economic dimension of the French novel. After all, why should we need a straw Englishman to define the terms of the debate, when there has been no shortage of new critical readings of the early modern French novel in recent years?³ Even though Watt's *Rise of the Novel* is only occasionally mentioned by scholars in France, the idea that the novel is first and foremost the literary genre of the bourgeoisie has also framed the French perspective. In his classic study, *Le roman français jusqu'à la Révolution*, Henri Coulet provides the following explanation for the emergence of new forms of narrative fiction in the early modern period: "what determined the evolution of the novel is the development of a bourgeois state of mind, the necessity of elaborating a mode of literary expression that reflects the outside world and modern thought when traditional modes were tied to a social reality which was no longer current."⁴ Or, to sum up Coulet's argument, "the novel is the means of expression of the bourgeoisie."⁵ Coulet, like others after him, already senses that this narrative might be too straightforward and unnuanced to be fully convincing, and hints at some of the problematic issues that need to be explored:

the rise of the bourgeoisie does not explain everything about the eighteenth-century novel. . . . bourgeois thought itself is not simple, it had its hesitations and contradictions, it was tempted by conformism and anarchism; there was something "bourgeois" in Prévost, in Rousseau, and by considering them as such, we might be able to explain important aspects of their art: the same explanation would not be worth much for Crébillon fils or Sade.⁶

The paradox is that almost fifty years later, and despite our more nuanced understanding of social hierarchies, identity formation, readership and authorship, and different veins of literary realism, the narrative of a bourgeois rise of the novel still dominates. It is a passive domination, often taken as a given, or as a convenient shortcut, especially in studies that are only peripherally concerned with economic and social questions. Few critics of the French novel (or of the English novel, for that matter) would portray the overall evolution of the genre in the same way as Coulet or Watt, and yet, it is quite common today to find readings of specific characters from novels that see in them bourgeois figures intent on subverting the old order; in fact, none of the characters that I focus on in this study—Lafayette's Mme de Clèves, Prévost's Des Grieux and Manon Lescaut, Graffigny's Zilia, Rousseau's Julie, and Sade's heroines Justine and Juliette—have escaped that fate. The paradigm is too tempting, too teleological to be replaced by what would necessarily be more "messy" interpretations that would require increasingly

specialized knowledge in a number of subfields such as eighteenth-century cultural history, theories of realism, and the history of the book, to name only a few.

The Other Rise of the Novel, in spite of its title, is not an attempt to pull together all the pieces of the puzzle in a new master narrative. Fantasizing over what Ian Watt would have said about Manon Lescaut or Julie d'Étange serves as a playful starting point, because *The Rise of the Novel* constitutes a frame of reference for the ideas that I present in this study. It explores the shifting representation of class identity in realistic narrative fiction, and it foregrounds rational individualism, both as a mode of behavior displayed by certain characters and as a discourse that stirs debates about the nature of social bonds. As a whole, scholarship on the eighteenth-century English novel has continued to pursue this line of questioning, most famously in Michael McKeon's *The Origins of the Novel* (1987) and, in the past twenty years or so, in a number of studies that seek to conceptualize in new ways the concomitant rise of literary realism and individualism. In that sense, Watt provides not a model to follow and apply indiscriminately to a different national tradition, but a door to a methodologically rich and complex body of research that has often been overlooked by scholars of the eighteenth-century French novel.

The Other Rise of the Novel begins by considering the contributions of revisionist cultural historians who have dispelled a number of "myths" about status and rank during the Ancien Régime and argues for new ways of assigning class identity to characters in novels from the second part of the seventeenth century and on through the eighteenth. Realistic storytelling, in the French novel, reveals a number of alternative economies that articulate private interest and other economic motives in ways that resist a straightforward narrative of the rise of individualism and bourgeois values. These economies, which rest on the moral and ethical choices that characters make when their identity or sense of self is challenged, are rarely well-integrated models and are often marked by the contradictions and uncertainties that result from overlapping ideologies. So the goal of this study is not to interrogate the relation between economic history or economic thought and the novel, but to dissect how economic behavior is depicted in works of fiction of this particular period. The novel functions as a staging ground for new modes of action and social models that can be observed, through close readings, with the eyes of a literary anthropologist. When we follow the "actors" in stories, step-by-step and without limiting what they do and say to predefined categories, we see that the French eighteenth-century novel does not point to a moment of epistemological transition or to the unfolding of a class dialectic, but to the radical indeterminacy that structures the complex politics of choice with which characters are confronted.

The story I tell in this book focuses on six novels that are demonstrative of how literary critics have traditionally analyzed the representation of economic behavior and class identity. It begins with the aptly named *Le Roman bourgeois* (1666), because Antoine Furetière's novel reveals that the Parisian "bourgeois" of the second half of the seventeenth century, even when they were derided for their greed and their hope for social mobility, were already tempted to seek refuge in idealized noneconomic spaces. Lafayette's *La Princesse de Clèves* (1678), Prévost's *Manon Lescaut* (1731), Graffigny's *Lettres d'une Péruvienne* (1747), and Rousseau's *Julie, ou La Nouvelle Héloïse* (1761) all stage characters who struggle with their noble identity and sense of self and who seek to protect their own interests from society's expectations and impositions. In each of the novels, a growing sense of anomie leads the main characters to define their own alternative economy as a response to a logic of reciprocal exchange. A reading of a less canonical text, Sade's *Les infortunes de la vertu* (1787), provides a dystopic closure to my study, for it signals that interpersonal relationships, even when they are still structured by the laws of the Ancien Régime, can prefigure the excesses and forms of exploitation of advanced capitalist societies. In the French novel, economic behavior does not evolve in a linear fashion. On the contrary, the old and the new, the premodern and the modern, are always entangled and negotiated in ways that resist classification.

* * *

Already in his *Dangerous Truths and Criminal Passions: The Evolution of the French Novel, 1569–1791*, Thomas DiPiero challenges us to question both the literary and social assumptions on which our understanding of the French novel and of the characters who populate it are based. His diagnosis that "the axiom that the novel appeared with the bourgeoisie and correlated its rise to predominance has long been unquestioned in the study of European fiction"⁷ serves as a preface for a more acerbic criticism of the rise of the novel paradigm:

Placing two simultaneous historical developments side by side and suggesting that they demonstrate a self-evident causality is simply an exercise in mystification. . . . To make sense of the apparently concurrent rise of the novel and the bourgeoisie, it is necessary to investigate not only the ideology of fiction at some convenient and arbitrary moment at which both novel and bourgeoisie can be said to exist, but also the ideology of fiction as a historical process.⁸

There are at least two other types of mystification beyond the simplistic homology that DiPiero denounces. He addresses one of them when he notes that "it is difficult to label the novel as a genre properly belonging to a specific portion of the ideological spectrum"⁹ and demonstrates that the nov-

el, not so surprisingly, also represents the ideological concerns of the nobility. Yet, DiPiero remains silent about a more fundamental and insidious type of mystification, partly because his analysis in terms of class struggle for hegemony between bourgeoisie and aristocracy relies on it. That mystification is visible in the discrepancy between revisionist historians' multifaceted descriptions of actual bourgeois and nobles in the seventeenth and eighteenth century and a tendency to continue seeing the two groups in light of a traditional narrative of the French Revolution. There is a "myth of the French bourgeoisie," as Sarah Maza has suggestively argued, just as there is still a myth of the French nobility that often conceals the central influence of noble social practices and moral ideals, especially in the eighteenth century.

If there was no self-conscious French bourgeoisie in the eighteenth century, then why are we sometimes tempted to assign bourgeois motives or values to an eighteenth-century novel's characters? Maza explains that *bourgeois* has referred to different types of people at different historical moments; Molière's *bourgeois gentilhomme* is obviously not the bourgeois entrepreneur of the nineteenth century, or the embodiment of the proletariat's nemesis. There is one common feature, however, among the different types of bourgeois. In the French social imaginary, "bourgeois" remains a pejorative term that no one willingly embraces as a description of one's own social identity. In fact, the term is rarely applied to characters in early modern works of fiction, except in comic novels like Furetière's *Le Roman bourgeois*, in which the bourgeois is the object of narratorial ridicule and sarcasm. As Maza points out, in the Ancien Régime, bourgeois was perceived first and foremost as a rank that provided access to certain fiscal advantages and effectively placed those who possessed it above laborious *négociants* and *avocats*. It was an old and respectable title, "given to a legally distinct, privileged, non-noble upper class" that functioned more like a "shadow aristocracy" than a counterpolitical or social force.¹⁰

The French bourgeoisie, then, is a myth not because there are no people called bourgeois, but because there is no coherent social group that thinks of itself as a class with a common identity and shared aspirations. So when historians and literary critics use the descriptor *bourgeois*, they refer to a set of values and behaviors that are not necessarily reserved for one particular group and are not always complementary. For Maza, this problematic generalization betrays a reluctance "to let go of the security blanket of Marxian terminology" because of the fear that questioning the relation between the bourgeoisie and capitalism in the eighteenth century "would amount to denying the reality and importance of things like inequality, penury, power, or exploitation."¹¹ Of course, it does not do so, as my reading of a number of novels will make abundantly clear in the following chapters. Even when seen from a "non-Marxist" or "post-Marxist" perspective, the novel still indexes social and economic phenomena that imply questions of power, social ex-

ploitation, or capital accumulation. The absence of a self-conscious bourgeoisie, as Marxist historian Colin Jones has convincingly shown in his critique of Maza and other revisionist historians, does not preclude the existence of "commercial capitalism," for instance.¹² But it means that those individuals engaged in capitalist ventures do not necessarily share all the traits that we associate with modern individualism and market economies and that, sometimes, the eighteenth-century capitalist might well have belonged to the court nobility.

The myth of the French nobility is just as pervasive and reductive as the myth of the French bourgeoisie, and here, too, historians of the eighteenth century have offered a less ideologically loaded view of the Ancien Régime, one that allows critics of the novel to think about strains of social identity and moral discourse and about the constraints these various influences pose for realistic (or less realistic) forms of novelistic representation. Guy Chaussinand-Nogaret's classic study, *The French Nobility in the Eighteenth Century: From Feudalism to Enlightenment*, still provides one of the most striking examples to debunk narrow conceptions of the nobility. He describes how Louis XVI himself, along with influential members of the old court nobility, invested capital in industrial projects, bankrolling, for example, a foundry in Le Creusot. Even though the high aristocracy rarely "competed with the commercial middle-class in traditional activities," it enjoyed "a sort of monopoly" when it came to "early forms of modern high capitalism."¹³ Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the nobility was also constantly recruiting and integrating new members from wealthy families who, generation after generation, had purchased offices leading to ennoblement. And, as Chaussinand-Nogaret notes, these newcomers tended to "[give] up middle-class values and assum[e] the ethic of the second order."¹⁴ While the nobility could still, in theory, lean on a strong common ideology, it was nonetheless far from being a coherent social group. The court aristocracy, for instance, had a different lifestyle and different interests from the provincial landed nobility, which saw its revenues fall and felt an ever-growing "disconnect" with monarchical power and its excesses.

The same characters who still tend to be labeled as portraying bourgeois ideals whenever they engage in apparently subversive behavior are often of noble origins themselves and in fact reflect the great variety of noble identities in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. Madame de Clèves is a true princess expected to live at court; Des Grieux comes from a well-respected provincial family with connections in Paris; Zilia's status as Peruvian princess carries over to the noble circles she visits in Paris and to her country retreat; Saint-Preux, even though he lacks the requisite *lettres de noblesse* for marrying Julie, still behaves like *un noble de cour*; and Sade's Juliette seamlessly moves from prostitute to courtesan to the enviable rank of *comtesse*.¹⁵ In other words, there is a critical propensity to rely on a category of analysis

that is not yet operative in the modern, nineteenth-century sense of *bourgeois* and to essentialize noble characteristics and backread them into earlier epochs, when novels actually require a greater sense of historical contingency, a more nuanced distinction among different ways of being noble, and a deeper understanding of the tensions that structure the noble class ethos.

Novels with strong noble characters generally portray a tension between, on the one hand, a certain nostalgic idealism and, on the other hand, decidedly modern ways of conceiving of social systems and the place of individuals in these systems. There was a strong nostalgic undercurrent in early modern noble culture, perhaps best described by David Posner as “a longing glance back toward a time when men were noble and kings knew their place—a *bon vieux temps* which, like all such entities, seems to have been written into the past, and to have been replaced by an inferior and corrupt imitation.”¹⁶ This trend was in many ways a response to the constant pressures to which models of noble behavior were subjected. The nobility, Posner, explains, “perceived itself to be in a period of difficulty, tension, and transition, in which certain previously secured ideas of what it meant to be ‘noble’ were being challenged, modified or replaced.”¹⁷ Realistic narrative fiction of the second half of the seventeenth century began indexing these uncertainties within the closed world of the court aristocracy, but also in the multifarious social space of the city.

For instance, Antoine Furetière’s *Le Roman bourgeois* (1666) is as much about the porosity of the nobility as a social group as it is about poking fun at crude Parisian bourgeois. As Elena Russo explains, the city “makes all sorts of disguise possible[;] with social mobility, human beings can wear masks, occupy new places and go through metamorphosis.”¹⁸ In Furetière’s novel, it is more specifically the space where commercial principles and idealized noble values converge. The ironic “*Tarif ou évaluation des partis sortables pour faire facilement les mariages*” epitomizes this tension, as it seeks to align the monetary value of a wife’s dowry with the more symbolic value of the office or title held by her husband. At the other end of the spectrum, Lafayette’s *La Princesse de Clèves* (1678) explores the question of noble identity and the value of the self in the context of court life. Madame de Clèves chooses to retreat to a nostalgic, quasi-presocial space in order to avoid uncertain and dangerous public spaces where relations between men and women are essentially corrupt and corrupting. In the novel, the heroine is constantly forced to navigate complex systems in which the individual engages in transactions with others and in which one’s autonomy is restrained by a network of allegiances and sentimental attractions. In the city or at court, the breakdown of a traditional noble ethos, the rise of anti-establishment behavior, or the presence of a commercial mindset were not subjects that emerged in the eighteenth century at the same time as a new class consciousness was supposed to be coming to the fore: they were already

crucial issues that found a fictional outlet in the second part of the seventeenth century.

As a matter of fact, the strong sense of self and desire for independence with which Lafayette endows her main character are not dissimilar to what historians like Jay Smith have described as being common practices among elite nobles at the court of Louis XIV. Those vying for important administrative and military positions were encouraged to think in meritocratic and thus individualistic terms, and to see themselves as managers of their own careers in royal service. For Smith, this new culture of merit highlights the tension between the nobility's "impressive adaptability" and its continued "adherence to established patterns of discourse."¹⁹ Jonathan Dewald also explores areas in which nobles were forced into "more individualistic modes of thought." It was not only political careers that required "focused attention on individual ambition rather than dynastic continuity as a key to understanding social arrangements." The increased sale of offices was related to new ways of thinking about property since it "forced nobles to think more carefully about money." Consequently, Dewald argues, "nobles came to view their society as in some sense an artificial creation rather than an organic hierarchy."²⁰ What marked social identity in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, then, was the intense integration and conciliation of seemingly antithetical modes of thought, patterns of social exchange, and forms of self-knowledge.

As Elena Russo claims in *La cour et la ville de la littérature classique aux Lumières: L'invention du soi*, conflicts over social identity "contribute[d] to maintaining a dynamic uncertainty over the conception of the self and of society, and . . . this unresolved tension produced an extraordinarily rich philosophical reflection that fed fiction."²¹ Rereading the French novel by pushing back against the historiographical "myths" concerning the nature of the bourgeoisie and of the nobility in the early modern period means that we should avoid using words like *bourgeois* and *aristocrat*, because doing so creates a tendency to erase the kinds of tensions and uncertainties that still make canonical works like *Manon Lescaut* or *Julie, ou La Nouvelle Héloïse* exciting to read. It also calls for a more open-ended investigation of the complex representation of action in narrative fiction. If we are not looking for moments of transition between the old aristocratic structures of the Ancien Régime and the new commercial principles of bourgeois capitalism, then we can follow characters as they engage in seemingly contradictory behavior and organize economic language in a number of alternative economies that have their own logic and interact in their own ways with early modern culture.

Historiographical revision is only the first hurdle to clear in order to begin thinking about a different rise of the French novel. The second hurdle is what Ian Watt calls “formal realism,” or more precisely, the idea that realism as a novelistic technique is best explained as being the byproduct of a new consciousness based on the emergence of middle-class values, capitalist ideals, and rational individualism. The homology, as Robert Folkenflik quips in his article “The Heirs of Ian Watt” is also a tautology: “The rise of the novel is the rise of capitalism is the rise of the middle class.”²² The notion that the novel is the literary companion to economic modernity has a long and glorious history. It stands behind Georg Lukacs’s *Theory of the Novel*, first published in 1920, and it is heralded by Lucien Goldman in his structuralist essay, *Toward a Sociology of the Novel*, as “the transportation on the literary plane of everyday life in the individualistic society created by market production.”²³ It is central to Watt’s thesis and remains a cornerstone of even the best post-Wattian analyses of the English novel. Michael McKeon’s *The Origins of the English Novel*, for instance, with all its theoretical sophistication and ambitious reworking of both literary and social categories, only updates the established critical mold: “the novel emerged in early modern England as a new literary fiction designed to engage the social and ethical problems that established literary fictions could no longer mediate.”²⁴

The evolution of realistic storytelling follows a paradoxical path in France. On the one hand, certain novels predate the “new literary fiction” exemplified by Defoe’s or Richardson’s bestsellers in England. The *romans comiques* of Scarron and Furetière blend social ambitions with reflexive narratorial comments about the ability of narratives to tell the “truth”; Lafayette’s *nouvelle historique*, *La Princesse de Clèves*, still surprises readers today for its groundbreaking treatment of a character’s inner thoughts; and the picaresque novels of Lesage or Challes at the beginning of the eighteenth century openly deal with the unintended consequences of social mobility. On the other hand, the French novel does not become the literary medium that channels in a cohesive manner new forms of consciousness or social identity. Even when it deals with economic concerns like investing in and managing relationships, determining objective and relative value, and weighing one’s interest against that of others, it tends to reaffirm the relevance of a traditional moral ethos and to paint a picture of noble characters as being more interested in questions of sociability than in financial or mercantilist activity. Recently, Nicholas Paige, in *Before Fiction: The Ancien Régime of the Novel*, has suggested a paradigm shift that would change the relation between textual and historical reality, and between the rise of realism and the rise of individualism. The central issue here is not only the rise of the bourgeoisie but also a more pervasive tendency to believe that “the way people write novels follows the way they think,” and thus that “because the way they think changes . . . the novel changes.” Lamenting the fact that our knowledge of

the novel “has been shaped and limited by an inability to separate the history of the novel from the history of realism,” Paige critiques the continued tendency to link the emergence of new forms of literary realism to the rise of modernity.²⁵

It is not necessary to rehearse here the critical history of realism for the early modern French novel. My argument is not about “techniques of illusion,” to borrow the title of Vivienne Mylne’s important book on the topic in 1965, nor is it meant to discriminate between different levels of realism and how early modern readers reacted to their introduction. I am interested in the relation between what we would generally recognize as realist texts and the forms of social and economic discourse that these texts convey. When we focus on that aspect, we cannot help but notice a long critical stagnation. Georges May’s seminal 1963 book *Le Dilemme du roman au XVIIIe siècle* follows in great detail the debates over the dangerous verisimilitude of the novel—over what readers were likely to take as being fictional and what they might misconstrue as fact. Fiction writers, he explains, had to adapt and toy with the formal characteristics of the genre to appease their detractors, since novels were seen as a threat to moral values and established hierarchies.²⁶ For May, however, the tension between the new possibilities offered by social realism and the more traditional conceptions of what could be represented in fiction can only be conceived within the opposition between “the forceful rise of the bourgeoisie” and “the decline of the authority principle.”²⁷ The consensus in the field had not changed much in 1992 when DiPiero wrote that “studies of the early French or British novel have traditionally considered formal realism to be the genre’s defining characteristic . . . but in general all agree that the rising middle class had something to do with the change.”²⁸

There are, however, a number of isolated instances in which critics have had the intuition that the status quo is too limiting and that the eighteenth-century novel cannot simply mirror a one-dimensional historical process. The first is another seminal work: Peter Brooks’s *The Novel of Worldliness*. For Brooks, “worldliness” is at once “a way of life and an outlook” and “a system and consciousness.”²⁹ In other words, the traditional understanding of the term, which readily applies to the novels of Crébillon, Duclos, and Laclos, cannot be dissociated from the broader study of “man-in-situation.”³⁰ Worldliness becomes “a concept at the same time real, moral, psychological, and imaginative: the actual way of life of a milieu, a system of values, a form of personal consciousness and behavior, and a literary subject.”³¹ What Brooks suggests in his study is that the representation of characters in a specific milieu is intimately linked to a reflection on the nature of representation itself. The novel of worldliness does not just represent reality; to an extent, it produces it and organizes it. In another instance, Marie-Hélène Huet cautions against reading processes of identification through the lens of

the French Revolution or the picaresque tradition of social mobility.³² Huet sees the hero as “le héros et son double,” a narrative force that vouches for the authenticity of what has been experienced by the characters, a force that guarantees “the link between reality and the text.”³³ But at the same time, she resists making a direct link between fictional examples of social success and the reality of eighteenth-century everyday life. “The phenomenon of social mobility, as it is described in eighteenth-century literature,” she concludes, “is more a product of the imagination—of our desire—than a fact.”³⁴

In *Le Héros et son double*, Huet is already hinting at the type of questions that Nicholas Paige recently raised and that Deirdre Lynch poses in a more systematic manner in *The Economy of Character*: “What [can we] know about character’s history if we refrain from using narrative frameworks such as ‘the rise of individualism’ or ‘the rise of realism’? What happens if we do not assume that the history of character and the history of the individual are the same thing?”³⁵ Instead of simply adding her own twist to the perennial question of the rise of the novel, Lynch proposes a much more provocative reversal of perspective as she argues for a new approach to reading character. Even though Lynch is primarily interested in the material culture of the Regency in England and its relation to fiction, the theoretical underpinnings of her argument are actually just as relevant for the French novel as they are for the English novel. With its variety of realist styles and its different approaches to the treatment of character, the French novel is a perfect candidate for what Lynch calls a “pragmatics of character” that avoids reductionist interpretations predetermined by literary convention or by a certain historical or ideological conception of the social world.³⁶

This pragmatics of character is not concerned with “individualities or inner lives”—that is, with the emergence of a “new” form of consciousness—but with “the systems of semiotic and fiduciary exchange—the machinery of interconnectedness—that made a commercial society go” (or, for that matter, I should add, that makes *any* society go).³⁷ Perhaps Lynch’s most compelling critical move is to think of character action in terms of social, financial, and discursive exchange and not in terms of its propensity to parallel the historical changes taking place in a particular time period:

Character has no autonomous history. Character is not a single object that presents itself in one form at the start of the eighteenth century and another, changed form at the end. Instead, what changes are the plural forces and rules that compose the field in which reading and writing occur. What changes as the eighteenth century unfolds are the pacts that certain ways of writing character establish, at given historical moments, with other, adjacent discourses—discourses on the relations between different sectors of the reading public or discourses that instruct people in how to imagine themselves as participants in a nation or in a marketplace or as leaders or followers of fashion.³⁸

Clearly, Lynch is primarily interested in the fruitful exchanges that might occur between characters in novels and actual eighteenth-century readers. But her pragmatics of character is also helpful in thinking about the discursive exchanges that take place between characters, or even *within* characters. The challenge for early modern French fiction writers was not so much to turn readers' "transaction with characters" into full-fledged "social experiences"³⁹ but to produce realist heroes and heroines who could mediate different types of discourse and modes of behavior. These characters had to reconcile, for instance, the idealized values of the nobility with court practices that promoted selfish interest; they had to adapt these forms of interest shaped by court relations to sentimental situations and transmit how the notion of interest transformed itself to fit a new ethic of *sensibilité*. So characters in the eighteenth-century French novel are not necessarily helping readers think of their place as "participants in a nation or in a marketplace," to quote Lynch again, but they are, novel after novel, painting a picture of a complex, layered, at times self-contradictory identity through "intrafictional" discursive and fiduciary exchanges.

A pragmatics of character helps eschew the pitfalls of the paradigmatic assumption that realism as a mode of storytelling emerged at the same time as rational individualism. It also helps avoid another problematic aspect of many studies focusing on the rise of realism in the eighteenth century and beyond. As several feminist critics have noted, privileging realism as a central component of the novel as a genre tends to conceal other dimensions of the text. It often obscures the contribution of romance to the novel and more generally "displaces the powerful presence of sentimentality in the literary field."⁴⁰ Of course, the rise of individualism, to the extent that it relies heavily on the language of political economy, is a narrative that primarily documents the development of modern male subjectivity. Any new rise of the novel should be gender-corrective and resist what Nancy Miller has called the "evolutionary thesis" that is often applied to readings of the eighteenth-century novel.⁴¹ This means foregrounding important novels written by women authors, but more importantly, it means insisting on the absence of continuity in the representation of female characters' thoughts and behavior. Not every heroine, whether she finally commits to conjugal fidelity like Manon, retreats to a private space away from the world like Zilia does, or becomes a model wife and mother like Julie does, should be automatically read as embodying the advent of bourgeois domesticity. This also means correcting a long-standing critical tradition that typically interrogates the language of interest and generosity, for instance, through the writings of great male philosophers like La Rochefoucauld or Rousseau on one side of the Channel, or Mandeville and Adam Smith on the other. We should turn instead to female characters who continue to fascinate us today for their complexity and singularity—Mme de Clèves, Zilia, Sade's Justine—and ana-

lyze how their actions offer a rich view of the relation between gratitude and disinterestedness or between untamed passion and self-preservation.

Conversely, male characters can often make important contributions to the study of sentimental motifs: the heartaches and tears of *l'homme sensible* constitute an integral part of his conception of social identity. Representations of the transformative power of feelings, the danger of social impositions, the politics of friendship, or the fear of unfair exchanges—whether they are depicted through a female or a male character—were shaped by the economic, ethical, and epistemic assumptions of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century society in which their authors lived, but they also shaped a view of the social world that could not be easily limited to a particular gender or class ethos. In other words, the treatment of characters in eighteenth-century realist novels is not simply representational and it does more than mirror actual social and economic phenomena in a verisimilar fashion. It is (and was) also reality-producing in that it produces meaning, knowledge, and a whole theory of social relations through the articulation, juxtaposition, and confrontation of different discourses. And in the chapters that follow, it will become clear that female characters are particularly apt at producing reality and at transforming their stories into alternative social models.

If the main drive behind realism in the French novel is not to index the emergence of a new consciousness that would replace old ways of thinking, then what does realistic prose fiction tell us about seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French society? In my readings of novels that span a 130-year period—from Furetière's *Le Roman bourgeois*, published in 1666, to Sade's *Les infortunes de la vertu*, written in the years preceding the French Revolution—I show that novels freely pitch the culture of the court society against a critique of moral corruption, sentimental against rational forms of thinking, and the discourse of sensibility against its subverted sexualized or pornographic version. Instead of “negotiating” the passage from the old to the new, the novel makes it clear that what we have learned to analyze as incompatible and distinct modes of thought and behavior are in fact intertwined. In particular, analyzing main characters' interaction with other characters and engagement with the social world portrayed in the novel provides fertile ground for thinking in both practical and theoretical terms about a number of questions that remain relevant in the twenty-first century: what type of social knowledge and self-knowledge is necessary to function in society? How are economic, social, and symbolic capital distributed and acquired? Can individuals trust each other in a world ruled by selfish interest? What must be given back when something is offered? How can body and soul preserve their unity and independence while being constantly steeped in social and commercial exchanges? The eighteenth-century French novel does not reflect material culture mimetically, nor does it generally comment on specific economic events of the period. It is primarily invested in the representation of economic

behavior as it stems from moralistic discourse on the nature of interest, from the language of social organization that characterizes political economy, and from concerns over the nature of action of what has come to be called economic sociology.

* * *

In the paradigm of the rise of the novel, the coming of age of a bourgeois middle class and the advent of new realistic techniques cannot be separated from the idea that the novel is the literary vehicle best equipped to convey through its characters and storylines the perfect rationality of *homo economicus*. Of course, the reverse hypothesis has also had a lot of traction. The novel, some have argued, does just the contrary, serving as a locus of resistance to classical and neoliberal economic theories about the primacy of self-interest as a human motive. In seventeenth- and eighteenth-century novels, the notion of interest is as omnipresent as it is hard to pin down. Heroes and heroines are constantly struggling with different ways of articulating their own interest and rationalizing their actions. Personal interest, for instance, means something different to Mme de Clèves, as she tries to reconcile her passion for M. de Nemours with her duty to her husband, than it does to Manon, who betrays her lover Des Grieux by repeatedly seducing rich Parisian aristocrats, or to Julie, who is compelled to accept M. de Wolmar as her husband even after she has promised herself to Saint-Preux. For Zilia, acting rationally means protecting herself from the dangers of interested exchanges, and Sade's Justine, who conceals a strong sense of self-interest behind seemingly altruistic actions, only suffers because of it.

As Pierre Force has shown, self-interest and the "selfish hypothesis" have a long and tortuous history even "before Adam Smith," as the concept progressively expanded beyond the realm of reason of state theory, where it originated, to "the totality of human conduct."⁴² La Rochefoucauld was the first to decipher disguised selfishness in the actions of his peers, but, in doing so, he also questioned the absolute systematicity of self-interest as a guiding principle. He "shows how human behavior follows the logic of self-interest and how, at the same time, it fails to live up to this logic. In addition, [he] injects ambiguity into the concept of self-interest by noticing that our passions themselves have an interest of their own."⁴³ Interestingly, Force remarks that this ambiguity structured debates over the centrality of self-interest not only in works of philosophy and political economy of the late seventeenth and eighteenth century, but also in those of the twentieth century; for instance, in Alfred Hirschman's critique of the "economic" approach developed by Chicago School Nobel laureate Gary Becker, Force sees "a modern continuation of Hume's critique of the neo-Epicurean philosophers of his age."⁴⁴

The evolution of self-interest as a concept is not contiguous with that of economic modernity and, in fact, self-interest becomes a crucial notion to help us think not in terms of transition or conflict between premodern and modern modes of action, but in terms of continuity and reconfiguration in a different historical context. In his analysis of La Rochefoucauld's maxims, Force documents how the idea that self-interest factors heavily in individual decisions originated in the world of the court society:

the behavior of courtiers as described by La Rochefoucauld is consistent with the two principal axioms of mainstream economic theory. Firstly, the courtier acts exclusively upon self-seeking motives (he wants power and prestige). Secondly, the courtier's behavior maximizes his utility: every move the courtier makes can be interpreted as an attempt to get the most power and prestige at the lowest cost for himself in terms of services rendered and favors done to others. The interest doctrine was born in the context of seventeenth-century politics and extended by La Rochefoucauld to the behavior of the entire aristocracy—that is to say, for La Rochefoucauld, all human behavior.⁴⁵

So what we see in Force's reading of La Rochefoucauld is not what Norbert Elias describes as a transition between, on the one hand, forms of rationality that were specific to the court and to a noble conception of action and, on the other, a new bourgeois rationality that emerged in the eighteenth century.⁴⁶ Likewise, what we see in works of fiction is not a struggle for dominance between two distinct forms of rationality or a shift to a more "bourgeois" or "capitalist" understanding of self-interest. Instead, each novel produces a self-contained theory of interest—almost always an unfinished theory steeped in its own contradictions—and hints at possible abstractions of economic behavior that are still relevant in today's conversations about the nature of economic motives.

As Martha Woodmansee and Mark Osteen argue in the introduction to the *New Economic Criticism*, the question of private interest and economic rationality remains one of the "neglected realms of economic storytelling."⁴⁷ There is a need to have "non-economic" or "anti-economic" theories bear upon Marxist and neoclassicalist assumptions because fiction has the potential to offer an alternative narrative to the evolution of the concept of interest in the early modern period and to its subsequent status as a universal primary motive that explains all economic behavior.⁴⁸ What is at stake here is not simply the usefulness of a different set of theories for thinking about the configuration of the social world in works of fiction but the possibility of devising new ways to read behavior. This is where economic sociology can help by providing a cross-disciplinary outlook on the versatile nature of private interest. Because it finds its roots in Maussian ethnology and structuralist anthropology, economic sociology is wary of mainstream liberal or neoliberal assumptions and suggests alternative ways of characterizing the

rationality of social actors. But it also shares parallel practices with literary analysis, because any conceptualization of action relies on direct observations and thus offers a “close reading” of interactions, modes of thought, and social systems. My approach is sociological, then, to the extent that I follow characters through their textual journeys and decode the nature of action in a number of fictional universes with their own idiosyncratic structures. In the case of the early modern novel, reading economic behavior with anthropological practices in mind makes room for interpretations that do not necessarily parallel the trajectory of political economy, from its early moralist incarnations in the seventeenth century to Rousseau’s social contract or physiocratic hypotheses in the eighteenth century. The expression of self-interest remains inextricably tied, and sometimes subordinated, to what we would characterize today as premodern modes of thought and action. In the end, interest is first and foremost presented as a skill, as a natural ability to read the social world and to adapt to situations by relying on different modes of behavior or different forms of rationality.

The work of Pierre Bourdieu on the notion of *habitus* provides theoretical support for revising monopolistic interpretations of interest in the early modern novel, and, beyond that, for conceptualizing more thoroughly the nature of individual action in complex social systems. In *Raisons pratiques*, Bourdieu argues that, “The economic universe is made up of several economic worlds, endowed with specific ‘rationalities,’ at the same time assuming and demanding ‘reasonable’ (more than rational) dispositions adjusted to the regularities inscribed in each of them, to the ‘practical reason’ which characterizes them.”⁴⁹ For him,

The theory of the process of differentiation and autonomization of social universes having different fundamental laws leads to a breaking up of the notion of interest; there are as many forms of libido, as many kinds of “interest,” as there are fields. Every field, in producing itself, produces a form of interest which, from the point of view of another field, may seem like disinterestedness (or absurdity, lack of realism, folly, etc.).⁵⁰

Reading economic behavior in works of fiction means uncovering these seemingly irrational forms of behavior and showing that they are in fact a very coherent expression of a character’s interest within a particular field—a particular fictional universe with its own singular relation to extratextual reality. Characters are interesting to us precisely because they do not always act according to expectations. The internal logic of their actions is not always immediately transparent to the reader. “Between agents and the social world,” Bourdieu explains, “there is a relationship of infraconscious, infralinguistic complicity: in their practice agents constantly engage in theses which are not posed as such.”⁵¹ The task of the “literary sociologist,” then, consists in making apparent what lies behind words and behind the articula-

tion of fictional action in narratives. In doing so, the observer and critic can avoid the danger of “economism,” of “considering the laws of one social field among others, namely the economic field, as being valid for all fields” and thus of reducing all modes of behavior to the definition of interest championed by classical economics.⁵²

Bourdieu’s approach to the practice of sociological interpretation underpins a conception of the individual that challenges the traditional methods used by literary analysis to read economic behavior and to group particular character traits under predefined social labels. Bourdieu warns against the temptation of applying a “substantialist mode of thought” to action and turning values and preferences into “a sort of biological essence.”⁵³ In his late work, Bourdieu seems particularly concerned that sociology might act to essentialize behavior and impose categories of interpretation on social actors: “the very validity of the classification risks encouraging a perception of theoretical classes, which are fictitious regroupings existing only *on paper*, through an intellectual decision by the researcher, as *real* classes, real groups, that are constituted as such in reality.”⁵⁴ I have shown in the first part of this introduction that literary critics tend to fall into a similar trap when they link novel characters to social groups that are in themselves critical constructions limited, by definition, to a particular set of attributes. In what sounds like a self-critique of his own theoretical models, Bourdieu delineates a sociology of action that is anchored in a more pragmatic and fluid conception of human action—an approach to reading behavior that can provide literary analysis with new critical tools as it moves toward a “pragmatics of character,” to borrow Deirdre Lynch’s concept again.

Following developments in sociological theory and epistemology can be particularly useful for reflecting upon the social and economic dimension of characters in the French eighteenth-century novel and beyond. Luc Boltanski’s recent call for a “pragmatic sociology of critique” (a sociology that is both a continuation and a critique of Bourdieu’s thought) offers new ways of understanding the coexistence of multiple forms of rationality in a specific social environment and of conceptualizing the relation between idiosyncratic systems of values and the interpretive categories that critics use to make sense of them.⁵⁵ Boltanski is spearheading a school of sociological thought that seeks to reinstate a level of uncertainty and randomness in the observation and decoding of individual modes of action, with the expressed goal of liberating action from theoretical frameworks, which invariably force individuals into static categories and, in doing so, limit our understanding of what they do and how they think. Boltanski suggests instead “to bracket an unduly powerful explanatory system, whose mechanical utilization risks crushing the data (as if the sociologists already knew in advance what they were going to discover), so as to observe, naively as it were, what actors do, the way they interpret the intentions of others, the way they argue their case,

and so on.”⁵⁶ Social actors, Boltanski argues, are endowed with “the cognitive capacity to make comparisons”⁵⁷ and are thus ideally placed to provide a critical reading of their own choices and preferences: “The pragmatic sociology of critique, by contrast, fully acknowledges actors’ critical capacities and the creativity with which they engage in interpretation and action *in situ*.”⁵⁸

Of course, the social actors addressed in sociological research cannot be unproblematically conflated with the social actors staged in works of fiction. But Boltanski’s new model posits the possibility that characters themselves might provide readers with the means of interpreting their own actions, with the critical instruments to make sense of their singular, multifaceted, and at times contradictory ways of being in the world of the text. It draws our attention to the creative critical potential that resides in characters, and to the need for critics to look at the depiction of action without the historically and ideologically loaded filters that they have learned to apply. In other words, what Boltanski’s pragmatic sociology of critique encourages us to do is to consider the representation of social and economic phenomena in fiction not from the perspective of “a social world that is already shaped” but from that of “a social world in the process of being shaped.”⁵⁹

Taken together, attempts by sociologists to reconfigure the nature of action have deep ramifications for how literary critics interpret characters’ behavior and, beyond that, for how they think of different societies as critical constructions of their own. Perhaps the most radical paradigm shift for apprehending social phenomena in new ways can be found in Bruno Latour’s *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Like Bourdieu and Boltanski, Latour warns against “follow[ing] social theorists and begin[nin]g our travel by setting up at the start which kind of group and level of analysis we will focus on,” and instead suggests that “we follow the actors’ own ways and begin our travels by the traces left behind by their activity of forming and dismantling groups.”⁶⁰ Sociology, for Latour, should no longer be defined as “the science of the social” but as “the tracing of associations.” In this alternative perspective, “‘social’ is not some glue that could fix everything including what the other glues cannot fix: it is *what* is glued together by many *other* types of connectors.”⁶¹ Again, the shift that Latour proposes can usefully be applied to the practice of literary analysis. If close readings, for instance, are often used to confirm or illustrate what has already been posited, they are more rarely used in a “pragmatic” manner, as the “tracing of associations,” whether they are linguistic, paratextual, metatextual, or other types of associations. Close reading, then, should reflect the desire to follow the text as it unfolds, and should pursue links and relations where they take us without looking for proof of a predetermined historical narrative or ideological view that a particular work of fiction should reinforce. Thus, when we read character behavior, we should not begin from “the

determination of action by society,” “the calculative abilities of individuals,” or “the power of the unconscious,” but from “the *under-determination of action*, from the uncertainties and controversies about who and what is acting when ‘we’ act—and there is of course no way to decide whether this source of uncertainty resides in the analyst or in the actor” (Latour’s emphasis). This is the reason why action, whether it is lived or represented, should “remain a surprise, a mediation, an event.”⁶²

Approaching the nature of action from this angle would not mean that sociological (or literary) analysis could suddenly make claims to total objectivity. The gaze that traces associations, as pragmatic and underdetermined as it tries to be, is necessarily shaped by its own subjective preconceptions. But using the methodologies suggested by Boltanski and Latour to inform our close reading practices would allow us, as literary critics, to uncover the ideological blind spots of previous readings and to create associations between textual elements that would otherwise appear disconnected. In the case of the early modern French novel, we can follow characters as they question their noble identity and ideals, provide a counternarrative for the evolution of the concept of self-interest in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and articulate alternative economies that seek to reclaim an authentic sense of self.

My close readings reveal that these alternative economies are idealistic constructions that are almost never directly connected to a critique of noble privileges, to actual social change, or to the works of the *philosophes* on political economy. They are characterized by a strong nostalgic undercurrent, but nonetheless contain a very dynamic and creative conception of action; they often highlight alternative forms of rationality that deviate substantially from the kind of rational individualism that constitutes the hallmark of economic modernity. These economies juxtapose social practices that we tend to see as being incompatible in fictional universes but that still manage to remain coherent and realistic. In *Le Roman bourgeois*, the same characters who accept arranged marriages based on economic valuation are also eager to retreat to the idealized world of pastoral storytelling. In *Manon Lescaut*, those who belong to the elite and the privileged classes engage in oppositional behavior in an attempt to carve out a space where authentic friendship and sentiments can be preserved. Zilia’s gift economy in *Lettres d’une Péruvienne* indexes the self-interested nature of individual action but at the same time lays out a set of principles that would permit truly disinterested social exchanges. The characters of *La Nouvelle Héloïse* progressively articulate the idea of an escrow economy based on the possibility of holding off on a transaction and of entrusting a friend with immaterial possessions to prevent them from circulating on the open market. And in *Les infortunes de la vertu*, Sade presents a network economy that makes trust, friendship, and more generally all moral behavior irrelevant, and that relies on secrecy, ease of

movement, and an intimate knowledge of social structures to exploit those who are excluded from dominant circles of influence.

So this is a story that Ian Watt would not have written, even if he had stumbled upon Prévost's or Rousseau's novels in his early days as a Cambridge student. The critical apparatus that each chapter deploys is a product of its time, of a post-Marxist moment in our thinking about early modern social groups and about the nature of interpersonal relations and personal motivations, in historiography, economic sociology, science studies, or critical theory. My study also tends to emphasize two particular aspects of literary analysis—reading economic behavior and decoding the types of fictional economies that novels foreground—at the expense, perhaps, of other aspects that were central to Watt's account of the rise of the British novel: the transformation of the literary marketplace, the coming of age of a large "middle-class" readership, or debates over what constitutes formal realism. What follows is not so much *the* other rise of the novel as it is a possible alternative story of the evolution of the French novel in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a story that I hope opens the way for other stories that can refine it and complete it.

NOTES

1. Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding* (1957; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001), 30. "In France, the classical critical outlook, with its emphasis on elegance and concision, was not fully challenged until the coming of Romanticism. It is perhaps partly for this reason that French fiction, from *La Princesse de Clèves* to *Les Liaisons dangereuses* stands outside the main tradition of the novel. For all its psychological penetration and literary skill, we feel it is too stylish to be authentic" (ibid.).

2. I should qualify this statement by mentioning a number of studies that have provided great insights into this question, beginning with Georges May, *Le Dilemme du roman au XVIIIe siècle* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1963), and Marie-Hélène Huet, *Le Héros et son double: Essai sur le roman d'ascension sociale au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Librairie José Corti, 1975). See also Malcolm Cook, *Fictional France: Social Reality in the French Novel, 1775–1800* (Oxford: Berg, 1993); and David Denby, *Sentimental Narrative and the Social Order in France, 1760–1820* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

3. Worth noting in the past fifteen years are Patrick Coleman, *Reparative Realism: Mourning and Modernity in the French Novel, 1730–1830* (Geneva: Droz, 1998); Jenny Mander, *Circles of Learning: Narratology and the Eighteenth-Century French Novel* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1999); Thomas Pavel, *La pensée du roman* (Paris: Gallimard, 2003); Christophe Martin, *Espaces du féminin dans le roman français du dix-huitième siècle* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2004); and Colette Cazenobe, *Au malheur des dames: le roman féminin au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Champion, 2006).

4. Henri Coulet, *Le roman jusqu'à la Révolution*, tome 1, *Histoire du roman en France* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1967), 323–24. The original in French reads as follows: "ce qui a déterminé l'évolution du roman, c'est le progrès de l'esprit bourgeois, la nécessité d'élaborer une forme d'expression littéraire à l'image du monde et de la pensée moderne quand les formes traditionnelles étaient liées à un état dépassé de la société . . ."

5. "[Le roman] est le moyen d'expression de la bourgeoisie," ibid., 286.

6. Ibid., 287. The original in French reads as follows: "l'ascension de la bourgeoisie n'explique pas tout le roman du XVIIIe siècle . . . la pensée bourgeoise elle-même n'est pas