

Lost in Translation: Crébillon fils' *Les heureux orphelins* and Haywood's *The Fortunate Foundlings*

by Antoinette Sol

In 1754, Claude Crébillon published four parts of what, according to Grimm (II: 372), was to be a six-part novel, *Les heureux orphelins, histoire imitée de l'anglais*. The text is an awkward adaptation of an English novel by Eliza Haywood, *The Fortunate Foundlings* (1744).¹ The first two parts of the work were published anonymously, while the following two quickly appeared under Crébillon's name. Given a poor review by Grimm, Reynal and Fréron, the French version was not a critical success and, discouraged by its reception, Crébillon left the novel unfinished.

From the moment of its publication, critics found *Les heureux orphelins* problematic. It was difficult to reconcile its inconsistencies in plot and style with Crébillon's other more polished works. In the *Correspondance littéraire*, the general consensus on the publication of the first two volumes of Crébillon's novel was that the work was neither his kind nor style of writing. Reynal finds that instead of a style "brillant et léger....[d]ans le nouveau roman, on ne trouve rien de tout cela; une machine usée, des caractères communs, des aventures et des sentiments romanesques, un style faible, inexact et plein de phrases longues et louches...." (II: 149-51). Although the second half was viewed as somewhat better, it was still considered unworthy of Crébillon.² Until recently, critics considered this novel an anomaly in Crébillon's œuvre.³

The last twenty years have seen a renewed interest in Crébillon with the work of scholars such as Laurent Versini, Bernadette Fort and Jean Rousset. One of the results of this attention has been a fresh examination of *Les heureux orphelins*. This rather obscure novel has proved important to the constitution of Crébillon's libertine aesthetic and to the study of his literary influence on such writers as Laclos. In

fact, in 1995 Desjonquères published a new edition of *Les heureux orphelins* with a fine introduction by Jean Dagen, accompanied by Anne Feinsilber's essay placing the text in its historical context.

In his introduction, Dagen ventures an explanation that takes into account both the structural flaws and the "banal" subject matter, an explanation in which the apparent stylistic "inferiority" and flawed construction of the novel that so troubled critics in the past are now highly significant. He contends that *Les heureux orphelins* is, in fact, a parody of Haywood's novel (7, 10) and that we have been misreading the text when we consider it awkward, as that is exactly its intention. The previously perceived faults are now to be considered integral to Crébillon's project. In short, according to Dagen, Crébillon wrote a corrective to the obsolete English "adventure" novel in which he clearly delineates the libertine agenda. We have come full circle to trace the recuperation of a work previously considered "marginal" into one of importance in Crébillon's canon (Dagen, 7, 15).

This "recuperation," however, seems to be at the expense of the earlier novel (Feinsilber, 28). Concentrating on the point where Crébillon starts to write a structurally different novel (switching from a third person narration to an epistolary format), Fort and Dagen have examined the divergence from the English model. However, after reading these studies, one is left with the impression that Crébillon's work is a significant improvement on the original. The work by Haywood has been considered as simply a springboard to study Crébillon's literary conception. If Crébillon's adaptation of Haywood's novel is a parody, and I believe it is, it is hardly a successful one. The success of parody depends on the reader's ability to recognize the targeted material as such. Because Crébillon's text is a hybrid one—the first half sentimental, the second libertine—the parodic aspect is not immediately perceptible and becomes clear only in the second half of the novel.

These two works, *The Fortunate Foundlings* and *Les*

18 - *Lost in Translation*

heureux orphelins, and the criticism they give rise to, are interesting for many theoretical reasons, as they embody problems of genre and gender. While the two works are ultimately very different, Cr  billon's text follows Haywood's narrative pattern fairly closely for the first four chapters. At times he translates the English text almost word for word, while at others, although recounting the same events, his narration puts a very different slant on things. I propose to examine this divergence at the very point at which these two novels coincide and, in so doing, attempt to tease out differences that are not simply a matter of nationally determined aesthetics, but rather spring from (and are complicated by) gender issues. These gender issues—by which I mean “social constructions having to do with social organization of sexual difference” (Nicholson, 79)—can be located in Haywood's and Cr  billon's differing treatments of sensibility and sentiment. To read both parts of the French text “correctly” one must read it with Haywood's. The double reading reveals the target of Cr  billon's parody, as well as the very different “gender agendas” of the two authors. Cr  billon writes a demystification of Haywood's text of female empowerment.

In order to locate the differences between the two works, it is useful to summarize rapidly the first four chapters of the original Haywood novel. In 1688, Dorilaus returns to England after a long sojourn abroad and finds a set of twins abandoned in his garden. The note accompanying them alludes to some mystery of their birth that may be revealed later and calls upon his generosity. He raises the children, Horatio and Louisa, as if they were his own. Fifteen years later, Dorilaus' foster-son, Horatio, decides on a military career. Dorilaus retains Louisa near him and falls in love with her. After she rejects his offer of marriage, Dorilaus attempts, after a night of drinking, to take her by force. To prevent further attempts on her honor, Louisa flees Dorilaus' protection. She finds refuge in a boarding-house, then takes up residence at a milliner's shop where she can

work. She catches the eye of Mr. B---n and Lord F---n whose attentions she finds inopportune. Her agitated state combined with the unaccustomed exertions of her work take a toll on Louisa's health. She goes to Windsor for a cure where she meets up with Melanthe, a "Lady of Quality." Melanthe takes Louisa under her wing as a companion and relates how she came to be in Windsor and the reason behind her projected voyage abroad. This is the fourth chapter and the last recognizable point at which the English and French texts coincide. It is apparent that Crébillon, from this point on, writes a very different novel.

In chapter five, Haywood leaves the two women to turn to Horatio's adventures. Throughout the remainder of the text Haywood follows this pattern of switching from Louisa to Horatio and back in a double construction. The final chapters find the brother and the sister reunited with their step-father and their respective *fiancés* in Paris where Dorilaus informs them he has found out that he is indeed their true natural father.

If Crébillon's "imitation" of the English novel is considered a hybrid work, Haywood's is no less so. She has written a work that combines her customary "adventure" novel with one of moral sentiment. Most often the story of two women, the double construction characteristic of Haywood's work explores the passive and aggressive dimension of the female psyche (Schofield, *Exposé* 95). The fact that the stories told in *The Fortunate Foundlings* concern opposite-sex twins is integral to Haywood's project of moral instruction and points to its larger purpose: the exploration of the meaning of female and male honor and virtue.

Haywood's stated aim in the preface to *The Fortunate Foundlings* is to "encourage Virtue in both Sexes." The alternation between the two stories creates a parallel between the siblings and allows Haywood to explore masculine and feminine virtue structured around the issue of paternity. Conforming to the model of manly excellence and valor (*virtus*), Horatio's ambition is to make "something of myself which may repair the obscurity of my birth, and

20 - *Lost in Translation*

prove to the world that heaven has endued [sic] this foundling with a courage and resolution capable of undertaking the greatest actions" (7) and to do "something that might give me a name" (8). Horatio's desire to serve his country is proof of his greatness of spirit (8). Louisa's virtue, on the other hand, consists of resisting a seemingly honorable offer of marriage from her guardian. Putting herself at great risk, Louisa flees his protection: "even starving lost its horrors when compared either to being compelled to wed a man whom she could not affect as a husband, or, by refusing him, run the risk of forfeiting her honor" (27). The brother would make a name for himself while the sister protects her own good name.

At first glance, Louisa's stand is an unreasonable one even to herself. There are no legal impediments to Dorilaus' marrying his foundling. The only social impediment (not knowing if Louisa is common or of noble stock) is given token consideration. Haywood sets up an opposition between Louisa's strange natural feelings of revulsion and a socially acceptable and advantageous situation. These feelings are in conflict with Louisa's self-interest, as she herself perceives:

—what maid of birth and fortune equal to his own but would be proud of his addresses; and shall I, a poor foundling, the creature of his charity, not receive the honour he does me with the utmost gratitude!— Shall I reject a happiness so far beyond my expectation! —so infinitely above any merit I can pretend to!—what must he think of me if I refuse him!—how madly stupid, how blind to my own interest, how thankless to him must I appear!—how will he despise my folly! —how hate my ingratitude! Thus did her reason combat with her prejudice....(20)

Of course, Louisa flees to save her virginity, but more to the

point, she flees to prevent a crime against nature, albeit one not founded in "fact." Hers is not a "reasoned" flight, but one motivated by an intuitive feeling of wrong. Since the reader does not yet know that Louisa has a valid reason for leaving, Haywood takes care to describe Louisa's "greatness of soul" in the scene directly preceding Dorilaus' declaration of passion:

At the departure of her brother, her only known family, Louisa was filled with the most terrible alarms for her dear brother's danger; but the little regard he seemed to have of it, and the high ideas he had of future greatness, soon brought her to think as he did; instead of dissuading [sic] him from prosecuting his design, she rather encouraged him in it; and in this gave the *first* testimony of greatness of soul, no less to be admired than the courage and laudable ambition which actuated that of her brother. (emphasis added, 10)

The second trial, and not the least in a long line of trials that bear witness to her superiority, is the rejection of her guardian's suit. In their subsequent adventures, Louisa's actions are put on a par with the unthinking, instinctive courage of her brother. For example, both brother and sister are imprisoned; she escapes through a ruse, and he is liberated. Although Horatio is the object of desire for the Russian woman, Mattekesea, out of a sense of loyalty to his *fiancée* he finds a substitute to replace him in her bed (272). The stakes are much higher for Louisa, and her superior morality authorizes her incredible adventures, such as the young woman's eight-month journey disguised as pilgrim. She travels from Italy to Paris where she is reunited with her brother and her father.

Haywood marks this hierarchy in the twins' courage early in the narrative through a juxtaposition of internal and

22 - *Lost in Translation*

external details. Dorilaus provides Horatio with a “handsome field-equipage, rich cloaths, horses, and a servant to attend him....” (9) while Louisa “taking nothing with her but a little linnen [sic] which she crammed into her pockets” fled Dorilaus’ house and began her adventures (28). The playing field is anything but level. Her brother must be supplied with letters of introduction to find help with his purpose (52) while Louisa’s nobility of spirit can be read on her countenance (29). This description of the various “degrees” of valor and suffering first established between brother and sister is then extended to include Dorilaus:

[Louisa] suffered much the same agonies in endeavouring to love [Dorilaus] in the manner he desired, as he had done to conquer the inclination he had for her and both alike were fruitless. Yet was her condition much more to be commiserated: he had only to debate within himself whether he should yield or not to the suggestions of his own passion; she to subdue an aversion for what a thousand reasons concurred to convince her she ought rather to be ambitious.... (emphasis added 20)

In comparing Dorilaus with Louisa, Haywood underscores not only the contrast between society’s values and individual feelings, but the superiority of women’s “nature” over man’s. Dorilaus’ finer sentiments are subordinated and his reason put to the service of his passion in a context where his baser nature takes precedence.

The proposition that the woman’s superior natural morality is the only dependable and stable order is underscored by the political setting in which this novel takes place. The England of 1688 during the flight of King James provides the setting for the novel. Haywood situates the tale of brother and sister in a context that, according to Toni O’Shaughnessy Bowers, “questions....the status of personal

honor and the authority of words in a world where sacred vows to God and king recently had been rendered negotiable and contingent" (63). The contingency of the larger political situation and the threatened breakdown of social order is played out again, across Europe, in Horatio's adventures. The male virtue of courage, national loyalty and honor is shown to be as relative as the socially acceptable marriage between Louisa and Dorilaus. Horatio begins fighting for England. He is then taken prisoner by the French with whom he makes friends. When the fighting begins again he cannot fight for France, as it is the (temporary) enemy of England. He subsequently takes up arms for Poland and Sweden. In a very real sense, his "honor" is for sale to the highest bidder, just as Dorilaus can convince himself, despite his first feelings of shame, that his persecution of Louisa is justified. Horatio fights for a contingent social order, while Louisa flees to maintain its moral underpinnings.

Crébillon kept the idea of a parallel construction in his version of Haywood's text, but transformed it. He takes a story of the same two orphaned siblings, erases the story of the brother and decenters the text away from the remaining sister. He augments the role of a secondary character, Lord Chester, by combining Mr. B---n and Henricus, the man who seduced Melanthe (now known as the Duchess of Suffolk) in Haywood's text. This reduction focuses the narrative on one man who becomes the central figure in all the female characters' stories. The exploration of female and male virtue through the adventures of the siblings in the English text is now placed in a sexual context. Of course, that context is present in Haywood's story, but it was not the only situation for the comparison of female and male virtue. Crébillon also changed the names of the characters to sound more "English." Dorilaus, Louisa and Horatio become Rutland, Lucie and Edouard in the French text.

As in Haywood's text, narration is in the third person (at least in the beginning). The Duchess' story takes

24 - *Lost in Translation*

up the second part. Chester takes control of the text in the third and fourth parts of the text which are written in an epistolary format consisting of letters to his mentor in France detailing his ultimately successful project of seducing three women whom he saw together at the Opera. The scope of Haywood's text, played out across the map of Europe, is reduced as the larger adventures of the two young people are replaced by the smaller (but just as dangerous) scale of the drawing room. These letters provide a corrective to the Melanthe/Duchess of Suffolk's account. The subtle change in emphasis from the first half of Crébillon's novel becomes manifest in the switch to an epistolary form. Through the juxtaposition of the Duchess' first person account and Chester's recounting of the same events, Crébillon establishes the relativity of morals in the mind of the reader. The "heart," no longer an intuitive guide to moral integrity, is merely another powerful tool of self-delusion. Even though, as James Munro remarks, "one of the striking features of the epistolary form of the novel is the absence of any privileged narrator, of any 'authorized version' of what is happening" (1154), it is Chester's voice that dominates. His version of the events has the ring of truth. Because the woman's perspective in the French text is partial and the women share the same "plot" of seduction under the control of Chester, his vision is the dominant one. It is not insignificant that Chester conceives his project at the Opera, which underscores the "mise en scène" aspect of his tale. The masculine perspective of the libertine (the *metteur en scène* and author of the letters) constitutes the dominant discourse of the text. Thus Crébillon shifts the power from a sentimental frame of meaning to a libertine one (Fort, 570).

This shift is successful and evident to the reader when Crébillon writes from the perspective of Chester. It is not as evident in the rewriting of Louisa as Lucie, unless one reads the texts side by side, and this is why the French text fails to communicate its status as parody to the reader. If Crébillon's text is read independently, one is left with mixed signals on at least two levels. A narrative practice shared by

the two frames of signification is an interest in spectacle: the physical display of emotions and passions. There is a fine line between sentimental and libertine display with the difference residing in the fact that a sentimental piece moralizes where the libertine analyzes (Todd, 4). In the first half of the French text the signs of the libertine are interchangeable with sentimental markers. Even the unfinished nature of Cr  billon's story leads to confusion between the two as fragmented and unfinished texts were common strategies in the sentimental novel (Todd, 6). And although the "unfinished" aspect of the narrative has been rehabilitated through an examination of the diegesis (Fort, 571; Dagen, 25), the reader is left in suspense. Claude Reichler notes that many libertine texts take great care to find an edifying conclusion to their novels, a characteristic of the subtle play of masks inherent to the genre (101). The lack of apparent closure in Cr  billon's text, combined with its fragmented quality, adds to the confusion of the reader.

Reading the texts side by side reveals not only what has been lost in the translation from one frame of signification to another, but also what is lost when reading the French text alone. Cr  billon left out Haywood's depiction of female agency grounded in moral authority, which was the intended target for his parody. The problem with the French text, then, is that his intended parody can still be read as an awkward sentimental text. The parody goes unnoticed until the change in the narrative structure, which is the most visible mark of the difference in register. Reading the texts side by side, however, demonstrates how Cr  billon prepares the way for the transformation of the English piece into a libertine one before Lord Chester ever takes control of the narrative.

The elision of the threat of incest, which plays such a large part in the construction of the English original, distinguishes the libertine text from the sentimental. The fear of incest on Louisa's part and the lack of perception on Lucie's radically change the tone from one novel to the other. With the effacement of nature as a moral force,

26 - *Lost in Translation*

Crébillon trivializes Lucie's reason for escape. If we compare Louisa's reactions to Dorilaus' declaration of love with Lucie's reaction to Rutland's, one can clearly see the English text's concern with morality is reduced to strictly social terms.

Louisa's reaction to Dorilaus' "so strange a proposition" (his declaration of love) was one of "surprise, grief and shame" (19). When Dorilaus kissed her with "the utmost tenderness," we are told that his kisses which were once acceptable when given as "demonstrations of friendship, were now irksome, as knowing them the effects of love" (23). The kisses provoked "various agitations....so violent, as to be near throwing her into a swoon" (19). She asks herself, "What unaccountable prejudice is this then that strikes me with such horror at his love!" (20). This physical response is countered by logical reasoning from both Dorilaus and Louisa. The match would in no manner be improper in the eyes of society: "As in this action he had no way transgressed the rules of decency, he could ill brook the finding her so much alarmed at it" (22).

Haywood must balance the reader's sympathy between Louisa and Dorilaus, who is in no way portrayed as a monster. Haywood accomplishes this balancing act through a repeated insistence on Dorilaus' position of authority as a father figure. Dorilaus performed "as could have been expected from a father....indeed he doubtless had passed for being so...." (4). He regarded the twins "with a tenderness little inferior to paternal; but which still increased with their increase in years" (6). "What more could have been expected from the best of fathers! What more could children, born to the highest fortunes, have enjoyed!" (6).

Dorilaus knows that little prevents his marrying Louisa, yet he must convince himself that his passion is just. He fights "to suppress a passion" for which "he blushed within himself at the inclinations he had for a girl whom he had always behaved to as a child of his own, and who looked upon him as a father...." (12). But for Dorilaus "love and nature at last got the victory....therefore he yielded to the

strongest side....and he settled everything, as he imagined, to the satisfaction of his passion...." (15).

The end of Haywood's novel vindicates Louisa's physical revulsion to Dorilaus' caresses as he is her natural father. However unexplainable it first appears, Louisa's "natural" reaction to Dorilaus' advances is ultimately revealed to be a morally correct one. At their reconciliation in chapter XXIII, Dorilaus exclaims "It was heaven....that inspired you with that abhorrence of my offers, which, had you accepted, we must both have been eternally undone!— You are my daughter, Louisa!....my own natural daughter!" (317). The opposition established by Haywood at the very beginning of the twins' story between socially condoned behavior and inexplicable intuitive reaction has been played out in favor of the woman's innate access to moral feelings manifested in physical response. Dorilaus overrides his first "feelings of shame" in favor of a brute passion that would lead to incest. Finer feelings are not absent in the male, they are merely subordinate to animal impulse. Louisa ignores logic in favor of feelings: "My heart is filled with duty, reverence and gratitude....as for any other sort of love I know not what it is: were it a voluntary emotion, believe me, Sir, I gladly would give it entrance into my soul, but I well see it is of a far different nature" (22).

Haywood writes an anti-analytical novel which privileges female intuition. Louisa's claim to independence is grounded in the representation of women's innate morality which defies objective reasoning. By contrast, Crébillon uses a sentimental construction to frame his rational exploration of women's psyche. Critics have noted one "improvement" in the French version of Haywood's work: notably the refinement in the brutishness of her portrayal of Dorilaus' attack on Louisa. This difference is attributed to a tendency in English aesthetics that would offend French notions of "bienséance." Feinsilber contends that "La brutalité de la version anglaise passerait pour 'barbare' dans un roman français" (29). Yet, Haywood is presenting the brute masculine nature of a *good* man. When Crébillon

28 - *Lost in Translation*

makes him as refined as Lucie (if not more so), it is one more indication of the change in register.

Louisa's honor is literally bound up in her body. She follows her "heart" but not as a seat of passion and disorder, rather as one of natural authority which would preserve moral order. Haywood presents Louisa's dilemma as a means of dramatizing the perceived power for women in the sentimental movement gaining popularity in the 1740s. She grounds a new version of her earlier licentious adventure stories within the increasingly popular sentimental discourse. Like other women writers of her time, Haywood "writes to show other women means for survival of their individual predicaments and for coping with the conditions of women in general" (Williamson, 23). Haywood draws upon the discourse of innate sexual difference and gendering of sensibility that threatened to "perpetuate past views of women, whereby they merely suffered the experience of the world, in contrast to the willful engagement and self-fashioning that Lockean psychology promised all men" (Barker-Benfield, xviii). The novel of sentiment proposed a paradigm of empowerment based on the female's susceptibility, her "weaker" nature turning a fault into a virtue. Haywood describes a world where Louisa's comportment sets her apart and "the adventures she was witness of made her, indeed, more knowing of the world, but were far from corrupting those excellent morals she had received from nature" (25). However, Crébillon collapses Lucie's story with that of three other women who are interchangeable, for they represent self-deceiving, easily manipulated objects of male desire whose unfinished "story" is all too predictable. And, as Dagen aptly remarks, "*Toute suite est prévisible*" (25).

By emptying Haywood's story of its moral significance, Crébillon contrasts his "imitation" of Haywood's text, which stresses the power of feeling to act as a moral guide over reason, with an exploration of people's (mostly women's) capacity for self-deception. Where Haywood demonstrates the subordination of the

power of reason to intuition (shown to be a higher form of reason), Crébillon represents its potentially dangerous, self-destructive consequences in a demystification of the sentimental construct. These two texts represent the struggle over the meaning of “sensibility” that is carried on in the eighteenth century on both sides of the Channel. According to G.J. Barker-Benfield, sensibility

denoted the receptivity of the senses and referred to the psychoperceptual schema explained and systematized by Newton and Locke....while sensibility rested on essentially materialist assumptions, proponents of the cultivation of sensibility came to invest it with spiritual and moral values. The flexibility of a word synonymous with consciousness, with feeling, and eventually identifiable with sexual characteristics, permitted a continuous struggle over its meanings and values. (*Sensibility* xvii)

Crébillon uses Haywood's novel of sentiment as a mask, in the manner of Chester who misrepresents himself as a “man of feeling.” This sentimental masking is impenetrable to the women. However, Crébillon shows his female characters as making use of sentimental paradigms to justify their passions, thereby masking their carnal desires while authorizing their actions. The difference in the position of the women and Chester stems from his lucidity and their capacity for self-deception. The dependence on the privileged position of the “heart” is false, as Chester notes (“La tête seule fait tous les frais du sentiment qu'on croit, ou l'on feint de se croire.”) The strength of Crébillon's analysis depends on the Duchess of Suffolk's tale of abandonment and the juxtaposition of Lord Chester's letters in the second half of *Les heureux orphelins*. Once again the shift in the focus of the French novel can be seen from the beginning.

30 - *Lost in Translation*

Crébillon prepares the reader for this change through the portrayal of the relationship between Rutland and Lucie and the emphasis on sentimental display or spectacle.

Although Rutland is presented as a father surrogate to the twins, there is an emphasis on his equality with his wards. If this “sentiment paternel” is accentuated, as Dagen contends, then it is done in such a way as to make it easier for Rutland to slip out of a position that is temporary (“de tenir lieu de ces parents”; “à se servir de père” 43) to occupy another. Haywood makes Dorilaus’ attempts to move from a paternal position to one of a lover much more awkward. Dorilaus asks Louisa to “look on him as a friend” (16) as he performs the duties of a father to “provide a husband” (17) for her. In two instances, Dorilaus conflates the positions: “The tender passion stole into his soul by imperceptible degrees, and under the shape of friendship and paternal affection, met with no opposition from his reason” (11); and “has my submitting to be your lover forfeited that respect you were wont to pay me as a guardian?” (21). The unnaturalness of Louisa’s predicament is therefore reinforced by Dorilaus’ unsuccessful maneuvers.

Lucie’s dilemma is of a different order. She does not feel horror at her guardian’s declaration of love. She feels nothing. A shift has occurred from a Louisa whose heart is repulsed at the thought of marriage to Dorilaus to a Lucie who has “un cœur si peu capable de recevoir des impressions vives, ou plutôt que vous êtes à plaindre de ne pouvoir pas connaître le bonheur d’aimer!” (50). The contrasting degrees of honor that Haywood sets up between male and female standards is effaced in the French text in favor of an exploration of differing terms and degrees of affection: “Ah! s’écria le chevalier [Rutland] qu’il m’est aisé de juger par la différence des expressions que vous employez, en parlant de nous deux, de celle qu’en effet votre cœur met entre nous! Attachement pour moi, tendresse pour lui?” (50). Rutland, like Dorilaus, lets his heart convince his mind that he is justified in his pursuit of Lucie. “Il n’éprouva que trop à quel point l’esprit suit le cœur” (53). Crébillon

accentuates the role of Rutland's fight against his passion in a long passage meant to analyse why he can neither seduce Lucie nor marry her. The question of her being his "daughter" does not enter into his deliberation as it does with Dorilaus. His not being able to decide is solely due to social concerns. The "virtue" with which his passion does battle is a social one, and great emphasis is placed on her unknown parentage or the possible consequences of having to render an account of his actions to her real parents (52).

Because Rutland feels no guilt in connection with his role as "father" to Lucie, her explanation that it is because she is used to seeing him as a father loses its potency: "Peut-être, accoutumée à vous regarder comme un père, n'ayant d'ailleurs jamais dû prévoir ce que l'amour vous inspire pour moi, devant même regarder comme un crime contre vous de désirer seulement l'honneur dont vous voudriez aujourd'hui me combler, en ai-je trop éloigné mes idées?" (64). The use of "maybe" undercuts her reasoning. Lucie with her "tendre et naïf" (51) appearance agrees that she would be willing "sans aucun mélange de répugnance ni de goût" (60, 62) to marry him; however, she cannot return his "sentiments" for her. Like Louisa, Lucie flees from her guardian after he assaults her in the garden (in Haywood's text it was in her chamber). As a result of the attack, Lucie has now come full circle, and her feelings match those of her English counterpart: "La fuite est l'unique parti qui me reste, puisqu'une malheureuse, mais invincible répugnance ne me permet pas de consentir jamais à l'épouser" (69). However, there is a difference. The repugnance Lucie feels is not a spontaneous one, nor one of revulsion at the idea of marrying a father-like figure. Instead, she gradually realizes, after examining her "heart," that she will never love Rutland and the repugnance is a result of the attack. In an irony only perceptible when reading the texts side by side, Crébillon writes that Rutland finds Lucie's heart "droit et rempli de tous les principes et de toutes les vertus qu'il lui pouvait désirer...." (48). Yet it is simply a lack of feeling for Rutland that determines Lucie's actions. The narrator

remarks that Lucie is, in many respects, insensible: “Il n’était pas possible qu’il [Rutland] ne se fâchât pas quelquefois contre Lucie, du peu d’attention qu’elle faisait à ses sentiments” (60). Louisa’s refusal of Dorilaus is a spontaneous realization of wrongness, unnaturalness, while Lucie had the “pureté stupide et provocante de l’ignorance” (Dagen, 17).

If Lucie’s finer feelings are unresponsive, her body does, however, participate in a sentimental display. In the second half of *Les heureux orphelins*, Chester explains: “moi, c’est le cœur humain que je développe, de la fausseté dans la plus intéressante des passions que j’expose à vos yeux.” The importance of spectacle and analysis go hand in hand as Crébillon explores the social being’s capacity for self-deception. The spectacle that is so important to the libertine mode in the last part of the adaptation is prepared by the sentimental display of the first part of Crébillon’s text. Crébillon takes his cue from Richardson and increases the pathos of scenes in the “English” manner; a few tears become torrents, one falls to one’s knees, implores, etc... Crébillon “contemple sans en prendre sa part la comédie de la morale et de l’affectivité” (Dagen, 20). Crébillon develops an empty theater of sentiment. This emphasis on spectacle translates into changes to Haywood’s text. Incidents that are simply noted in passing are turned into highly charged scenes of leave-taking. When Crébillon erases the “raison d’être” underlying Haywood’s text, he is left with an empty shell, a sentimental mask.

Feinsilber comments that “....on ne saurait vraiment accuser Crébillon de suivre la mode, il l’annoncerait plutôt, y trouverait motif à parodie et pastiche” (27). This may be the case as Crébillon’s text participates in a trend that arises out of the popularity of the sentimental novel and is critical of it. The emphasis placed on spectacle in the French text written a decade later than Haywood’s is indicative of a sentimentalism reduced to appearances, where importance is placed on mechanistic displays of emotion. This “imitation” of a novel of sentiment emptied of its moral content, and its

transformation into a novel of sensibility, can be seen, in effect, as a disempowerment of the sentimental paradigm for women. It is brought about in the second half of the French novel through the representation of the libertine's project. The libertine paradigm exposes the fallacy of women's sentimental susceptibility and reduces it to its materialist aspects where form takes precedence over content. Dagen notes: "...l'expression des diverses tonalités de l'amour dans *Les heureux orphelins* doit répondre à une esthétique du désordre sentimental" (21). The appearance of emotional disorder takes precedence in Crébillon's text. This undercuts Haywood's representation of moral sentiment (content) upon which social order (form) depends.

Bernadette Fort writes: "Crébillon dépasse de loin les ambitions limitées de son modèle" (571). But if one examines what these "limited" ambitions entailed, it seems more than likely that Crébillon shared them. Haywood was one of the early women writers in England to earn a living from her literary production. Her prime "ambition" was therefore to make money and sell books. In a similar movement, Haywood and Crébillon were jumping on the bandwagon created by the immense popularity of Richardson's *Pamela* (1740) which established a new trend in moral edification through novels. In France, the popularity of Richardson's work created a market for English novels in a growing atmosphere of "Anglomania" (Grieder).

Fort surmises that, in the absence of documentation to the contrary, it is reasonable to suppose that Crébillon was looking for a way to rehabilitate himself after the scandal caused by the publication of *Le sopha: un conte moral* (1742) (556). Following l'Abbé Prévost, translator of Richardson's *Clarissa* in 1751, Crébillon chose a work by an already popular novelist that would meet the needs of the reading public. It is ironic that he chose to "imitate" a work by Eliza Haywood, herself a writer of amorous and scandalous novels up until the 1740s. Both Haywood and Crébillon had to overcome their less than sterling reputations

for publishing scandalous texts. Although the radical change in the subject matter of the English woman's novels from scandal to morality is often attributed to Pope's satire, "The Dunciad," it could be seen just as well as a response to a change in the public's reading habits. Both Haywood and Crébillon employed the same strategy to reinsert themselves into the literary scene after a scandal by way of translations. But where the new trend in domestic fiction serves as a mask for Crébillon to continue his explorations of the war between the sexes and the elaboration of the libertine project, Haywood adapts it to explore a new power base for women. His is a strategy of reinsertion into the marketplace, while Haywood adapts the new trend to reposition herself and uses it to explore the difficult situation of women in society.

Haywood wrote *The Fortunate Foundlings* during the same period that she published *The Female Spectator*, a periodical destined for women which was to redeem her reputation as a writer and establish her credibility as a moral advisor. *The Fortunate Foundlings* is a pivotal text in Haywood's *œuvre*, reinforcing the new moral image she wanted to create, and it serves as a bridge from her early popular scandalous novels to the later works. The problems and contradictions inherent in a sentimental construction of femininity did not go unnoticed. *The Fortunate Foundlings* can be seen as a transitional text presenting an idealized conception of women toward works such as *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless* (1751) and *The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy* (1753) in which good-hearted but independent-minded women learn some hard lessons in society. The novel of *développement* permits Haywood to exploit the less restrictive narrative possibilities of a woman's moral and social education in which she can hint at "a distinction between the woman and the image of femininity" (Todd, *Angellica* 148).

But as a transitional text, the novel of moral sentiment allows Haywood to combine previously antagonistic characteristics of women, passivity and aggression, acted out by different characters in her amorous

fiction of the early eighteenth century. In the context of moral sentiment, women can aggressively protect their honor and therefore “achieve a balance between their contrary natures and....[be] presented as models of moral rectitude and proper behavior” (Schofield, *Quiet Rebellion* 20). The romanesque adventures of Haywood’s early aggressive libertine heroines and the “hidden irrational urges” that motivated them are now legitimized and transformed by the natural moral superiority of women (Schofield, *Haywood* 43). While women’s adventures are still rooted in the heroine’s body, it is no longer the libido but the moral sense that condones unconventional anti-social behavior. Haywood uses the new form not to mask a novel of amorous intrigue, as does Crébillon, but to explore a potential source of female empowerment. Crébillon’s “histoire imitée de l’anglois” thus empties Haywood’s exploration of sentimental power of all signification.

Feinsilber explains that Crébillon’s “adaptation obéit à cette autre règle qui est de ‘naturaliser cette plante étrangère’” (29). But this “foreign plant” (the novel of moral sentiment or the domestic novel) is, in reality, naturalized by a writer more in line with the woman’s tradition of the novel, Marie-Jeanne Riccoboni, who writes her first novel *Les lettres de mistriss Fanni Butler* in 1757. Riccoboni is a much more faithful “translator” of the English tradition of the domestic novel and offers a better synthesis of the English and French traditions. Her works, especially those written in the 1750s, explore the social predicament of women and their empowerment through the moral authority of the sentimental tradition. But this is the subject for another exploration of crossgendered narratives.

Notes

1. The complete titles of these texts are as follows: *The Fortunate Foundlings: Being the Genuine History of Colonel M---rs, and his Sister Madam du P---y, the Issue of the Hon. Ch---es M---rs, son of the Late Duke of R--l--d* and *Les heureux orphelins: histoire imitée de l'anglois*.

2. “....ces deux derniers volumes sont bien de M. de Crébillon; quoiqu’ils ne soient pas tout à fait dignes de lui, ils sont dans son genre et on reconnaît la main à chaque pas; des détails de mœurs, des réflexions fines et ingénieuses, des caractères agréablement peints et surtout les finesses, le ton et le manège d’un petit maître rusé et audacieux bien soutenus, voilà le beau côté de ces deux volumes. L’autre côté nous présentera des discussions sans fin, des choses trop osées, d’autres trop recherchées,...trop de raisonnements, et trop peu de faits...” (*Correspondance littéraire* II: 168). Considered a “hybrid” work, an awkward imitation of an “inferior” novel by an English woman, a good deal of the critical effort resided in excluding the work from the Crébillon canon (Kent, 326).

3. Despite a public avowal by Crébillon that the work was his, critics insisted on looking for an alternative explanation to the authorship of a work that was, according to Grimm, “ni son genre, ni son style” (qtd in Kent 326). One such explanation is that it was a “retouched piece of juvenilia,” another is that he did not write it at all. In fact, a few critics suggested that the true author of the text was Crébillon’s wife, Henrietta Maria Stafford Howard, whose reputation he was protecting (Kent, 327).

4. It is necessary to define such terms as sensibility, sentiment and sentimental, as well as the novel of sentiment or sentimental novel. I am using Janet Todd’s explanation: “Often in literary criticism ‘sentiment’ and ‘sensibility’ are felt to be synonymous, a novel of sentiment differing in no

way from a novel of sensibility. But there is, nonetheless, a useful distinction to be made in historical usage and reference. A 'sentiment' is a moral reflection, a rational opinion usually about the rights and wrongs of human conduct. But a 'sentiment' is also a thought, often an elevated one, influenced by emotion, a combining of heart with head or an emotional impulse leading to an opinion or a principle....a feeling heart as well as a reflecting mind...." (7). Sensibility "also presupposes an emotional susceptibility" (7). I contend in this paper that Haywood writes a novel of sentiment which Crébillon transforms into a novel of sensibility, only to finish as a libertine text. Jacques Rustin defines libertine novelists as "auteurs rationalistes toujours engagés à quelque degré dans le combat contre les préjugés, 'en particulier les préjugés d'ordre sexuel'" (28).

5. I follow Crébillon's usage of "imitation" to describe his text. As Bernadette Fort points out, it is rather a free adaptation of the English text and not an imitation in the modern sense of the word.

6. The story of Dorilaus and the twins is told in the third person. However, the narration shifts from time to time from the editors, the "we" (1, 38, 147) of the introduction, to an occasional "I" (5, 70, 313) as guarantor of the truth of the tale. Now and again Crébillon uses the device of the rhetorical question (7) to make the narrator's presence felt in the first half of his "imitation."

7. Fort explains: "La tentative de séduction de Lucie (I) est en effet postérieure aux événements racontés par la duchesse (II) et par Chester (III et IV). Ceci permet, contrairement à l'opinion répandue, d'interpréter le roman de Crébillon comme achevé" (571). Dagen writes "Quant au dessein de l'œuvre, on peut, à considérer la composition en boucle, le juger accompli" (25).

38 - *Lost in Translation*

8. “Rutland le retira [Edouard] chez lui, comme dans sa maison paternelle. Là, il ne retrancha vis-à-vis de lui, des façons et du ton d’un père, que ce qui inspire aux enfants plus de crainte que de respect, ce qui souvent interdit la confiance, et ne permet pas à l’amour de naître” (45) and “tout ce que j’ai prétendu, a été de vous parler en ami” (47).

9. “Mais quel est-ce ce sentiment qu’il exige de moi; et comment se peut-il qu’il existe dans la nature, et qu’il ne me le communique pas! Ah! sans doute, je suis destinée à ne le connaître jamais, puisque je ne le trouve pas pour lui dans mon cœur! mais pourquoi fait-il qu’il s’obstine à le désirer, lorsqu’il ne lui est pas nécessaire pour me faire consentir à recevoir sa main!” (66).

10. For example, Haywood writes: “It is certain, indeed, that when she first heard the motive which had occasioned her being sent for, her gentle breast was filled with the most terrible alarms for her dear brother’s danger; but the little regard he seemed to have of it, and the high ideas he had of future greatness, soon brought her to think as he did....” (10). Crébillon turns this into: “L’attendrissement de Rutland, en le voyant [Édouard] partir, fut extrême; pour Lucie, elle semblait n’avoir de force que pour retenir son frère dans ses bras; enfin, il s’arracha malgré elle malgré lui-même; et après s’être jeté mille fois aux genoux de son généreux bienfaiteur, il les quitta tous deux” (49).

11. Interestingly, Haywood and William Hatchett translated Crébillon’s *Le sophia* into English in 1742. This translation of the scandalous French novel underscores the financial concerns to Haywood’s production. This is during the same period in which the publication of Richardson’s *Pamela* (1740-41) changes the nature of the novel in England, forcing her to change the ostensible nature of her texts.

Works Cited

- Barker-Benfield, G.J. *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Chicago and London: Chicago UP, 1992.
- Bowers, Toni O'Shaughnessy. "Sex, Lies, and Invisibility: Amatory Fiction from the Restoration to Mid-Century." *The Columbia History of the British Novel*. Eds. Richetti, John et al. New York: Columbia UP, 1994. 50-72.
- Crébillon, Claude. *Les heureux orphelins*. Paris: Desjonquières, 1995.
- Dagen, Jean. "Introduction." *Les heureux orphelins*. Paris: Desjonquières, 1995. 5-26.
- Feinsilber, Anne. "Notice Historique." *Les heureux orphelins*. Paris: Desjonquières, 1995. 27-32.
- Fort, Bernadette. "Les heureux orphelins de Crébillon: De l'adaptation à la création romanesque." *Revue d'histoire littéraire de France* 30 (1980): 554-73.
- Grieder, Josephine. *Anglomania in France 1740-1789: Fact, Fiction and Political Discourse*. Genève-Paris: Droz, 1985.
- Grimm, Diderot, et al. *Correspondance Littéraire, philosophique, et critique*. Edited by Maurice Tourneux. 16 vols. Paris: Garnier, 1877-82.
- Haywood, Eliza. *The Fortunate Foundlings*. New York and London: Garland, 1974.
- Kent, John P. "Crébillon fils, Mrs Eliza Haywood and *Les heureux orphelins*: A Problem of Authorship." *Romance Notes* 11 (1969-70): 326-32.
- Munro, James. "Studies in sub-conscious motivation in Laclos and Marivaux." *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 89 (1972): 1153-68.
- Nicholson, Linda. "Interpreting Gender." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 20.1 (1994): 79-105.
- Niklaus, Robert. "Crébillon fils et Richardson." *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 89 (1972): 1169-85.

40 - *Lost in Translation*

- Richler, Claude. "Le Récit d'initiation dans le roman libertin." *Littérature* 47 (1982): 100-12.
- Rustin, Jacques. "Définition et explication du roman libertin des Lumières." *Travaux de linguistique et de littérature* 2.XVI (1978): 27-34.
- Schofield, Mary Anne. *Eliza Haywood*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1985.
- . *Quiet Rebellion: The Fictional Heroines of Eliza Haywood*. Washington: U P of America, 1981.
- Sgard, Jean. "Catalogue des œuvres de Claude Crébillon." *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* 96.1 (1996): 3-20.
- Todd, Janet. *The Sign of Angellica. Women, Writing and Fiction, 1660-1800*. New York: Columbia UP, 1989.
- . *Sensibility: An Introduction*. London: Methuen, 1986.
- Williamson, Marilyn L. *Raising Their Voices: British Women Writers, 1650-1750*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1990.