

INTRODUCTION

“Little French books” and the European Novel

Wann ein Quartal verstreicht/ da nicht einer oder mehr *Romans* auß/ und in die *Catalogos* kommet/ ist es so seltsam/ als eine grosse Gesellschaft/ da einer nicht Hanß hiesse. Manchem ermanglet nicht an einem Wand=gestell voller *Romans*, aber wol an Bibel und Bettbuch. Mann= und Frauwen=Volk sitzt darüber/ als über Eyern/ Tag und Nacht hinein. Einige thun gar nichts anders.... Ward demnach von dem Französischen Wort *Roman*, oder *Romant* geredet/ und anerkennet/ daß man diser *Nation* billich überlassen/ disen Materien einen besondern und daurenden Namen zuerfinden/ als die der Romanen vornehmste Eröffnerin/ und mehr solcher sachen getragen/ als die andre alle.... Man halte Franckreich und andere Länder/ item die Zeiten/ da die *Roman* gemein worden sind/ gegen denen Zeiten und Ländern da sie seltsam sind/ und rede ohnparteilich von der Sach!

A season without a *Roman* published and listed in the book fair catalogues is as unusual as a large crowd with no one named Hans. Some people do not want for a wall lined with *Romans* but have no Bible or prayer book. Men and women brood day and night over them like eggs. Others do barely anything else.... Thus we talked about the French word *Roman* or *Romant* and judged that one should readily grant this nation the right to invent a special and lasting name for these materials since they were the chief inventor of the *Roman* and had borne more of these things than all others.... Compare France and the other countries, ditto the times where the *Roman* has become common with those times and places where they have remained rare and then talk about it impartially!

—GOTTHARD HEIDEGGER, *Mythoscopia romantica* (Zurich, 1698)

One man's anger haunts the pages of this book and demands exorcism. As the seventeenth century drew to a close, Gotthard Heidegger (1666–1711), occasional critic and full-time Swiss Calvinist, poured his rage into pages treating the origin and progress of romance, *Mythoscopia romantica*. The baroque syntax and

vocabulary fail to obscure Heidegger's shrill tone. Styled as a conversation between friends, Heidegger's anti-romance, anti-novel tirade has long been identified as a foundational text for the history of the German novel. It has been reprinted, excerpted, collected in anthologies, quoted by scholars, and read by generations of *Germanisten* as arguably the first full-blown German-language theory of the *Roman*—a term encompassing what English divides into romance and novel. My own book thus began as an exploration of the fury at the origins of the modern novel. Specifically, I set out to discover what lay behind Heidegger's palpable vexation. And the search stretched on, for although Heidegger's *Mythoscopia romantica* escaped obscurity, the books that enraged him did not.

Heidegger's *Mythoscopia romantica* theorized more than just the genre he labeled with what was then considered by Germans to be a French word, *Roman*. He also presented a theory of the rise and fall of nations. Heidegger's printer-publisher in Zurich, David Gessner (1647–1729), followed common German typographical practice and set the term *Roman* in italic letters to make its foreignness leap off a page of Gothic type (*Fraaktur*). So foreign was the word that its spelling was uncertain: “the French word *Roman* or *Romant*.” While the many texts labeled with this term could vary considerably, their shared French provenance overrode any differences.

In assigning the *Roman* an exclusively French origin, Heidegger was explicitly borrowing from a more celebrated theorist of the genre, Pierre Daniel Huet (1630–1721), elected to the Académie française in 1674. Huet's *Traité de l'origine des romans* (1670) had provided what many across Europe agreed to be the most erudite and elegant treatment of the genre to date, and it was quickly translated into English, German, and Latin. His *Traité* also neatly excluded any Spanish and Italian pretenders from the genre's throne—despite ample claims that seemed to make the genre theirs. Charles Sorel (1602–1674), for example, had famously used and recommended the adoption of Spanish examples by other French writers. Spanish models, and not only the picaresque, were in fact so widely imitated in French that later scholars have identified a seventeenth-century French subgenre named the “roman hispano-mauresque.”¹ So advanced were Spanish and Italian practitioners of the form that French Jesuit scholar René Rapin (1621–1687) argued, in his *Reflections on Aristotle's Poetics* (1674), that it had precluded those nations' success in writing tragedy. And, ironically enough, Huet's *Traité* was itself first published with *Zaïde*, whose subtitle prominently proclaimed it an *histoire espagnole*. No matter, however, for France was the place where, Huet claimed, the *roman* had first been brought to full flower, initially by Honoré d'Urfé (1568–1625), then by Madeleine de Scudéry (1607–1701), and finally by the author of *Zaïde*, listed on the original title page as “Monsieur de Segrais” (Jean Regnault de Segrais, 1624–1701),

1. For references to the early twentieth-century scholarship that proposed this subgenre, see Coulet 248.

a title attributed today to Segrais's friend and close collaborator Marie-Madeleine, comtesse de Lafayette (1634–1693), whose *Princesse de Clèves* (1678) is often cited as the first modern novel. Huet played down the wealth of evidence to the contrary to stake his claim for French cultural achievement. He flaunted the *roman* as the crown jewel in Gallic power and imperial glory.

If Huet's theory of the *roman* was overdetermined by a theory that yoked culture to power, so too was Heidegger's. Across time and space, the Swiss pastor tirelessly demonstrated, cultural achievement and political power had traveled in tandem, *translatio studii et imperii*. Each term subtended the other. Crucially, they could also be read in reverse. If cultural accomplishment accompanied political might, cultural decline was equally certain proof of power's ebb. What augured the rise prognosticated by one soothsayer could be read by another to herald a fall. Thus, while for Huet the *roman* predicted French preeminence, for Heidegger it told of French decadence. Huet's *roman* burnished French glory; Heidegger's exposed that nation's seamy underside. It was the genre's intense reception beyond France that had so vexed the Swiss Calvinist. Its popularity portended a fall from grace for all nations who sampled of its fruits.

Laced with a generous dose of sexism and brimming with anti-French chauvinism, Heidegger's warnings elicited lukewarm reactions in the press of his day. In the March 1702 edition of *Neue Unterredungen* (New Conversations), first in a string of journals edited by publicist Nicolaus Hieronymous Gundling (1671–1729), the enlightened editor identified Heidegger's allegations as "eine Grille" (wild fantasy) and snickered: "Gewiß es nimt mich Wunder/ daß unser Autor nicht auch gesagt/ Eva hätte kurtz zuvor/ ehe sie vom verbotenen Baum geessen/ einen Roman gelesen: oder eine von der nichts würdigem Schlangen praesentirte Histoire galante" (60). (I confess it surprises me that our author did not go on to claim that Eve, right before she ate from the forbidden tree, had read a *Roman*—or a *histoire galante* given to her by that no good snake.) It seemed, Gundling hinted, that "der Mann . . . hat vielleicht keine andere *Romans* gelesen/ als etliche *Histoires Galantes, Amours Secrettes*, worüber kluge Frantzosen selbst en lachen" (58). (The man might not have read any other *Romans* than various *Histoires Galantes, Amours Secrettes* that are ridiculed by clever Frenchmen themselves.) But what were they? And which ones? Unlike Heidegger's censorious judgment, these books have been quite forgotten.

Traditional literary histories are not much help in approaching the origins of Heidegger's wrath, for several reasons. Firstly, the *Histoires Galantes* and *Amours Secrettes* that Gundling fingered as the censor's model *Romans* are often considered *unliterary*—even, until more recent decades, in French literary history. In his foundational study of the French novel before the Revolution, Henri Coulet echoed Heidegger's opinions of the *histoires* and *nouvelles* that Coulet identified as dominating the market for prose fiction from 1690 to 1715 (289–95). Such texts, critics in

both the eighteenth and twentieth centuries judged, were popular with all sorts of readers, not just with those of more highbrow tastes. Many even smacked of pornography. In any case, they were not *literature*. Secondly, beyond French literary history, these “French” texts fall outside the frames with which national literary histories fence their borders. Only recently have English-language critics, such as Catherine Gallagher and William Warner, insisted on recuperating the French origins of the English novel. Thirdly, the decades around 1700 have, for reasons closely connected to the first two, not traditionally sustained the attention of literary or cultural historians. This neglect is particularly true of German literary history.² These decades could thus be quickly summed up in the nineteenth century by Karl Goedeke, one of the field’s fathers: “Man übersetzte” (One translated) (3: 244).

The time for an intervention is ripe. The tasks of translators have never seemed more urgent, the cultural labor that is translation recognized anew. Emily Apter captures the widely shared sense that “the traditional pedagogical organization of the humanities according to national languages and literatures has exceeded its expiration date” (581). Fitfully feeling our way toward organizations appropriate to and sustainable in the brave new world of globalism, we scrutinize prenatal political formations with more than antiquarian interest. Historical models of empire and power (*imperium*) appear oddly contemporary. Translation, we realize, provides both the vehicle to project that power across space and time as well as the site to renegotiate it on local terms.

As the following pages document, many early novels were cosmopolitan books, “strangers nowhere in the world”—or, at least, strangers nowhere in Europe.³ Between roughly 1680 and 1730, the early novel’s passport was French. With its French papers, the fledgling genre traveled far and wide. Readers across the continent voraciously consumed “little French books.” And as they snapped up new titles, they domesticated the new genre. This intense reception of French fictions spawned the European novel. Across borders, the novel lent readers everywhere a suggestion of sophistication, a familiarity with circumstances beyond their local ken.

But the genre’s border crossings did not proceed without local opposition. The routes the cosmopolitan genre traveled were lined by circumstances in which the novel’s French origins long mattered. Into the eighteenth century, the modern German novel (*Roman*) was thus not German at all; like the contemporaneous English novel, it was French. By the early eighteenth century, Germans’ usage of the loan-word *Roman* appears, at first glance, strikingly like our own, stretching to cover

2. Olaf Simons has represented the lack of attention to the decades around 1700 in graph form. The only period less represented in the standard reference work, Frenzels’ *Daten deutscher Dichtung*, are the decades leading into the Catholic Reformation, roughly 1545–1570. Simons’s graphic depiction has been widely reproduced on the many wiki sites he coauthors. See, for example, <http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Literatur> (10 March 2010).

3. In the 1751 entry in the *Encyclopédie*, Diderot defined *cosmopolitan* in this way (cf. Jacob, *Strangers*).

a wide variety of forms for which latter-day critics have invented countless subgenres: pastoral romance-novels, war and travel chronicles, heroic novels, courtly novels, as well as the *nouvelles*, *amours secrets*, and *histoires galantes* and *scandaleuses* that spread with the Huguenot diaspora after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (Edict of Fontainebleau) in 1685.⁴ And yet, in German and across Europe, the *Roman* at 1700 differed in one absolutely crucial aspect: it was coded as French.

This French chapter in the novel's history is the subject of *Novel Translations*. As my conclusions suggest, this long and long-neglected chapter began gradually to draw to a close only in the 1720s, more than sixty years after the term first migrated into German. The *Roman* in German remained laden with baggage from its "French" origins even into the nineteenth century. By the 1720s, English fictions—many themselves indebted to French *nouvelles* and *histoires*—began to be translated directly into German. Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, translated into German and French within a year of its initial publication in English in 1719, marked the beginning of the end of French hegemony over the German novel.⁵ As English models increasingly dominated the now well-established European market for fiction, the French chapter in the genre's always transnational history drew slowly to a close.

The *Roman* in German, like the novel across Europe, gradually lost its French accent. Nonetheless, repressed memories of the genre's fashionably French origins long haunted the book world, subtending diagnoses of the illnesses suffered by later readers. The widely discussed *Lesewut* (reading rage) and *Lesesucht* (addiction to books) thought to plague eighteenth- and nineteenth-century readers of *Trivialliteratur* (popular materials), for example, were in large part simply subsequent strains of the seventeenth century's *Modesucht* (fashion rage or addiction), similarly contagious to women and youths.

The use of quotation marks to enclose "French" is crucial. For "French" texts themselves often turn out to have borrowed from other models. In addition, a text written in French in these years, and especially after 1685, hardly signaled support for French royal politics. In her sweeping *World Republic of Letters* (published originally in French in 1999), Pascale Casanova has shown that the language's "cosmopolitan character," already evident by the 1660s, accompanied a "curious 'denationalization' of French" (68). French had become the international language of letters, a medium whose plasticity allowed its use by France's champions as well as its most scathing critics. The adoption of French signaled the seismic shifts occurring in the literary field. Indeed, Casanova persuasively sketches how French became

4. Historians of the novel will note immediately that I have not included any of the subgenres that critics assign to the so-called low *Roman*. While picaresque and satirical fictions are obviously essential parts of the rich fictional tradition later texts drew upon, they were not usually, if ever, labeled around 1700 as *Romane*.

5. The year 1719 was, arguably, also when French hegemony of the English market for novels was radically curbed. The histories of the English and German novels, like the histories of English and German gallantry, are truly *croisées*, to use the term advocated by Werner and Zimmermann.

the medium that enabled the creation of the modern category “literature,” a project with which the history of the novel is intimately entangled and which I take up in chapter 1. Margaret Jacob makes a similar point, specifically for eighteenth-century philosophy: “French was as much the *lingua franca* of Huguenot refugees, business travelers, and the non-French elites, particularly in The Netherlands and the German speaking lands, as it was in France” (“Clandestine Universe” 9). Publication of French-language titles was of course an everyday occurrence in the Netherlands and the area just outside the reach of French censors called by Robert Darnton the “fertile crescent” (*Forbidden Bestsellers*). English printers, too, set French texts, even producing bilingual editions of famed titles, such as the *Lettres portugaises* (1669).⁶ German publishers also printed French texts, eager to trade in the *lingua franca* whose cosmopolitanism made it so fashionable far beyond Paris. And in addition to publishing in French, English and German publishers alike rushed out “French” titles in their respective vernaculars—some, actual translations from the French; others, more or less successful knockoffs of French models; and still others that treated “French” topics from love to war.

As we unsettle the borders of national literary histories, we begin to see the marketplace’s transnational spaces connected, for example, by the production of the fake printer Pierre Marteau of Cologne. As book historian Karl Klaus Walther has recognized, the Marteau imprint is an emblem of a “market that turned the word into a ware.”⁷ The whiff of scandal, promise of notoriety, and hints of sexual and political outrage emanating from the Marteau brand draw us in no less than they attracted readers in the decades around 1700. They also remind us of the ill repute that so long attended the early novel, described in German literary history even recently as “insipid, trivial, or even distasteful.”⁸ Product of an industry that always needs to skirt the censor, the Marteau imprint epitomizes the speed with which *Romane* were translated, printed, and brought into circulation on the European market. They were the hottest of hot book commodities: both spicy and stolen. While the commercial success of Marteau titles might not have been enjoyed by all *Romane*, they undoubtably set the gold standard to which others aspired; while other *Romane* failed to deal with it as frankly as Marteau titles, sex sold.

6. I have consulted the 1702 printing of this bilingual edition, which appeared in London. The title pages—one English, one French—proclaim the 1702 printing to be the “second” or “dernière” edition. English and French pages alternate in this edition, which is paginated continuously across languages.

7. Walther’s painstaking examination of German-language Marteau titles disproves assumptions (by Jacob [“Clandestine Universe”] and others) that Marteau was the private property of the Dutch house Elzevier. The imprint, and others much like it, were used by various printers.

8. The quote is from McCarthy. His important article picked up on the slim—and equally moralizing—volume by Herbert Singer, *Der galante Roman*. While in some ways Singer’s sociohistorical work is akin to Richetti’s seminal study of “normal literature” and the early English novel, Richetti’s work launched a wave of feminist scholarship that sought, in part, to rehabilitate the reputations of women novel writers, such as Aphra Behn and Delariviere Manley (see, for example, Ballaster’s *Seductive Forms*). In doing so, this feminist work categorically challenged the morality that had long formed the basis of discussion of the early novel.

The continental geography charted in *Novel Translations* provides a thick description of what is today the "core of Europe." The genre's fortunes on the European market—indeed its role in creating that market—are most legible from a vantage point well beyond Paris or London. By 1700, Leipzig had eclipsed Frankfurt as the center of the German publishing industry. The city's publishing houses cultivated commercial ties to Amsterdam, Paris, and London and extended their activities well to the east. The scope of this geography shaped the burgeoning genre's commercial and critical fortunes with singular force. It encompasses a space far larger than the maps demarcated by national literary histories.

The space traversed by the European novel is more expansive still than the cross-Channel space proposed by Margaret Cohen and Carolyn Dever that helped draw sustained attention to the novel's hybrid origins. It is now generally accepted that what came to be called the modern novel emerged in a geographical "core" (Moretti) or "zone" (Cohen and Dever) dominated by France and England, while Holland played a supporting role. Rather than narrate the "rise of the novel" (Watt), be it English or French, recent literary historians working in those national literatures have explored the novel's hybrid origins, origins that may in fact stretch back to Greek antiquity (Doody). One might locate the origins of the modern novel in Heliodorus, Cervantes, Lafayette, or Defoe, to name a few frequently mentioned candidates. But, by 1700, French prose output dominated European markets.⁹ William Warner describes the dominance of French-language productions on the English market: "During the seventeenth century, France functions for England as a kind of Hollywood for prose fiction. It sets the standards for taste, develops the new subgenres, advances the theoretical debates, and dominates novel publication with sheer numbers" (48).¹⁰ The same relationship was true in large part for the German market by 1688. From a perch in Leipzig, we can more easily assess the magnitude of the transformations in the novel's transnational geography and usefully complicate accounts of its core geography.

As we attend to the European dimensions of the novel, our story must change and become *croisée* (Werner and Zimmermann). The view from Leipzig, the Saxon *klein Paris*, reveals more accurately the scope of the novel's transnationalism. It also shows how different the geography of the novel's core or zone appears when considered in terms not of authorial supply but readers' demand. Already by the 1680s,

9. DeJean similarly notes: "From 1660 to 1750, the prose fiction created both in England and France was massively 'French'; from 1750 on, it became increasingly English" ("Transnationalism" 38).

10. Warner includes a note documenting the dominance of French models. He relies on Salzman's *English Prose Fiction, 1558–1700: A Critical History* for the following figures: "Of 450 new works [of prose fiction] published in England during the seventeenth century, 213 were translations, and 164 of these were originally French. When one considers that some of the English nontranslations were patent rip-offs of French novels, the magnitude of the influence of French models becomes impressive, and after 1660 is only increasing" (48 n. 2). As helpful as Warner's Hollywood analogy is, however, it also misleads. French-language publication could—and did—occur well beyond the "Hollywood" of Paris. No consideration of French production in German has been undertaken to date.

the same novels were read from London to Leipzig and beyond—and read at the same time, ready in translations for readers of French, English, German, and other languages. The novel had become European.

My focus on the French-German dyad provides crucial detail to sketches that render Europe or the continent with the broad strokes of cartoon.¹¹ It marks, of course, an area far more modest in size than the continent's complex cultural and literary geography. But tracing the routes along which the genre wandered across Spain, Italy, Poland, the Nordic countries, and beyond must be left to scholars more proficient in local languages and histories. Here, however, I can suggest some of the questions to be asked and the measurements to be taken in pursuit of transnational histories of the novel and the global, planetary literary history of which they are a part.

The transnational history of the novel might approximate what Mieke Bal has called a “preposterous history,” a way of doing history that underlines the past's production by the present. As Bal paraphrases Derrida in *Limited Inc.*, the word (or the past) cannot return “where it has been before it was quoted . . . without the burden of the excursion through the quotation” (11). The past, we realize, is always translated by the present. Early novels thus ineluctably work like fun-house mirrors. In them, we may glimpse startling resemblances of our postnational, postmodern lives, knowing all too well that our gaze melts all that is solid into air. These shifting similarities, preposterous history recalls, may all too easily collapse the alterity that is the past. Lest Nemesis come to assist its Echo, the transnational history of the novel must not fall into the enchantment of its own image.

Nonetheless, where critics like Goedeke sneered that “one translated,” we see something else. Our recognition of the significance of the novel's cultural translations, like Minerva's owl, flies only at dusk. For only now can we read the genre's investment in an overarching project of cultural translation or mobility. It is one not unlike the *translatio studii et imperii* with which early moderns such as Huet and Heidegger were so familiar.¹² It is more commonly discussed through examples such as classicist Anne Dacier's (1654–1720) French prose translations of

11. Even *The Novel*, the two-volume survey edited by Moretti, omits discussion of the German-speaking world and the novel.

12. Affinities between theories of *translatio studii et imperii* and cultural translation exist—despite our noble hopes that the latter is not doomed to repeat the former's hierarchical chauvinism. Do we not also promise ourselves cultural renewal from the hybrid practices constitutive of cultural translation? In accounts of his Cardenio project, for example, Stephen Greenblatt emphasizes that his search for Shakespeare's lost adaptation of Cervantes's story is also a search for a model of cultural mobility attuned to present political needs. Foregrounding the unexpected, contingent slips and shifts in meaning produced by translation, Greenblatt's account of cultural mobility is explicitly intended to counteract the chauvinism of early modern concepts of *translatio imperii* while also borrowing from them. This discussion of Greenblatt's account of cultural mobility draws from a lecture delivered in Philadelphia on 26 February 2009 and revisited in his introductory essay to the edited collection of essays *Cultural Mobility*.

the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, or Alexander Pope's (1688–1744) Englishing of the *Iliad*, famously rendering him "indebted to no prince or peer alive." Partisans of ancient and modern, of Dacier, Pope, and others, quarreled over who had best translated Homer. They also fought over claims to cultural inheritance. Translation, as Walter Benjamin later proposed, was then as now the afterlife—of a canonical work as well as of the golden age that produced it. And in German literary history too, Martin Opitz (1597–1639) cajoled would-be poets to follow his example and compose poetry in the vernacular with promises that such endeavors would engender a renaissance of the arts and sciences in Germany. The beauty of their poetic blossoms would rival the earlier brilliance of the Pléiades in France, he argued, a poetic constellation itself a well-considered *imitatio* of Dante Alighieri's and Petrarch's earlier promotion of an Italian poetic vernacular via projects intimately, even genealogically, connected with the Latin *auctores* (Brownlee). Then as now, the stakes of such translations were high, especially if one got the translation wrong.

Novel Translations charts just one of the paths by which newness—in its avatars as fashion, novelties, and the novel—entered the European world in the decades around 1700. Newness, as Homi Bhabha reminds us, is the unstable precipitate of cultural translation. It is essentially related to the foreignness (*Fremdheit*) between and of languages, what Benjamin famously called the untranslatable nucleus of the original, a hard kernel of difference glossed by Bhabha as "the *element of resistance* in the process of transformation, 'that element in a translation which does not lend itself to translation'" (*Location of Culture* 224).¹³ Newness's affinities with translation are thus not elected but ontogenetic.

My title *Novel Translations* intends to recall how these critical terms, *newness* and *translation*, are joined at the hip. Both title and subtitle also designate a specific chapter in the history of newness and the work of cultural translation. They should also signal the importance of transnational space and place to this history, recalling that translation is of course never singular, always *unheimlich*. The *Translations* of the title thus marks a location in flux, one perched on "the borderline negotiations of cultural translation," a locus in-between, Bhabha's "interstitial place" (*Location of Culture* 227). They inhabit a place touched by the nations whose territories they traverse while not essentially of them. Long unseen by historians of the nation, novel translations—far less celebrated than those of a Dacier of a Homer—and the space that they created emerge anew, transformed by their detour through twentieth-century theory. Only now do we see in them a space of "an empowering condition of hybridity; an emergence that turns 'return' into reinscription or redescription" (Bhabha, *Location of Culture* 227).

13. Bhabha is quoting from Benjamin's seminal essay "The Task of the Translator." On the untranslatable, see also Apter.

The cultural historical moment around 1700, long so tersely described, looks quite different from our present place, dotted with posts signing a collective loss of faith in grand narratives: not only the nation, but also reason, progress, originality, art, to name only a few. In the last decade, several important German-language studies of these neglected years have begun the work of revision and translation.¹⁴ Our ears are open to a time lived under the sign of crisis.¹⁵ In years once considered by literary histories as epigonal (after *l'âge classique*, the English Renaissance, the German *Barock*), as premature (rococo, *frühe Aufklärung*), or as monstrously hybrid, something speaks to us anew. The present book thus attends to the voices drowned out by critic-censors whose shrillness at times recalls Heidegger; many of these voices, it turns out, have interesting things to say. To elicit these voices, we must change our questions.

From a different vantage point, we can begin to counteract the disciplinary effects of narratives that tell the novel's national rise. A pre-post-national view provides a needed antidote to Lessing's consequential *laudatio* of *Agathon* as the first German novel suitable for a thinking mind—and the subsequent assignment of novels before Wieland to history's garbage dump. With resolute eclecticism, the following chapters draw from approaches that make common cause against older disciplinary formations: new historicism, new intellectual history, and the new book history or the history of material texts. Heterodoxy is always dangerous, and yet at this still early (but always preposterous) stage of writing transnational histories of the novel it must be the principle of first resort.

German commentators in the decades around 1700 often read the imitation of French culture as the arrival of an unruly woman. Novel readers were always effeminate, and they threatened to turn the world topsy-turvy. Later scholarship too squeezed novels' disorders into a restrictive corset that condemned imitation as derivative and the early novel as insufficiently national. It is precisely this disorderly figure I wish to recover, in forms foregrounded as always fragmentary, provisional, and contingent. To loosen the stays, we must borrow widely and eclectically. Synthetic approaches such as the "distant reading" proposed by Franco Moretti have

14. See, for example, Mulsow's *Moderne aus dem Untergrund*, Borgstedt and Solbach's introduction to *Der galante Diskurs*, and Simons's *Marteauss Europa*. Simons's invaluable study, for all its merits, considers only cursorily what it meant that Londoners and Leipzigers were simultaneously reading the same *French* prose fictions both in the original and in translations. In his attempted reconstruction of the "discursive landscape" in which English and German novels developed, Simons credits Delarivier Manley's scandalous histories with considerable ripple effects. Certainly within the English-novel landscape for the decade Simons considers, Manley's importance was enormous. But Manley too was responding to shifts in the market for novels that had already occurred when she (or someone else) anonymously published *The New Atalantis*. In addition to its extensive sections on Manley's *Atalantis*, *Marteauss Europa* devotes a short section to other female authors of the early eighteenth century (639–46), including there two French writers, Aulnoy and DuNoyer. Aulnoy seems to have been Manley's explicit model for *Queen Zarah* (1705) (see Ballaster). While recognizing Aulnoy's popularity in early eighteenth-century London, Simons radically understates the importance of French innovations in the market for novels.

15. Hazard's 1935 *Crise de la conscience européenne* retains much of its currency.

their place here.¹⁶ But to imagine the aesthetic pleasures readers found in these novels, to reconceive the seminal labor of fashion, we must ask still other questions. I have drawn them from diverse methodological traditions united, perhaps exclusively, by their attention to the relations of power figured in and by discourse.

The wealth of unknown materials that emerge in these explorations of heterodox questions helps to dispel the lingering assumption that the German discussion of letters and the book was moribund in the decades around 1700.¹⁷ Because they have long been censored, I present them here in fulsome detail. Longer excerpts attest to the diversity of voices that discoursed on Germans' love for new fashions (poetic fashions and reading fads included), their imitation of the French (or their damning of them) in new and various forms, and their pursuit of worldliness in the pages of novels. The disorderliness documented in *Novel Translations*—skirmishes along the shifting lines fencing the *res publica litteraria* and the world of commerce, rampant piracy, and the blurring of national borders—was part and parcel of the *Roman* between 1680 and 1730. To write its history requires another order than that of traditional literary history.

Novel Translations tells a story of Parisian fashion on the European margins. More importantly, it documents the history of how the periphery refashioned the metropolitan. On the margins, the novel popularized reading and commodified the book, launching a daring assault on the borders of the world of letters and transforming the literary field (Bourdieu). Fashion makes the man, we know; it also invents new literary practices. Literary novelties abounded in the seventeenth century, the genre of the vernacular poetic handbook (*Regelpoetik*) among them.

16. In his widely read article, "Conjectures on World Literature," published in 2000, Moretti makes the case for "distant reading," anticipating the figures and tools he subsequently explores in the essays collected in *Graphs, Maps, Trees*. "Conjectures" compares distant reading to the day of synthesis requiring years of analysis (Moretti quotes Bloch), illustrated by Wallerstein's synthesis of others' analyses into system. Analysis, or "close reading," Moretti emphasizes, remains in literary history finally a "theological exercise—whereas what we really need" to produce world literary history "is a little pact with the devil" (57). This Faustian global literary history, Moretti suggests, can proceed only in abstractions, far removed from any particular object of analysis or subject of close readings: "the more ambitious the project, the greater the distance" (57). Dimock's work on genre sustains a productive dialogue with Moretti, proposing methods drawn from geology and astronomy to account for the detail lost by Moretti's abandonment of close reading. Signaling her allegiance to Spivak's call for planetarity in *Death of a Discipline*, Dimock alleges that "the loss of detail" that Moretti readily concedes "is almost always unwarranted" ("Genre as World System" 90). Spivak's reply to Dimock critiques both Moretti's and Dimock's reliance on kinship models of genre, proposing instead the model of creolity or "the delexicalization of the foreign" ("World Systems" 106), a process not unlike Benjamin's suggestion that the translator must make German Chinese.

17. This assumption remains more widely held by Germanists working in North America than in Germany, despite the obvious productivity of an expanded concept of literature (*Literaturbegriff*). Nowhere is the assumption more obvious than in the curricula followed by numerous American German departments, which fail to train students, even at the graduate level, in premodern traditions. While medieval and early modern studies have experienced brilliant renaissances in English, romance, and comparative literature departments, German limps behind, crippled by institutional insistence that literature before 1750 is simply not important enough to be studied.

When Opitz launched the genre in 1624 he also bitterly complained, as chapter 1 discusses, that poetry had become a fashionable commodity. The complaint, hypocritically enough, echoed loudly in the scores of subsequent handbooks compiled in imitation of Opitz's slim volume.

In the long and uneven history of consumption, the decades around 1700 appear particularly lumpy as ever more participants elbowed their way onto an increasingly vernacular and crowded literary field. Newness and novelties, including many in print, became ever more tightly braided with German's articulation of Frenchness. Across Europe by the 1680s, the hottest fashion was gallantry, a form of the "French imitation" that Thomasius famously theorized at the end of that decade, also subject of chapter 2. Both novelty (newness) and Frenchness were, for many, equally problematic for the latitude they gave to female readers and writers. While some—Thomasius, and before him Opitz—imitated properly (*imitatio, Nachahmung*), others poached (Certeau), none more problematically than gallant Woman.

While the first two chapters stand under the sign of my title's *Novel*, the second two turn squarely to *Translations*. Processes of transculturation touched on in the book's first half come to the fore in the second. Narratives driven by events from 1688 in chapter 3 and from 1696 in chapter 4 help me create the plural history, *Novel Translations*. Plucked from the countless historical traces held by the libraries and archives I have mined, they allow me to sketch two key moments in the genre's transnational history: its initial import and its subsequent domestication. As is so often the case for work that reads culture as text, no hard and fast rules of selection apply. My choice of events, or what Ezra Pound famously called "luminous details," can be born out only by "the actual practice of teaching and writing" (Gallagher and Greenblatt 15)—in other words, by the stories these chapters offer.¹⁸

This event-driven narrative technique permits the *disorderliness* needed to recover the repressed disorder of the early novel. It is not simply messy. Rather, the juxtaposition of diverse events works to produce "an effect of heterogeneity" and to disrupt "the traditional orderliness of most histories of literature" (Hollier et al. xix).¹⁹ In 1688, as the new novel was imported into German, the *Roman* became simultaneously poetical and popular. *Literati* such as Albrecht Christian

18. In their anti-programme programmatic essay in *Practicing New Historicism*, Gallagher and Greenblatt linger over the ineluctability of the historian's choice, reminding us of the interpretative freedom accompanying the responsibility of the choice. They write: "We ask ourselves how we can identify, out of the vast array of textual choices in a culture, which are the significant ones, either for us or for them, the ones most worth pursuing. Again it proves impossible to provide a theoretical answer, an answer that would work reliably in advance of plunging ahead to see what resulted. We have embarked upon what Ezra Pound in an early essay calls 'the method of Luminous Detail' whereby we attempt to isolate significant or 'interpreting detail' from the mass of traces that have survived in the archive, but we can only be certain that the detail is indeed luminous, that it possesses what William Carlos Williams terms 'the strange phosphorous of life,' in the actual practice of teaching and writing" (15).

19. This principle of heterogeneity practiced by Hollier and the authors of *A New History of French Literature* was carried on in *A New History of German Literature* by Wellberry et al.

Roth increasingly found themselves crossed by writers and publishers who recognized the *Roman's* profit potential in the pages, for example, of Thomasius's newsy journal *Monthly Conversations*. In 1696, one man, August Bohse, sought to bring the proliferation of *Roman* production in German under the authorial control promised by his chosen pseudonym, Talander. Plagiarized, robbed, and allegedly cheated, Bohse attempted to direct the massive production that passed under Talander's name. While literary history has neglected most gallant writers, the literary marketplace rewarded them in their day. Translators like Talander inhabit the terra incognita of transnational literary history.

The genre's steady encroachment on the hallowed ground of poetry and letters was not uncontested, its trespasses unforgiven. Its opponents, men of letters such as French academician and ancient partisan Nicolas Boileau (1636–1711), famously sought to consign it to the waters of Lethe. Beyond France, critics such as Johann Mencke (1674–1732), editor of the *Acta eruditorum*, joined Boileau in the quixotic attempt to rout the allegedly effeminizing *Roman* from the literary field and to wipe its last trace from historical memory. Our Swiss critic of the *Roman* placed its readers beyond the pale of civilization, such was their delight in execrable stories. Borrowing from Plutarch's "On Garrulosity" in the *Moralia*, Heidegger pronounced the harshest of judgments on novel readers:

Nemlich ihre Ohren (Augen) sind den Schrepf=Köpfen oder *Ventosen* nicht gar ungleich/ dann wie diese das fäulste und ungesundste Geblüt abzapfen/ also nehmen jenne nur das schlimmste und schändlichste zubehalten auf: und/ besser zu reden/ wie die wolangeordnete Stätte einige unehrliche Porten zuhaben pflegen/ dadurch man die *Maleficanten*/ oder auch den Ohnrath der Sprach=Häuser f.h. außführet/ nichts ehrliches/ aber da auß= oder ingehet/ also passiert durch die Ohren vorwitziger Leuth nichts fast ehrliches/ sonder allein lose garstige Erzehlungen/ und Stanckwerck. (138)

Their ears and eyes are not unlike chamber pots: these collect the most poisoned and unhealthy fluids, and so novel readers' eyes and ears gather up also the most bad and damaging things. To speak more clearly, well-regulated places typically have dishonorable gates through which *Maleficanten* are taken out or the waste from houses of ease, but nothing honest either enters or exits through them. So too nothing but corrupted stories and putrefaction passes through the ears of such meddling people other than only lewd, foul stories and stinking stuff.

While Heidegger's specters of pollution may have been extreme, they were visions widely shared. Scores of critics saw tracts into print designed to stem the novel's rise. "The German Patriot," whom we will encounter in chapter 2, militated against the genre as a French ruse. It was, he and his brothers in arms across Europe trumpeted in alarm, a Trojan horse of French design. This fashionable reading material encouraged loose morals among untutored readers, and it infected

the body politic with the “French disease,” syphilis, rendering it impotent to withstand Gallic pretensions to “universal hegemony.” Early modern cultural translation often entailed infection, decline, and decay. Figures of disease inhabit the dark side of renaissance. They also comment—problematically, interestingly—on our own celebration of hybridity and the productive work of translation.

The view from Leipzig, then, reveals how the European geography of the novel was transformed in the decades between 1680 and 1730. Core and periphery were on the move. By 1680, Paris and its culture makers exercised a magnetic pull on the genre’s European geography. The capital of French fashion was at the symbolic (if not always the actual) center of prose production. On the map of the early novel, all roads led to Paris. By the 1720s, however, the genre’s topography was shifting fast. By the end of that decade, as I discuss in the conclusion, London, not Paris, had become the novel’s new metropole, both the novel’s origin and its destination. From Leipzig, we clearly see how readers on the periphery shaped the metropole’s very location.

The early, “French” chapter in the genre’s international history is crucial. It is my hope that historians with the necessary competencies will continue the work of fleshing out a more precise geography of the European novel in this phase. Just how far did Paris’s metropolitan influence extend? What became of those Spanish and Italian examples so quickly elided by Huet? But for all its importance, this particular chapter in the genre’s history is not the whole story. Borrowing again from Moretti, this project suggests that the French chapter is one among many shifts in the genre’s apparently cyclical meanderings. It came to an end when the novel’s aura of Frenchness had worn off. With the growing popularity of English novels on the European market, a commercial success marked most visibly by the *succès de scandale* that *Robinson Crusoe* fast became, a new chapter in the genre’s history began.²⁰

The *roman*’s initial popularity stemmed from the religious, cultural, political, and military turbulence that shook the continent in the decades around 1700, rattling from England in the northwest to the Ottoman Empire in the southeast. The genre was a product of a shrinking world, and it proliferated across often hostile borders. In the communication and trade networks that knit the continent ever more tightly together, the novel appealed to and created a broad readership eager for news and accounts of the contemporary, cosmopolitan world, a readership whose members extended well beyond the exclusive purview of the *litterati*, the learned men to whom we now turn.

20. In *Graphs*, Moretti postulates the cycle of generations as providing the structure of the novel’s history. His stress on the cycles of the novel—of normal literature and its generational time span (twenty-five to thirty years)—seeks to correct histories of the (English) novel, which mistake another cycle for a singular shift (William Warner’s “elevation of the novel” in the early eighteenth century or April Alliston’s “great gender shift” at midcentury) (26). All great theories of the novel, Moretti observes in the conclusion to his essay, “have precisely reduced the novel to one basic form only (realism, the dialogic, romance, meta-novels . . .); and if the reduction has given them their elegance and power, it has also erased nine tenths of literary history. Too much” (30).