

INTRODUCTION

Eighteenth-Century Translating

Early in *Don Quixote* the reader is told of a Basque squire accompanying a lady traveler whom Don Quixote believes to be a captive of wicked and monstrous creatures—actually two Benedictine friars. When Don Quixote encounters her with the Basque squire, he attempts a rescue and almost comes to blows with the Basque: “Don Quixote was charging the wary Basque with his sword on high, determined to cut him in half, and the Basque, well-protected by his pillow, was waiting for him, his sword also raised, and all the onlookers were filled with fear and suspense regarding the outcome of the great blows they threatened to give to each other.”¹ With swords raised, spectators agape, and the reader held in suspense, part 1 of *Don Quixote* abruptly ends: “[A]t this very point and juncture, the author of the history leaves the battle pending, apologizing because he found nothing else written about the feats of Don Quixote other than what he has already recounted.”² The narrator thus goes out in search of the story and fortuitously discovers it in some papers sold at the market in Toledo, but they are in Arabic and a translator must be found. Toledo, the famous medieval translation center where Arabic translators preserved the ancients, has no shortage of translators. A Morisco begins to interpret aloud from the “History of Don Quixote of La Mancha. Written by Cide Hamete Benengeli, an Arab Historian,” and the man is quickly contracted to render a faithful version of the Arabic.³ The rest of the novel is, then, the narrator’s account of the anonymous translation of the Arabic historian’s narrative, the second version in the book thus far, and possibly one of any number of versions of the Don Quixote story in the world. The torsions

of translation and originality in *Don Quixote* seem all the more conscious when the narrator, affirming his belief in the narrative's recoverability—"it seemed impossible . . . that so good a knight should have lacked a wise man who would assume the responsibility of recording his never-before-seen deeds"—adds a two-line quotation from Alva Gómez's Spanish translation of Petrarch's *Trionfi*, but it is a passage from the translation that does not appear in the original.⁴ And when the narrator also suggests that the Morisco translator and the "second author" might not be truly translating the Arab historian, we become aware that we will never be able to tell the difference anyway.

I begin with this oft-quoted scene in *Don Quixote* not because it is a clever metafiction about translating, but because it describes an underappreciated truth about eighteenth-century novels. As in the *Don Quixote* story, translating and originality are not easily distinguished in eighteenth-century fiction, not least because novels did not simply move from the source to target language, and one nation to another, but dangled between languages and cultures. *The Spread of Novels* is a study of this imbricated field and how it fed the novel's emergence in the eighteenth century, focusing specifically on English and French as the novel's core languages. Although novels in the eighteenth century came from diverse regions and were translated from other European vernaculars, as well as Greek, Latin, and Arabic, cross-Channel translating was the most active and fervent arena and, few would argue, the site of the novel's emergence. My goal is not, however, to prove that the modern origin or rise of the novel was transnational. The claim that eighteenth-century prose fiction is a mixed form and culturally hybridized through translation and transmission has been almost axiomatic since at least the eighteenth century. It has been renovated in recent scholarship on eighteenth-century fiction, and more broadly in studies that reconfigure national literary traditions in regional, imperial, or global contexts.⁵ This study takes for granted the claim that prose fiction had a long and varied history in translation and that cultural mixing is endemic to the novel. Rather than arguing that the rise of the novel is transnational, I attempt to trace the dynamic history and changing meaning of fiction's mobility in the eighteenth century. Prose fiction was always already cross-national because of translation long before the rise of the novel and has only widened its realm of circulation since the mid-eighteenth century, but translating—both rendering practices and their meaning for literary relations—changed drastically in the eighteenth century. I argue that the novel emerges because of the ways in which fiction accommodated this shift in translating. In other words, I do not attempt

to demonstrate the transnationality of the novel in the eighteenth century so much as historicize fiction's extranationality as a key to the emergence of the novel. To begin, we need a method for the study of translation that recognizes the eighteenth century's historical specificity.

What We Talk about When We Talk about Translation

In recent years, scholars have provided a much-needed alternative to linguistic and empirical approaches to translation by arguing for its cultural role.⁶ Linguistics alone can “unduly restrict [translation’s] role in cultural innovation and social change,” as Lawrence Venuti has noted, and the alternative has been to argue that translation is at least a cipher for cultural processes, if not an agent in those processes.⁷ Focusing as much on the target nation and culture as the source culture, we now look more closely at how translation can “wield enormous power in constructing representations of foreign cultures”⁸ and at translation’s crucial role in nation building and national literary canons.⁹ Translation has also played an increasing role in colonial studies, seen as an instrument of colonization that can establish and extend imperial hegemony or alternatively seen as one of the ambiguous and negotiable aspects of colonial encounter.¹⁰ In a postcolonial context, scholars have shown how translating reappropriates or resists a hegemonic language and literary norms.¹¹ At the same time, the notion of “translating cultures” or “cultural translation” has come to the fore in discussions of globalization and transnationalism.¹² While this latter trend represents the renewed purchase of translation in the academy, it has sometimes co-opted translating for nonlinguistic mediations, and Emily Apter is rightly concerned to avoid allowing “the terms *translation* and *translingualism* to become pallid metaphors for any act of cultural negotiation.”¹³

One widespread and influential method in translation studies, which addresses both the linguistic and the cultural aspects of rendering, analyzes the transfer of texts across borders as either “domesticating” or “foreignizing.” Lawrence Venuti explains that domesticating involves “adherence to domestic literary canons,” while foreignizing “entails choosing and developing a translation method along lines which are excluded by dominant cultural values in the target language.”¹⁴ Domesticating and foreignizing can be used to discuss a single literary object—the literary translation in comparison with its original—but the terms go beyond comparative linguistic analysis to reveal the cultural ideology behind translating

and are applicable to different periods, languages, locations, and texts. Most scholars have agreed that translating in England and France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was almost exclusively of the domesticating kind. Venuti has argued persuasively that domesticating and its valorization of transparency and readerliness reached a high point in the English language in the early modern period.¹⁵ Domestication was also the dominant ideology of translation in early modern France as original texts were altered to better fit demands for readerliness in the target language. Domesticating may seem a natural consequence of the emergence of modern national languages and literatures in this period, not least because constructing and confirming the unique identities of the national vernaculars might well have entailed controlling the threat of the foreign. The presumption that the ideology of domestication which began in the seventeenth century continued to operate long into the eighteenth century has long been accepted in analyses of eighteenth-century fiction translations in particular. Whether or not these studies use the term “domestication,” they have tended to point out fiction translators’ distortions of the originals and cite prefaces containing admissions that the novel has not been rendered literally in order to argue that the translation conforms to the target nation’s literary and cultural norms.¹⁶ Several studies show that in England, French novels were said to reflect certain features of the French language (usually its “lightness”) in need of alteration, while eighteenth-century French translators and critics complained of the disorderliness of English prose and recommended alterations to better accommodate French taste.¹⁷ This approach has illuminated some important aspects of translating, but it conceals much more about eighteenth-century translation and its relationship with novels than it divulges.

Eighteenth-century scholars are well aware that we cannot always trust translators to have given us an accurate or complete rendering of the source, but analyzing translations as domesticating (or foreignizing) oversimplifies a much thornier problem. The problem begins with our limited ability to discern and identify translations in the eighteenth century. This is not to say that we cannot distinguish between any translations and originals, but even a cursory look at eighteenth-century prose fiction in England and France reveals the complex entanglements that beg the question: What is a prose fiction translation? For example, several fictional narratives were translated from an English or French original, but then accidentally translated back into the original language because the translator was unaware that her original was already a translation. Thus, J. B. Brilhac’s *Agnès de Castro*, translated by Aphra Behn in 1688, was put back

into French in Marie Thiroux d'Arconville's *Romans traduits de l'anglais* in 1761. When the editor of the *Gray's Inn Journal*, Arthur Murphy, was in need of copy and took Samuel Foote's suggestion to translate a short oriental tale from a French magazine, he discovered only too late that the French was a translation of the tale that had already appeared in Johnson's *Rambler*.¹⁸ The translations of Eliza Haywood's novel *The Fortunate Foundlings* are an even better object lesson in the translingual mutability of fictional narratives. Haywood wrote the *The Fortunate Foundlings* in 1744, and it appeared in 1754 as *Les Heureux orphelins*, "imitée de l'anglais," translated by the French novelist Crébillon fils or possibly his English wife with no mention of the original from which it was taken. Some of the French narrative is directly translated, but other parts are loosely translated and, at one point, the French turns away from the original altogether. Four years later, *The Happy Orphans* appeared in English, now "translated and improved from the French original"—the Crébillon translation put back into English. Again part of the French version was followed with more or less rigor, but at the very same point that the French translator decided to veer from the original entirely, the English translator did the same.¹⁹

In general, we cannot assume that a translation came directly from an original, or suppose a translation provided a literal or complete rendering of its source, because it was common enough for translators not only to alter the text but also to add some original work to it. John Lockman, a well-known eighteenth-century translator of several works from French, wrote in the preface to his translation of Desfontaines' *Le Nouveau Gulliver*: "With regard to my Version, I've endeavour'd . . . to infuse a little of that spirit, which is the life of translations."²⁰ He explained in another preface: "With regard to the following Version, I have endeavour'd to give it the Air of an Original, and consequently have been far from translating my Author literally."²¹ Lockman uses the term "version" to denote a large range of textual operations and to suggest that a translation was not necessarily an attempt to copy an original, but partly an original in its own right. At the same time, the field we identify as original novels is seeded with translation. For example, Oliver Goldsmith translated and inserted passages from Marquis d'Argens' *Lettres Chinoises* into his *Citizen of the World*, and some of the passages Goldsmith used were translated from d'Argens' own unacknowledged use of Du Halde's description of China.²² A host of other eighteenth-century translators used similar tactics.²³ Examples of indirect pathways from source to target and translators' refusals to disengage original writing from translating are sometimes cited as curiosities, but they are too numerous to be anomalies.

To apply the terms *domesticating* and *foreignizing* to eighteenth-century prose fiction translation can too easily presume distinctions that do not obtain, and consequently, the terms risk misjudging the object of study by preemptively limiting the field. Too rigid a definition of translation can easily distort the operations and significance of the field, and may even distort our analysis of acknowledged and faithful translations for lack of familiarity with the eighteenth century's culture of translation. More importantly, *domesticating* and *foreignizing*, which are terms borrowed from the German romantic philosopher and translation theorist Friedrich Schleiermacher, presume a cultural context for rendering decisions that cannot be rigorously applied to eighteenth-century fiction. Schleiermacher explains that the "genuine translator, who wants to bring those two separated persons, the author and the reader, truly together" can either domesticate the work by leaving the reader in peace and bringing the author toward him/her, or foreignize, bringing the reader toward the author.²⁴ Schleiermacher's separation between foreign author and domestic reader is conditioned, I would argue, by the advent of culture in the romantic period which denotes a new integration of language, customs, and other factors into the totality of national identity. Thus, Schleiermacher puts the onus on translation to reconcile differences, either concealing them by domesticating or exposing them by foreignizing, but both strategies presuppose national-cultural differences as formidable obstacles between the author and reader. I will return to the advent of culture in translation history later, but for now my point is that domesticating and foreignizing may anachronistically impose culture on eighteenth-century fiction translating. Just as domesticating or foreignizing may falsely separate translating from literary creation at a time when the modern concept of originality was still forming, these terms can also assume a particular configuration of national-cultural differentiation at a time when the idea of culture and its isomorphism with the nation in a modern sense was just on the horizon. To impose such concepts is to presume what in fact most needs analysis if we are to understand the historical specificity of translating in the eighteenth century and its imbrication with the emergence of the novel.

My approach to translation differs from most studies initially by tabling such questions as: How was the text translated? With what sorts of effects? I begin instead with the observation that the relationship between translating and prose fiction was a dense and blurry one. Though we tend to think of a translation as an image of a source (good or bad, literal

or free, and so on) with certain effects (loss or gain, liberating or repressive, and so on), basic distinctions between source and target were intentionally blurred in the eighteenth century; the territory that we now see as problematically obscure was the norm. Thus, the field under investigation in this study includes known translations from identifiable sources, but also freely translated novels or what we would now call adaptations. It also includes texts that overlap with original novels because they imitate in broad strokes, or incorporate translation, though they are not necessarily categorized as translations; I am also willingly including novels advertised as translations even if they were not translated because they were perceived as part of a translative field of prose fictions. If prose fiction translation looks blurry from our perspective, from the standpoint of the eighteenth century it was merely manifesting its relationship with transmission. Throughout this study, I maintain that English and French translators were not providing copies of each other's original novels in a straightforward exchange of national literary products. Instead, because translating had long been embedded in transmission as the basis of European literary culture, conceptualized in the premodern period in the twin concepts of *translatio imperii* (the transfer of power) and *translatio studii* (the transfer of learning), the activity of rendering was still in many ways a ubiquitous task that belonged to all literary endeavor. Yet, as vernacular translating began to compete with translating ancient languages, and as nations and their literatures established themselves as unique fields, these premodern aspects of translating underwent a tectonic shift. *The Spread of Novels* traces this sea change in translation from several different angles to argue that the waning of transmission and the beginnings of translation as a national-cultural project constituted the emergence of the novel as a modern literary form. I begin by arguing for a new periodization of translation history that places the eighteenth century at the juncture of premodern and modern translation. Certain assumptions about the translatability of languages and the ease of rendering were embedded in the tradition of learning ancient languages and reapplied in the acquisition of the vernaculars in the eighteenth century, revealing the continuities of eighteenth-century practice with a premodern translating system. Returning to the advent of culture in translating, I situate eighteenth-century translation as a hinge between a prior model of transmission that had directed rendering from ancient times through the Renaissance and modern, national literary exchange.

Double Vision: Instituting Vernacular Translation

To establish the ubiquity of translating, its place in literary culture, and why it matters to novels in the eighteenth century, it is useful to analyze the institution of language acquisition and the ways in which it instilled translation habits. The cross-Channel arena in particular was steeped in translation in the eighteenth century as in previous eras, not least because translating was a routine activity among the literate, a habit formed in one's early education. Language acquisition texts for French and English, or what they called simply "grammars," followed the pedagogy of ancient languages. Applying the principles and structure of Latin education, vernacular grammars did not focus on oral competence, but taught French and English almost as dead languages where translating had always been a crucial step required to comprehend basic grammatical categories and syntax as well as learn vocabulary. One trend in vernacular grammars was to streamline the traditional grammatical methods. Beginning in the seventeenth century and extending through the eighteenth century, many multilingual grammars like John Minsheu's *Ductor in linguas, the guide into the tongues viz. english, welsh, low dutch, high dutch, french, italian, spanish, portuguez, latine, greek and hebrew languages* (1617) and John Henley's *The Compleat Linguist. Or, an Universal Grammar of all the Considerable Tongues in Being* (1719) use a single grammatical system and method to teach any number of languages. Nicholas Adam's *La Vraie manière d'apprendre une langue quelconque, vivante ou morte, par le moyen de la langue française* (1779) was also based on the universal method, and included tables of declensions and conjugations, which organize every language into the same grammatical categories based on Latin morphology. Adam also promises the student a table in which several different languages are displayed together, each arranged according to the same set of categories. This method avoids the inconvenience of paging through the book: "[O]n pourra les placer l'un à côté de l'autre en composant, et par ce moyen, les comprendre et les retenir beaucoup plus aisément." [One will be able to place one next to the other in composing, and by this means, comprehend them and retain them much more easily.]²⁵ Taking in the unified system in a single glance, this visual projection of equivalence promises to drastically reduce the many difficulties presented by linguistic differences. In grammars that focus solely on French and English, analogy is also the preferred *modus operandi*, and visualization its primary vehicle. Latin morphological categories organize the grammar in an introductory section, which is

usually followed by facing-page vocabulary lists, then facing-page phrases, then parallel conversations or readings.

Chapters entitled “Gallicisms” or “Anglicismes” relegate all the grammatical particularities of the language and its many idioms to a single category of exceptions. Jacob Villiers’ *Vocabularium analogicum or the Frenchman speaking English and the Englishman speaking French* (1680), Abel Boyer’s *The Compleat French-Master* (1706), and Rogissard’s *Nouvelle grammaire anglaise* (1776) follow this pattern to suggest syntactical identity along a smooth progression of correspondences from single words, to phrases, to whole conversations.²⁶ (See figures 1 and 2.) Like Adam’s proposed chart, this mirroring of the languages on the page is a visually compelling assertion of equivalence, and the frequent use of simple phrasing and cognate words made the parity all the more visible.

Because English and French were presented as fundamentally similar, or at least accidentally rather than essentially different, students were supposed to move quickly and effortlessly from the basics to a full grasp of the language in a short time. Paul Festeau, author of English and French grammars, maintains that memorizing vocabulary and phrasing is minimized because reading and translating back and forth between the two languages is sufficient: “I do maintain that it is not necessary to learn such abundance of dialogue by heart; it is enough to read and English them, and next to that explain them from English to French.” In this way, “the words and phrases do insensibly make an impression in the memory and the discreet scholar goeth forward with a great deal of ease.”²⁷ This desire to dispense with the rules and memorization suggests that the rote work of gathering, ordering, digesting, and repeating was outmoded. It was enough to read and “English” or translate and then translate back to French as if memorization was superseded by another mental process—a mysterious commingling of the structure of language with the mind as the “words and phrases do insensibly make an impression in the memory.” The new methods, though they relied as always on reading, translating, and composing as a continuum of learning exercises, were a radical departure from the pedagogy of ancient languages. Modern language pedagogy nearly abolished word-by-word, interlinear translation as a belabored first step. In his pedagogical tract from 1660, Charles Hoole explained this standardized process of treating Latin: “(i) Let them, at first especially, translate every lesson by way of interlineary writing according to the grammatical order; (ii) Let them parse the whole lesson in that order, and give you the variation and derivation of the most difficult nouns and verbs throughout, and the rules of syntax and of the accents.” Hoole then suggests transcribing

<i>VOCABULAIRE</i> Anglois & François.		
A VOCABULARY <i>English and French.</i>		
<i>Du Monde en général.</i>		
Of the World in general.		
D IEU,	G O D	
Dieu le Père,	} God the	Un Séraphin; <i>a Seraphin</i>
	<i>Father</i>	Les Saints, <i>the Saints</i>
Jésus Christ,	} <i>Jesus Christ,</i>	Les Bienheureux, <i>the Blessed</i>
ou Dieu le Fils,	or God the Son	Un Martyr, <i>a Martyr</i>
Le Saint Esprit,	<i>the Holy Ghost</i>	Un Prophète, <i>a Prophet</i>
Nôtre Créateur,	} <i>our Maker, or</i>	Un Evangeliste, <i>an Evangelist</i>
	<i>Creator</i>	Un Apôtre, <i>an Apostle</i>
Nôtre Rédempteur,	} <i>our Re-</i>	L'Enfer, <i>Hell</i>
	<i>deemer</i>	Le Diable, ou } <i>the Devil</i>
La Création,	<i>the Creation</i>	le Démon, } <i>the Devil</i>
Le Consolateur,	<i>the comforter</i>	Les Damnez, <i>the Damned</i>
Le Sanctificateur,	<i>the Sanctifier</i>	
Nôtre Dame, ou,	} <i>our Lady, or</i>	* Des Éléments.
La Vierge Marie,	<i>the Virgin Mary</i>	Of the Elements.
Les Créatures,	<i>the Creatures.</i>	Le Feu, <i>the Fire</i>
Une Créature vi-	} <i>Aliving Crea-</i>	L'Air, <i>the Air</i>
vante, ou un } <i>ture, or an</i>	<i>Animal.</i>	La Terre, <i>the Earth</i>
Animal.		L'Eau, <i>the Water</i>
La Nature,	<i>Nature</i>	La Mer, <i>the Sea</i>
Un Corps,	<i>a Body</i>	Le Ciel, ou le } <i>the Sky</i>
Un Esprit,	<i>a Spirit or Ghost</i>	Firmament. }
Le Ciel,	<i>Heaven</i>	Les Astres, <i>the Stars in general</i>
Le Paradis,	<i>the Paradise</i>	Une Etoile, <i>a Star</i>
La Gloire,	<i>the Glory</i>	Le Soleil, <i>the Sun</i>
Un Ange,	<i>an Angel</i>	La Lune, <i>the Moon</i>
Un Archange,	<i>an Archangel</i>	Le Croissant, ou } <i>the Crescent, or</i>
Un Chérubin,	<i>a Cherubin</i>	Demi-Lune, } <i>Half-Moon</i>
		Pleine Lune, <i>Full Moon</i>
		Une Planete, <i>a Planet</i>
		Une Comete, <i>a Comet</i>
		Les

Figure 1. Abel Boyer, *The Compleat French-master, for ladies and gentlemen* (London, 1706), 160. Princeton University Library.

II.	II.
<i>Expressions de Tendresse.</i>	<i>Expressions of Kindness.</i>
<p>MA Vie. / ^ Ma chère Âme. Mon Amour. Mon petit Mignon, ou ma petite Mignonne. Mon petit Cœur. Mamie Ma petite Poupone. Ma chère fanfan, ou ma chère Enfant. Mon bel Ange. Mon tout.</p>	<p>M^{<i>Y</i>} Life. My dear Soul. My Love. My little Darling. My little Heart. Sweet Heart. My little Honey. My dear Child. My pretty Angel. My All.</p>
III.	III.
<i>Pour Remercier & faire Compliment, ou Amitié.</i>	<i>To Thank and Complement, or shew a Kindness.</i>
<p>JE vous remercie. Je vous rends Graces. Je vous rends mille Graces. Je le ferai avec plaisir. De tout mon Cœur. De bon Cœur. Je vous suis obligé. Je suis tout à vous. Je suis vôtre Serviteur. Vôtre très humble Serviteur. Vous êtes trop obligeant. Vous vous donnez trop de peine. Je n'en trouve point à vous servir. Vous êtes fort obligeant, ou fort honnête. Cela est fort honnête. Que souhaitez-vous? Je vous prie d'en user librement avec moy.</p>	<p>I Thank you. I give you thanks. I give, or I render you a thousand thanks. I shall do it chearfully. With all my Heart. Heartily. I am obliged to you. I am wholly yours. I am your Servant. Your most humble Servant. You are too obliging. You give your self too much trouble. I find none in serving you. You are very obliging, or very kind. That's very kind. What will you be pleased to have? I desire you to be free with me.</p>
	Sans

Figure 2. Abel Boyer, *The Compleat French-master, for ladies and gentlemen* (London, 1706), 218. Princeton University Library.

phrases and elegant words into a commonplace book.²⁸ Each word's grammatical function is analyzed and described, and then the reading process requires another step, *constructio*, because the *ordo artificialis* of Latin must be put into vernacular word order. Hoole and others often used double translation as part of their pedagogical program; the student changed Latin word order into English word order, then converted the Latin words into English ones, and finally, went through the process in reverse, going from English back into Latin.²⁹ In this pedagogical tradition, which went back to Quintilian, parsing and word-for-word translation was followed by more liberal rendering to work tropes and style, developing the student's rhetorical skills, and eventually his own style.

Eighteenth-century grammar books promoted the ease of translation between vernaculars without interlinear reading and rendering in the belief that visualizing equivalence and replacing vocabulary was sufficient. This unimpeded rendering process enforced in pedagogical texts was not merely the promotional rhetoric of their authors, but was based on the theoretical pretense that unlike ancient languages, modern vernaculars are guided by rational principles. According to the *Encyclopédie*, French and English, which they call "analog" languages, follow a rational order, which is described as "le lien universel de la communicabilité de toutes les langues et du commerce de pensées, qui est l'âme de la société: c'est donc le terme où il faut réduire toutes les phrases d'une langue étrangère" [the universal link of communicability of all languages and of the commerce of thoughts, which is the soul of society: it is then the term to which it is necessary to reduce all the sentences of a foreign language].³⁰ Not surprisingly, analog languages facilitate reading and translating because of their natural, analytical word order, while the artificial order of what they call "transpositive" languages such as Latin and Greek required that they be first reduced to analog order, then translated:

Les langues analogues suivent, ou exactement ou de fort près, l'ordre analytique, qui est, comme je l'ai dit ailleurs, le lien naturel, et le seul lien commun de tous les idiomes. La nature, chez tous les hommes, a donc déjà bien avancé l'ouvrage par rapport aux langues analogues, puisqu'il n'y a en quelque sorte à apprendre que ce que l'on appelle la Grammaire et le Vocabulaire, que le tour de la phrase ne s'écarte que peu ou point de l'ordre analytique, que les inversions y sont rare ou légères, et que les ellipses y sont ou peu fréquentes ou faciles à suppléer.

[Analog languages follow, either exactly or very closely, analytical order, which is, as I have said elsewhere, the natural link, and the only common link of all idioms. Nature, among all men, has thus already well advanced the work with relation to analog languages, since in a way one only has to learn what is called Grammar and Vocabulary, that the phrasing is separated little if at all from analytical order, that inversions are rare or slight, and that ellipses are infrequent or easy to supply.]³¹

If analog languages mirrored rational thinking, but Latin did not, the *Encyclopédie* writers implied that the link between analog languages superseded the genealogical link to ancient languages. It became irrelevant that Latin was a parent language of French and English, and that they shared common root words or grammar, for now they had both progressed beyond the ancients and manifested natural ties to one another.

The *Encyclopédie* is not entirely representative of eighteenth-century ideas regarding language and translatability. We will see later that translatability was more contested during the Enlightenment than these articles indicate. Nonetheless, a deep-seated belief in the communicability of the vernaculars was philosophically grounded, consistently reasserted in practical guides to language acquisition, and internalized by students of French and English. Languages as different as French and English, now liberated from the intensive, drawn-out translation exercises performed with ancient languages, could be translated with ease by novices. In his memoir, Francis Kirkman explains that he translated a French version of the romance *Amadis de Gaule* as a means of learning the language: "I . . . began to hammer out the Sence of some part of it; and finally, I took so much pains therein, that I attained to an indifferent knowledge of that Language."³² For Kirkman, knowledge of French was simply a matter of reading in two languages, recognizing similarity, and filling in the gaps. The translator and novelist Antoine François Prévost wrote that at the end of two weeks' initiation with bilingual grammar books, he suddenly translated English with the utmost ease: "Mais ayant choisi quelques Livres écrits d'un stile léger, j'entrepris. . .d'en traduire même quelque chose; et mon propre étonnement fut extrême en trouvant que j'entendais déjà fort facilement tout ce que je lisais." [But having chosen some books written in a light style, I undertook to translate something; and my own surprise was extreme in finding that I understood already very easily everything I was reading.]³³

From this brief look at translating in the institution of pedagogy, I want to draw out three points about eighteenth-century translating that closely link it with translating in the premodern era. The first point is that translation was a habit-forming practice in a tradition of European multilingualism. In the Middle Ages and Renaissance, ancient languages were the student's first written languages and there was little or no formal education in one's own native tongue, though it was spoken daily.³⁴ As the vernaculars began to take on a new role at the center of literary culture in the early modern period, literate Europeans continued to be multilingual, but with an emphasis on vernacular multilingualism and on translating more easily between modern, living languages.³⁵ Second, because the habit of translating, imbibed early, was necessarily shared with other literate people, translators were not a separate class of writers, but often the same bi- or multilingual writers who were building competence in several languages. As a result, translations were not necessarily written and published for those who were entirely ignorant of the foreign language, but for a community of multilingual readers. In his dedication to the English translation of Madeleine de Scudéry's romance *Artamènes, or The Grand Cyrus*, Humphrey Moseley wrote: "I humbly beg pardon for presenting a Translation to You who so perfectly command the original."³⁶ The translator of Marie d'Aulnoy's *The Prince of Carency* was one of many who defended the alterations made to the original in recognition of those "who shall take the Trouble of comparing this with the Original."³⁷ The final point is that the belief in linguistic intimacy between French and English, instilled along with the habits of translating, helped forge a closely knit milieu of bilinguals who could appreciate a variety of rendering styles, and thus did not consider every infidelity an affront.

Translation, Transmission, Modernity

My approach to translation emphasizes that the translative fictional field reflects the historical situation in which translating was endemic to literary culture, and translating between English and French in particular was little more than an ordinary complement to the expected acquisition of languages and literacy. It was not a practice of the few, but of the many, and integrated closely with reading, where it tended to the literal side of the rendering scale, and with composition, where it tended toward a freer kind of rhetorical exercise. Rendering traditionally fulfilled its true purpose by

performing the renewal of a canon of authorities or *auctores*. In the Romans' relationship to the Greeks, and then in Europeans' relationship to antiquity from the Middle Ages through much of the seventeenth century, translating was the tooth of the literary fabric. In the context of this dense relationship with the European tradition, it was hardly an exaggeration to say that literature as a whole was translative. Although translation remained commonplace and formative as a practice into the eighteenth century, a major shift in the purposes of translating took place as moderns began translating moderns. Eighteenth-century translating sustained the flexibility that had defined its role in a premodern setting, but how did it cope with the purposes of translating when the scales tipped, and vernacular literary production and vernacular translating began to compete with translating the ancients? The structure and meaning of translation in a premodern world was not suddenly overturned, but the eighteenth century could not sustain the ways in which translating coursed along with transmission. The eighteenth century represents the hinge between a premodern world of translative literary endeavor and a modern world where translation would occur alongside, almost as adjunct to literary production. Eighteenth-century translation theory, however, provides a poor entry point into this complex historical shift. Its rhetoric is demure about the role and purpose of translating, and the discourse tends to repeat old commonplaces, and more frequently, descends into wan recommendations like d'Alembert's to "shun the two extremes of rigour and indulgence" myopically dealing with the art of translation as mere technique.³⁸ The spate of familiar advice about translation, which pervades much of the writing on translation in the period, in lieu of theories of transmission, can sometimes indicate a kind of hazy consciousness of the change, but it does not provide the ideal texts with which to grasp it. To periodize eighteenth-century translating, it is better to juxtapose the main features of the premodern nexus of rendering and transmission with what are usually recognized as the hallmarks of modern translation. In other words, the medieval and Renaissance modality of translative literary endeavor, which I see as emanating from its particular configuration of authority and temporality, and *imitatio* as the keystone that secured the link between them, can be compared with early nineteenth-century discourse on translating and its elaboration of a new bifurcated matrix of translation: the national and the foreign. Such a comparison, though it appears to skip over the period in question, helps open up the particularity of the eighteenth century as a juncture in translation history. Premodern translativity was pried open in the eighteenth century as its connection to authority, temporality, and

imitation seeped away, but it had not evolved so far as to become the endeavor of national literary exchange that would characterize the modern translating system.

The connection between rendering and transmission in the West was first elaborated in the writings of Cicero and Quintilian. It is important to remember, however, that translation itself was rarely a direct concern, except as it belonged to grammar and rhetoric. Rita Copeland explains that Roman theories of translation recognized that it was “essentially replicative,” but as a part of rhetoric and not a mere grammatical exercise, translation also aimed at differentiation.³⁹ Imitation was structured around a slightly different relationship; it represented “a patriarchal pattern of transmission” and was predicated on the act of invention: “[T]he model, or ancestor, discovers and posits the ground for future invention. . . . [T]he copy produces, not a conspicuous likeness of the original, but rather what is understood and revalued in the original.” As Copeland explains, in the Roman schools and continuing through the Middle Ages and Renaissance, translating was embedded in a rhetorical tradition, emphasizing the “active production of a new text endowed with its own affective powers and suited to the particular historical circumstances of its reception.”⁴⁰ Glyn Norton’s study of French humanist translators in the Renaissance reveals that these principles of rhetorical *imitatio* or *aemulatio* also emerged in philological or literal translation. Norton writes that “the more the translator seeks to express the latent *sententia* of the original, the more he finds himself engaged in a search for new rhetorical structures and means of expression.”⁴¹ These philological translators were “unable to map exact boundaries between translation proper and the articulation of a *novum opus*.”⁴² During the Renaissance there were questions about whether one should imitate one model or many, and about whether one should imitate style or tropes, or genres and their *topoi*, or of subject matter more broadly, but like the Roman tradition, imitation was defined by an engagement with revered models, the *auctores*. From the standpoint of the individual writer, imitation (in neo-Latin or in the vernacular) was self-expressive, and one’s individual genius as a writer was inextricable from his formative relation to the *auctores*. Not surprisingly, metaphors for imitation—*apian*, *digestive*, and *eristic*—multiplied during the Renaissance to figure this dialectic.⁴³

In the seventeenth century, translating the ancients into the vernaculars became more common than imitating the classics in neo-Latin, with an increasing focus on the vernacular’s own distinction as a literary language and on writers’ own strength and individuality with respect to the canon.⁴⁴ Still working within the translative system, seventeenth-century

writers continued to imitate and emulate classical authors and genres, but as Theo Hermans argues, from the 1650s onward “it becomes possible to conceive of ‘literary translation’ as a separate type, a separate *category* of translation” and is connected with the emergence of what John Denham and Abraham Cowley called the libertine way of translating in England, and what in France became known as the *belles infidèles*.⁴⁵ Seventeenth-century writer-translators spoke of keeping the spirit of the original rather than following the word, and saw themselves as both authors of their own translation and the bearers of the authorial essence of the original. Nicholas Perrot d’Ablancourt said of his translation of Thucydides in 1662: “[C]e n’est pas tant icy le portrait de Thucydide, que Thucydide luy mesme, qui est passé dans un autre corps, comme par une espece de Metempsychose, et de Grec est devenu François.” [This is not as much a portrait of Thucydides as Thucydides himself, who has passed into another body as by a kind of metempsychosis and from the Greek has become a Frenchman.]⁴⁶ While Renaissance translation was interwoven at one end with pedagogical translation and at the other end with imitation, seventeenth-century libertine translators restaged the aims of *imitatio*, and the notion of a literary translation began to sever rendering from the larger scope of translative literary activity.

Libertine translation signals a deep rift in the single continuum of imitative writing in premodernity, not least because instead of one roomy mode of writing which straddled rendering and originality, libertine translators pitted the literal translation against their own poetic or literary translation. It is symptomatic of this rift that, as the Latin word *imitatio* became “imitation” in English and French, its meanings diverged. On the one hand, in Restoration and early eighteenth-century England, *imitatio* became the “Imitation,” a kind of free translation of the ancients in which names, places, and so on, were modernized according to contemporary historical circumstances while nonetheless insisting upon the recognition of the source. *Imitatio* was now calcified into the Imitation, a minor poetic genre, but at the same time it came into general vernacular usage as “imitation,” an ambiguous clump of ideas that could refer to imitating authors (in every possible way) or could denote the loose and baggy set of concepts relating to the imitation of reality.⁴⁷ The retraction of *imitatio* into an overspecialized poetic practice on the one hand, and the concomitant expansion of the term to denote mimesis on the other, was not only the result of the new category of literary translation, but more importantly, was also the effect of shifting ideas about authority and temporality in transmission. As I have described it thus far, *imitatio* revolves around the writer’s dialectic

tical relationship with the canon, but this relationship was enfolded in a specific temporal mode. The voices of the *auctores* obviously hailed from an ever-receding past, but transmitting them to the present did not involve representing that past time with respect to its historicity so much as suiting it to a new audience. Recreating antiquity in a new language for a new time relies on the past, but puts an emphasis on the presence of the ancients in one's own time. Whether that past was relatively neutralized as it was in the Middle Ages, or subject to a more acute sense of historical consciousness as it was in the Renaissance, "creative imitation . . . represents a kind of affirmation of the present," as Thomas Greene argues.⁴⁸ Though dependent upon antiquity, translators realized that the ancients were dependent upon the present to resurrect them. An important corollary to this temporal dialectic is the nonuniqueness of the present. Imitations exist in the context of prior and future imitations; they are conveyances that transmit the dead over and over again in different times.⁴⁹ Thus, the temporality of translative literature is both a thick temporality in which the promise of antiquity can become fully present through *imitatio*, but also cyclical because of its quasi-ritualistic function of continually reviving learning and civilization in the canon.

One of the structural hallmarks of modernity according to most theorists is the emptying of time. Modern time, it is thought, is perceived as neither cyclical nor moving toward fulfillment, but as uniform clock time. Most pinpoint the Enlightenment as the period in which rational or clock-measured time, along with rational, measurable space, became "abstract and strictly functional systems."⁵⁰ In *The Consequences of Modernity*, Anthony Giddens explains that premodern social processes were conditioned by a temporality in which "'when' was almost universally either connected with 'where' or identified by regular natural occurrences," but this temporality was revolutionized by clock time, which expressed "a uniform dimension of 'empty' time."⁵¹ Benedict Anderson, explaining the same shift to modern time, emphasizes that the modern apprehension of time is "marked not by prefiguring and fulfillment, but by temporal coincidence, and measured by clock and calendar."⁵² Eighteenth-century discourse on translation rarely addresses the temporality of translation, yet the absence of a discourse of temporality is itself notable. By the early nineteenth century, the evacuation of time from translation theory indicates the modernity of the new translating system. In her brief essay, "De l'Esprit des Traductions" (1816), Germaine de Stael addresses translations of the ancients, reconfirming that translating is transmission, but without the concomitant discourse of temporality. Stael opens the essay with a

general remark on the purpose of translating: “Il n’y a pas de plus eminent service à rendre à la littérature, que de transporter d’une langue à l’autre les chefs-d’oeuvre de l’esprit humain.” [There is no more eminent service to render to literature than to transport the masterpieces of the human spirit from one language to another.]⁵³ Translation is a transfer of learning and humanity, she claims, but it takes place without any temporal signal such as revival or renewal. Much less does she employ necromantic metaphors or the image of metempsychosis that can be found prior to the eighteenth century. In Stael’s essay, the past is temporally neutralized as universal “human spirit.” Translation is not, however, the flow of spirit. Though the aim may be to transmit genius, Stael believes that translation is a means of energizing the nation’s language and literature: “Ces beautés [of the foreign text] naturalisées donnent au style national des tournures nouvelles et des expressions plus originales.” [These naturalized beauties give new turns and more original expressions to the national style.]⁵⁴ Stael’s notion that the nation is enriched through translating the ancients is widely shared among her contemporaries and significant because it does not directly challenge, but quietly replaces the fastening of authority, temporality and *imitatio* with the nation and its other. The same year that Stael wrote her essay, Wilhelm von Humboldt published his translation of *Agamemnon*. He wrote in the introduction that despite the very untranslatability of a work like Aeschylus’ tragedy, translation is one of the most necessary tasks of any literature because it introduces readers ignorant of another language to “forms of art and human experience that would otherwise have remained totally unknown.”⁵⁵ Humboldt, like Stael, replaces renewal with the enrichment of the nation and its language through translation: “Think how the German language, to cite only one example, has profited since it began imitating Greek meter.”⁵⁶ Rather than define translating as a transfer of learning formative of literature as a totality, translation affords a transformation of national literature in its contact with the foreign. August Wilhelm Schlegel, another German romantic writer and translator, wrote that translation’s highest aim “is nothing less than to combine the merits of all different nations, to think with them and feel with them, and so to create a cosmopolitan centre for mankind.”⁵⁷ Thus, Schlegel’s “cosmopolitan centre” brings different nations together and allows them “to think with” and “to feel with” each other, suggesting a cultural field of exchange where many nations’ literatures are gathered together in homogenous, empty time. For the romantics, the matrix of translation is *cultural* not temporal, and the past is just another foreign country.

Most scholars place the origins of modern translation in the romantic era, as I have done here, but the eighteenth century has hardly been tapped as the crucial period between the ebb of premodern translative literature and flow of modern translation as transnational exchange. The intervention I hope to make in *The Spread of Novels* is to show that the novel emerged during the middle decades of the eighteenth century in French and English, and soon in an ever-widening set of languages and geographical domains, because of this juncture. Prose fiction was predicated on its mobility, but the shift in translating from a premodern, thick system of transmission to modern literary exchange between nations brought about the consolidation of fictions into the form we refer to as the novel. Much of this argument about the novel's emergence depends on discerning the aftereffects of premodern translating and disclosing surprisingly unmodern aspects of the consolidating novel. The emphasis on, and privileged status of, premodernity signals an intentional challenge to the lock that modernity has had on the novel in such diverse arguments about the genre as its relation to the formation of a modern middle class or modern capitalism, to modern individualism, and especially the genre's affinity with the modern nation-state. The story of emergence I attempt to tell is not, however, from romance as a precursor literary form to the modern novel, or from nonfictional genres into the novel in tandem with other cultural shifts. The novel comes about, I will argue, as an effect of its changing mode of transmissibility, from a nation-blind transfer to a transnationalized exchange. By the middle of the eighteenth century, new novels were increasingly received at home and abroad as representatives of their nations, showing signs of a nascent transnationalism in which the bundling of language, culture, and literature in the nation altered fiction's spread. Novels continued to move between languages and regions, but the character of fiction's mobility was redefined. The identification of novels more closely with a national origin and character, now circulating across languages in translation, particularized novels, and then in a necessary reversal, both internationalized and universalized the novel. This complex process of transnationalization constituted the form of the novel—its allegiance to a single language and location, and its emergence as a genre with indefinite boundaries.

Given the complex valences of translation in the eighteenth century, I have restricted my use of the word "translation" to rendering, using it primarily as a neutral term for the task of moving oral or written discourse from one language to another, however strict or loose the rendering

may be. To designate the historical and cultural dimensions of translation, I use “transmission” or *translatio* to denote the premodern mode, and “transnationalism” to signify modernized literary exchange between nations. Transnationalism does not, however, sufficiently encompass or represent the complexity of literary and cultural relations in the eighteenth-century cross-Channel or transatlantic arenas. The shift in the eighteenth century from translation as transmission—the defining principle and practice of fiction-making—to an instrument of nationalized literary exchange exposes the unsettled relations of nation and world, particular and universal, through which the novel emerged. Some novels foster identification with a specific nation not least by their formal and thematic concern with the domestic sphere. As the nation begins to have a hold on prose fiction in the mid-eighteenth century—and by “nation” we must recognize not a cohesive entity but assemblages of diverse sets of communities and languages that bear the marks of an early nation form—the trade in novels becomes less dense, less blurry. The beginning of a transnational exchange of prose fiction takes place, however, in the context of the Channel’s tightly woven cross-cultural history. The British and French were thoroughly interlocked even as they antagonized each other; their social and cultural practices and self-perception clung together because of a shared history, but also because disciplining national pride and a marked enthusiasm for acquiring each other’s languages and cultural advantages were understood as essential to the transcendent goal of civilization. During this period, the expansion of European empires across the Atlantic also manifests linguistic and cultural detachments from national belonging as the British and French reveal a similar voracity for absorbing and representing the dizzying variety of languages and cultures of the Atlantic world. Even as both nations attempted to secure a dominant role in the cross-Channel and transatlantic spheres, the experience and record of interculturality reveals a counterpoint to nation building. Thus, cultural individuation and detachments from nascent national identities were simultaneously operating and complicating what we can call the early stages of a transnational novel trade. Another equally potent trend in the eighteenth century was the new discourse of universalism in discussions of prose fiction. In the middle of the eighteenth century, claims were made about the transcendence of novels’ own particularity to represent humanity as such. This study undertakes the task of analyzing the novel through the shift in translating that urges the genre’s consolidation, but this is bound up with these forces redefining the extranational. To understand this shift

from transmission to modern transnationalism as meaningful in eighteenth-century terms, my argument takes into account the nexus of ideas that British and French writers used to configure the extranational. Cosmopolitanism, though it was used in many different ways and contexts in the eighteenth century, is a useful term for the modernization of translating in the cross-Channel and transatlantic worlds because of its associations with detached and open-minded cultural tolerance as well as with a critical self-reflection of nationalism. It was an antidote to the detriments of national identification, but not necessarily a high-minded global consciousness so much as rational and civilizing interactivity of nations, now seen on a world stage. Second, universality is a useful term not least because it was juxtaposed with the national and cosmopolitan. As the antithesis of particularity and as a humanist ideal, universality was a specific claim made on behalf of the novel, and one that was decisive for reimagining transmissibility.

Each chapter also builds on the claim that the eighteenth century is situated at a turning point in translation history to develop the argument that this turn plays a constitutive role in the emerging novel, but the chapters do not form a series of case studies of translations of novels from English to French or vice versa. Case studies of translations too often rely on drawing comparisons between the rendered text and the original, and get caught in a binary modality, even if they complicate binarism, that misses the forest for the trees. Specific cases will come to light, and the focus remains trained on English and French fiction, for few would disagree that these languages are those in which the novel first emerged. But the primary aim is to trace aspects of the historical shift in translating in the eighteenth century and the ways in which this shift informed the emerging novel.

The first chapter is a critical reading of the “origins of the novel” theory from the point of view of translation. Having outlined my approach to translating and its history here, I turn to the ways in which theorizing the novel as a literary avatar of modernity has occluded the complex role of transmission. Ian Watt’s seminal *The Rise of the Novel*, which was a significant departure from previous studies of the novel, depends upon an unstable relationship of the novel’s national particularity to its universal form—a function of his highly influential argument about the novel’s modern origins. I then investigate the prehistory of this unstable theory in the eighteenth century’s historiography of fiction. Eighteenth-century speculation about the origins of fiction produced its own modern theory

of the novel, not least by prising apart the continuum and density of premodern transmission. Their narratives show the first signs that the twin poles of national particularity and universality would unseat premodern transmissibility as the narrative of fiction's origins and spread.

The second chapter addresses the business of translating fiction. Its aim is to provide a sketch of prose fiction translating in the eighteenth century from the point of view of the book trade. While a complete bibliography of the traffic between English and French among the many other languages of the novel would be impossible, a survey of the field and an analysis of the problems of identifying translations of fiction reveal the ingrained structures that prolonged premodern modes of transmission. We will also see that the structure of the book trade, and particularly the independence, initiative, and energy of translators, reflected a premodern system of free transmissibility. By the middle and later eighteenth century, however, contradictory factors were at play in getting a translation of a novel published: the trade relied on the translator's independence, and freedom from constraints such as international copyright laws, but such freedoms were limited by new pressure to beat the competition. I contest the long-standing presumption of translation as hackwork, and trace instead how translating fiction, which had once been a kind of intellectual leisure or amusement, was increasingly demonized as a job in ways that affected the viability and character of fiction translating as a whole. Changes to the material conditions of translation, and specifically the new temporal pressures on publication which altered the labor time of translating, are thus one facet of the ways in which literary exchange was modernized. In place of fiction's translativity, translations of novels were becoming adjacent to the originals.

The third chapter focuses on eighteenth-century translators but turns from questions of translating as labor to the topic of rendering practices. All faithful translators are faithful in the same way, we might say, but those that are unfaithful are unfaithful in different ways. In a field where translating could vary considerably, literal translations need little explication, but those that stray from the original, and the motives behind them, require attention. Nearly every critic who has worked on translations of fiction, from English Renaissance versions of Italian *novelle*, through seventeenth-century French translations of Peninsular romances, to late eighteenth-century French and English versions of novels, has demonstrated the existence of infidelities, bringing to light a myriad of important interpretive and stylistic differences made in individual transla-

tions.⁵⁸ The aim here is to illuminate general patterns of translating decisions that have often been explained as a scandalous lack of attention, or the pernicious ideology of national taste. I begin with early modern translation theories to show that its taxonomies are largely inadequate for understanding the variety of translation practices found in eighteenth-century novels. When translators added details to the description of a character, or put words into a character's mouth that did not appear in the original, they worked within a tradition of rhetorical exercises. By the mid-eighteenth century, these premodern strategies began to attend to a specific purpose which they call "interest"—the development of sentiments in the translated text to better elicit readerly feeling. In readings of Eliza Haywood's translations from French in the early eighteenth century and Antoine de La Place's translations from English in the middle of the century, I trace the uses of the very same exercises of omission and amplification to illuminate a shift away from intensifying passages of the display of passions toward a more integrated goal of interest. This shift indicates a merging of premodern practices into the recognizable shape of the sentimental novel.

The fourth chapter explores translation and the emerging novel through the lens of Anglo-French relations. The chapter expands the scope of the study from issues regarding rendering to the role of translation in the context of the twin poles of nationalism and cosmopolitanism that characterized cross-Channel relations more broadly. A wide-angled view of the discourse about translation in Britain and France in the middle decades of the century demonstrates that, during the period in which the novel is said to come into its own, translating reflected neither a phobia of the other nor a simple admiration of the other. I attempt to disentangle the rhetoric—often marked by a resistance to linguistic or cultural corruption on the one hand and extreme adulation on the other—from practices of cross-Channel interculturality which belie such extremes. A variety of texts on Anglo-French relations allow me to make the case for a more nuanced view of cross-Channel relations as a new phenomenon of nation-based, but not nationalistic, cosmopolitanism—a struggle toward bundling language and culture, and yet subsisting along with a continual revalorization of a civilizing Europe, based in part on acquiring languages, translating them, and humanizing one another through cultural mixing. Turning then to Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* and *Clarissa*, and their European reception starting in France, I explain how the perception of translatability in cross-Channel relations helped consolidate the novel. When Richardson's first domestic novel became a national allegory for readers abroad

through its antic cosmopolitan heroine, readers and writers resisted *Pamela* by reasserting imitation as a norm. It was a backlash against a new transnational exchange but also the sign of its birth. With *Clarissa*, however, readers and writers in Britain and France articulated a new universal moral value to mediate Richardson's domestic nationalism. Now, *the* novel could represent both the universal "human heart" and yet be representative of a particular nation.

The final chapter is an investigation of the emergent novel in the context of the eighteenth century's novelistic obsession with linguistic and cultural contact in the Atlantic world. Setting the transatlantic novel in the context of a different kind of Atlantic translation scenario, I contend that language switching and multilingualism were possibly even more highly valued than in Europe. As a practical necessity and distinct advantage in the Atlantic, translating was not surprisingly infused into the structure of prose fiction. I argue that the emergence of the novel was partly the effect of incorporating translation into fictional narrative. The diegetic uses of translation in the Atlantic arena, and the ways in which they are mimetic of specific conditions of Atlantic multilingualism and translation, help the novel consolidate, but as an undomestic and cosmopolitan form. Readings of Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and Françoise Graffigny's *Lettres d'une Péruvienne*—two canonical transatlantic novels, both of which were hypertranslated in the eighteenth century—elucidate the novel's thematization of detachment from national language in the Atlantic arena and thus reveal another contestation to domesticity and its implications for nationalizing literary exchange in the emerging genre. The chapter ends with a reading of Frances Brooke's *The History of Emily Montague*, which returns us to national tensions and cosmopolitanizing mediation in British-French relations. Set in Quebec just after the Seven Years' War, the formal and thematic uses of translation in Brooke's novel bear out their constitutive role in the novel as it goes abroad in transatlantic empire. Translation, then, is not something that happens to novels; it allows us tease out the reasons why the novel emerged as both local and delocalized, domesticated and nationalized, yet globalizing. The emergence of the novel is the story of its imbrication with the dynamics of translation.

Each chapter illuminates different aspects of translation and its processes of modernization, and while the shift from premodern transmission to transnational literary exchange may have had significant effects on any genre in the eighteenth century, my argument is that translation's imbrication with the emerging novel is a peculiar one, not least because the novel is the only major literary genre said to rise in its modern form

in this period. Tracing the historical juncture of translation contributes, then, to a specific view of the novel, that is, that its coalescence is not an internal formation, but rather an effect of transfer and circulation. I do not see genre as the winnowing of heterogeneous prose fictions into a unified form, or a symbiosis of modernity with literary form, but rather as an effect of a broad-based, multinational recognition that took place because of the way fictions spread.